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This study examines a collaborative endeavor in which a Chapter One teacher and a researcher worked together to plan, conduct and reflect on a reading instruction designed to promote strategic reading.

For eleven weeks, data were collected during conversations and reflective/planning sessions conducted by the teacher and the researcher and during instruction for a group of fourth- and fifth-grade students. Ethnographic methods such as participant observation, interviews, document collections and researcher journal writing were used as data collection techniques. Two methods of data analysis were used--discrepant case analysis (Erickson, 1986) and constant comparison method (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

The findings suggest that the teacher-researcher collaboration motivated changes in the teacher, the researcher and the students. That is, the collaborative work helped the teacher learn to use a process approach to teaching reading
comprehension. It also helped students learn about the reading process and reading strategies. Finally, this study helped the researcher learn about ways to assist teachers in becoming more knowledgeable and reflective.
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CHAPTER 1
Rationale and Review of Literature

This study examined the collaborative efforts of a teacher and a researcher who together designed a reading program to promote skill and will development of poor readers within a remedial reading setting. That is, it was our purpose to examine the teacher’s and the researcher’s contributions to the instructional processes for poor readers working within a reading program designed to provide these readers opportunities to become strategic readers who are interested in learning.

This chapter reviews and discusses the research from three related areas: the research on the influence of interactions among cognition, motivation, and affect on learning to read; the research on teaching and learning to read in classrooms; and the research on collaborating with teachers as a way of facilitating their reflection and learning. The review of the literature provides the rationale for the study and reveals its importance.

Learning to Read

Learning to read is one of the most important tasks children have to face when entering school, since effective reading is an essential condition for their academic success (Paris, Lipson and Wixson, 1983; Baker and Brown, 1984; Duffy and Roehler, 1987). Indeed, in a highly literate and
competitive society, such as the American one, learning to read is often a gateway to education and better jobs. Johnston's (1985) three case studies about adult poor readers provide good examples of these readers' difficulties with getting good jobs or better positions in their actual work, and of the constant pressures they are under at home and at work because of their reading failure.

In school, children spend many hours in reading instruction. Nonetheless, some of them have difficulty learning how to read (Varnhagen and Goldman, 1986; Martin, 1986; Allington, Stuetzel, Shake, and Lamarache, 1986; Clay, 1982, 1972). For example, Martin's (1986) report of a 9-year-old boy's struggles learning to read provides a compelling picture of a child's unsuccessful efforts to fix up inadequate reading strategies developed from an inappropriate view of the reading process. This little boy, as many others, in spite of his efforts to fix up the strategies he used to read, looses the battle to develop an adequate view of several aspects of reading and fails to learn adequate strategies necessary for effective reading.

For children like these, failure may mean being classified as a slow learner or a learning disabled reader and being removed to a special setting for supplemental or special reading instruction. Such readers, then, have to cope with difficulty with academic work in two reading settings.
and, often, also with their debilitating beliefs about themselves as poor readers, and with the loss of motivation to learn, which often reflects their low expectations for successful performance (Doyle, 1983; Covington, 1983; Martin, 1986; Stanovich, 1986; Winograd and Johnston, 1985; Johnston and Niquette, 1987).

There are many factors involved in learning to read. Indeed, much of recent research indicates that reading is a multiple context process in which the various knowledge sources of the reader interact with one another and with other pertinent factors, such as the reading situation (task), the materials, the teacher and the reading setting (Mosenthal, 1984; Lipson and Wixson, 1986: Wixson and Lipson, 1986). As discussed by Mosenthal (1984), a fully specified definition of reading is a "multi-context phenomenon," which he represents as a pyramid model in which each side consists of a reading context, such as setting, situation organizer (e.g., the teacher), reader, task and materials. As Mosenthal noted, the definition of one context requires the involvement of the other reading contexts. For example, to understand a reader's performance we need to consider sources from the reader context, as well as from the teacher, materials, the task and the setting contexts. (See Figure 1.)

Within interactive models of the reading process such
as the one proposed by Mosenthal, failure to learn to read is understood as a relative and dynamic concept rather than a static state which resides within the reader (Wixson and Lipson, 1986; Lipson and Wixson, 1986; Johnston, 1985; Winograd and Smith, 1987). The reader's performance varies as a function of the interactions among the several knowledge sources and processes of the reader and influences from the various other reading sources as represented in Figure 1. Among the reader factors thought to be important are various types of reader knowledge, including knowledge about the several aspects of the reading process, about reading strategies, and also the beliefs a child holds about him/herself as reader and his/her motivation to perform (Lipson and Wixson, 1986; Johnston, 1985; Johnston and Winograd, 1985).

An understanding of reading failure as a dynamic and interactive process will emphasize the reader's higher cognitive processes, such as the child's awareness of the reading process and the reading strategies, and metacognitive control over his/her own reasoning this child has developed in the social and instructional daily activities of classroom reading settings (Johnston, 1985; Johnston and Winograd, 1985; Paris et al., 1983; Wixson and Lipson, 1986). In fact, from this point of view, the social and instructional environment created by the teacher to provide
Figure 1: The Mosenthal Pyramid Model
children with opportunities to learn strategic knowledge about reading is of primary importance (Paris et al., 1983; Paris and Oka, 1986; Winne, 1981; Marx and Winne, 1982; Marx and Walsh, 1988; Marx, Winne, and Walsh, 1985; Duffy and Roehler, 1987).

