Loyola University Chicago
Loyola eCommons

Dissertations | Theses and Dissertations

1994

What Teachers Do in the Classroom: A Study on the Use of Research-Based Instructional Practices in Reading

Virginia-Ellen Goodman
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss

Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Goodman, Virginia-Ellen, "What Teachers Do in the Classroom: A Study on the Use of Research-Based Instructional Practices in Reading" (1994). *Dissertations*. 3303.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/3303

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License.
Copyright © 1994 Virginia-Ellen Goodman

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

WHAT TEACHERS DO IN THE CLASSROOM: A STUDY ON THE USE OF RESEARCH-BASED INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES IN READING

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
DOCTORATE OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

VIRGINIA-ELLEN GOODMAN

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

January, 1994

Copyright by Virginia-Ellen Goodman, 1993
All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is important that I express my appreciation and gratitude to those individuals most responsible for guiding me through this entire process of conducting this study. I am thankful for the support and words of encouragement from Dr. Robert Cienkus who served as Chair. I thank Dr. Barney Berlin for his support in helping me develop the instrument. I am grateful to Dr. Jack Kavanagh for the endless support he provided me during the stages of data analysis.

I owe a special thank you to Dr. Genevieve Lopardo who graciously provided me with words of encouragement, expectations of persistence, and endless patience. I am eternally grateful for her professional expertise and friendship.

I am especially grateful to the principals and teachers who participated in this study. Also, I owe a special thank you to Dr. Ora McConner Jones.

I thank my mother, Winifred H. Jones for her love and unwavering support. I thank my brother, Dr. Courtney P. Jones, who has enthusiastically supported all of my life endeavors. I also thank Beverly and Linda for being my friends.

Finally, I dedicate this study to the memory of my father, Irvin L. Jones, who had a passion for knowledge and a steadfast love of reading. He was my inspiration.

VITA

The author, Virginia-Ellen Goodman, received her elementary and secondary education in the Chicago Public School system.

She received her Bachelor of Arts in Sociology and Psychology from William Penn College in Oskaloosa, Iowa in 1971. In 1979, she received a Masters of Science in Education in the Teaching of Reading from Chicago State University.

Mrs. Goodman began her teaching career in 1972. As a reading specialist, she taught primarily the eighth grade. She has served in the following positions: director of a summer school program, chairperson for the Black Urban Child conference in affiliation with the Archdiocesan School Board, and reading coordinator for elementary school teachers--grades kindergarten through 6. She has taught in the reading clinic at Chicago State University. Presently, the author is an assistant professor in the reading department at Chicago State University.

Mrs. Goodman is a member of the International Reading Association; the American Educational Research Association; the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; Phi Delta Kappa, Loyola chapter; the Chicago State University chapter of Alpha Upsilon Alpha, an honorary society of the International Reading Association; and The National Sorority of Phi Delta Kappa, Mu chapter.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iii
VITA iv
LIST OF TABLES vii
CONTENTS OF APPENDICES ix

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1
A. Elements Of A Research-Based Curriculum 2
Whole Language 3
Critical Thinking 4
Cooperative Learning 6
B. Research-Based Studies 8
C. A Traditional Curriculum 14
D. Educationally Disadvantaged Students 14
E. Influence of Policy on Instruction 15
F. Summary of Study 17

II. RELATED RESEARCH
A. Studies On Related Research 20
B. Summary Of Selected Literature Review 37
C. Significance Of Present Study 38

III. DESIGN OF STUDY
A. Introduction 40
B. The Survey Instrument 41
C. Pilot Study 50
D. Sample 57
E. Statistical Procedures 58

IV. Analysis Of Data
A. Whole Language 61
B. Critical Thinking 71
C. Cooperative Learning 75
D. Influence Of Local School Policy 81
E. Results Of Telephone Interviews/
Classroom Observations 84
F. Classroom Observations 85
Grade 8 Class 85
Grade 5 Class 86

G. Demographic Results Of Survey 87
H. Statistical Analysis 90

V. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, IMPLICATIONS
A. Summary 96
B. Discussion Related To Hypothesis One 97
C. Discussion Related to Hypothesis Two 99
D. Discussion Of Statistical Analysis 100
E. Recommendations For Further Research 101
F. Implications For Schools 101

BIBLIOGRAPHY 111

APPENDIX A 117
APPENDIX B 119
APPENDIX C 130
APPENDIX D 135
APPENDIX E 138

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Definition of Reading	62
2.	Engaging Students' Prior Knowledge Before Reading	63
3.	Combining Reading and Writing	64
4.	Instructional Materials	65
5.	Teacher Modeling Reading	66
6.	Teaching Reading Subskills	67
7.	Students Engaged During Reading	68
8.	Teaching Vocabulary	69
9.	Materials Used To Teach Vocabulary	71
10.	Predicting Story Content Before Reading	72
11.	Constructing Meaning During The Reading Lesson	73
12.	Using Questions To Construct Meaning	75
13.	How Students Are Grouped As They Work On Reading Assignments	76
14.	How Students Are Assigned To Groups	77
15.	Group Activities	79
16.	Does Your School Have A Local School Policy Concerning Instructional Practices	82
17.	Components Of Local School Policy	83
18.	Person/s Responsible For Local School Curriculum Policy	84
19.	Have You Ever Served On A Local School Curriculum Committee	84
20.	Reading Definition And Critical Thinking	92
21.	Reading Definition And Cooperative Learning	92
22.	Reading Definition And Whole Language	93
23.	Whole Language - Critical Thinking	94
24.	Whole Language - Cooperative Learning	94
25.	Variables In The Equation	95
26.	Classroom Organization	130
27.	How Students Are Grouped For Reading Instruction	130
28.	Number Of Reading Groups	130
29.	Overall Reading Ability Of Students	130
30.	Racial Composition Of Class	131
31.	Classroom Enrollment	131
32.	Percentage Of Students Receiving A Free Lunch	131
33.	Current Assignment	132
34.	Number Of Years In Present Position	132
35.	Number Of Years Teaching	132

36. Area Of Certification 132
37. Educational Background 133
38. Major In College - Undergraduate 133
39. Major In College - Graduate 133

CONTENTS OF APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
A.	Teacher Letter	116
B.	Teacher Survey	118
C.	Demographic Data	129
D.	Results Of Illinois Goal Assessment Program	134
E.	Responses To Questions In Which "Other" Was Indicated	137

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

A research-based curriculum in reading includes instructional practices that allow the learner to engage in self-regulated learning, metacognitive development, and educative social development. Advocates of a research-based curriculum consider the teacher as a facilitator of the learning process. At the opposite end of the spectrum is a traditional curriculum which tends to be subject-centered.

The emphasis of a traditional curriculum is the acquisition of knowledge as the end product with the teacher taking charge of the learning process for themselves as well as students.

Increased student achievement is the goal of a research-based and traditional curriculum. However, the former capitalizes and values the prior knowledge of students and guides students in assuming ownership of their learning experiences, all of which facilitates transfer of learning (Bruner, 1977; Palinscar & Brown, 1989). Central to a traditional curriculum is the subject matter which is the embodiment of facts, knowledge, and mastery of skills. Conceptually, the purpose of a traditional curriculum is to impart ideas and facts to the learner in order to build a knowledge base. There is little concern for the learner's prior experience nor are the learner's experiences paramount in the consideration of development of the curriculum.

In the context of this study, a research-based curriculum is guided by a theoretical framework of the reading process consisting of elements shown to be viably sound when put into practice. Such elements include a focus on whole language which includes a reading and writing connection, critical thinking and reasoning which encompasses metacognitive and self-regulated learning, and cooperative learning to promote individual and social growth and heterogeneous grouping. For purposes of this study, a traditional curriculum in reading includes use of a basal reader, a related workbook, related worksheets, and homogeneous grouping.

Elements of A Research-Based Curriculum

A research-based curriculum consists of instructional practices that have been validated by classroom research studies. An analysis of these studies has shown that a curriculum grounded in critical reasoning, holistic development, and cooperative learning facilitates meaningful, consistent, and enduring learning, especially for educationally disadvantaged students (Means & Knapp, 1990; Slavin, 1989/90). This type of curriculum is embedded in such theoretical components as whole language, critical thinking which assists the learner in self-regulated reading, and cooperative learning which integrates reading and writing (Collins, Hawkins, & Carver, 1991; Stevens, Madden, Slavin, & Farnish, 1987; Palinscar & Brown, 1989).

Whole Language

Whole language is considered a philosophy rather than a reading strategy. The objective of a whole language philosophy is to use those natural elements within an individual that bring about reading and writing.

Whole language proponents (Weaver, 1990) suggest several important factors related to the philosophy:

1. Learning is meaningful when students are actively engaged in the process.

2. Learning occurs naturally with little direct instruction: this is within the context of what students already know prior to arrival at school.

3. Teachers who believe in and practice the whole language philosophy serve as facilitators rather than imparters of knowledge.

4. Teachers engage in realistic, functional, reading, writing, listening, and speaking.

Crafton (1990) says that the process of whole language is guided by six principles.

1. Language develops from whole to part--young children communicate in their language as a whole and not in a fragmented manner.

2. Language is embedded in a social framework--children are constantly engaged in conversations with people in their lives--reading and writing is a communication process.

3. Literacy and language are developed through real, meaningful use--such behaviors are developed in daily activities such as trips to the grocery store and playground interactions.

4. The process of reading and writing needs to be modeled for students--to demonstrate the reading/writing process from start to

finish--those who are involved with students personally must show their own reading and writing process.

5. Students should be encouraged to take risks--any type of learning involves risk taking.

6. Students must take ownership for their learning--taking ownership involves knowing when comprehension is occurring, having the ability to initiate specific strategies to stimulate comprehension, and developing a purpose for engaging in the learning process.

According to its proponents, whole language allows students to become immersed in print. Whole language provides students the opportunity to share with and to listen to others. It also provides students the opportunity to write about and read their experiences. During this process, teachers share, demonstrate, and model their processes of reading, writing, thinking, and reflecting. The role of teachers is a collaborative one rather than control of the learning situation.

Critical Thinking

Critical thinking is an active process in which the learner addresses a problem which at first glance can be perplexing. This process includes but is not limited to reasoning, problem solving, making generalizations, and strategy building. Ericson, Hubler, Bean, Smith & McKenzie (1987) define critical thinking in terms of critical reading which involves the learner in thinking analytically in order to evaluate what is read. Bruner (1977) identifies two types of thinking, analytical and intuitive. Analytical thinking engages the learner in systematic

inductive and deductive reasoning. Intuitive thinking is a form of thinking that requires no systematic purposeful action in solving a problem (Bruner, 1977).

According to Ennis (1985), critical thinking is reflective and reasonable thinking. This type of thinking guides the learner in focusing in on deciding what to believe or what to do. Embedded in this definition are formulating hypotheses, formulating questions, identifying alternatives, and developing plans for experiments (Ennis, 1985).

Thistlewaite (1990) defines critical reading as being related to such key concepts as schema, metacognition, and writing. Schema is the organization of knowledge in an individual's mind (Anderson & Pearson, 1986). This knowledge is derived from experiences that the learner has encountered. Another way to view schema is to think of it as a mental outline. May (1990) refers to this outline as a mini-theory that helps a reader predict sequential events in a reading selection.

Metacognition, another element of thinking critically, involves setting a purpose for reading, determining whether or not comprehension is taking place, and, if not, being able to activate a variety of strategies that will facilitate comprehension (Palinscar & Brown, 1989). Metacognitive reading behavior also facilitates self-regulated reading. It is characterized by readers taking ownership of their learning and being able to take appropriate measures when understanding fails. In order for students to become self-regulated learners who incorporate metacognitive strategies, instructional practices should include teaching students

a variety of strategic approaches given the structure of the text, teaching students how to monitor their comprehension in order to initiate a given strategy if comprehension fails, and teaching students the connection between strategic activity and learning outcomes so they are able to engage in self-regulated learning (Palinscar & Brown, 1989; Weinstein, 1987).

In the context of this study, critical thinking is defined as teachers providing a learning environment in which students can develop their metacognitive skills and engage in strategic learning.

Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning involves students working collectively towards a common goal (Sharan & Sharan, 1989-90). Usually these goals are associated with classroom assignments and projects. Some of the effects of cooperative learning on students are building positive relationships with other students, face to face interaction which provides students with the opportunity to see other students in the context of working together collaboratively, individual accountability, and group processing (Johnson & Johnson, 1989/90). It is not sufficient to assign students to groups with directions to complete an activity. Rather, students should be provided with the opportunity to experience working collectively with each member, and, at the same time having a specified task. A cooperative learning environment assists students in valuing each other and drawing upon each other's strengths. Not only are students experiencing interdependence, they

also learn about individual accountability. Thus their contributions or lack of contributions will affect the groups scores (Johnson, et al., 1989/90; Slavin, et al., 1989/90).

There are several cooperative learning models, Student Team Achievement Divisions, STAD, Team Assisted Instruction, TAI, and Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition, CIRC (Ornstein, 1990; Slavin, Madden & Stevens, 1989/90). The STAD model of cooperative learning involves students being assigned to groups according to their rank which is determined by their test scores or grades. Students are then divided into thirds or quarters. One student is from each division (Ornstein, 1990). The TAI model is somewhat different in that the teacher pre- and posttests students over certain skills that must be mastered. Students work individually on their skills with assistance from team members. Once a student has achieved 80% or better on a practice quiz, they have earned the right to take the final exam (Ornstein, 1990). What makes these two models examples of cooperative learning is that students work collectively as a group providing encouragement and assistance. According to Ornstein (1990), both models include the following components:

1. Each group concentrates on a lesson presented by the teacher. Members assist and encourage one another.

2. Group Scores are the average of each member's individual score.

3. Groups are recognized for their work which can be for high scores or improvement.

4. New groups are formed every five or six weeks. This gives students the opportunity to work with other students as well as providing the opportunity for members of low scoring groups to improve (Ornstein, 1990).

Research-Based Studies

Results of a study conducted by Morrow (1992) showed that a literature-based instructional program does increase literacy achievement. Literacy can be defined as one's ability to think critically, read critically, and write critically (Shor, 1987). All of these elements are at higher levels than functional thinking, reading, and writing. To achieve literacy, students must be immersed in a variety of reading selections; there must be shared purpose for reading embedded in high expectations; students must be guided in taking ownership of their learning; teachers must model their own literate behavior; students must be allowed to work collaboratively with others; and the act of reading and writing must be integrated (Cambourne, 1988; Holdaway, 1979; Teale, 1984; in Morrow, 1992). Morrow's study investigated the effects of a literature-based instructional program on literacy achievement and attitudes, particularly with culturally diverse students. Two treatments in this study included a literature program in conjunction with basal instruction: one that was school-based and one that was school and home-based. The control group received traditional instructional practices. Instruction for the control group consisted of the use of basal readers. Students were, however, allowed to read trade books after completion of reading instruction.

Subjects who participated in Morrow's study were in second grade. Overall, the two experimental groups did better on measures of literacy achievement (probed recall and oral and written retelling). There was no indication that the school-based treatment and school/home-based treatment were significantly different. Standardized achievement results were about the same across the three groups. Morrow points out that traditional instruction (i.e., use of basal readers) lends itself conceptually to a skills oriented standardized assessment. Regarding students from diverse backgrounds, minority students demonstrated improvement in achievement given exposure to a literature-based instructional program. This last finding is significant because generally, minority students classified as being at risk of academic failure tend to receive a diluted curriculum which emphasizes rote learning, skills in isolation, and lower level cognitive skill development, and these students seldom receive the opportunity to learn in a constructive social setting (Means and Knapp, 1991).

Stevens, Madden, Slavin, & Farnish (1987) conducted two studies to investigate the effects of cooperative learning on reading and writing. These investigators used the Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) model. Subjects were in the third and fourth grades. A general description of the CIRC model follows.

The CIRC model is comprised of three elements, basal related activities, direct instruction in reading comprehension, and integrated language arts/writing (Stevens, et al., 1987).

Students are grouped homogeneously according to their reading level as determined by the teacher. Reading instruction is carried out in a traditional manner: teacher directed instruction, modeling, checking for understanding, and guided practice, followed by independent practice by students. Within groups of eight of fifteen members, students are subgrouped forming pairs or triads. Pairs or triads of students work together on follow-up activities. These are activities that are related directly to instruction from the teacher. Once students have gained facility with a particular activity, the pairs or triads form a team with pairs or triads from another group resulting in heterogeneous team. Once teams have been formed, the result is two pairs or triads from the high group and two from the low group. Remedial and academically handicapped students are distributed among the teams. Students work on a variety of activities in which they provide assistance and encouragement to one another. Basal reading activities include a teacher directed lesson, setting the purpose for reading, introduction of vocabulary, review of old terms, and student discussion after the reading. Once selections have been read, students engage in partner activities within their teams. Such activities include partner reading in which students take turns reading aloud while the other listens and corrects errors. Students discuss the plot and predict the resolution at the midpoint of the reading selection. After this activity, students engage in a writing activity which may involve writing a different ending or summarizing. Research has shown that such activities as predicting, summariz-

ing, and paraphrasing enhance comprehension (Stevens, et al., 1987; Palinscar & Brown, 1989).