Readers’ Strategic Behavior

Within this framework, reading is understood as a strategic process and readers are seen as decision makers and active processors of information. For instance, before reading, strategic readers may make decisions about what prior knowledge to activate, about what predictions to make about upcoming events (Anderson and Pearson, 1984), about their purposes for reading and the goals they wish to achieve, and about what strategies to use to reach those purposes and goals (Paris, et al., 1983; Duffy and Roehler, 1987; Baker and Brown, 1984; Nicholls, 1983; Maher, 1983; Hagen, Barclay, and Newman, 1982). During reading, readers may make decisions about combining the new information with existing information, and about the necessity to modify the initial decisions made about predictions, goal setting and choice of strategies (Anderson and Pearson, 1984; Baker and Brown; Duffy and Roehler, 1987; Paris et al., 1983). After reading, readers may make decisions about which inferences to draw and about the meaning of the text (Duffy and Roehler, 1987; Paris, 1986; Anderson and Pearson, 1984).
Children's effective reading seems greatly influenced by their knowledge about reading, and about reading strategies, and by their metacognitive awareness of their own reasoning (Paris et al., 1983; Baker and Brown, 1984; Duffy and Roehler, 1987). The relationship between knowledge and the use of strategies and metacognition in effective reading appears to be strong and tight. Strategies are understood as selected actions chosen by the reader among others for the purpose of achieving a particular goal (Paris et al., 1983; Duffy and Roehler, 1987). A reader's choice of strategy varies according to the reading situation, the reader's purpose and goals in reading, the difficulty of the text and/or the task, and the reader's resources. For example, according to their goal and purpose in reading (e.g., studying, reading for pleasure, reading to complete a worksheet), text, content or task difficulty, readers take different actions such as scanning, skimming, taking notes, making outlines, rereading or slowing down (Paris, Newman and Jacobs, 1985; Paris et al, 1983). As discussed by Paris, Lipson, and Wixson (1983), it is not the effectiveness of the action, but its deliberate choice to reach an end that defines a strategy.

The use of strategies to read is particularly important for beginning and poor readers who are learning how to proceed during reading in order to recognize an unknown word,
or to check comprehension. However, as their reading skills become more automatic, most readers do not need to consider means and goals deliberately (Paris et al., 1983). The choices expert readers make are typically automatic, and such readers will consider the strategic component only if a triggering event occurs, such as a failure in comprehension (Paris et al., 1983; Palincsar and Brown, 1984). Thus, a strategy differs from an automatic skill, since the former presupposes a person’s intentionality, purpose and choice of a particular alternative action, while the latter does not (Paris et al., 1983). Indeed, we regard this intentional, effortful, self-selected and reflected means to achieving an end as crucial to an understanding of the concept of strategy as we are using it.

Closely related to the concept of strategy and, in fact, the essential condition for an efficient use of strategies is the concept of metacognition. Metacognition is understood as a person’s knowledge of and control over his/her own thinking and learning (Baker and Brown, 1984). As discussed by Baker and Brown (1984), the term metacognition has been used to refer to two related but slightly different phenomena: a person’s knowledge about his/her own cognitive resources, and his/her regulation of cognition. An individual’s awareness of his/her own thinking and resources, and the congruity of these resources with
the mental operations necessary to perform effectively allow him/her to become an active and planful reader (Paris et al., 1983; Baker and Brown, 1984; Duffy and Roehler, 1986). In addition, a person's regulation of his/her own thinking and learning will permit him/her to develop self-regulatory mechanisms to solve the problems encountered during reading task performance. According to Baker and Brown (1984), self-regulatory mechanisms include actions that involve metacognition, such as checking an outcome, planning the next move, monitoring the effectiveness of an action chosen, testing, revising and evaluating the strategies used. Metacognitive activities, thus, help a reader to become aware of what he/she needs to perform efficiently so that he/she can choose and employ strategies that meet the demands of the task. In addition, these activities help the reader to detect a problem and to choose a particular strategy to repair this failure (Baker and Brown, 1984; Paris et al., 1983; Duffy and Roehler, 1987). Indeed, as discussed by Paris and his colleagues and by Duffy and Roehler (1987), the awareness of the utility and appropriateness of strategies is essential to their efficient use (see Figure 2).

As discussed by Paris, Lipson and Wixson (1983), knowledge about strategies, metacognitive awareness, and willingness to read and perform together define strategic reading. Metacognitive awareness is understood as the ability to
Figure 2: Relationships between Metacognition, Action and Strategy.
think about and monitor one's own thinking which allows the detection and repair of failure during a reading task (Paris et al., 1983; Duffy and Roehler, 1987). A child's awareness of the need of monitoring task outcomes and his/her own learning, and his/her knowledge that special plans and actions are sometimes necessary during task performance to reach a desired goal have been considered extremely important for strategic reading (Paris and Oka, 1986; Myers and Paris, 1978; Baker and Brown, 1984; Palincsar and Ransom, 1988; Duffy, Roehler, Meloth, Polin, Rackliffe, Tracy and Vavrus, 1987; Duffy and Roehler, 1987).

For Paris, Lipson, and Wixson (1983), three kinds of knowledge are necessary for a reader to develop a strategic reading behavior: declarative, procedural and conditional knowledge. Declarative Knowledge is "knowing that". It includes the individual's information about the task characteristics and his/her personal beliefs. That is, it encompasses knowledge about the structure and goals of a task (e.g., knowing that the title of a text can help to preview what the text is going to be about before reading, or knowing that the goals of a task change according to task purpose). However, declarative knowledge alone is not sufficient for a skilled performance since the individual may have the knowledge but may not know how to use it (Paris et al., 1983; Flavell, 1977; Duffy and Roehler, 1987). Johnston
(1985) provides good examples of adult poor readers who knew about adequate strategies to use, but did not use them due to the development of inadequate strategies (coping strategies), strategies which used these readers' strengths to compensate for their weaknesses and helped them to cope with their problem without solving it. Thus, it is also crucial to know how to use the information, that is, to have developed the procedural knowledge necessary for action.

Nevertheless, declarative and procedural knowledge also does not ensure that a strategic behavior will occur during reading, since it is also necessary to know when and why to use the strategy, that is, to possess the conditional knowledge (Paris et al., 1983). Again, Johnston (1985) provides compelling examples of how adult poor readers knew how to skim through the text, how to use context but had problems with why and when to use this knowledge.

Paris and his colleagues (Paris, Lipson and Wixson, 1983) state that a crucial goal for reading instruction, as well as for education in general, is to help students to become "self-controlled" learners, learners who plan, evaluate and regulate their learning. For example, Peterson and Swing (1982), and Peterson, Swing, Braverman, and Buss (1982) found that students' metacognitive knowledge of the mental operations necessary for efficient learning during math tasks, such as student's ability to judge and monitor
their own understanding, students' ability to talk about the specific strategies used to understand the task, to solve the problems and to check their answers was related to their achievement. According to Peterson and her colleagues, low achievement students' reports of the strategies used indicated a lack of knowledge about mental operations that might facilitate learning. For the authors, this lack appeared to limit these students' learning potential (Peterson, 1988). Accordingly, Peterson, Swing, and Stoiber (1986); Swing, Stoiber, and Peterson (1988) found that helping low ability students to develop requisite thinking improved their strategic awareness in math problem solving and consequently their achievement (Peterson, 1988).

Research in reading has come to similar findings which reveal a lack of knowledge about reading strategies among poor readers, and crucial differences between good and poor readers' awareness of the purposeful and flexible use of strategies (Myers and Paris, 1978; Paris and Jacobs, 1984; Johnston, 1985). For example, researchers have found that poor readers usually lack adequate knowledge about the reading process (Canney and Winograd, 1979; Johnston, 1985; Paris and Jacobs, 1984; Clay, 1982, 1972). Contrary to good readers, poor readers do not engage deliberately in strategic operations which require planning, flexibility and constant monitoring (Murphy, 1987; Palinscar and Ransom,
Such differences in good and poor readers' flexible use of strategies to complete academic tasks are described in Murphy's (1987) descriptive study of four fifth-graders' academic task accomplishment. For example, one of the focal students, considered a successful achiever by her teacher, was a reader who used strategies flexibly and efficiently. As described by Murphy, when given a list of vocabulary words, for instance, the girl would first predict the meaning of each word and then check her prediction against the definition given. If she was not sure about the word, she would rely on the information provided by the text, by the teacher and peers to figure out the meaning of the word. On the other hand, another focal student, considered an unsuccessful reader by her teacher, was less efficient in her strategic behavior. For instance, if this girl encountered words she was not sure about, she reported that the first thing she used to try was to sound them out. Further, as pointed out by Murphy, in the face of difficulty, the girl actually stopped working and stared at the paper or book she was reading from.

As discussed, cognitive aspects of learning to read, or "skill", include a reader's knowledge about the reading process, his/her knowledge about strategies, their use and control, and his/her knowledge about the purposes and goals of
the task (Paris et al., 1983; Duffy and Roehler, 1987). Although the reader’s skill is crucial to efficient reading behavior, this is not the whole picture. Motivation or will is also a key factor (Paris, 1988, Paris et al., 1983; Paris and Oka, 1986; Wixson and Lipson, 1986; Covington, 1983). Motivation is understood here as a feeling that affects a child’s willingness to respond to reading. Within the interactive framework, motivation interacts with many other factors, such as the child’s perception of the reading situation, his/her beliefs about his/her ability to function appropriately in these situations, and the child’s expectations of success or failure in future performances, to influence reading success (Wixson and Lipson, 1986; Nicholls, 1983). We define belief here as a proposition, or statement of relation among things, accepted as being true (Lalik, R. and Pecic, K., 1986).

Indeed, learning and performing seem directed by both knowledge (skill) and by the beliefs readers hold about themselves as readers together with their motivation to perform and learn (will). That is, an individual may possess the skill, but, influenced by contextual factors such as lack of time, lack of resources, lack of interest in the text or task, the public nature and risk of the task environment, or by reader factors such as low self-concept as reader, low motivation to respond to task, low expectation
of success, that reader may choose not to use this skill (Wigfield and Asher, 1984; Ames and Ames, 1984; Paris et al., 1983; Lipson and Wixson, 1986; Covington, 1983; Paris and Oka, 1986; Schoenfeld, 1983; Palincsar and Ransom, 1988; Anderson, Stevens, Prawat, and Nickerson, 1988; Briggs, 1986). For example, Palincsar and Ransom (1988), in discussing how metacognitive knowledge affects the selection of strategies and the cognitive operations necessary for their use in two boys studying for an essay test, stress how motivation, or will, affects the boys' choices and performance.