Regarding vocabulary instruction, students are provided a list of words that are either new or difficult. Partners assist each other in the pronunciation with the goal of fluency. Vocabulary instruction calls for students defining the words according to the dictionary, paraphrasing the definition, and writing a sentence that demonstrates the denotation of the word. When students are tested, total scores are averaged, thereby obtaining one score for the group. The writing component of the CIRC model involves process writing.

The study conducted by Stevens et al., (1987) included an experimental and control group. The former received instruction using the CIRC model; the control group received traditional instruction in reading. The latter consisted of using the basal series in three reading groups, with workbooks and worksheets for seatwork or follow-up activities. Subjects were administered the California Achievement Test as pre- and posttest measures. Results indicated those students instructed using the CIRC model did significantly better on the reading and writing standardized test than the control group. According to the investigators, those students receiving instruction using the CIRC model did significantly better on two major reading skills, decoding and comprehension (Stevens et al., 1987).

In another study, Konopak (1988) investigated the effects of vocabulary learning under contextual constraints. Typically, a traditional vocabulary lesson entails presenting the words in isolation. A research-based learning experience

draws upon the concept of contextual analysis. According to Konopak (1988), recent studies have shown that word meaning acquisition based solely on textbook content actually may range from, non, to limited, to reasonably complete knowledge. The strength of the text is determined by the nature of the context as to the worth, that is, the consideration of it being misleading or not, implicit or explicit, complete or incomplete (Konopak, 1988). In analyzing the worthiness of the context, Konopak conducted a study in which two history passages and two economic passages were examined in regards to vocabulary learning in conjunction to contextual information. One of the passages was maintained in its original form, and the other was revision. The revised passage included contextual consideration of proximity, clarity of connection, explicitness and completeness. Proximity refers to the closeness of the context and the key word being clear and understandable; explicitness means the contextual information should be concrete and not inferential in nature; completeness indicates the thoroughness of the context.

Subjects were eighth grade students whose Stanford Achievement Test (1981) test scores in reading ranged from average to above average. Subjects were randomly placed into one of two groups: those students receiving the treatment in its original form or the revision. Subjects received a pretest in which the ten key words were presented in isolation; subjects had to indicate whether or not they had experience with the word. Treatment was composed of exposing the two groups to their respective passage. Regarding the revised passage, only the

sentence containing the key word was changed. These revisions were at the sentence level in order not to change the topic content but to enhance word comprehension. An example of the treatment is as follows:

Impeach is the target word.

Original sentence:

"In 1929, an attempt to impeach Long failed, and the next year he was elected to the United States Senate."

Revised Sentence:

"In 1929, an attempt to impeach, or charge Long with a crime in public office had failed, and the next year he was elected to the United States Senate."

Konopak suggests the reader must infer meaning of the target word in the original sentence. In the revised sentence, the meaning of the target word is clear because of contextual clarity and proximity. The results of Konopak's study indicated the revised text elicited greater learning for all students than did the original text.

The purpose for discussing research in this section was to present investigations that addressed the effectiveness of research-based instructional strategies in reading. It is universally agreed reading is the cornerstone for all general learning. Once mastered, those critical thinking skills associated with the reading task make reading instruction the impetus that gives body and purpose to other content area subjects. A research-based curriculum driven by a conceptual framework of reading should make all other learning possible.

A Traditional Curriculum

A traditional curriculum is usually subject-centered. The body of knowledge comes mainly from the text. In reading, lessons are generally developed according to the teacher's manual of a basal reader and its accompanying workbook. Instructional practices usually include homogeneous grouping, "round robin" oral reading and skills driven activities from worksheets (Pose & Arnold, 1989). Primary grade reading instruction is more of a "bottom-up" approach in which the focus is on word recognition and fluency (Chall, 1990). As students move into the intermediate grades the typical focus is isolated word analysis and isolated vocabulary and comprehension skill development such as main idea (stated and inferred), identification of the author's purpose and viewpoint, drawing conclusions, and characterization.

Educationally Disadvantaged Students

Educationally disadvantaged students are students who are usually achieving well below grade placement. These are students who because of their poor performance often receive a diluted curriculum and are often placed in special education classes. The concept of educationally disadvantaged students is discussed here to identify the characteristics of such student.

Educationally disadvantaged students are defined by some educators as students at risk of academic failure. In the context of this study, at risk students and educationally disadvantaged students are students who are not likely to

complete their schooling because of such extenuating factors as truancy, pregnancy, substance abuse, and single/multiple retentions due to poor academic achievement. Specifically, such students come from an environment defined by one or more of the following attributes: 1) poverty, 2) race and ethnicity, 3) family composition, 4) mother's education, and 5) language background (Pallas, 1989, p. 2). Regarding race and ethnicity and family composition, African American and Hispanic students frequently score lower on tests than do white students, are more likely to receive a curriculum that emphasizes lower level reasoning skills, and are more likely to drop out of school than are white students (Pallis, 1989; Means & Knapp, 1991). Moreover, children growing up in a single parent household frequently spend much of their childhood in poverty ". . . and [in 1988] more than seventeen million children under the age of eighteen lived in households without both parents (Pallas, 1989, p. 2)." Given the above characteristics of educationally disadvantaged students, the one attribute that can be most influenced by the school is that of achievement. The discussion now turns to policy which can influence the type of curriculum directed towards all children, especially children at risk of academic failure.

Influence of Policy on Instruction

It is important to this study to address policy because its influence is far reaching. At the local level policy can and often does determine what instructional materials will be used with students and what instructional practices will be

implemented. Sound policy and evidence of effective schooling are the components that directly affect student achievement. Effective school research states there exists in such schools evidence of strong leadership, expression of high expectation communicated to students and parents by administration and faculty, a positive school climate, and continuing monitoring and assessment of student achievement (Rauuhauser, 1991). Policy is a mandate that usually comes from the top (federal, state, local). These mandates govern such issues as teacher certification, budgetary matters, program evaluation, and curriculum issues. Lately, state boards of educations are focusing more on student achievement as in the case of the state of Illinois with the Illinois Goal Assessment Program (IGAP). Thus far, the IGAP measures reading, writing, science and social studies. The IGAP reading component emphasizes an interactive process of reading. Elements of an interactive process of reading include text characteristics, prior knowledge, reading strategies, and literacy habits and attitudes (Illinois State Board of Education, 1988). For students to be successful on this test, they must be able to do the following:

a. demonstrate knowledge and interest of the topic about to be read;

b. monitor comprehension by adjusting strategies according to the ease or difficulty of the reading task;

c. engage remedial strategies if comprehension fails;

d. demonstrate an attitude of general interest about the topic; and,

e. read different types of material.

This interactive model reflects a strategic model of reading and is based on the premise that all good readers, regardless of level of sophistication try to make sense of the reading (Illinois State Board of Education, 1988). The IGAP is an example of state level policy directly affecting the local school site. What is unique about the IGAP assessment is the emphasis on higher reasoning skills that call for students to respond to test items interactively. In order for students to do well on such a measure of achievement, the curriculum must be composed of content and learning activities that promote inquiry, problem solving, discovery, and shared experiences.

Summary of Study

The purpose of this study is to identify research-based instructional practices that teachers are using in Chicago metropolitan schools, particularly with educationally disadvantaged students. This study attempts to determine whether or not such instructional practices are driven by school-based policy.

Three questions are the focus of this investigation:

1) To what extent do teachers in the Chicago metropolitan area engage in research-based instructional practices?

2) What instructional practices are being used with educationally disadvantaged students?

3) To what extent are such practices driven by a school-based policy?

Two hypothesis are stated as follows:

1) Teachers do not use research-based instructional practices in reading with students, particularly with educationally disadvantaged students.

2) Instructional practices used by teachers are not driven by local school policy.

The significance of this study is the information provided to administrators, curriculum developers, and classroom teachers. The results of this study should indicate to school personnel the characteristics of their instructional program. Given the findings of research which promotes a curriculum that is interactive and holistic, results from this study should provide a conceptual framework for administrators and teachers in evaluating their local-site curriculum and staff development programs.

There are two major factors which may limit generalizability of the findings: the candidness in which teachers respond to questions on the survey and the number of surveys returned. In order to maintain validity of the survey, the investigator conducted follow-up interviews and classroom observations.

CHAPTER TWO

The purpose of this study was to determine those instructional strategies teachers are using in reading with their students, particularly those students labeled as being at risk of academic failure.

Curriculum is a process by which students are exposed to various learning experiences which in turn facilitate the acquisition of knowledge and more learning. There have been many opinions as well as strong debates as to the role of curriculum as children experience it (Dewey, 1938). There is the subject-centered versus learner-centered debate and a traditional methodology versus a holistic approach. The purpose for briefly mentioning curriculum here is because once a blueprint for a curriculum has been identified, there emerges a pattern of identifiable instructional practices.

Much of the curricula in American schools focus on a basic skills oriented approach. This approach is typically taught in isolation and must be mastered before students are exposed to cognitive skills of reasoning, problem solving and inquiry (Means & Knapp, 1991).

The review of literature in this chapter includes selected studies that describe instructional practices in classrooms across the United States. The final study reviewed (Kos, 1991) discusses the perceptions of four educationally disadvantaged students who are experiencing academic failure in reading.

Studies On Instructional Practices

A great deal of how a teacher presents a curriculum centers around that teacher's belief structure. Richardson, Anders, Tidwell, and Lloyd (1991) conducted a study to determine the relationship between teachers' beliefs about the teaching of reading comprehension and their classroom practices. These researchers investigated reading practices that are considered important in research. Such reading practices included consideration of the student's prior knowledge, the teaching of vocabulary, the use of a basal text, and reliance of oral or silent reading.

A teacher's system of belief and practice is generated by the knowledge that teacher possesses. In 1986, Harvey (cited in Richardson et al., 1991) defined a system of belief as a "set of conceptual representations which signify to its holder a reality of given state of affairs of sufficient validity, truth, and/or trustworthiness to warrant reliance upon it as a guide to personal thought and action (p. 562)." In other words, according to Harvey, a teacher's system of belief and practice is driven by representative ideas that are real to the individual and thereby are embraced as fact and are relied upon thus motivating specific behavior in given situations.

Given the discussion of motivating factors that determine a teacher's behavior during instruction, the authors of "The Relationship Between Teacher's Beliefs and Practices in Reading Comprehension Instruction" (Richardson, et al., 1991) were interested in determining how reading comprehension instruction is

influenced by a teacher's system of beliefs and practices. A conceptual framework of reading can be defined in a number of ways given one's experiences and perspectives. Some teachers view reading as a skill that exists apart from other content area domains. Others believe that reading is an interactive process in which the reader brings meaning to and derives meaning from the text. These disparate views of reading can also be found in the scholarly literature as well as (Harste & Burke, 1976; in Richardson et al., 1991). Earlier theoretical views suggest that reading is embodied in the context of scope and sequence skill development. This type of instruction emphasizes worksheets, use of a basal, and introduction of vocabulary in a controlled manner with varying degrees of difficulty. Also, the vocabulary is limited to the context of the reading selection presented. Later theoretical views of reading focus on the construction of meaning.

This concept of reading acknowledges the ideas, experiences, and knowledge that students bring to the reading process. The organization of the learner's knowledge is referred to as schemata. Schemata is the framework by which students relate their existing knowledge to unfamiliar concepts, thereby facilitating comprehension. Also embedded in the construction of meaning concept of reading is the whole language philosophy which advocates exposing children to authentic literature (Goodman, 1986; in Richardson, et al., 1991). Crucial to the present study is identifying what teachers know, what teachers believe, and what teachers do in regards to reading comprehension instruction. And in identifying what teachers know, believe, and do, the present study seeks

to determine whether or not the instructional practice is one of decoding or a constructivist approach in which the reader brings background knowledge to the process which facilitates learning.

In order to determine a teacher's system of belief and practice in the context or reading instruction, Richardson et al. interviewed teachers individually, made predictions about the type of instructional strategies each teacher might use given the interview, and finally observed them as they taught.

The findings of Richardson et al. indicate a strong relationship between teachers' stated beliefs about the reading process and their instructional methodologies. A majority of teachers believed in a skills/word approach to teaching reading. The authors, therefore, discovered that current theories on reading comprehension, using students' prior knowledge, contextual vocabulary development, and the inclusion of authentic reading materials, were not a part of the majority of teachers thinking nor practiced instructional behavior. For the most part, teachers relied upon basal texts with a focus on skill development (Richardson et al., 1991).

In A Place Called School, Goodlad (1984) investigated a variety of elements that affect schooling. Such elements include parental, teacher, and student expectations, classroom management, time allotment of subjects taught, and curriculum matters.

Goodlad found that for the most part classroom instructional strategies were limited, teacher directed, and skill oriented. For example, reading instruction

at the junior and senior high level included vocabulary development and word recognition. Grammar lessons focused on mechanics such as punctuation, parts of speech and sentence structure. The same was reported for mathematics, social studies, and science. Moreover, those children who were academically unsuccessful were tracked in remedial groups or classes and tended not to receive higher order reasoning skill development. In mathematics classes at the elementary level, basic skills was the focus. Inherent in social studies and science are critical thinking elements that are conducive to higher reasoning development. However, Goodlad found that students mostly used textbooks, workbooks, and worksheets with an emphasis on the mechanics of the subject. Ironically, when interviewed, the teachers in Goodlad's study felt that critical thinking, problem solving, and decision making were desired goals to incorporate in their lessons. Classroom observations demonstrated a gap between teacher beliefs and classroom practices. In Goodlad's words ". . . teachers were not able . . . to square their performance with their theory (p. 215)."

Chall, Jacob, and Baldwin (1990) conducted a study in which the purpose was to determine the lack of achievement of educationally disadvantaged students beginning at the fourth grade. According to Chall et al., children from a low socio-economic environment tend to achieve poorly compared to children from a middle/upper socio-economic environment. This lack of achievement tends to manifest itself during the middle grades and widens as these children move through their junior and senior high school years. Chall et al. selected subjects

who were classified as low income status. Status was determined by eligibility for a free or reduced priced meal. Subjects were studied over a two year period of time while they were in grades two, four, and six, and grades three, five, and seven. Teachers of students were observed and interviewed. Even though the primary purpose of this study was to determine at which grade level achievement deteriorated, the authors discussed the type of instruction children received. Results of teacher interviews and observations showed instruction consisted mainly of the use of basal readers and workbooks with an emphasis on basal skill development, particularly at the second and third grade levels. Further findings showed that overall, low SES and mainstreamed students' achievement scores were comparable. However, as low SES students passed through the middle grades, their achievement levels began to decline. Chall et al. addressed this decline in terms of those elements that make up reading instruction. According to Chall et al., primary reading instruction at the second and third grades is, and appropriately so, word recognition, specifically, words that children already know. Chall et al. state the reason for this belief is that children in the primary grades are more advanced in language and thinking than in reading skills. Another term for this recognition of children operating on a higher level in language and thinking abilities than in reading abilities is emergent literacy (Clay, 1991; Crafton, 1991; Strickland, 1990). Reading instruction from fourth grade on requires higher cognitive and linguistic performance, and the instructional materials used are more complex and technical such as with the use of social studies and science text.

Instructional practices that teachers used were very traditional in that there was emphasis on basal skill development with a focus on individual performance. There was no mention of incorporating cooperative learning nor the conceptual use of whole language. The discussion of critical thinking was addressed as an element of the curriculum in the middle grades and beyond, however, according to the authors the primary focus of reading at the primary grade level should be word recognition with fluency and to do otherwise would be to lose time in the development of word recognition (Chall et al., 1990).

Through observations, Chall et al. characterized the strength of classrooms by identifying the following variables: structure, high-level skill development, challenge, and enrichment. These four variables refer to the control of the class instructionally, critical thinking development, lessons presented at a student's instructional ability or beyond, and access to a print rich environment. It was found that these four variables directly affected basic elements of reading such as word recognition, reading comprehension, and vocabulary development. In one third grade class the teacher presented the reading lesson in a task oriented manner using the teacher's guide to check children's reading comprehension. Actual reading lessons consisted of reviewing parts of a previously read lesson, answering questions, oral reading, and sounding and defining particular words given the syllabic make-up. In a sixth grade class, the lesson centered around thirty-three words and definitions. The teacher listed the words, elicited meanings from students, supplied some meanings, then directed students to look up the

remainder of the words. The entire class period was spent on word meaning. This method of instruction did not reflect balance of the four variables of classroom characteristics. A fourth grade class which did illustrate the four variables of classroom characteristics included the use of textbooks, workbooks, tradebooks, evidence of activities which combined traditional instruction with writing and vocabulary development through interdisciplinary subjects, wall charts, and the teacher reading novels to students daily.

One major finding of the Chall et al. study was that students of poverty do not excel as well as their more affluent counterparts, particularly after leaving the primary grades. One speculation concerning this phenomenon is that more affluent children come from a more literary enhanced home environment, and as they move into the middle grades and beyond, the curriculum becomes more reasoning centered. The tasks that children of poverty are called upon to do is a different experience to which they are unaccustomed. During their primary years, these children received instruction that focused on word recognition and fluency. There was no real critical thinking experience nor development of prior knowledge.