According to Covington (1983), all cognitions (e.g., cognitive activities such as remembering, reasoning and problem solving) are motivated, since they are directed by a purpose of creating meaning for an individual's experiences, and by the need of establishing and maintaining his/her personal worth. Therefore, when a person's motives are not fulfilled, he/she may direct cognitions to a defensive and self-protective goal. In this case, there will be a shift in this individual's motivation from learning to defending his/her ego (Nicholls, 1983: Wang, 1983).

There is empirical evidence that students' cognitive behaviors are shaped by the beliefs they hold about the task, by the instructional environment, by themselves as performers, and by their resources (Murphy, 1987; Schoenfeld, 1983). Murphy (1987), although not focusing on the
influence of will on child's task accomplishment, provides
good examples of the influence of children's motivation on
their skillful reading performance. For instance, Murphy's
descriptions of Rena constitutes a vivid example of the
destructive influence of negative beliefs. Although Rena
used strategies that might lead her to successful task com-
pletion, she suffered from the influence of her low beliefs
about herself as reader, from her low expectation for suc-
cess and from the impact of a competitive classroom context
for the reading created by the teacher. As a result, Rena
failed as reader. In the face of difficulties in accomplishing
reading tasks, Rena, instead of reasoning about changing
her strategies or trying to solve the difficulties, just
quit. As stated by Murphy,

Rena's response to the risk level of the class-room was to
assume a passive attitude toward the reading activities. She
waited to be called on and when she was, waited to give a
response until she was sure of her answer. [...] She would
sit silently when faced with a word she could not pronounce
and she would turn in incomplete work when she did not
understand what she was being asked to do (p.310).

Rena's behavior seemed to stem from an interaction
among cognitive, motivational and affective problems that
Johnston and Winograd (1985) call "passive failure". Expla-
nations of how students' beliefs about themselves as readers
and their motivation affect their cognitive performance and
strategic reading behavior are provided within various con-
ceptual frameworks, such as achievement motivation, attribu-
tion theory, and learned helplessness (Johnston and Winograd, 1985; Johnston, 1985; Bristow, 1985; Covington, 1983; Wigfield and Asher, 1984; Frieze, Francis and Hanusa, 1983).

**Achievement Motivation.** Early theoretical views (Atkinson, 1957, 1964; Atkinson, Clark and Lowell, 1953; McClelland, 1961) emphasize achievement behavior as a result of an emotional conflict between the fear of failure and the hope of success. However, this kind of conflict focuses not on cognitive factors but on affective processes such as the motive to achieve or to avoid failure and conflict resolution. The motive to achieve is seen as a function of the individual's expectancy of reaching a goal and the value this person placed on attaining it (Covington, 1983; Frieze, Francis, and Hanusa, 1983; Wigfield and Asher, 1984). Weiner and his colleagues further develop these ideas to emphasize the cognitive factors that influence achievement motivation. Although achievement motivation is still seen as a function of expectations of success and value attached to outcomes, a person's causal reasoning or attributions about their successes and failures is seen as affecting motivation and, consequently, the person's behavior in subsequent achievement situations (Weiner, 1979, 1980, 1983; Frieze, Francis and Hanusa, 1983).

Mæhr's (1983) research on achievement motivation stresses the meaning of achievement for the achiever. For
him, any demonstrated achievement is a function of a person’s goals and beliefs and the particular situation in which this person finds him/herself. According to Maehr, the meaning of achievement motivation involves an individual’s (1) judgments about his/her competence, (2) judgments about his/her role in initiating and controlling the performance, (3) goals in performing, and (4) ways in which these goals can be attained.

Attribution Theory. Weiner and his colleagues developed an attribution theory of achievement motivation which views an individual’s cognitive and affective responses to success and failure in achievement tasks as a result of the causal attribution he/she used to explain a particular outcome (Frieze et al., 1983). Attribution theorists examine students’ attempts to make sense of their own behaviors and of the behaviors of others, such as teachers, peers and parents. Weiner (1980) presents several notions about beliefs: (a) individuals held beliefs about themselves, (b) beliefs are motivators of behavior, (c) beliefs may function as cues to provide a person with information about him/herself. Thus, the causes children use as explanations for the successful or unsuccessful task outcomes affect their expectations, motivation and the efforts that will be applied to upcoming instructional tasks.

Weiner (1980, 1983) discusses four dominant causal
attributions of success and failure: ability, effort, luck and task difficulty, which he classified into three dimensions: internality, controllability and stability. These dimensions are discussed both as dichotomous and as lying along a continuum. Internality refers to whether the cause of an event is perceived as internal, that is, as related to the actor (e.g., ability and effort), or as external, that is, as related to something else in the environment (e.g., luck and the difficulty of the task). Stability refers to whether the cause is perceived as enduring or fleeting over time, and controllability to whether the cause is perceived inside or outside the actor's dominion. Within this classification scheme, ability and effort are usually perceived as internal to the actor; however, whereas ability is often seen as stable and outside the perceiver's control, effort is understood as unstable, that is, as changing over time and within the perceiver's control.

Nevertheless, recent research has shown that students mention other causes of success or failure, such as help from teachers and peers, and students' feelings — good, bad or sick (Frieze, Francis and Hanusa, 1983; Weiner, 1983), and the dimensions of causes vary across situations (Hiebert, Winograd and Danner, 1984). For instance, Hiebert and her colleagues found that sixth-graders' locus of control varied across reading tasks. That is, children rated
task difficulty higher for comprehension than for evaluation situations. According to Hiebert and her colleagues, this finding suggests that children know the effect of text difficulty on comprehension. In addition, causal attributions and the dimensions under which these causes are perceived change with the child's development and affect this child's future attributions, and his/her behavior and cognitions during task accomplishment (Hiebert et al., 1984; Covington, 1983). Indeed, unlike older children, first and second graders seem not to relate failure to lack of ability and continue to have high expectations for future success after failure.

Nicholls (1983) suggests that there is evidence that younger children internalize adults' values and come to value effort. However, unlike older students, younger ones seem to understand ability and effort as almost synonymous. For example, Harari and Covington (1981) found that ability and effort were valued by students from first grade to college (Covington, 1983), but only younger children perceived high effort as indicative of high ability and studying as predictor of ability. After second grade, students increasingly perceived ability as a stable entity, and did not see effort as predictor of success any more. Indeed, ability became for them the most important condition for successful performance (Covington, 1983). Similarly, Hiebert et al
(1984) found that third and sixth graders held different conceptions of ability.

According to Nicholls' (1983) work on attribution theory, self-concept and self-perceptions of reading ability have more than one meaning aroused by different reasons in the actor's motivation to achieve. In this view, an understanding of these motives is important to the comprehension of students' task accomplishment. For Nicholls, there are three types of achievement motivation: task-involvement, ego-involvement and extrinsic-involvement. In extrinsic-involvement, learning is motivated as a means to an end. For instance, a student accomplishes a task to receive a reward or to please the teacher. According to Nicholls, however, this type of motivation may direct the child's attention to the premium at the expense of the task, which will impair task learning. The states of ego-involvement and task-involvement are related to higher rather than lower motivation. In task-involvement, the child's attention is focused on the task and on the processes and strategies for learning the task. On the contrary, in ego-involvement, attention is directed to the self, and learning becomes only a means to protect the self (Nicholls, 1983).

For Nicholls, underlying the above states are differences in the conception of ability. In task-involvement, learning suggests competence. Ability is not understood as a
stable entity, and the learner's attention is directed toward how to learn something. On the other hand, in ego-involvement, ability is understood as a stable entity measured as related to others' performance, and the learner's attention is concentrated on how to look smart, or at least, how not to look stupid.

**Learned Helplessness.** The phenomenon of learned helplessness refers to an individual's perception that he/she is unable to control task outcomes. The conception of learned helplessness initially came from Seligman's (1975) research on adult depression (Johnston and Winograd, 1986; Winograd and Niquette, 1987; Covington, 1983). He observed that dogs, when faced in the laboratory with unavoidable aversive events (shock), changed their cognitive and emotional responses and developed a helpless behavior similar to those of depressed adults. Seligman, then, postulated that the dogs, as well as the depressed adults, saw the outcomes of the events as independent of their personal responses. Consequently, this feeling of helplessness reduced their motivation in trying to affect the situation and control the outcomes (Johnston and Winograd, 1986; Johnston and Niquette, 1987; Covington, 1983).

Studies in classrooms (Butwosky and Willows, 1980) or in laboratories (Diener and Dweck, 1980) have typically shown that under conditions in which difficulty is
experienced, some children have more difficulty than others to perform effectively, and fail to accomplish even the tasks they have completed successfully prior to failure. As found by Diener and Dweck (1980), unlike non-helpless children, helpless fifth- and sixth-graders appeared to be directed toward evaluation of ability rather than toward acquisition of ability (mastery-directed). In the face of obstacles, helpless children started interpreting their errors as indication of low ability, perceiving their past successes as few and irrelevant, and the efforts to achieve future success as unnecessary, since they had little expectations of success. In contrast, mastery-oriented children, in the face of difficulty, intensified their efforts, verbalized self-directions, tried different strategies, and engaged in constant self-monitoring.

Attribution theory, achievement motivation and learned helplessness literatures can provide us with useful frameworks for understanding the behavior and cognitions of the children with a history of reading difficulty.

The Classroom as an Environment for Learning to Read

Learning to read often occurs in classrooms. Consequently, to understand the learning experiences of students, we may wish to study classroom environments. Because the development of skill (knowledge) and will (affect and motivation) is important in learning to read, it should be
fruitful to examine the classroom with these factors in mind. One way to do this is to study the ways in which teachers provide opportunities for students to learn reading skill and will.

Providing students opportunities during instruction has been a recurrent theme in recent research on teaching and learning in classrooms usually examined as opportunities to learn. As discussed by Doyle (1987b), Roehler and Duffy (1981), and Rosenshine and Stevens (1984), research on teacher effectiveness defined opportunities to learn in terms of content covered. According to these authors, opportunities to learn in reading had been studied by correlating one of several measures of content covered (e.g., the content of textbooks, the number of books read, the number of words a teacher attempted to teach) with student achievement. More recently, researchers have defined opportunities in terms of other variables. For example, Doyle (1987b) argues that the concept of opportunity to learn must include student attention and task engagement as well as the actions students perform, such as "solving word problems, answering comprehension questions, writing expository essays." Jones (1988) also discussed opportunities to learn as a function of several variables. Among those variables, he included hours of instruction, time on task, the amount and quality of student work, the appropriateness of course content, the
teacher qualification and teaching effectiveness.

For the purpose of this study, we are defining opportunities as the curriculum chosen and implemented by the teacher. Curriculum is an organized structure for carrying out instruction (Calfee and Piontkowski, 1984). It involves (1) the teacher's choice of goals for instruction; (2) the teacher's choice of instructional activities; (3) the teacher's choice of materials to be used by the students and the teacher; and (4) the teacher's behavior during instruction (e.g., modeling, questioning, providing explanations, providing students time to reveal their thinking, providing feedback and encouragement).