The task of schooling children of poverty is difficult and can be frustrating given the problems that seem to be inherent in the community in which they live. Such problems include dwindling resources, inadequate facilities, transiency, and a set of diverse learning needs (Kozol, 1992; Knapp, 1991). With this in mind, Knapp (1991), along with a team of other researchers, investigated the kinds of

curriculum and instructional practices available to children of poverty. This two year study focused on mathematics, reading and writing. Fifteen schools in six districts were chosen as the samples. Teachers of grades one, three, and five students were the subjects of investigation. Two questions this study sought to answer were: What is taught to the children of poverty? How is it taught?

In the design of Knapp's study there was no randomization because the focus was to investigate the curriculum and instructional practices. Therefore, this study purposefully excluded such inhibitors as new teachers, poorly maintained classrooms, and very poor academic classes. In the area of reading, 1991 interim results were as follows: regarding what is taught in reading across the school year by grade level, basal textbooks are of predominate use in first grade; and at the third and fifth grades, teachers rely on basal and trade books.

California has implemented a state frameworks that emphasize higher order thinking skills and integrating reading and writing. Given these frameworks which are across the content areas, basal publishers have been called upon to restructure the format and content of their books, replacing traditional format and content with more literature-based reading selections, and more writing exercises in line with reading selections. Therefore, some of the classrooms in Knapp's study used transformed basals. Transformed basals have a new format and are referred to as literary readers (Knapp, 1991). The traditional basal and the literary reader were in evidence in classrooms across this study. Another interim finding reported by Knapp concerns comprehension instruction. Instructional practices

in comprehension primarily emphasized recall, locating the answer, literal understanding, and summarizing. A small percentage of higher reasoning was in evidence. These findings were across the three grade levels.

Knapp also investigated how reading is taught. Findings showed ability grouping was the primary agent of organization for classroom instruction. Ability grouping means children are usually placed in a group given their achievement level. The practice of ability grouping leads to homogeneous grouping. Such grouping often leads to differential instructional practices. Those students placed in a lower achievement group characteristically receive a curriculum that is quite basic and literal in nature, whereas those students grouped because of high achievement generally receive a curriculum that emphasizes problem solving, discovery, and critical reasoning (Goodlad, 1984; Ornstein, 1990; Means and Knapp, 1991). Even though most of the teachers in Knapp's study grouped students according to ability, some of the teachers were aware of current research-based instructional practices such as whole language and cooperative learning. These practices according to observers were used on a limited basis and it was not clear as to the impact of such practices on improved class performance. Also, according to Knapp, many of the school districts mandated a change from a traditional instructional configuration to a more holistic approach. This mandated change reflects the influence of policy on classroom instruction.

Instructional strategies in the context of Knapp's study include five elements: the opportunity to read, integrating reading and writing, focusing on

meaning, minimizing isolated skills instruction, and maximizing opportunities to discuss what was read. Less than half of the classrooms emphasized oral or silent reading.; a little over one-third of the classrooms integrated reading and writing; the three grade levels in the sample did include some learning activities that focused on understanding in regards to comprehension instruction; on the average reading instruction was somewhere in the middle between skills in isolation and skills embedded in context. Students were able to discuss what they read with their peers and their teachers about one-third of all school days.

Knapp's interim findings show that a traditional curriculum continues to be emphasized with tentative steps towards a more holistic approach. Also, policy as mandated at the district level, seems to be the reason for those tentative steps. Apparently the district has determined that an integrated, heterogeneous approach would benefit student achievement. What is not reported is the amount (or lack of) input from teachers regarding policy. In order for there to be meaningful change, the people most affected should be a part of the curriculum decisions. If a school district is current on the findings of instructional research and has decided to implement those findings, then it is critical that classroom teachers participate in the development of policy (Fullan, 1991).

School policy is an element of the educational process that can and often determines what teachers do and the organization and climate of the school. Taken from Guba's conceptualization of policy, Duke and Canady (1991) define school policy as "any official action taken at the district or school level for the

purpose of encouraging or requiring consistency and regularity (p. 2)." In this context, effective local school policy influences many aspects of schooling, one of which is curriculum, and out of curriculum one can extract instructional practices. Consistency and regularity are paramount here because student achievement is the basis for which schools are held accountable. In light of this discussion of school policy, the discourse is directed at a program that is now being implemented in California.

Known as the California curriculum frameworks, the purpose of this reform movement is to effect change in the schools and school practices. This reform movement under the auspices of policy making was designed to not only improve student achievement on paper, but to "promote substantial changes in instruction designed to deepen students mathematical understanding, to enhance their appreciation of mathematics, and to improve their capacity to reason mathematically (Cohn & Ball, 1990, p. 233)." What is clear is the California curriculum frameworks is a tool designed to move instructional practices from an isolated skills orientation to more of a problem solving, discovery, interactive mode. Change and reform involve many facets of schooling; people involved with the change are the most crucial. If the people, in this case teachers, have not been included in the development of the innovation, nor perceive a need for change, then change is not likely to happen (Fullan, 1991). On the other hand, the policy makers involved with the California reform movement are concerned not only with student outcomes, but with the delivery of instructional practices. According to

Cohen and Ball (1990), policy makers in education characterize teachers' methods of instruction as mechanical, uninteresting, and superficial, all of which do not facilitate learning growth. Despite this characterization of how teachers teach, policy makers continue to grind out educational policies in hopes of striking the one mandate that will act as a panacea for all educational outcomes. The concern is to develop and implement a policy that will strengthen instructional practices, and in order for these practices to be effective, a program must be in place to ensure successful implementation.

The California curriculum frameworks as stated earlier was designed as a tool to implement change in instructional practices across the content area. Peterson (1990) conducted a study in which mathematics was the focal point. "The purpose of the California Study of Elementary Mathematics is to examine the effects of state education reform in elementary mathematics curriculum on teaching and learning in elementary mathematics classrooms (Peterson, 1990 p. 241)." Researchers in Peterson's study observed many classrooms and interviewed teachers over a period of time. Two qualitative classroom studies are reviewed below. For purposes of identification, classrooms are referred to by number.

Classroom I

Classroom I was comprised of twenty-two students predominately from low income groups. Subjects in Classroom I were classified as low SES. Given these characteristics, the teacher of Classroom I was required to implement the Achievement of Basic Skill (ABS) model along with the California curriculum frameworks program (Peterson, 1990). The ABS instructional model includes instructional pacing and mastery, testing, and reteaching. The instructional program for Classroom I is embedded in the ABS model, and includes problem solving, the use of manipulatives, a publishers' mathematics program and materials and several textbooks approved by state-level policy makers (Peterson, 1990). Overall for Classroom I, two factors were operating simultaneously: the ABS model which can be characterized as traditional and the frameworks program which can be characterized as a thinking curriculum. According to Peterson, the teacher in this classroom engaged in a little of both models. Her overall mathematical instructional practices included individualized whole class activities and a simulation of cooperative learning. She led students in convergent learning activities, and when children were paired to work collaboratively, the children did very little speaking to one another. In fact this teacher dominated verbal interactions. This method of instruction demonstrates the wide difference between a traditional skills approach and a research-based methodology. The problem of the "right answer, wrong answer" syndrome is that children build their strategies based on their own observations of the teacher's strategies in guiding the lesson.

If the modeled behavior is one that emphasizes arriving at the right answers, then the signal sent to students is the end product of attempting to produce the right answer. According to Holt (1964), schools are a kind of temple of worship for right answers, and the way to get ahead is to lay plenty of them at the altar. The right answer environment only serves to be counterproductive to a curriculum that encourages creative and critical reasoning. The right answer, using one strategy precludes the notion of other existing viable alternatives.

Classroom II

The teacher in Classroom II can be characterized as a traditionalist. His instruction is mainly teacher oriented; students listen as he discusses, and lessons are principally drawn from a textbook (Wiemers, 1990). The school is characterized as upper middle class. Classroom II is heterogeneously grouped. There were more girls than boys, mostly white students, and a few Hispanics and African-Americans. This teacher well understands the thrust of the California frameworks curriculum which is to guide students in understanding and application. However, he does disagree as to the emphasis on how instruction is to be delivered. Policy makers, according to the frameworks program, view curriculum content and instructional practices as inseparable. The frameworks policy emphasizes developing understanding and conceptual schema, identifying global relationships, and incorporating cooperative learning, whereas the teacher in Classroom II is comfortable with and uses such instructional practices as teaching rules and procedures, relies heavily on rote memorization, and initiates

competitiveness (Wiemers, 1990). There are few to challenge this teacher's instructional practices because he has been quite successful thus far. However, there remains a philosophical difference of opinion between the policy makers and the classroom teacher. As time went on, it was observed that this teacher did incorporate some of the key ideas in the frameworks. He used pictorial representations. The problem however was that these small changes actually were reconfigurations of what he had always done mathematically with his students. These changes were, therefore, not significant. Usually, when schools are interested in implementing change, the results are first order change, which indicates that change has occurred on the surface, and the teacher's environment and beliefs and practices have not really been challenged (Fullan, 1991). Discussions between the teacher in Classroom II and the interviewer revealed the teacher's belief that significant change occurs over a period of time, especially when policy dictates radical innovative change in instructional delivery.

Four Educationally Disadvantaged Students

Thus far the discussion in this chapter has focused on instructional practices in various classrooms: (Richardson et al., 1991; Goodlad, 1984; Chall et al., 1990; Knapp, 1991; Peterson, 1990; Wiemers, 1990). What is common among these investigations is they focused on the instructional behavior of the teacher. The final discussion of this chapter is Kos' (1991) study of disabled students and their perspectives on why they think they are failing. Kos' study is

highlighted here because children are critical elements to be considered as one studies the characteristics of curriculum and instruction. In a traditional sense, one rarely has the opportunity to discover what students think of themselves during the learning process. By reviewing Kos' study, the reader is given the opportunity to become acquainted with the opinions, beliefs, and notions of students. While there are only four students, it is a step toward understanding students' interpretations of reading disability and instructional practices.

The purpose of Kos' case study was to determine the attitudes, perspectives, and beliefs of four disabled students about themselves and their instructional experiences in reading. As the author addresses these issues, she confronts the characteristics of traditional reading instruction and reading instruction that is research oriented. Kos points out that research findings on the acquisition of literacy have resulted in changes in the teaching of reading in the primary grades, however, as students get older and disabled, instructional practices change very little and tend to remain traditional.

Subjects in Kos' study were four eighth grade disabled students, two boys and two girls, two African-American and two Caucasians. Their reading levels ranged from preprimer to third grade. What appeared to be of most concern to these students was how they would function in high school during the next year given their inability to read adequately. They acknowledged quite openly that reading was difficult. Three of the students displayed adequate fluency with minimal meaning: the other was not fluent. All of the students were able to aptly

characterize their reading instruction which was primarily phonetic analysis. One of the students was agitated as he discussed his reading instruction--the teacher would urge him to sound out a word that he was unable to pronounce. It seemed as though this exchange between teacher and student was some sort of ritual whenever the student was unable to pronounce a word. Finally, if the student was unable to pronounce the word, the teacher would tell him the word.

The student who was unable to read beyond a preprimer and who had a limited sight word vocabulary was issued reading books well beyond his instructional level. He was not able to discuss the type of instruction he received.

Generally for all four students, instructional practices in reading included phonics along with other unnamed subskill reading development. Evidence of these instructional practices was taken from two sources: from the students themselves during the interview sessions and from documentation in their Individual Educational Plans (IEP). Kos makes an ironic point in her study: the very programs designed to give assistance to disabled students in reading may in fact contribute to their disability. Kos states policy seems to be the factor that inhibits the reading progress of disabled readers. Students characterized as disabled readers are often placed in learning disabled programs. According to Kos, there are several reasons why these students are placed in such programs: there may be a lack of knowledge of the reading process from teachers as well as those individuals responsible for testing and placement; evaluation procedures may be limited in that they are based on criterion measures in conjunction with

students' previous individualized educational program; guidelines that facilitate placement and structure of the program usually ensure that once placed, a student will continue to receive instructional practices that are ineffective. Kos concludes that schools are likely to encounter students who are disabled readers and their disability is likely to be exacerbated by ineffective classroom practices. Therefore, policy makers must examine such programs with the end result being the design and implementation of an efficacious curriculum that addresses the needs of such students. Finally, Kos says educators must be sensitive to reading disabled students by allowing them to vocalize their reactions, their expectations, and their visions.

Summary of Selected Literature Review

Given the findings of the reviewed studies, what appears to be evident is the typical curriculum in the classrooms observed is subject-centered oriented with an emphasis on imparting a certain knowledge of facts and ideas by means of traditional instructional practices. Instructional practices for the most part centered around teacher directed, didactic instruction driven by textbook, workbooks, and skill acquisition. This is what Friere (1990) refers to as the banking concept. The banking concept refers to the act of educating. Those with the power (because they are in possession of the knowledge) are in the position to distribute those facts that are deemed important. The teacher is in total control; the teacher does the thinking, the choosing, and the disciplining with the student in the position of

being the passive receiver (Friere, 1990). It is also evident from the review that policy may or may not influence instructional methodology.

Significance of Present Study

The significance of this study beyond the identification of instructional practices being used in the classroom is the efficacy of such instructional practices in reading, student achievement in reading, assessment of reading achievement, program evaluation and change, and staff development. In Identifying the characteristics of instructional strategies being used in the classroom, individuals in administration and curriculum development and supervision will be able to judge whether or not these practices in their schools are significantly improving or hindering student achievement, assess whether or not policy is a factor driving their instructional program, and whether or not that policy is effective. Student achievement refers not only to standardized test scores, but true literacy achievement. Schooling is more than instructional materials and product. It involves more than the student and the teacher, it involves the process of attaining continuing growth and development for each.

Another significant factor of this study includes the potential for a longitudinal study. One perceived limitation of the experimental studies discussed in Chapter One is the sample size. It is not enough to experiment with various classes across the United States to determine the strength of a research-based curriculum embedded in theoretical practices. There must be longitudinal studies

targeting the long-term effects of research-oriented instructional practices involving students from varying backgrounds, cultures, and ability. If research supports the validity of instructional practices that enhance, refine, and expand one's knowledge, thereby promoting continuing learning, policy makers and classroom teachers will be able to use the information to design and develop a curriculum undergirded by theoretical concepts of reading that are sound, reflect a research orientation, and are beneficial for all students.

Chapter Three

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to identify instructional practices in reading that teachers are using in their classrooms in the Chicago metropolitan area, particularly with educationally disadvantaged students. This investigation also sought to determine how school based policy drives those instructional practices.

This chapter contains the methodology of the study including the pilot study that was conducted to establish validity and reliability of the survey instrument, a description of the sample and statistical procedures.

This study was concerned with the following questions.

1. To what extent do teachers in the Chicago metropolitan area engage in research-based instructional practices?

2. What instructional practices are being used with educationally disadvantaged students?

3. To what extent are such practices influenced by a school-based policy?

Two hypothesis that stem from the questions are as follows:

Ho1: Teachers do not use research-based instructional practices in reading, particularly with educationally disadvantaged students.

Ho2: Instructional practices that teachers use in reading are not driven by local school policy.

The variables being studied are the levels of use of research-based instructional practices in reading and the influence of local school policy on those instructional practices.

The Survey Instrument

Instructional practices are those activities that teachers engage in with students to influence learning. These instructional practices can be characterized as traditional or research-based. In order to determine the type of instructional practices in reading teachers are using, the researcher designed a survey that questioned teachers on specific strategies they use with their students. Questions on the survey (See Appendix B) were developed around three main areas of instruction, whole language, cooperative learning, and critical thinking. In the survey, teachers were also required to identify the amount of time they spend engaged in specific strategies. They were asked to check if they used a particular strategy frequently, occasionally, seldomly, or not at all. It was determined that simply knowing which strategies teachers use was not enough to critically analyze the data, rather, knowledge of the amount of time teachers engaged in certain instructional activities would enable the researcher to analyze the data in conjunction with level of use.

Teachers of reading and reading resource teachers participated in this study. The first survey question asked whether or not respondents taught reading; if not, they did not complete the survey.

QUESTION 2: WHICH DEFINITION OF READING BEST REFLECTS YOUR DEFINITION OF THE READING PROCESS?

Three definitions of reading were presented. Teachers were required to indicate the one which best reflected a bottom-up, top-down, and interactive approach to the reading process (Bond and Tinker, 1973; Harris and Sipay, 1975; May, 1990). A bottom-up definition assumes that reading begins with the teacher focusing on the letter/sound correspondence; the top-down definition assumes reading begins with the reader using contextual information from the printed word and using previous knowledge thereby facilitating comprehension; the interactive definition is a combination of bottom-up and top-down (May, 1990). In addition to incorporating both aspects of bottom-up and top-down, the interactive approach to reading recognizes the reader brings something to the printed page. The interactive process includes a cueing system consisting of four elements: syntax, semantics, schemata and graphophonetics (May, 1990). This concept of the interactive process is important regarding instructional strategies that teachers use because it affects how they interact with students during the reading process. For example, if teachers do not hold to the definition that reading involves more than use of graphophonetics, they may constantly correct a student as they read orally regardless of the type of error or miscue.

Teachers were asked to identify their definition of reading to determine whether or not some of the instructional practices they use with their students could be associated with their beliefs about how reading occurs.

QUESTION 3: APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY MINUTES PER DAY IS YOUR READING LESSON?