Opportunities for Learning Strategies

Recent research has emphasized the need for classroom instructional and social influences which promote student learning of strategies during reading instruction. For instance, Winne (1981) and Winne and Marx (1982) argue that, since students have to apply cognitive activities to learn, the focus of research on student learning needs to be not only on the teaching, but also on whether students are applying the necessary cognitive operations during task accomplishment. This view reflects a change of emphasis from research on effective teaching focusing on the teacher's behaviors alone to research that stresses both the teacher's thinking and behavior and the students' cognition,
behavior and motivation to learn and perform.

Within this framework the reader is seen as a cognitively active and purposeful processor of information who interprets (mediates) reading instruction. Doyle (1983), Winne (1981) and Winne and Marx (1985) call this research "cognitive mediational paradigm" because teachers influence students by offering them opportunities to think and to behave in certain ways. The effects of these mediating events exerted by teachers may help students to learn. However, as the effects of teaching on learning are mediated by students' cognitive processes, the cognitive mediational paradigm requires an understanding of students' perception of the task to be accomplished and the cognitive operations used (Winne and Marx, 1979; Marx, Winne and Walsh, 1985). Applied to reading instruction, this research suggests the importance of teacher's knowledge about reading and about strategies, the decisions they make to engage students in learning to read, how they communicate these decisions to students, and how they facilitate students' learning of the reading process. Most important, this theoretical approach to classroom research suggests stressing the mental processes actually used by students during task accomplishment.

One approach to helping students to develop strategic reading has come from Duffy and his colleagues (Duffy, Roehler and Herrman, 1988; Duffy, Roehler, Putnam, 1987; Duffy,
Roehler, Sivan, Rackliffe, Book, Meloth, Vavrus, Wesselman, Putnam, and Bassiri, 1987; Duffy and Roehler, 1987; Duffy, Roehler and Rackliffe, 1986; Duffy, Roehler, and Wesselman, 1985; Roehler, Duffy, and Meloth, 1986). These researchers give theoretical and empirical evidence of the need to provide students with direct instruction about the mental activities involved in strategic reading, and to provide students with time to practice these strategies while they are reading meaningful texts. Similarly, Paris and his colleagues (Paris, Lipson and Wixson, 1983, and Paris, 1986) argue that just demonstrating and telling is not sufficient for a child to learn how to use reading strategies and how to exert metacognitive control during reading. For Paris and Duffy and their colleagues, it is also essential to provide a great amount of reading practice on meaningful texts and feedback, so that the child can connect what she/he is learning to the reading process as a whole.

As discussed by Duffy, Paris, and their colleagues, direct instruction means telling students explicitly how the reading process works, what strategies to use; and how, when and why to use them. The instructional emphasis of this approach is on the mental processes necessary to make sense of a text, or to control for comprehension and learning. A good example of this type of teaching is provided by Roehler, Duffy, and Meloth (1986). In their example, the teacher
uses a thinking out loud procedure to explain the mental processes involved in using content clues:

I don’t know what upbraided means. I have to figure out. What do I do first? I look for clues. Are there any clues that might tell me what that means? I look at the words around it and then..." (p. 89)

This version of direct instruction also involves teacher modeling of the mental processes necessary for strategic reading. To model, the teacher has to make his/her covert mental process somehow visible to students. The teacher thinks out loud to clarify for the students what mental processes she/he used, what processes she/he wants them to learn, and what are the ways of gaining and maintaining metacognitive control of their own reasoning. Duffy, Roehler, and Herrmann (1988) provide an example that illustrates a teacher modeling how to acquire metacognitive control of the process of activating prior knowledge before reading:

Watch me think out loud while I try to predict what this story is going to be about. The title is Sign Language Fun. [The teacher looks at the pictures.] Here is a picture of Sesame Street characters and a picture of a lady doing sign language. And the title says it is going to be about sign language. I know something about Sesame Street characters from my past experience. I’ve seen them do some pretty fantastic things. And the people in Sesame Street teach things to puppets. Since the lady is doing sign language, maybe she is going to teach the Sesame Street characters how to do sign language. I’m going to guess that in this story the lady is going to teach them how to use sign language (p. 764).

Duffy and his colleagues call this approach to instruc-
tion process-into-content because it emphasizes not only the content of the text but also the thinking readers use during reading. Even when discussing the content of the text, the teacher encourages the students to verbalize how they made sense of the text, and how they come to an answer. For example, Roehler, Duffy, and Meloth (1986) describe a teacher explaining how to use context clues, and encouraging a student to verbalize his mental operations. The teacher responds to the student’s answer:

Are you saying that divulge means mention? Oh, you jumped ahead to the end. You went through all the clues in your head and you are saying that this means mention. How did you know that? How did you figure out that it is mention (p. 90)?

This teacher encourages a student to verbalize the strategies he used to answer the question and to make the successful mental processes he used clear to other students.

Roehler, Duffy and Meloth (1986) and Duffy and Roehler (1987) contrast process-into-content with a content-only emphasis. According to Duffy and his colleagues, neither drill-and-practice, nor question-and-answer models of instruction (content-only emphasis) are adequate for teaching. Duffy, Roehler, Meloth, Vavrus, Book, Putman, and Wesselman (1986) provide a good illustration of how two teachers' explanations of the mental processes to be learned by the students conveyed different messages about the reading process. One teacher provided the students with clear expla-
nations about the mental processes to use:

...Look for clues in the context. Remember, the context means all the words before the new word or the words after the new word. Sometimes they are words in a different sentence close by the new word. After you look for clues, the second time we do this (writing on the board) put the clues together with what you already know about the word - and you try out what that word means... (p. 248)

In contrast, the other teacher focused on rote memorization of the steps to be used, and on the label context:

T: Okay, on the board I’ve listed the strategy, on the board behind you. Okay? The first step is to read the sentence. The second thing?
S: Look for the underlined word.
T: The third thing?
S: Reread the sentence.
T: And then you...
S: Look for the clue words (p. 248).

In spite of the great amount of research that emphasizes the importance of teacher’s clear and explicit explanation of strategies, research in the instruction typically offered to poor readers indicates that these readers have few opportunities to learn strategies either in their regular classrooms or in their reading compensatory settings (Allington, 1984, 1983, 1981, 1980, 1977; Allington, Suetzel, Shake and Lamarche, 1986). In fact, this research reveals a differential reading instruction offered to good and poor readers, with fewer opportunities to read provided to poor readers (Allington et al., 1986, Allington, 1984, 1983, 1980, 1977), and a great similarity in the types of instruction poor readers receive in both classroom and compensatory settings. This research further reveals that the
The greatest part of time devoted to reading instruction was spent on activities that support learning to read, but do not involve reading itself, such as discussing, listening, and completing worksheets (indirect reading activities). Time spent on direct reading activities was mostly devoted to exercises at word and sentence levels, the focus of the majority of instruction was on the correct answer, and no teacher was observed monitoring students' progress. (Allington et al., 1986; Duffy and McIntyre, 1982).

Furthermore, research has shown that beginning and poor readers have more difficulty using strategies spontaneously and effectively than expert readers do (Paris and Myers, 1981; Duffy, Roehler and Wesselman, 1985; Roehler, Duffy and Meloth, 1986; Roehler Duffy, Putman, Wesselman, Sivan, Rackliffe, Book, Meloth and Vavrus, 1986; Clay, 1972, 1982; Canney and Winograd, 1979). Besides being less aware of reading strategies, poor readers have more difficulty choosing among the strategies available to them, and also with procedural and conditional knowledge (Paris et al., 1983). Therefore, direct explanations and modeling of mental processes is particularly important for novice and poor readers, because it makes explicit for these readers the mental processes good readers use.

Opportunities for Developing Positive Affect
From the research developed by Allington and his colleagues, it seems that poor readers are not offered many opportunities to become involved in learning (task-involved) during reading instruction. Rather they become involved in preserving their egos (ego-involved). As discussed by Allington and his colleagues, the reading instruction poor readers typically receive in both reading settings is focused on performing correctly rather than on learning (Allington, 1977, 1980, 1981, 1983, 1984; Allington, Stuetzel, Shake, and Lamarch, 1986).

According to Nicholls (1983), this kind of teaching typically directs student to the goal of producing correct responses on worksheets rather than of making sense while reading. In this situation, the student will concentrate his/her attention on avoiding failure or looking stupid rather than on trying the text analysis. Many examples of child's ego-involvement in classrooms academic work are provided by Holt (1982) and Murphy (1987). For instance, Murphy describes the passive behavior of Rena, who never volunteers to answer, and, when called on, only answers if she is sure of the correctness of her answer. In addition, during class correction, Rena changes her answers in order to make them appear correct. For Rena, understanding a text is not a goal in itself. Instead, she works hard so as not to look stupid.

Ego-involvement rather than task-involvement is likely
to predominate under conditions of competition (Nicholls, 1983; Ames and Ames, 1984). Competition may turn classrooms into stressful places for some children (Rohrkeimper and Corno, 1988). Specific classroom conditions associated with high ego-involvement are: (a) teaching that values the correct answer rather than the cognitive operations used to accomplish the task (Blumenfeld and Meece, 1988; Marshall and Weinstein, 1986); (b) presentation of tasks that are too difficult, or with goals and cognitive operations that are not clear for the students (Murphy, 1987); (c) public comments on students' differential success in reading (Murphy, 1987); (d) teacher's control over most classroom tasks, such as choices of the task to be accomplished, the goals to be pursued, the materials to be used (Murphy, 1987).

According to Marx and Walsh (1988), in situations in which the teacher is the only one to have control of instruction, all the students will share the same goal. This situation will facilitate social comparison and diminish motivation, since students may shift their goals and motivations from learning to ego preservation and finding the correct answer for task accomplishment. Furthermore, the students may not be interested in what the teacher wants them to do (Murphy, 1987).

Thus, a teacher's organization of a classroom during reading instruction may enhance poor readers' ego- or task-
involvement, since it may facilitate social comparison, affect students' beliefs about themselves as readers, and promote avoidance behavior and lack of motivation to perform and to learn. Murphy (1987) describes a classroom in which the conditions created by the teacher during reading instruction typically increase students' ego-involvement. That is, this teacher exerts exclusive control of the execution of the tasks, evaluates students publicly, emphasizes the right answer rather than learning, and competition among students rather than cooperation. As a result, the students in her class work toward the right answer and ego-preservation. For instance, Anne, a good reader:

Anne's response to the risk level in the classroom was to do what was necessary to provide accurate and complete responses to reading tasks. She was...avoiding sanctions and ridicule by having the answer and having it right. When she did not have the correct answer, she would change her answers...(226)