The purpose of this question was to determine if there was some variation of instructional time across grade level.

QUESTION 4: INSTRUCTIONALLY, HOW DO YOU TEACH STUDENTS TO PREDICT STORY CONTENT PRIOR TO READING?

This question addressed the engagement of students in critical thinking and prior knowledge. There are various strategies teachers can use with students to predict the events in a reading selection. The survey identified 4 strategies: title of a selection, questions following a selection, pictures accompanying a selection and discussion based on students' prior knowledge. Teachers were asked to indicate other strategies they might use. Teachers were also required to indicate their level of use of these strategies.

QUESTION 5: HOW DO YOU ENGAGE STUDENTS' PRIOR KNOWLEDGE BEFORE THEY READ THE SELECTION?

The purpose of this question was to determine how teachers stimulate students' prior knowledge in whole or small group shared experiences. Teachers also had to indicate whether or not they share their own experiences as it relates to the reading selection.

QUESTION 6: HOW DO YOU ASSIST STUDENTS IN CONSTRUCTING MEANING DURING THE READING PROCESS?

Palinscar and Brown (1989) identify key characteristics of proficient readers. Such readers are able to identify major concepts within the reading selection, monitor their comprehension by evaluating whether or not comprehension is occurring and evaluating the compatibility of their prior knowledge with the text. Palinscar and Brown further discuss the value of summarizing and self-questioning as means of increasing comprehension. Drawing on the research of Palinscar and Brown, the investigator included such items as paraphrasing, self-questioning, making predictions, and the use of prior knowledge to determine how teachers help students to construct meaning.

QUESTION 7: WHAT TYPES OF QUESTIONS DO YOU USE WITH STUDENTS TO CONSTRUCT MEANING?

Response items ranged from literal questioning/discussion, follow-up questioning/discussion and students construct and answer their own questions/discussion. The purpose of this question was to not only investigate the use of questioning as a technique, but to identify the level of use of different types of questions: literal, interpretive-analytical, and follow-up. Follow-up questioning was included because it encourages students to elaborate, expand, and clarify their answers. It also generates more questions and gives students the opportunity to think about alternative answers rather than a single right answer. The purpose for including the last item, students constructing and answering their own questions/discussion, was to determine whether or not students were encouraged to

share their thinking process with their peers. Questioning is a critical element to the reading process because it builds comprehension.

QUESTION 7: HOW DO YOU COMBINE READING AND WRITING IN YOUR LESSONS?

Response items included summaries, explaining, changing the ending, describing, comparing-contrasting, and other. Items were included because they relate to instructional practices that build comprehension. The practice of combining reading and writing is an element of whole language.

QUESTION 9: HOW DO STUDENTS WORK ON READING ASSIGNMENTS?

Response items included individually, whole group, small group, and other. This question as well as questions 10 and 11 focused on cooperative learning.

QUESTION 10: IF STUDENTS WORK IN SMALL GROUPS, HOW ARE THEY ASSIGNED TO GROUPS AND WHAT PROCEDURES ARE FOLLOWED?

QUESTION 11: GROUPS ARE ENGAGED IN WHAT TYPES OF READING ACTIVITIES AFTER DISCUSSION?

The purposes of questions 9 through 11 were to determine if students work in cooperative learning groups and to investigate whether or not such grouping was an actual cooperative learning group or simply a group of students working on the same activity.

QUESTION 12: WHAT INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS DO YOU USE TO TEACH READING?

Response items included basal reader and workbook, literature, and content area text. The purpose of this question was to determine whether or not teachers rely on a basal reader, to the exclusion of other materials.

QUESTION 13: HOW DO YOU MODEL YOUR OWN PROCESS OF READING DURING INSTRUCTION?

Response items included reading aloud to students and modeling the process of arriving at an answer. Collins, Hawkins, and Carver (1991) refer to the concept of modeling, coaching, and scaffolding as methods of engaging students during the learning process. These methods are a part of the cognitive apprenticeship used to enhance learning for educationally disadvantaged students (Collins et al., 1991). Modeling is one of several methods a teacher can use for students to observe.

QUESTION 14: HOW DO YOU TEACH SUCH READING SUBSKILLS AS DRAWING CONCLUSIONS, SEQUENCE, CHARACTERIZATION, CAUSE AND EFFECT, AUTHOR VIEWPOINT, AND MAIN IDEA?

Response items included worksheets, skills embedded in the reading selection and workbooks. The purpose of question 14 was to determine if the instructional practices are contextual or in isolation, apart from a reading selection.

QUESTION 15: HOW ARE STUDENTS ACTIVELY ENGAGED DURING THE READING LESSON?

Response items included round robin reading, silent reading, and silent and oral reading. According to Ransom, Lamb, and Arnold (1988), oral reading can

be an effective strategy for teachers to use if done appropriately, however round robin oral reading is ineffective in that it does not yield beneficial information to the teacher regarding the processes used by the student. In fact, round robin oral reading is prevalent in many traditional classrooms using a skills oriented approach. The authors state oral reading is appropriate in beginning reading programs, but the benefits are minimal as readers mature. They also say that as decoding becomes automatic, there should be more silent reading. The purpose of question 15 was to determine which method among the response items teachers use with their students as they read.

QUESTION 16: HOW DO YOU TEACH VOCABULARY DURING A READING LESSON?

Response items included a holistic and traditional approach. Traditional approaches are those in which students look up and write the definition of the words or the teacher provides the meaning. Holistic approaches are those in which words are presented in sentences (context), semantic mapping.

QUESTION 17: WHAT MATERIALS DO YOU USE TO TEACH VOCABULARY?

Response items included basal reader, supplementary materials (workbooks and worksheets), and content area text. Instructional practices that reflect a whole learning process are not limited to one resource, but make use of a variety of materials to enhance learning.

QUESTION 18: APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY MINUTES PER DAY DO YOU TEACH VOCABULARY?

QUESTION 19: APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY DAYS PER WEEK DO YOU TEACH VOCABULARY?

The purpose of these questions was to determine how much time was allotted to vocabulary during the reading lesson and during the week.

QUESTION 20: DOES YOUR SCHOOL HAVE A LOCAL SCHOOL POLICY CONCERNING INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES TO BE USED BY TEACHERS?

QUESTION 21: WHICH ITEM/S LISTED BELOW IS THE PREDOMINANT COMPONENT OF YOUR LOCAL SCHOOL POLICY?

QUESTION 22: WHO IS PRIMARILY RESPONSIBLE FOR YOUR LOCAL SCHOOL CURRICULUM POLICY?

QUESTION 23: HAVE YOU EVER SERVED ON A LOCAL SCHOOL CURRICULUM POLICY-MAKING COMMITTEE?

Components of a local school policy include a school improvement plan or classroom action plans. In some situations teachers are expected to use a particular basal or to incorporate specific instructional models in their lessons such as whole language or cooperative learning. Teachers were also required to identify those individuals responsible for their local school curriculum policy. Question 21 response items were Local School Council (LSC), Principal, teachers. Teachers were also asked whether or not they ever served on a local school curriculum policy-making committee and if so, how recently. The purposes for

questions 22 and 23 were to determine whether or not teachers participate in the development of local school policy and the amount of influence of local school policy on instructional practices in reading.

QUESTION 24: HOW WOULD YOU CHARACTERIZE YOUR CLASSROOM?

QUESTION 25: HOW DO YOU GROUP YOUR STUDENTS FOR READING?

QUESTION 26: HOW MANY READING GROUPS DO YOU TEACH?

QUESTION 27: PLEASE CHARACTERIZE THE OVERALL READING ABILITY OF YOUR READING GROUPS?

QUESTION 28: WHAT IS THE PREDOMINANT RACIAL COMPOSITION OF YOUR CLASSROOM?

QUESTION 29: WHAT IS THE ENROLLMENT OF YOUR CLASSROOM?

QUESTION 30: WHAT IS THE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS IN YOUR CLASSROOM RECEIVING A FREE LUNCH?

These questions concerned the characteristics of the classroom such as regular education, special education, self-contained, departmental, bilingual, Chapter I, and state Title I, grouping (heterogeneous-homogeneous) for reading, number of reading groups, overall reading ability of students, ethnicity of students, enrollment of the class and the percentage of students receiving a free lunch. Question 30 was included in the survey in order to determine the percentage of students who could be characterized as educationally disadvantaged.

QUESTION 31: WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT ASSIGNMENT?

QUESTION 32: NUMBER OF YEARS IN PRESENT POSITION

QUESTION 33: NUMBER OF YEARS TEACHING

QUESTION 34: IN WHAT AREAS ARE YOU CERTIFIED?

QUESTION 35: EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

QUESTION 36: MAJOR IN COLLEGE AS AN UNDERGRADUATE

QUESTION 37: MAJOR IN COLLEGE AT THE GRADUATE LEVEL

QUESTION 38: APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY SEMESTER HOURS DO YOU HAVE IN READING?

The purpose of these questions was to obtain specific demographic information as it pertained to each subject.

Finally, teachers were required to identify whether or not they would agree to a follow-up telephone interview or classroom observation. The purpose for requesting follow-up telephone interviews and classroom observations was to validate teacher responses on the survey by having teachers elaborate on the instructional practices they use in their classrooms.

Interview questions were developed around the three main instructional practices: whole language, critical thinking, and cooperative learning. Teachers were asked to characterize the overall ability of their students including students'

strengths and weaknesses. Teachers were also asked to discuss the effects of their local school policy.

In order to establish validity and reliability, a pilot study was conducted. Content validity was established by having 5 experts examine the survey instrument. These experts were a combination of reading specialists and statisticians. Upon examination of the instrument, revisions were made on the format of the survey and some questions were refined or excluded. Following is a report of the final pilot study.

Pilot Study

Subjects for the pilot study included eight teachers enrolled in a graduate level reading course at a Chicago area university.

Subjects were asked to write their definition of the reading process. Definitions were classified bottom up, top down, and interactive. These are three common definitions of the reading process. Results were as follows: none of the pilot subjects' definitions was classified bottom up approach, four were classified as top down, one was classified as interactive, and three of the definitions could not be classified. These results indicate that half of the respondents viewed reading as a process that focuses on meaning (i.e., top down).

Six respondents indicated their school does have a local school policy concerning instructional practices. Seven responded their school has a school improvement plan. One indicated classroom action plans, mandated use of a

basal, and mandated use of cooperative learning were components of their local school policy. Three indicated the use of whole language was required. Two respondents indicated the principal and LSC were primarily responsible for their local school curriculum policy. Six indicated the LSC, principal, and teachers worked collaboratively on local school curriculum. Seven were serving or had previously served on their local school curriculum policy-making committee. Three indicated they had never served on a curriculum committee.

Regarding classroom organization, results include the following: seven indicated their classrooms were organized as regular education, self-contained, or regular education departmental. Of those respondents who indicated they were departmentally organized, one taught language arts/science, the other taught English. One teacher taught bilingual students and one taught in a classroom classified as State Title I. Five indicated their students were grouped heterogeneously and one indicated her students were grouped homogeneously; one subject did not respond to this question.

Three of the pilot subjects taught African-American students, two taught caucasian and Hispanic students, and one taught in a multi-ethnic environment.

Four respondents had enrollments of twenty-one to thirty students; three had an enrollment of more than thirty students; one had an enrollment of eleven to twenty students.

Three of the respondents indicated that over eighty-six percent of their students received a free lunch.

Two teachers taught second grade; one teacher taught fourth grade, one teacher taught fifth grade; one teacher taught a split fourth and fifth grade; one teacher taught seventh grade; one teacher taught secondary grade levels ten, eleven, and twelve.

Four respondents indicated they had taught in their current position between one and five years. One pilot subject indicated they had taught in their current positions six to ten years, eleven to fifteen years, and twenty-one years or more respectively. One respondent indicated they had taught school between one to five years, six to ten years, sixteen to twenty years, and twenty-one years or more respectively.

Six respondents reported they were certified in elementary education. One was certified but did not indicate the area of certification.

Four respondents reported they hold a Bachelor of Arts degree plus fifteen to thirty credit hours; one reported she held a Masters of Arts plus fifteen to thirty credit hours.

Six respondents reported their major in college as an undergraduate was education. One pilot subject checked "other" without indicating the major.

Five reported their major in college at the graduate level was reading; one reported her major was supervision and administration.

One respondent indicated they had no hours in reading, four indicated they had between three to nine hours, and one reported they had between twelve and eighteen hours.

Summary

For the most part, teachers in the pilot study reported they use whole language and critical thinking instructional strategies frequently and occasionally. However, regarding cooperative learning, these pilot subjects reported their students are frequently grouped according to ability rather than in cooperative learning groups. One pilot subject reported her students do very little writing in connection with reading. One respondent reported the frequent use of worksheets and workbooks. In contrast to these two pilot subjects, another respondent reported she did not use basal readers, rather, Junior Great Books which promote critical thinking. In general, pilot subjects did use research-based instructional practices that reflect their concept of the reading process (i.e., top down). As was pointed out above, cooperative learning for the most part, was not used as an instructional practice.

Based on the limited pilot study, it can be concluded policy does not influence the use of specific instructional practices, even though all subjects reported their schools have a local school policy contained within a school improvement plan document. Local school policy encouraged the use of whole language, critical thinking and cooperative learning, however, these practices were not mandated nor supervised.

Results of Telephone Interviews

Three teachers indicated they would agree to a follow-up telephone interview. Several attempts were made to contact one of the three teachers. These attempts were unsuccessful, consequently she did not participate in the follow-up interview. Following are the results of the telephone interviews with two teachers (classroom 1 teacher and classroom 2 teacher).

Classroom I teacher taught grade five with an enrollment of twenty-nine students. The students were predominately African American. Students' reading scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (administered in the spring of 1992) ranged from 1.0 to 7.0. Students were heterogeneously grouped. A high number of students received bilingual instruction and state Title One services. The remaining students were regular education students in a self-contained classroom.

Classroom teacher 1 was asked to describe a typical reading lesson. The primary instructional materials used were basal readers and the Junior Great Books. Classroom 1 teacher defined reading as an interactive approach. Prior to reading, classroom teacher 1 said she stimulated prior knowledge. She asks students what they already know about the subject they are about to read. She frequently engages her students in prereading activities that include predicting story content given the title of a selection. Occasionally she draws the attention of students to the questions following the selection and pictures in a selection. During the actual reading, students may read simultaneously with her or she reads to the students as they read silently.

As students read, they are encourage to identify words unfamiliar to them. After the reading, student share their unknown words for class discussion. Students also construct their own questions which are given to the teacher for further discussion. The teacher indicated she selects interpretive questions for small groups of students to answer.

Regarding reading subskills, under teacher direction, students do comparison/contrast analyses of major characters or events using evidence from the reading selection to support their responses.

A final activity discussed by classroom teacher 1 involved writing in which students write to summarize, explain, and compare/contrast characters. Classroom teacher 1 reported that one week was required to complete a reading selection and all related activities.

This teacher stated she really does not use cooperative learning in its true form, i.e., models by Slavin or Johnson and Johnson. However, her students do work in groups with everyone doing the same activity.

Finally, classroom teacher 1 reported there is no local school policy beyond the school improvement plan. According to this teacher, whole language, cooperative learning, and critical thinking are not mandated, nor is the use of a basal.

Classroom teacher 2 taught grade four with an enrollment of thirty. She taught one reading group which she characterized as being below average. She reported her students are very weak in comprehension, but do very well with their

vocabulary. Students in her class were predominately caucasian and were grouped heterogeneously for reading instruction. The organization of her classroom was regular education/departmental. In addition to teaching reading, classroom teacher 2 reported she taught language arts and science. She further indicated she incorporated reading instructional strategies in her science lessons.

Classroom teacher 2 reported she uses a basal reader with her students. She defined reading as a top down approach and views the reading process as a process that focuses on comprehension. According to classroom teacher 2, a typical reading lesson includes introducing a skill to the entire class; the skill is then practiced independently by each student for the entire period. The next day, the skill is taught in conjunction with the reading selection. On the third day, students do activities that focus on the skill. Such activities include workbooks and worksheets. Students also develop their own questions.

Regarding cooperative learning, students work in pairs of their choice or in prearranged groups depending upon the activity or project. Everyone in the group has a particular assignment.

Writing is done cooperatively: students write summaries or multiple meanings to words. During the multiple meaning lesson, students write definitions of words as well as sentences. Another writing activity is writing answers to questions.

The local school policy strongly encourages whole language and cooperative learning, however, they are not mandated.

Parents and teachers are primarily responsible for their local school policy. Classroom teacher 2 was currently serving on the local school curriculum policy-making committee.

Sample

The school district in this study is divided into eleven subdistricts, also referred to as school service centers (SSC). Initially, three schools were selected from each of the ten SSCs. Some principals, however, were represented by only one or two schools. A total of twenty four schools participated in this study. The eleventh SSC was omitted because those schools were made up of junior and senior high schools. Subjects for this investigation included teachers of grades four through eight in kindergarten through eighth grade schools. Kindergarten through eight schools were selected since the school policy of these schools affected all grades, K through eight. A school such as a middle school (6-8), junior high (7-8), or elementary (K-6) would have a local school policy affecting a more limited range of grades.

Grades four through eight were chosen because in these grades the emphasis is typically on comprehension and students are expected to engage in more thinking and reasoning activities. Furthermore, according to research (Chall et al. 1990), academic achievement begins to decline around the fourth grade.

A list of schools was obtained from a retired superintendent. Thirty schools were contacted across 10 School Service Centers and twenty four schools agreed

to participate. Schools chosen for participation were those in which it was thought principals would be more receptive in participating in this study. If a principal declined participation, the investigator arbitrarily chose another school from the list of schools. Once principals agreed to participate, a letter of introduction was sent followed by a telephone call. Two hundred surveys, a cover letter (See Appendix A) and a stamped self-addressed return envelope were mailed to the principal or the school's designated contact person. The investigator was invited by the principal to visit several schools prior to teachers receiving the survey instrument.

Statistical Procedures

In the study, the statistical procedures were: a univariate analysis of variance, Tukey's multiple comparison and a stepwise multiple regression.

Multiple regression is a statistic that considers the prediction of Y from two or more combinations of independent variables (Glass & Hopkins, 1984). In this study the dependent variable, whole language was used to predict the use of the two independent variables, critical thinking and cooperative learning.

The Tukey method of multiple comparisons tests the difference in each set of means. This procedure establishes a Type I error rate for an experiment's entire family of pairwise comparisons between population means (Glass & Hopkins, 1984).

A univariate analysis of variance (anova) is used to ascertain whether or not the differences among two or more means are greater than would be expected from sampling alone (Glass & Hopkins, 1984). In examining several means simultaneously, anova allows the researcher to determine if one of more of the means varies significantly from one or more of the other means due to something other than sampling error.

The findings are reported in chapter four.

Chapter Four

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to identify research-based instructional practices in reading used by reading teachers of grades four through eight in the Chicago metropolitan area schools, particularly with educationally disadvantaged students. This study also determined whether or not such instructional practices were driven by a school-based policy. Two types of analysis of the data are presented: descriptive and statistical.

Descriptive Data Analysis

The independent variables in this study were 3 definitions of reading reflecting 3 theoretically different views of the reading process. The dependent variables in this study were 3 different instructional practices, whole language, critical thinking, and cooperative learning and the frequency with which these instructional practices were used. The frequency of use along with percentages are presented in Tables 1 through 18. Tables 19 through 21 report results of an analysis of variance; Tables 22 through 24 report results of a stepwise multiple regression.

Whole Language

Table 1 Definition of Reading

bottom up	18 (17.6%)
top down	32 (31.4%)
interactive	50 (49.0%)

Table 1 reports 49% of respondents view reading as an interactive process, that is, reading involves the reader using both written and phonetic information along with their prior knowledge to process information from the text. As seen in Table 1, 31.4% of respondents view reading as acquiring meaning from the printed page. These results indicate that respondents perceive reading as meaning from and bringing meaning to the printed page. Given these results, one would expect teachers to report they use instructional practices that reflect principles of whole language and higher levels of critical thinking.

As discussed earlier, whole language is a process that incorporates principles of holistic learning. This includes oral language development, written language, experience and background knowledge, and the use of authentic reading materials.

Table 2 Engaging Students' Prior Knowledge Before Reading

A. whole group	
F	84 (82.4%)
O	14 (13.7%)
S	2 (2.0%)
D	2 (2.0%)
B. small group	
F	23 (22.5%)
O	27 (26.5%)
S	24 (23.0%)
D	28 (27.5%)
C. teacher shares	
F	42 (41.2%)
O	45 (44.1%)
S	9 (8.8%)
D	6 (5.9%)

Letters to the left of data indicate levels of use of sub variables; F = Frequently, O = Occasionally, S = Seldomly, D = Don't Use.

Table 2 reports that 82.4% of respondents frequently engage students' prior knowledge through whole group discussion; 22.5% of respondents frequently engage students prior knowledge through small group discussion; 41.2% frequently and 44.1% occasionally share their own experiences with students. This last item (sharing) is a critical characteristic of whole language instruction. It is considered important for teachers to share their experiences in whole language instruction.

Table 3 Combining Reading and Writing

A. summaries	
F	47 (46.1%)
O	38 (37.3%)
S	16 (15.7%)
D	1 (1.0%)
B. writing to explain	
F	45 (44.1%)
O	43 (42.2%)
S	8 (7.8%)
D	4 (3.9%)
C. writing to change the ending	
F	20 (19.6%)
O	40 (39.2%)
S	27 (26.5%)
D	15 (14.7%)
D. writing to describe	
F	49 (48.0%)
O	38 (37.3%)
S	12 (11.8%)
D	1 (1.0%)
E. writing to compare/contrast	
F	41 (40.2%)
O	41 (40.2%)
S	11 (10.8%)
D	7 (6.9%)

Another critical characteristic of whole language is the connection between reading and writing. Table 3 reports 46.1% of respondents frequently have their

students write summaries; 44.1% of respondents frequently have their students write expository passages; 19.6% of respondents frequently have their students write to change the ending of a selection; 48% of respondents frequently have their students write descriptive passages; 40.2% of respondents frequently and occasionally have their students write to compare and contrast.

Table 4 Instructional Materials

A. basal reader	
F	81 (79.4%)
O	6 (5.9%)
S	6 (5.9%)
D	9 (8.8%)
B. basal/workbook	
F	58 (56.9%)
O	18 (17.6%)
S	10 (9.8%)
D	15 (14.7%)
C. literature	
F	51 (50.0%)
O	32 (31.4%)
S	11 (10.8%)
D	8 (7.8%)
D. content area text	
F	45 (44.1%)
O	34 (33.3%)
S	9 (8.8%)
D	14 (13.7%)

Another characteristic of whole language is the type of materials used. Advocates of whole language promote the use of authentic reading materials, such as literature. Table 4 reports that 79.4% of respondents frequently use a basal; 56.9% of respondents frequently use a basal and workbook; 50% of respondents frequently use a literature series; 44.5% of respondents frequently use a content area text.

Table 5 Teacher Modeling Reading

A. read aloud to students	
F	61 (59.8%)
O	34 (33.3%)
S	5 (4.9%)
D	2 (2.0%)
B. shares how to arrive at an answer	
F	69 (67.6%)
O	27 (26.5%)
S	4 (3.9%)
D	2 (2.0%)

Another characteristic of whole language is the teacher modeling the reading process which includes reading aloud to students and orally demonstrating the process of critical thinking. Table 5 reports that 59.8% of respondents frequently read aloud to students; 67.6% of respondents frequently share their process of arriving at an answer.

Table 6 Teaching Reading Subskills

A. worksheets	
F	45 (44.1%)
O	33 (32.4%)
S	13 (12.7%)
D	11 (10.8%)
B. skills embedded in a reading selection	
F	73 (71.6%)
O	22 (21.6%)
S	4 (3.9%)
D	3 (2.9%)
C. workbooks	
F	48 (47.1%)
O	19 (18.6%)
S	8 (7.8%)
D	25 (24.5%)

Another characteristic of whole language is the treatment of skill development. Skill development typically should be presented to students in context and not in isolation. Table 6 reports that 44.1% of respondents frequently use worksheets to teach reading; 71.6% of respondents frequently teach reading subskills embedded in a reading selection; 47.1% of respondents frequently use workbooks to teach reading subskills.

Table 7 Students Engaged During Reading

A. round robin reading	
F	30 (29.4%)
O	25 (24.5%)
S	22 (21.6%)
D	24 (23.5%)
B. silent reading	
F	49 (48.0%)
O	38 (37.3%)
S	4 (3.9%)
D	8 (7.8%)
C. silent and oral reading	
F	72 (70.6%)
O	25 (24.5%)
S	1 (1.0%)
D	2 (2.0%)

Table 7 reports 29.4% of respondents frequently use round robin reading; 48% of respondents frequently have their students read silently; 70.6% of respondents have their students read silently and orally.

Table 8 Teaching Vocabulary

A. students look up words in the dictionary

F	49 (48.0%)
O	24 (23.5%)
S	18 (17.6%)
D	11 (10.8%)

B. teacher provides meaning

F	34 (33.3%)
O	32 (31.4%)
S	27 (26.5%)
D	8 (7.8%)

C. teaching words in context

F	82 (80.4%)
O	18 (17.6%)
S	--
D	2 (2.0%)

D. semantic mapping

F	18 (17.6%)
O	32 (31.4%)
S	27 (26.5%)
D	8 (7.8%)

E. vocabulary taught separately

F	13 (12.7%)
O	15 (14.7%)
S	29 (28.4%)
D	43 (42.2%)

F. minutes per day teaching vocabulary

0- 4	3 (2.0%)
5-10	21 (20.6%)
11-15	32 (31.4%)
16-20	26 (27.5%)
21+	14 (13.7%)

G. days per week teaching vocabulary

0	1 (1.0%)
1	7 (6.9%)
2	20 (19.6%)
3	30 (29.4%)
4	6 (5.9%)
5	34 (33.3%)

As stated earlier, a characteristic of whole language is to expose students to authentic reading material that is presented in a contextual environment. Table 8 reports 48% of respondents frequently have students look up words in the dictionary and write the meaning; 33.3% of respondents frequently provide the meaning of words for students; 80.4% of respondents frequently develop vocabulary words within the context of a sentence; 17.6% of respondents use semantic mapping to develop vocabulary; 12.7% of respondents frequently teach vocabulary separately; 32% of respondents teach vocabualry between 11 - 15 minutes per lesson; 33.3% of respondents teach vocabulary five days per week. Regarding semantic mapping, this is a strategy used to engage students' critical thinking as well as activating prior knowledge and building vocabulary (Heimlich

and Pittelman, 1986). These results indicate the majority of respondents use it occasionally or not at all.

Table 9 Materials Used to Teach Vocabulary

A. basal reader	
F	69 (67.6%)
O	15 (14.7%)
S	5 (4.9%)
D	8 (7.8%)
B. supplementary material	
F	59 (57.8%)
O	24 (23.5%)
S	8 (7.8%)
D	9 (8.8%)
C. content area text	
F	58 (56.9%)
O	23 (22.5%)
S	7 (6.9%)
D	11 (10.8%)

Table 9 reports 67.6% of respondents frequently use a basal reader to teach vocabulary; 57.8% of respondents frequently use supplementary materials such as workbooks and worksheets to teach vocabulary; 56.9% of respondents frequently use content area textbooks to teach vocabulary.

Results in Tables 2 through 9 indicate teachers do engage in whole language practices, however, on a limited basis. Even though teachers reported

they frequently engage students in contextual reading and writing (Tables 3, 5, 6 and 7), they continue to rely on workbooks, worksheets, and basal readers (Table 4).

Critical Thinking

A second variable, the development of students' critical thinking was examined in this study. Critical thinking in the context of this study includes engaging students' prior knowledge, developing metacognitive skills and assisting students in becoming self-regulated readers.

Table 10 Engaging Students Prior Knowledge
Reading

A. title of a selection

F	65 (63.7%)
O	27 (27.5%)
S	7 (6.9%)
D	3 (2.9%)

B. questions following a selection

F	56 (54.9%)
O	20 (19.6%)
S	17 (16.7%)
D	9 (8.8%)

C. pictures in a selection

F	54 (52.9%)
O	37 (36.3%)
S	7 (6.9%)
D	9 (8.8%)

D. discussion based on prior knowledge

F	87 (85.3%)
O	14 (13.7%)
S	1 (1.0%)
D	--

Table 10 reports 63.7% of respondents frequently have students predict story contents based on the title of a selection; 54.9% of respondents frequently have students predict story contents based on questions following a selection; 52.9% of respondents frequently have students predict story contents based on pictures in a selection; 85.3% of respondents frequently engage students in an oral discussion based on prior experience to predict story contents.

Table 11 Constructing Meaning During the Reading Lesson

A. paraphrasing

F	51 (50.0%)
O	37 (36.3%)
S	9 (8.8%)
D	3 (2.9%)

B. self-questioning

F	29 (28.4%)
O	33 (32.4%)
S	34 (33.3%)
D	6 (5.9%)

C. interpreting what is read

F	75 (73.5%)
O	25 (24.3%)
S	--
D	2 (2.0%)

D. predicting

F	68 (66.7%)
O	27 (26.5%)
S	4 (3.9%)
D	2 (2.9%)

E. making connections

F	74 (72.5%)
O	21 (20.6%)
S	4 (3.9%)
D	2 (2.0%)

There are certain strategies teachers can implement with students to develop metacognitive behavior: paraphrasing, self-questioning, interpreting what is read, predicting, and making connections. Table 11 reports 50% of respondents frequently have their students paraphrase the reading selection to construct meaning during reading; 28.4% of respondents frequently have students construct their own questions when they are not comprehending; 73.5% of respondents frequently have students interpret what they are reading as they read; 66.7% of respondents frequently have student make predictions during reading; 72.5% of respondents frequently assist students in making connections between what they already know and concepts that are unfamiliar to them.

Table 12 Using Questions to Construct Meaning

A. literal questions/discussion	
F	73 (71.6%)
O	24 (23.5%)
S	3 (2.9%)
D	1 (1.0%)
B. interpretation - analytical questions/discussion	
F	66 (64.7%)
O	32 (31.4%)
S	2 (2.0%)
D	2 (2.0%)
C. follow-up questions/discussion	
F	77 (75.5%)
O	17 (16.7%)
S	5 (4.9%)
D	3 (2.9%)
D. students construct questions/discussion	
F	14 (13.7%)
O	38 (37.3%)
S	30 (29.4%)
D	20 (19.6%)

In order to build comprehension, teachers engage students in questioning and discussion. Table 12 reports 71.6% of respondents frequently ask students literal questions with discussion; 64.7% of respondents frequently ask students interpretative-analytical questions with discussion; 75.5% of respondents frequently

ask students follow-up questions with discussion; 13.7% of respondents frequently have students construct their own questions with discussion.

These results (Tables 10 through 12) indicate teachers do engage students in critical thinking through predicting, creating connections between prior experience and concepts to be learned, questioning and oral discussion. However, a significant number of respondents reported they seldomly or do not have students construct their own questions which is a critical element in developing students inductive reasoning abilities.

Cooperative Learning

The last variable examined was cooperative learning. Teachers use cooperative learning for a variety of purposes, such as having students work collaboratively on a specific project, skill development, and to develop interpersonal skills.

Table 13 How Students Are Grouped As They Work on Reading Assignments

A. individually

F	67 (65.7%)
O	25 (24.5%)
S	7 (6.9%)
D	3 (2.9%)

B. whole group

F	52 (51.0%)
O	29 (28.4%)
S	10 (9.8%)
D	8 (7.8%)

C. small group

F	34 (33.3%)
O	34 (33.3%)
S	18 (17.6%)
D	12 (11.8%)

Table 13 reports how students work on their reading assignments. As seen in Table 13, 65.7% of respondents frequently have students work alone on their reading assignments; 52% of respondents frequently have students work as a whole group on their reading assignments; 33.3% of respondents frequently and occasionally have students work in small groups.

Table 14 How Students Are Assigned to Groups

A. randomly assigned

F	5 (4.9%)
O	11 (10.8%)
S	24 (23.5%)
D	61 (59.8%)

B. grouped according to interest

F	13 (12.7%)
O	39 (38.2%)
S	21 (20.6%)
D	27 (26.5%)

C. grouped according to reading ability homogeneously grouped

F	30 (29.4%)
O	20 (19.6%)
S	16 (15.7%)
D	35 (34.3%)

D. heterogeneously grouped

F	42 (41.2%)
O	20 (19.6%)
S	11 (10.8%)
D	28 (27.5%)

E. 3 or 4 students per group

F	43 (42.2%)
O	23 (22.5%)
S	9 (8.8%)
D	26 (25.5%)

F. teacher provides direct instruction

F	76 (74.5%)
O	9 (8.8%)
S	2 (2.0%)
D	15 (14.7%)

G. individual grades averaged for one group score

F	21 (20.6%)
O	28 (27.5%)
S	18 (17.6%)
D	35 (34.3%)

H. every one does the same activity/individual scores

F	44 (43.1%)
O	25 (24.5%)
S	11 (10.8%)
D	22 (21.6%)

Table 14 reports how students are assigned to groups. As seen in Table 14, 4.9% of respondents frequently assign students to groups randomly; 13% of respondents frequently group students according to their interest; 29.4% of respondents frequently group students according to ability; 41.2% of respondents heterogeneously group students; 42.2% of respondents frequently place 3 or 4 students in a group; 74.5% of respondents provide groups with direct instruction; 20.6% of respondents frequently average individual grades resulting in one group score; 43.1% of respondents frequently have groups work on the same activity resulting in one grade per student.

Table 15 Group Activities

A. answering questions

F	55 (53.9%)
O	28 (27.5%)
S	12 (11.8%)
D	6 (5.9%)

B. answering worksheets

F	39 (38.2%)
O	26 (25.5%)
S	27 (26.5%)
D	8 (7.8%)

C. writing summaries

F	36 (35.3%)
O	37 (36.3%)
S	18 (17.6%)
D	10 (9.8%)

D. reading orally/discussing content

F	41 (40.2%)
O	26 (25.5%)
S	18 (17.6%)
D	16 (15.7%)

Table 15 reports on various activities students are engaged in while in groups. As seen in Table 15, 53.8% of respondents frequently have groups answer questions; 38.2% of respondents frequently have groups complete worksheets; 35.3% of respondents frequently have groups write summaries; 40.2% of respondents have students read orally to each other and discuss story content.

Results in Tables 13 through 15 indicate teachers do not use cooperative learning groups as an instructional practice, rather, they group students primarily to complete the same activity or students work on reading assignments individually.

Discussion Related to the Use of Research-Based Instructional Practices

The first hypothesis states teachers do not use research-based instructional practices in reading with students, particularly with educationally disadvantaged students. This hypothesis stemmed from two questions: (1) To what extent do teachers in the Chicago metropolitan area engage in research-based instructional practices? (2) What instructional practices are being used with educationally disadvantaged students?

The descriptive data indicate that teachers do implement to some extent instructional practices that reflect theoretical concepts of reading which can be found in research studies. Teachers do integrate certain strategies within the reading lesson, such as asking questions that are literal and inferential, stimulating prior knowledge, engaging students in reading and writing, modeling for students the behavior of an expert reader, and assisting students in becoming self-regulated and taking ownership of their reading. Even though the majority of teachers reported they use instructional practices that demonstrate a holistic reading approach and stimulate critical reading, they also reported they rely on basal readers and workbooks. Such reliance is more typical of traditionally oriented instruction.

Regarding cooperative learning, teachers reported they use some form of grouping, however, the grouping that was reflected in their classrooms would not be considered as formal cooperative learning groups. In fact, the majority of teachers reported their students work individually on reading assignments, and

slightly less than half reported when they are in groups, everyone does the same activity. Another result was about one third of teachers indicated they do not use the one critical element of cooperative learning: averaging all individual grades within the group for one group score. These results indicate teachers for the most part do not use cooperative learning.

Influence of Local School Policy

The final variable studied was the influence of local school policy on the use of research-based instructional practices. Teachers were asked (1) whether or not their school had a local school policy concerning instructional practices; (2) to identify elements of their local school policy; (3) who was primarily responsible for their local school policy; and (4) whether or not they had ever served on a local school curriculum policy-making committee.

Table 16 Does your School Have A Local School Policy Concerning Instructional Practices

Yes	35 (34.3%)
No	66 (64.7%)

n = 101

Table 17 Components of Local School Policy

	school improvement plan	
	Yes	59 (57.8%)
	No	43 (42.2%)
n = 102		
	classroom action plans	
	Yes	27 (26.4%)
	No	75 (73.5%)
n = 102		
	mandated use of basal	
	Yes	32 (31.4%)
	No	70 (68.6%)
n = 102		
	mandated use of whole language	
	Yes	16 (15.7%)
	No	86 (84.3%)
n = 102		
	mandated use of cooperative learning	
	Yes	12 (11.8%)
	No	90 (88.2%)
n = 102		

Table 18 Person/s Responsible for Local School Curriculum Policy

Local School Council	10 (9.8%)
Principal	21 (20.6%)
Teachers	24 (23.5%)
Other	37 (36.3%)

Table 19 Have You Ever Served on a Local School Curriculum Policy-Making Committee?

Yes	52 (51.0%)
No	50 (49.0%)

n = 102

The second hypothesis states instructional practices used by teachers are not driven by local school policy. Clearly descriptive data analysis (Table 16) indicate there is no policy which provides a framework to guide teachers in the use of research-based instructional practices in the classroom. It is important to note that several teachers indicated conflicting responses concerning whether or not their school had a policy governing the use of instructional practives. More than several teachers from the same school indicated their school did or did not have such a policy. One teacher indicated being unaware of a local school policy. Moreover, in many cases, teachers reported the Chicago Board of Education was

responsible for their local school policy regarding the use of instructional practices.

Results of Telephone Interviews/Classroom Observations

For the most part, of the 18 teachers interviewed, a majority reported they engage in a basal approach to teach reading. A typical reading lesson using a basal approach includes prereading activities, silent and oral reading and post reading activities. During the prereading activities, the majority of teachers reported they begin by focusing students' attention on the vocabulary. Several teachers reported they have their students write in their dialog journals or work on skill sheets prior to the reading lesson. After the vocabulary lesson, the majority of teachers reported they have students read silently and orally. During this time, teachers indicated they build upon students' prior knowledge by asking various questions. After reading, teachers usually have students answer questions and engage in some writing activities. There were several exceptions to this portrait of a typical reading lesson. Several teachers reported engaging in round robin reading with students and emphasizing isolated skill development. One teacher reported using a "true" cooperative learning group in which students are grouped heterogeneously. The other teachers engaged in some grouping that would not be characterized as cooperative learning. Many teachers reported not having participated in any staff development programs centered around whole language

or cooperative learning. One exception was one teacher who reported having staff development activities in whole language and cooperative learning.

According to teachers, their schools did not have a policy regarding the use of certain instructional practices. The only mandate reported was the use of a basal, however, there was no supervision regarding the use of the basal.

Finally, teachers were asked to identify the strengths and weaknesses of their students. For the most part, teachers reported their students were strong in word recognition and weak in comprehension, especially comprehension that required inductive reasoning.

Classroom Observations

Two classroom observations were conducted. Following is a presentation of the results of those observations.

Grade 8 Class

When students enter the classroom in the morning they are expected to write in their dialog journals. After writing the teacher began the lesson with vocabulary development. The reading selection for that day was "The Gift of the Magi". This teacher used an overhead projector to introduce words. Students pronounced several words after the teacher. She asked students which words they already knew. If students did not know the meaning of a word, the teacher told them the meaning.

The skill for this reading selection was irony. Students reviewed the concept of irony as it related to "The Monkey's Paw". Students were to read the first eight pages, after which the teacher asked mostly literal and evaluation questions which centered around how irony was reflected in the reading selection. There were few inferential questions. After questioning and predicting, students were directed to finish reading the selection. After the reading lesson, students looked up the definition of the vocabulary word and wrote the definition and a sentence that contextually matched the reading selection. This was the end of the reading lesson. The observation in this classroom matched the teachers responses on her completed survey.

Grade 5 Class

Students were engaged in a spelling exercise in which they wrote the antonym of an underlined word in a sentence. Many of the students had difficulty with this assignment; the teacher gave further explanation. For most of the students, this activity was to difficult for them because they did not know the meaning of the words. To compensate for students' lack of word meaning, the teacher led students in a discussion of the meaning of words and related those meanings to their experiences. Students were able to generate answers during the discussion, however, when they were asked to finish the assignment individually, they experienced difficulty and again needed assistance from the

teacher. This lesson was a "morning" assignment and was not considered the reading lesson.

The reading lesson focused on content area reading in social studies. The topic was "Coming to America". Students first discussed a film that was seen the previous week. Prior to reading, the teacher led students in a discussion concerning immigration. She asked students many questions that focused on their prior experiences, and students were actively engaged. Soon the discussion narrowed to the Statue of Liberty. After the discussion, students were given a worksheet with a paragraph. They were to read the paragraph silently, then work cooperatively with a partner to complete the activity. As students worked cooperatively, the teacher circulated among the groups. Several groups made up of male students were not engaged in the lesson. Actually, only two or three groups out of approximately nine worked intently on the lesson. Following completion of the group lesson, students discussed their answers as a whole group. The teacher continued to ask many questions, the majority of which were inferential. This was the end of the lesson. The observations in this class, for the most part, matched the teacher's responses on her completed survey.

Demographic Results of Survey (See Appendix C)

Teachers were asked to respond to certain questions pertaining to the organization of their classrooms including the number of reading groups they taught, grouping of students for reading (homogeneously or heterogeneously),

reading ability of students, racial composition of classroom, enrollment of classroom and percentage of students receiving a free lunch. Teachers were asked about the number of years they had been teaching, areas in which they were certified, their educational background and the number of semester hours they had earned in reading.

Results of the survey showed 78.4% of respondents characterized their classrooms as special education rooms. This number seemed exceptionally high. Results from telephone interviews revealed some of these classrooms were not actually special education rooms, however the teachers characterized their students as being learning disabled or educably mentally handicapped and were serviced by a special education resource teacher. In some cases, these students had not been formally tested and responses from these teachers reflected their perceptions based on observations, 56% of respondents indicated they group their students heterogeneously; 51% of respondents indicated they teach one reading group; 59% of respondents indicated the overall reading ability of students in their class is below grade level; 53.9% of respondents reported the racial make-up of their class is African-American; 41.2% of respondents reported they have an average enrollment of 31 or more students; 62.7% of respondents reported 86% or more of their students receive a free lunch; 22.5% of respondents taught 4th grade, 14.7% taught 5th grade, 18.6% taught 6th grade, 14.7% taught 7th grade and 18.6% taught 8th grade; 45.1% of respondents reported they were in their current positions from 1-5 years, 42.2% of respondents reported they had taught

21 or more years; 97.1% of respondents reported education as a major at the undergraduate level; 23% of respondents reported they had 21 or more semester hours of reading, and an almost equal number or respondents, 23.5% reported they had between 2-9 semester hours of reading; the majority of respondents in this category, 48%, reported they had between 12-18 semester hours of reading. Given these results, it can be concluded the majority of teachers in this study had 21 or more years in teaching, yet had only been in their current positions less than five years. Also, the majority of teachers taught minority students with the majority of them receiving a free lunch.

Appendix E contains "other" responses to questions in which respondents gave a written explanation. Those teachers who indicated the organization of their classroom was departmental taught math, science or social studies along with reading. Teachers reported a variety of areas in which they were certified. For the most part, areas of certification included supervision and administration, counseling, a foreign language (German and Spanish), science and math. Teachers also reported a variety of areas in which they majored at the undergraduate level. These areas included sociology, psychology, music, English literature, nursing, speech pathology/auditory, rhetoric, agriculture, political science, business and human service. At the graduate level, teachers reported such majors as supervision and administration, reading, curriculum, urban education, multicultural education, bilingual education, creative writing, early childhood education, theology, Black studies and librarianship.

The investigator examined whether or not there was a difference between a teacher's definition of reading and the use of research-based instructional practices. To examine this difference, a one way analysis of variance was conducted. A stepwise multiple regression was conducted to examine whether or not there was a correlation between the use of whole language as a dependent variable and the use of critical thinking and cooperative learning as independent variables.

Statistical Analysis

A reliability coefficient was calculated for each item to determine internal consistency. By using this procedure it was possible to identify the extent of item correlation. Results include an alpha of a = .65, a = .64 and a = .70 for whole language, critical thinking and cooperative learning respectively. These results indicate a low correlation between subscale items which might be due to the low number of items representing whole language, critical thinking, and cooperative learning.

An anova was conducted to determine whether or not there were differences in a teacher's belief concerning the process of reading, (that is, viewing reading as a bottom-up, top-down or interactive approach) and a teacher's implementation of whole language, critical thinking and cooperative learning. Results are presented in Tables 20 through 22.

Table 20 Reading Definition and Critical Thinking

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares
between groups	2	36.3739	18.1869
within groups	97	1719.8661	17.7306
total	99	1756.2400	
F ratio 1.025		F probability .3624	

Table 21 Reading Definition and Cooperative Learning

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares
between groups	2	81.1012	40.5505
within groups	97	3863.1387	39.8262
total	99	3944.2400	
F ratio 1.0182		F probability .3651	

Tables 20 and 21 present results on critical thinking, cooperative learning and teachers' definition of reading. These results suggest there is no difference in teachers' definition of reading and their use of critical thinking and cooperative learning as instructional practices. There is an insignificant F of 1.025, $p > .3624$, for critical thinking and an insignificant F of 1.0182, $p > .3651$, for cooperative learning.

Table 22 Reading Definition and Whole Language

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares
between groups	2	654.6213	327.3106
within groups	97	7336.2887	75.6318
total	99	7990.9100	

F ratio 4.33277 F probability .0158

Tukey-HSD Procedure

	84.5	87.0	90.0	
84.5	NS	NS	*	group 1 bottom-up
87.0	--	NS	NS	group 2 top-down
90.0	*	NS	--	group 3 interactive

Table 22 reports a significant F value of 4.3, $p < .01$ level. These results indicate there is a difference in teachers' beliefs of the reading process and their use of an instructional practice. According to the Tukey procedure, group 3 (interactive) accounted for the significant difference, $p < .05$. The means of group 1 and group 2 are not significantly different; the mean of group 2 is not significantly different from group 3. Therefore, it can be concluded that those teachers who believe reading is an interactive process are most likely to use whole language as an instructional practice.

A stepwise multiple regression was conducted to determine whether or not the use of whole language predicted the use of cooperative and critical thinking.

Table 23 Whole Language - Critical Thinking

Multiple R	.401197
R Square	.16158

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	1	1294.11932	1294.11932
Residual	100	6715.22381	67.15224

F = 19.27143 Significant F = .0000

Table 24 Whole Language - Cooperative Learning

Multiple R	.469437
R Square	.22037

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	2	1764.98846	882.49423
Residual	99	6244.35467	63.07429

F = 13.99135 Significant F = .0000

Table 25 Variables in the Equation

Variable	B	SE B	Beta
Cooperative Learning	.5228178	.124127	.379261
T = 4.255	Significant T = .0000		
Critical Thinking	.519615	.190177	.243527
T = 2.732	Significant T = .0074		
(constant)	49.911834	8.836370	
T = 5.648	Significant T = .0000		

Results in Tables 23 through 25 indicate a direct relationship between the implementation of whole language as an instructional practice and the use of cooperative learning and critical thinking. Both variables (cooperative learning and critical thinking) have a statistically significant T of 4.25 and 2.73 respectively. Cooperative learning shows a beta weight of .38; critical thinking shows a beta weight of .24. Cooperative learning is shown to be two-thirds as important as critical thinking regarding the implementation of whole language. These results indicate a teacher who uses whole language is most likely to use cooperative learning as an instructional practice. The use of whole language as a predictor

of the use of cooperative learning has a critical F of 19.27. The use of whole language as a predictor of the use of critical thinking has a critical F of 14.

A summary of the study, including discussion of the findings, is contained in chapter five following.

Chapter Five

This final chapter presents a summary of the study and discussion related to the testing of the two hypotheses. Following the summary and discussion of results, recommendations for further research and implications for schools are presented.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to identify instructional practices teachers in grades four through eight use with their students, particularly with educationally disadvantaged students. This study also attempted to determine whether or not the use of such instructional practices were driven by local school policy. The variables studied were three instructional practices: whole language, critical thinking and cooperative learning.

This investigation was designed to examine the frequency with which teachers used these instructional practices. The instrument used to ascertain the frequency of the use of the instructional practices was a survey. After data collection, the data were analyzed using percent of frequency analysis and parametric statistical analysis. An analysis of variance was conducted to determine the difference between a teacher's concept of reading and the use of research-based instructional practices: whole language, critical thinking and

cooperative learning. A stepwise multiple regression was conducted with whole language as a dependent variable to predict if teachers were likely to use critical thinking and cooperative learning as instructional practices.

Discussion Related to Hypothesis One

Hypothesis One: Teachers do not use research-based instructional practices in reading, particularly with educationally disadvantaged students.

Descriptive data analysis related to this hypothesis indicated the majority of teachers do implement research-based instructional practices, however, they do so on a limited basis. Teachers reported they engage in the use of reading and writing, whole group discussion, stimulation of prior knowledge, questioning and teacher modeling. However, it can be concluded that the use of these instructional practices is limited since the majority of teachers also reported they frequently engage students in more traditional types of instruction such as literal questioning and discussion, and students working on reading assignments individually. Moreover, an overwhelming majority of teachers reported they frequently use (traditional) basal readers. Follow-up telephone interviews and classroom observations support these findings. Very few teachers reported the frequent use of semantic mapping (a research-based instructional practice) as a strategy to teach vocabulary.

Regarding cooperative learning, the majority of teachers reported they do group their students in some manner, however, results indicated approximately

one-third of respondents (29.4%) frequently group their students according to ability; less than one-half of respondents (41.2%) frequently group their students heterogeneously; less than one-half of respondents (43.1%) reported that frequently everyone in the group does the same activity. Of the 18 follow-up telephone interviews conducted, all 18 indicated they do not use cooperative learning in their classrooms, rather, they group students for direct reading instruction. Therefore, it can be concluded that teachers in this sample do not use cooperative learning as an instructional practice. Overall, the use of research-based instructional practices was limited.

Demographic data indicate less than one half of teachers had been teaching for over 21 years. (See Appendix C, Table 34) In fact 67.7% of teachers reported they had been teaching for 16 years or more. These results should be considered as an explanation for teachers engaging in research-based instructional practices on a limited basis.

Because of societal demands, curricular emphasis has shifted over a period of time; with these changes, there have been a number of movements such as back to basics and teacher accountability (Lamb and Arnold, 1988).

According to Lamb and Arnold (1988), teachers tend to teach according to their beliefs, the way they were taught, and the way they were trained for the profession. Given the results indicating 67.7% of respondents were trained for the profession more than 16 years ago, teachers who participated in this study

probably were trained to teach from a traditional approach which utilizes basal readers and workbooks as primary instructional materials.

Discussion Related to Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis Two: Instructional practices teachers use in reading are not influenced by local school policy.

Descriptive data analysis related to this hypothesis indicated that local school policy does not influence the use of whole language, critical thinking, and cooperative learning. More than one-half (64.7%) of respondents indicated their schools did not have a local school policy. A majority of respondents reported whole language, critical thinking, and cooperative learning were not mandated at their schools. Results from follow-up telephone interviews indicated these three instructional practices were "encouraged", however, there was no supervision on the use of instructional practices, and, most teachers reported they had received no staff development activities concerning these instructional practices. One teacher, who was the reading coordinator at her school, reported there was a concerted effort to implement whole language practices and cooperative learning school-wide. These efforts included having students read at least one novel per school year. Each grade level (primary, middle and upper) was assigned the same title to be read in a specified time period. This teacher also reported it is mandatory for teachers to include Sustained Silent Reading (SSR) and teachr "read alouds" in their schedules.

For the most part, the use of whole language, critical thinking and cooperative learning was not influenced by local school policy.

Discussion of Statistical Analysis

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the levels of use teachers engaged in the implementation of research-based instructional practices in reading in grades four through eight. After the data were analyzed descriptively, the investigator examined whether or not an interrelationship existed between those research-based instructional practices (whole language, critical thinking, and cooperative learning). Regardless of content, central to the use of instructional practices is one's beliefs regarding teaching and learning. Thus, the investigator examined whether or not there was a difference between teachers' perceptions of the reading process and the implementation of whole language, critical thinking, and cooperative learning.

Results of the analysis of variance showed that teachers who view reading as an interactive process are likely to use whole language as an instructional practice, whereas teachers who view reading as a bottom-up or top-down process are likely to engage in a more traditional approach to teaching reading. In other words, there was no difference in teachers' philosophies of reading and their instructional practices.

Results of a stepwise multiple regression showed that teachers who use whole language are most likely to use critical thinking and cooperative learning,

but particularly, cooperative learning. That is, those teachers who used whole language would tend to use cooperative learning as an instructional practice.

Recommendations for Further Research

The results of this investigation suggest that teachers do use research-based instructional practices albeit on a limited basis, and local school policy does not influence the implementation of these practices. Further reliability of the study needs to be extended to other school districts in order to obtain a profile of instructional practices being used in area schools. Since the majority of schools that participated in this study served large numbers of educationally disadvantaged students, a study should be conducted to examine the use of instructional practices in more affluent school districts to determine whether or not socio-economic status is a determinant in the use of research-based instructional practices. Also, further validation of responses needs to be obtained through less obtrusive classroom observations.

Implications for Schools

It has been established throughout the literature that the implementation of research-based instructional practices in a reading program promote transfer of learning, increased student achievement and an appreciation of and cooperation with other students while working with others (Augustine, Gruber and Anson, 1989/90). Given the results of this study in which teachers engage students in the limited use of research-based instructional practices in reading which apparently

results in low student achievement scores on the Illinois Goal Assessment Program (IGAP) (See Appendix D), an assessment program that requires students to use research-based instructional strategies, the following recommendations are presented.

There is a need for schools to formally address the use of whole language, critical thinking, and cooperative learning in grades four through eight since these instructional practices are currently used to assess student performance in reading. It has been this investigator's experience that school initiatives affecting classroom instruction usually begin at the primary level. Thus it is important that such initiatives be affected at the school level.

Teachers should continue to engage in the implementation of certain instructional models that foster students' oral and written language development, critical thinking, and collaborative work. Because the majority of teachers in this study indicated they either occasionally or seldomly have students engage in self questioning or constructing their own questions, teachers should provide for students the opportunity and encouragement to engage in such activities which promotes metacognitive behavior and self-regulated learning and reading. Such instructional practices include more questioning at levels higher than literal or inductive thinking. Students should be afforded the opportunity to share their thinking process with their peers. They should engage in analytical learning experiences associated with their real experiences within their community and their schools. Because an overwhelming majority of teachers in this study indicated

they primarily use a basal reader to teach reading and vocabulary, teachers should consider reading material that is authentic and is closely aligned with the language of students. These recommendations do not, however, exclude the use of a basal reader. The use of research-based instructional practices with all reading material is the criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of the instructional practice.

Research studies have shown that educationally disadvantaged students are grouped according to their academic ability (Goodman, 1984; Knapp, 1991; Means and Knapp, 1991). Results of this study indicated that the majority of teachers group their students heterogeneously. Morever, the majority of teachers also characterized their classrooms as below average in reading ability, and there was no information reported regarding the academic diversity of students within each group. And, for the most part, students worked on reading assignments individually. Critical to a students success is to be in an environment which promotes learning cooperatively, thinking critically and creatively, and having a mentor within the classroom who serves as a model.

The implementation of research-based practices should be embedded within the framework of a local school curriculum policy. The majority of teachers in this study indicated their schools have a local school policy regarding the use of instructional practices which is referred to as a school improvement plan, however, the majority of teachers also indicated there is no mandated policy regarding the use of basals, whole language, and cooperative learning. These

results indicate a systematic need for staff development, collaborative supervision, and evaluation.

Quellmalz (1991) suggests that schools considering restructuring consider several models of restructuring. One model she discussed was developed by James Comer, "The School Development Program". This program includes. . ." a governance and management team, a mental health team, and curriculu and staff development activities (Quellmalz, 1991 p. 205)." Comer's model addresses the issue of restructuring schools which calls for schools to incorporate school-site management, redefine the responsibility of staff through staff development, redesign curriculum and instruction by initiating higher reasoning skill development, and reassessing the assessment of student achievement. This model is one which considers multivariate aspects (sociological, psychological, physiological, and educational) of the whole child. This concept is important for all school age children, but it is of particular importance to educationally disadvantaged students because of the unique experiences they bring to the classroom and their numbers are increasing.

One aspect of restructuring schools which is of critical importance is staff development. Staff development includes any activities for faculty that will improve classroom instruction. It is a process that includes goals, knowledge of content, and a training process for all individuals involved in the process of learning (Sparks, 1983). Staff development includes supervision; supervision entails the improvement of classroom practices because, if implemented constructively,

teachers work collaboratively with other teachers through peer coaching or within the context of a clinical framework in which they work jointly with a supervisor to implement effective classroom strategies (Bolin and Parnaritis, 1992). Evaluation is also included in staff development. Worthen and Sanders (1987) define evaluation as ". . . the formal determination of the quality, effectiveness, or value of a program, product, project, process, objective, or curriculum (p. 2)." In the context of this study, the efficacy of applied instructional practices should be evaluated in order for these schools to move forward. Even though the use of evaluation was not examined in this investigation, the investigator did not perceive schools in the study engaged in self-evaluation, formally or informally, regarding their instructional practices. This issue is addressed here because of the results from telephone interviews. Teachers for the most part engaged in certain instructional practices because either it was mandated, encouraged, or "the right thing" to do given the type of learners in their classrooms. There was little indication of any supervision of teachers by administrators regarding the use of instructional practices nor did the teachers engage in self-evaluation regarding their instructional practices.

There should be a formal evaluation of the instructional program in reading in conjunction with staff development. In evaluating the schools instructional program, teachers and administrators would be able to identify those elements within the program that are either ineffective or effective. The objectives of the IGAP are embedded in research-based theoretical concepts of reading and

learning, and reading is presented as an interactive process. Thus, all schools in the state of Illinois should begin to assess their instructional program given the tenets of IGAP.

Once an evaluation has begun, there should be formulated goals for instructional improvment through staff development programs. According to Wood, Thompson, and Russell (1981), a school-based staff development program that would promote goal attainment involves 5 stages: readiness, planning, training, implementation, and maintenance. This model of staff development would be included within the framework of the local school policy regarding curriculum issues.

Principals, faculty and the LSC should consider joining other schools in their district so as to effect collaborative networking. The purpose of such collaboration relates to the schools in this study. Since the majority of schools in this study served educationally disadvantaged students, a student transferring to another school in the same district would continue to receive instructional practices without interrupting continuity.

At the readiness stage, faculty, parents and administrators would identify programs and practices that improve student learning and achievement. These activities should include articulation sessions that focus on current practices and trends in education in conjunction with the needs and climate of the school. Teachers and administrators must develop long term plans to address the changes that might take place within their schools. Schools might identify area

schools that are academically successful to understand how these schools promote student success. Within the framework of this readiness stage, a time line should be established in which specific instructional practices are to be implemented.

Once long range plans have been developed, teachers and administrators should address the issue of training faculty, staff and others who will be directly affected by the change. To ensure success in the implementation of a new program, there must be a well designed training process, i.e., staff development.

Staff development should be more than a one time in-service training. Rather, good staff development is a series of substantive collaborative sessions over a given time period that address the needs of teachers (and of course students) in the area of effective teaching. Teachers should be encouraged to network with each other and participate in peer coaching sessions.

Once the initiative has passed through the proposal and readiness stage and has entered the implementation phase, all school personnel and community members should be well versed with the goals and objectives. As implementation proceeds, the use of instructional practices should be monitored and evaluated to ensure that progress is being made to achieve specified goals and objectives. A model of supervision should be considered for systematic and planned evaluation. One model is clinical supervision. This model allows the supervisor and teacher to work together as partners and not as adversaries (Sergiovanni, 1986). Results of telephone interviews indicated teachers were not supervised

regarding the use of instructional practices such as whole language, critical thinking and cooperative learning. Teachers further indicated they were not supervised as to the types of materials used, even though in some cases policy mandated the use of specific materials (i.e., basal readers).

As teachers and administrators proceed through a process of change including staff development and supervision, evaluation must be on-going. That is, there must be formative and summative assessment. A formative evaluation would involve assessing strengths and weaknesses of a program while currently in use; a summative evaluation would involve assessing the efficacy of the entire program at its conclusion (Worthen and Sanders, 1987). In this case, summative evaluation of the instructional program would occur at the end of the school year.

As administrators and teachers consider a staff development program, to implement certain instructional practices for the improvement of student achievement, they must be cognizant of two factors. Research-based instructional practices are embedded in a theoretical framework in reading, and teacher instructional behavior is governed by a system of beliefs. Therefore, research-based instructional practices grounded in theoretical concepts and teacher implemented instructional practices, although seemingly similar, are in fact embedded in different sets of beliefs, intentions and theoretical frameworks (Richardson and Anders, 1990). Any staff development program prior to implementation must acknowledge these two factors. Teachers must be given the opportunity to articulate their set of beliefs as well as engage in dialog with other

faculty members and administrators concerning current research practices and the implication for classroom instruction. Emanating from these articulating sessions should be an understanding of the connection between research and practice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, R.C. and Pearson, P.D., (1986), A Schema-Theoretic View of Basic Processes in Reading Comprehension, In Handbook of Reading Research, P. David Pearson (Ed), Longman, Publishers, New York 255-291

Augustine, D.K., Gruber, K.D. and Hanson, L.R., (1989/90), Cooperation Works, Educational Leadership, Vol 47(4), 4-7

Bolin, F.S. and Panaritis, P. (1992), Searching for a Common Purpose: A Perspective on the History of Supervision, In Supervision and Transition, C. Glickman (Ed), 1992 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 30-43

Bond, G.L. and Tinker, M.A., (1973), Reading Difficulties - Their Diagnosis and Corrections, Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York

Bruner, J., (1977), The Process of Education, Harvard University Press, Massachusetts

Chall, J., Jacobs, V. and Baldwin, L., (1990), The Reading Crises - Why Poor Children Fall Behind, Harvard University Press, Massachusetts

Chicago Tribune, November 30, 1992

Clay, M.M. (1991), Becoming Literate - The Construction of Inner Control, Heinemann Publishers, New Hampshire

Cohn, D.K. and Ball, D.L. (1990), Policy and Practice: An Overview, Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, Vol 12(3) 233-239

Collins, A., Hawkins, J. and Carver, S., (1991), A Cognitive Apprenticeship For Disadvantaged Students, In Teaching Advanced Skills To At Risk Students - Views from Research and Practice, B. Means, C. Chelemer and M. Knapp (Eds), Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco

Crafton, L.K. (1991), Whole Language: Getting Started...Moving Forward, Richard C. Owens Publishers, New York

Dewey, J., (1938), Experience and Education, Macmillan Publishers, New York

Duke, D.L. and Canady, R.L. (1991), School Policy, McGraw-Hill Inc., New York

Ennis, R.H. (1985), A Logical Basis for Measuring Critical Thinking Skills, Educational Leadership

Ericson, B., Hubler, M., Bean, T., Smith, C., McKenzie, J., (1987), Increased Critical Reading in Junior High Classrooms, Journal of Reading, Vol 30(5) 430-439

Freire, P., (1990), Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Continuum Publishers, New York

Fullan, M., (1991), The New Meaning of Educational Change, second edition, Teachers College Press, Columbia

Glass, G.V. and Hopkins, K.D., (1984), Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology, second edition, Allyn and Bacon Publishers, Boston

Goodlad, J.L., (1984), A Place Called School, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York

Harris, A. and Sipay, E. (1975), How To Increase Reading Ability, sixth edition, David McKay Company Inc., New York

Heimlich, J. and Pittleman, S.D. (1986), Semantic Mapping: Classroom Applications, International Reading Association, Delaware

Holt, J., (1964), How Children Fail, Dell Publishers, New York

Illinois Goal Assessment Program, (1988) Illinois State Board of Educational Technical Manual

Johnson, D.W. and Johnson, R.T. (1989/90), Social Skills for Successful Group Work, Educational Leadership, Vol 47(4) 29-33

Knapp, M.S., (1991), What Is Taught and How, To The Children of Poverty - Interim Report from a Two Year Investigation, An Eric Document 336491

Konopak, B., (1988), Eighth Graders' Vocabulary Learning from Inconsiderate and Considerate Text, Reading and Research Instruction, Vol 27(4) 1-14

Kos, R., (1991), Persistence of Reading Disabilities: The Voices of Four Middle School Students, American Educational Research Journal, Vol 28(4)875-895

Kozol, J., (1991), Savage Inequalities - Children in America's Schools, Crown Publishers, Inc., New York

May, F., (1990), Reading As Communication - An Interactive Approach, Merrill Publishing Company, Ohio

Morrow, L., (1992), The Impact of a Literature-Based Program on Literacy Achievement, Use of Literature, and Attitudes of Children from Minority Backgrounds, Reading Research Quarterly, Vol. 273 250-279

Means, B. and Knapp, M. (1991), Introduction: Rethinking Teaching For Disadvantaged Students, In Teaching Advanced Skill To At Risk Students - Views from Research and Practice, B. Means, C. Chelemer, and M. Knapp (Eds), Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco

Ornstein, A.C., (1990), Strategies For Effective Teaching, Harper and Row Publishers, New York

Palinscar, A. and Brown, A., (1989), Instruction For Self-Regulated Reading, In Towards The Thinking Curriculum - Cognitive Research, L. Resnick and L. Klopfer (Eds), ASCD Yearbook

Palinscar, A. and Klenk, L., (1991), Dialogues Promoting Reading Comprehension, In Teaching Advanced Skills To At Risk Students - Views from Research and Practice, B. Means, C. Chelemer and M. Knapp (Eds), Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco

Pallis, A., (1989), Making Schools More Responsive to At-Risk Students, Eric Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Number 60

Peterson, P.L., (1990), Doing More in the Same Amount of Time, Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, Vol 12(3) 261-280

Quellmalz, E.S. (1991), Commentary, In Teaching Advanced Skills to At-Risk Students - Views from Research and Practice, B. Means, C. Chelmer and M. Knapp (Eds), Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco

Ransom, P., Lamb, P. and Arnold, R., (1988), The Curriculum, In Teaching Reading - Foundations and Strategies, Third Edition, Pose Lamb and Richard Arnold (Eds), Richard C. Owens Publishers

Rauhauser, B., (1991), Design For Implementing Effective Schools Research, School Improvement Specialist Inc. 1-34

Richardson, V., Anders, P., (1990), Final Report of the Reading Instruction Study, An Eric Document 324655

Richardson, V., Anders, P., Tidwell, and Lloyd, C., (1991), The Relationship Between Teachers' Beliefs and Practices in Reading Comprehension Instruction, American Educational Research Journal, Vol. 28(3) 560-586

Sergiovanni, R.J., and Starratt, R.J., (1988), Supervision Human Perspectives, Fourth Edition, McGraw-Hill Publishers, New York

Sharan, Y. and Sharan, S., (1989/90), Group Investigation Expands Cooperative Learning, Educational Leadership, Vol. 47(4) 17-21

Shor, I., (1987), Educating the Educators: A Frirean Approach to the Crisis in Teacher Education, In Freire for the Classroom - A Sourcebook for Liberatory Teaching, Ira Shor (Ed), Boynton/Cook Publisher, New Hampshire, 7-32

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A. and Stevens, R.J., (1989/90), Cooperative Learning Models for the 3R's, Educational Leadership, Vol. 47(4) 22-33

Sparks, G., (1983), Synthesis of Research on Staff Development for Effective Teaching, Educational Leadership, Vol. 41(3) 65-72

Stevens, R.J., Madden, N.A., Slavin, R.E. and Farnish, A.M., (1987), Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition: Two Field Experiments, Educational Leadership, Vol. 22(4) 433-452

Strickland, D., (1990), Emergent Literacy: How Young Children Learn to Read, Educational Leadership, Vol. 47(6) 18-23

Thistlewaite, L.L., (1990), Critical Reading for At-Risk Students, Journal of Reading, Vol. 33 No 8, p. 586-593

Weaver, C., (1990), Understanding Whole Language - From Principals to Practice, Heinemann Educational Books Inc., Portsmouth New Hampshire

Weimers, N.J., (1990), Transformation and Accommodation: A Case Study of Joe Scott, Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, Vol. 12(3) 281-292

Weinstein, C.E., (1987), Fostering Learning Autonomy through the Use of Learning Strategies, Journal of Reading, Vol. 30(97), 590-595

Wood, F., Thompson, S., and Russell, F., (1981), Designing Effective Staff Development Programs, In Staff Development/Organization Development, B. Dillon-Peterson (Ed), Virginia, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 26-43

Worthen, B.R. and Sanders, J.R., (1987), Educational Evaluation Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines, Longman Publishers, New York

APPENDIX A

LOYOLA
UNIVERSITY
CHICAGO

School of Education

Water Tower Campus
820 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611
Telephone (312) 915-6800

8018 South Princeton Ave.
Chicago, Illinois
January, 1993

Dear Teacher:

This is to request your participation in a study which is required for my dissertation at Loyola University of Chicago.

I am conducting a survey designed to identify instructional practices in reading that are being used by teachers of grades four through eight in the Chicago metropolitan area. This instrument is divided into four categories: instructional practices in reading, local school policy, classroom organization, and demographic questions regarding your educational experiences. There are a total of 39 response items which should take approximately twenty minutes to complete. Please return the completed survey in the enclosed self-addressed envelope no later than **February 5, 1993.**

I am a former Chicago Public School teacher. Currently, I am an assistant professor in the Reading Department at Chicago State University. If you have any questions regarding the survey, I can be reached at the University at this telephone number, 995-2089.

Your participation in this study is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Virginia-Ellen Goodman

APPENDIX B

TEACHER SURVEY

1. Do you teach reading?

yes ____ no ____ If you do not teach reading, it is not necessary for you to complete this survey.

2. Which definition of reading best reflects your definition of the reading process? *check only one*

Reading involves the recognition of printed or written symbols which serve as stimuli for the recall of meaning built up through the reader's past experience.

_____

Reading is the meaningful interpretation of printed or written verbal symbols.

_____

Reading involves the reader using both written and phonetic information along with their prior knowledge to process information from the text.

3. Approximately, how many minutes per day is your reading lesson?

40-50 ___ 51-60 ___ 61-70 ___ 71-80 ___ 81-90 ___ 91-100 ___ 101+ ___

PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING ITEMS CONCERNING THE INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE YOU USE TO TEACH READING IN YOUR CLASSROOM AS WELL AS THE AMOUNT OF TIME YOU SPEND ENGAGED IN SUCH PRACTICES.

F = FREQUENTLY O = OCCASSIONALLY S = SELDOM DU = DON'T USE

4. Instructionally, how do you teach students to predict story content prior to reading?

	F	0	S	DU
title of selection	____	____	____	____
questions following a selection	____	____	____	____
pictures in a selection	____	____	____	____
discussion based on prior knowledge/experience after previewing	____	____	____	____

other (please specify)_____

5. How do you engage students' prior knowledge before they read the selection?

	F	0	S	DU
whole group shared experiences through oral discussion	____	____	____	____
small group shared experiences through oral discussion	____	____	____	____
shared teacher experiences	____	____	____	____

other (please specify) _____

6. How do you assist students in constructing meaning during the reading lesson?

	F	0	S	DU
paraphrasing the reading selection	____	____	____	____
encouraging self questioning (students construct their own questions when they are not comprehending)	____	____	____	____
students interpret what they read	____	____	____	____
students make predictions	____	____	____	____
you assist students in making connections between what they already know with ideas from the reading passage that are unfamiliar to them	____	____	____	____

7. What types of questions do you use with students to construct meaning?

	F	0	S	DU
literal questioning/discussion	____	____	____	____
interpretive-analytical questioning/discussion	____	____	____	____
follow-up questioning/discussion	____	____	____	____
students construct and answer their own questions/discussion	____	____	____	____

8. How do you combine reading and writing in your lessons?

	F	0	S	DU
writing to summarize	____	____	____	____
writing to explain	____	____	____	____
writing to change the ending	____	____	____	____
writing to describe	____	____	____	____
writing to compare and/or contrast	____	____	____	____

other (please specify) _____

_____

9. How do students work on reading assignments?

	F	0	S	DU
individually	____	____	____	____
whole group	____	____	____	____
small group	____	____	____	____

other (please specify) _____

10. If students work in small groups, how are they assigned to groups and what procedures are followed?

	F	0	S	DU
the teacher randomly assigns students to groups by having them count off by numbers	____	____	____	____
students are grouped according to their interest in a particular project	____	____	____	____
students are grouped according to their reading ability (homogeneously grouped)	____	____	____	____

groups include one or two students from each ability level (one or two from above level, average level, below level--heterogeneously grouped)	____	____	____	____
there are three or four students per group	____	____	____	____
students receive teacher directed instructions prior to working in the group	____	____	____	____
each student has a specified task as it relates to the assignment and individual scores are averaged resulting in one group score	____	____	____	____
everyone does the same activity and individual scores are recorded	____	____	____	____

other (please specify) _____

_____

11. Groups are engaged in what types of reading activities after discussion?

	F	0	S	DU
writing answers to questions	____	____	____	____
completing worksheets	____	____	____	____
writing summaries	____	____	____	____
reading orally to each other and discussing story content	____	____	____	____

other (please specify) _____

12. What instructional materials do you use to teach reading?

	F	0	S	DU
basal reader	____	____	____	____
basal/workbook	____	____	____	____
literature	____	____	____	____
content area text	____	____	____	____

13. How do you model your own process of reading during instruction?

	F	0	S	DU
read aloud to students	____	____	____	____
share with students the process you use to arrive at an answer	____	____	____	____

other (please specify) _____

14. How do you teach such reading subskills as drawing conclusions, sequence, characterization, cause & effect, author viewpoint, and main idea?

	F	0	S	DU
work sheets	____	____	____	____
skills embedded in the reading selection	____	____	____	____
workbooks	____	____	____	____

other (please specify) _____

_____

15. How are students actively engaged during the reading lesson?

	F	0	S	DU
round robin oral reading	____	____	____	____
individual silent reading	____	____	____	____
silent and oral reading	____	____	____	____

16. How do you teach vocabulary during a reading lesson?

	F	0	S	DU
students look up and write the definition of the words	____	____	____	____
teacher provides meaning	____	____	____	____
present words in sentences (context)	____	____	____	____
semantic mapping	____	____	____	____
vocabulary is taught separately from the reading selection	____	____	____	____

other (please specify) _____

17. What materials do you use to teach vocabulary?

	F	0	S	DU
basal reader	____	____	____	____
supplementary materials (workbooks-worksheets)	____	____	____	____
content area text	____	____	____	____

other (please specify) _____

_____

18. Approximately how many minutes per day do you teach vocabulary?

0-4____ 5-10____ 11-15____ 16-20____ 21+____

19. Approximately how many days per week do you teach vocabulary?

_____

PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING ITEMS CONCERNING
YOUR LOCAL SCHOOL POLICY

20. Does your school have a local school policy concerning instructional practices to be used by teachers? If the answer is no, skip number 21 and go on to number 22.

yes____ no____

21. Which items/s listed below is the PREDOMINANT component of your local school policy?

school improvement plan involving curriculum development____

classroom action plans____

mandated use of a basal____

mandated use of whole language____

mandated use of cooperative learning____

22. Who is PRIMARILY responsible for your local school curriculum policy?

LSC____ Principal____ teachers____ other (please specify)_____

23. Have you ever served on a local school curriculum policy-making committee?

yes___ currently serving___ 1-3 years ago___ 4-5 years ago___ over 5 years____

no, I have never served on a local school curriculum policy-making committee___

PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING ITEMS CONCERNING THE ORGANIZATION OF YOUR CLASSROOM

24. How would you characterize your classroom? *check all that apply*

regular education___ special education___ resource/pull out___

self-contained___ departmental (please specify subject/s)___

bilingual___ monolingual___

Chapter 1 (ESEA)___ State Title 1___

25. How do you group your students for reading?

heterogeneously___ homogeneously___

26. How many reading groups do you teach?

____

27. Please characterize the overall reading ability of your reading groups.

above average___ grade level___ below grade level___

specify reading ability by groups if you teach more than one group_____

_____

28. What is the predominant racial composition of your classroom?

African-American___ Caucasian___ Hispanic___ multi-ethnic___

29. What is the enrollment of your classroom?

less than 10___ 11-20___ 21-30___ more than 30___

PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING DEMOGRAPHIC ITEMS

30. What is the percentage of students in your classroom receiving a free lunch?

0-5%___ 6-25%___ 26-45%___ 46-65%___ 66-85%___ 86%+___

31. What is your current assignment? (Include grade level if you are a classroom teacher.)

_____

32. number of years in present position

1-5___ 6-10___ 11-15___ 16-20___ 21 or more___

33. number of years teaching

1-5___ 6-10___ 11-15___ 16-20___ 21 or more___

34. In what areas are you certified? *check all that apply*

elementary___ reading___ special education___ other _____

35. educational background

B.A.___ B.A. plus 15-30 hours___ M.A.___ M.A. plus 15-30 hours___

36. major in college as an undergraduate

education___ liberal arts (major)_____ other_____

37. major in college at the graduate level

_____

38. Approximately how many semester hours do you have in reading?

none___ 2-9___ 12-18___ 21 or more___

Would you agree to a follow-up telephone interview? If yes, please sign your name and provide a telephone number where you can be reached.

Yes, I would agree to a follow-up telephone interview:

Name _____ Telephone Number _____
area code

What is the best time to call? _____

Would you agree to a classroom observation/interview? If yes, please sign your name and provide a telephone number and the address of your school.

Yes, I would agree to a classroom observation/interview:

Name _____ School Name_____

School Address _____

_____

Telephone Number _____

No, I would not agree to a follow-up interview nor classroom observation_____

Final Comments (optional)_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX C

Table 26 Classroom Organization

Special Education Classroom	80 (78.4%)
Resource/Pull out	17 (16.7%)
Self-Contained	53 (52.0%)
Departmental	28 (27.5%)
Bilingual	13 (12.7%)
Monolingual	45 (44.1%)
Chapter 1 ESEA	12 (11.8%)
State Title 1	5 (4.9%)

Table 27 How Students Are Grouped for Reading Instruction

Heterogeneously	58 (56.8%)
Homogeneously	36 (35.3%)

Table 28 Number of Reading Groups

1	51 (50.0%)
2	24 (23.5%)
3	14 (13.7%)
4	3 (2.9%)
5	8 (7.8%)
8	1 (1.0%)
9	1 (1.0%)

n = 102

Table 29 Overall Reading Ability of Students

Above Average	11 (10.8%)
Average	27 (26.5%)
Below Average	61 (59.8%)

n = 99

Table 30 Racial Composition of Class

African-American	55 (53.9%)
Caucasian	4 (3.9%)
Hispanic	21 (20.6%)
Multi-Ethnic	22 (21.6%)

n = 102

Table 31 Classroom Enrollment

Less than 10	7 (6.9%)
11-20	15 (14.7%)
21-30	38 (37.3%)
31+	42 (41.2%)

n = 102

Table 32 Percentage of Students Receiving a Free Lunch

0-5%	--
6-25%	2 (2.0%)
26-45%	4 (3.9%)
46-65%	10 (9.8%)
66-85%	20 (19.6%)
86%+	64 (62.7%)
Don't Know	1 (1.9%)

n = 101

Table 33 Current Assignment

Grade 4	23 (22.5%)
Grade 5	15 (14.7%)
Grade 6	19 (18.6%)
Grade 7	15 (14.7%)
Grade 8	19 (18.6%)

n = 91

Table 34 Number of Years in Present Position

1-5	46 (45.1%)
6-10	19 (18.6%)
11-15	10 (9.8%)
16-20	6 (5.9%)
21 +	20 (19.6%)

n = 101

Table 35 Number of Years Teaching

1-5	16 (15.7%)
6-10	6 (5.9%)
11-15	11 (10.0%)
16-20	26 (25.5%)
21 +	43 (42.2%)

n = 102

Table 36 Area of Certification

Elementary Education	99 (97.1%)
Reading	19 (18.6%)

Table 37 Educational Background

B.A.	17 (16.7%)
B.A. + 15 to 30 Hours	19 (18.6%)
M.A.	26 (25.5%)
M.A. + 15 to 30 Hours	40 (39.2%)

n = 102

Table 38 Major in College - Undergraduate

Education	83 (81.4%)
Liberal Arts	17 (16.3%)

Table 39 Semester Hours in Reading

None	1 (1.0%)
2-9	24 (23.5%)
12-18	29 (48.0%)
21 +	23 (22.5%)

n = 97

APPENDIX D

RESULTS OF ILLINOIS ASSESSMENT PROGRAM
APRIL, 1992 (Chicago Tribune, November, 1992)

READING

School	Grade -6	Grade - 8	Percentage of Low Income
1	113	167	98.2%
2	162	203	77.4%
3	244*	255*	70.9%
4	112	202	94.7%
5	155	169	85.5%
6	173	180	89.4%
7	120	159	100.0%
8	207	198	81.8%
9	160	190	100.0%
10	204	186	88.0%
11	177	173	78.9%
12	180	205	96.7%
13	152	182	91.6%
14	190	221	92.1%
15	138	168	100.0%
16	191	224	89.1%
17	250*	217	87.9%
18	166	195	74.8%

19	184	176	86.6%
20	196	231	74.8%
21	171	216	100.0%
22	194	194	89.1%
23	321*	345*	40.8%
24	184	209	100.0%

State Averages*

Grade 6 - 244
Grade 8 - 248

APPENDIX E

Responses to Questions in Which Other Was Indicated

INSTRUCTIONALLY, HOW DO YOU TEACH STUDENTS TO PREDICT STORY CONTENT PRIOR TO READING?

use KWL activities
use prediscussion questions
use vocabulary from selection
story mapping
read, discuss, summarize questions

HOW DO YOU ENGAGE STUDENTS' PRIOR KNOWLEDGE BEFORE THEY READ THE SELECTION?

use KWL activities
discussion based on leading question
use games involving the reading/subject
use charts, graphs, webbing
read the introduction of the reading selection

HOW DO YOU COMBINE READING AND WRITING IN YOUR LESSONS?

creative writing from stories
reading, writing, deep thinking
student authorized stories
opinion of plot and characters
construct a similar story
writing to interpret and define
write own experiences that are similar to story
writing beyond the lesson

HOW DO STUDENTS WORK ON READING ASSIGNMENTS?

peer tutors
with help of an assistant
discussion groups
workbooks/worksheets
small and large discussion groups

IF STUDENTS WORK IN SMALL GROUPS, HOW ARE THEY ASSIGNED TO GROUPS AND WHAT PROCEDURES ARE FOLLOWED?

students are encouraged to work with each other
specific tasks for each group member
students work for points in group
same activity, different levels
group discusses a problem

GROUPS ARE ENGAGED IN WHAT TYPES OF READING ACTIVITIES AFTER DISCUSSION?

making story webs/answering 5wh questions
creating their own tests
story mapping/SSR/interpreting story
completing workbooks
discuss similar life experience and story
pupils read to each other
change character parts/revise ending
answer on computer
reading to pictures without words
illustrating maps, charts, graphs
semantic maps/character clusters

HOW DO YOU MODEL YOUR OWN PROCESS OF READING DURING INSTRUCTION?

think aloud/read aloud
SRA Lab
show feeling with face as reading
read aloud each day
silent reading
model writing process
structural analysis - prefixes/suffixes

HOW DO YOU TEACH SUCH READING SUBSKILLS AS DRAWING CONCLUSIONS,

SEQUENCE, CHARACTER ANALYSIS, CAUSE & EFFECT, AUTHOR VIEWPOINT, AND MAIN IDEA?

a lot of review at the end of the week
prepare own lesson
reward for comprehension recognition
discussion, writing from a prompt
students write story conclusions
use games
through content area textbooks
analyzing causal effects
oral discussion after reading
worksheets for homework
use newspaper articles
video games/board games
computer instruction
fishbowl and questions on the board

HOW DO YOU TEACH VOCABULARY DURING A READING LESSON?

read/review/write vocabulary
use word sentence/look up word in dictionary
tell memorable meaning of word
word search
define vocabulary in own words

WHAT MATERIALS DO YOU USE TO TEACH VOCABULARY?

magazines/newspaper
SRA reading for understanding
vocabulary games
20 spelling words from content
literature text
computer instruction program
context charts
reading charts from publisher

The dissertation submitted by Virginia-Ellen Goodman has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Robert Cienkus, Director
Associate Professor, Curriculum and Instruction
Loyola University of Chicago

Dr. Barney Berlin
Associate Professor, Curriculum and Instruction
Loyola University of Chicago

Dr. Jack Kavanagh
Professor, Counseling and Educational Psychology
Loyola University of Chicago

Dr. Genevieve Lopardo
Dean, College of Education
Chicago State University

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is, therefore, accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Ph.D.

6/1/93 — Date

Dr. Robert C. Cienkus — Director's Signature