Teacher's Decisions and Students' Focus on Learning. Marshall and Weinstein's (1986) findings show that teachers can increase students' focus on learning simply by emphasizing learning and the cognitive processes rather than not making errors or getting work done, and by making task completion challenging and fun, which agrees with the approach to reading instruction proposed by Duffy and his colleagues. Marshall and Weinstei describe a classroom in which the teacher used to tell her students, "I'm not interested in
how many you got wrong. I'm interested in if I can help you" (p. 450). This teacher appears to encourage students' performance and high expectations by showing them that they can make mistakes. In a setting like this, during reading instruction, a poor reader may feel more encouraged to read and show his/her difficulties without being afraid of looking stupid or of becoming an aim for peers' jokes. This climate of cooperation also characterizes the instructional processes of guided participation described by Rogoff (1986), Palincsar and Brown (1984), Palincsar (1987), and Paris (1986), in which the teacher guides the student through a process of solving problems. The teacher and the student engage together in a joint responsibility, in which the teacher, at first, assumes more responsibility and gradually increases the demands for student involvement, till the student performs independently. This student-teacher shared responsibility for learning was found to enhance students' interest in learning (Blumenfeld and Meece, 1988) and their use of strategies (Palincsar, 1987; Palincsar and Brown, 1984; Blumenfeld and Meece, 1988; Paris and Oka, 1986; Paris, Cross, and Lipson, 1984; Paris and Jacobs, 1984).

Furthermore, teachers who permit students to choose materials they are interested in, or who think of tasks that may help their students to feel challenged but not over-
whelmed by the task difficulty are also more likely to increase students' motivation to learn. However, as stressed by Nicholls (1983), individualized instruction may establish competition as well as the whole class instruction does. It appears that the teacher can make the most difference by emphasizing learning and cooperation.

The level of publicity and clarity of the teacher's evaluation criteria also seems to affect students' willingness to learn and perform (Murphy, 1987; Marshall and Weinstein, 1986). As observed by Marshall and Weinstein, when students know how they will be evaluated and that the results of their task performance will not be publicly exposed, they are more likely to become more task-involved. However, Marshall and Weinstein found that when the teacher stressed learning and the cognitive processes used for task completion rather than the correct answer, the publicity of evaluation did not appear to affect students' task-involvement.

In summary, the teacher's decisions and the reading setting she/he creates seem crucially responsible for students' task-involvement.

**Research Conducted with Poor Readers**

Poor readers, in addition to their regular reading instruction, may receive supplemental instruction from remedial reading programs. In fact, from the research conducted
by Murphy (1987) and Allington, Stuetzel, Shake, and Lamarche (1986), we know that sometimes the compensatory education is the only reading instruction poor readers are offered. Furthermore, as described by Allington and his colleagues (Allington, 1984, 1983, 1981, 1980, 1977; Allington, Stuetzel, Shake, and Lamarche, 1986), even when these readers receive reading instruction in both regular and compensatory settings, they often do not have many opportunities to learn the reading strategies they need to become better readers. That is, in both reading settings, poor readers typically are offered the same kind of reading instruction which emphasizes low level cognitive operations, such as memorizing and training of reading skills in isolation from the reading process as a whole.

Some research, conducted with teachers in reading settings, has been designed to provide poor readers with opportunities for learning strategies. In most of these programs, teachers have been trained by outside experts. For example, Clay (1982) reports successful results of a tutorial preventive program aimed at helping six year old children who had problems with learning to read after the first year in school. The emphasis of this program is on early prevention of reading difficulties rather than on remediation of firmly established cycles of cognitive, motivational and affective problems (Stanovich, 1986; Johnston, 1985; Johnston and
Winograd, 1985). These students participated in the program until they were able to perform like average readers in regular classrooms which, according to Clay, took an average of twelve to thirteen weeks.

This program was organized into three phases: (1) tutoring phase in which children received daily tutorial instruction, (2) back-in-class phase in which children were discontinued from the program, and (3) follow-up phase in which 93% of the children were retested one year later. To conduct the program, one experienced teacher was chosen by schools and trained by tutors whose work was, according to Clay, more supportive than prescriptive. The tutors invited the experienced teachers to teach, demonstrated to them and discussed with them new concepts and new activities. For Clay, a crucial part of this training program was an every-other-week demonstration and discussion session which used a one-side window between two rooms. Children were tutored in one room, and in the other teachers observed and discussed the ongoing tutoring session guided by a tutor-trainer. During the first six weeks of training, a tutor-trainer demonstrated the teaching, whereas another tutor-trainer modeled the discussions procedures. After this stage, teachers started the tutoring demonstrations, while the tutor-trainer directed the discussions. These demonstrations were followed by a session in which teachers and tutor-trainer
discussed the tutoring session just observed. Clay states that teachers reported feeling uncomfortable when demonstrating; however, they felt that these sessions helped them very much to become aware of their own choices and assumptions and to become self-critical. In addition, the tutor-trainer visited the schools regularly to (1) communicate with school officials about the program, (2) discuss with the tutor and demonstrate some procedures considered necessary, (3) observe the tutor at work, and (4) work with a particular child at the teacher's request.

Two basic principles underlie this program. First, the tutor-trainer was supposed to guide teachers to work for two weeks with what the children could do before introducing new materials, and, typically, to spend some time working with old and easy material. According to Clay, teachers soon realized the importance of reading quantities of easy material. Secondly, teachers were trained and required to observe and to record what the child was doing by writing a diagnostic summary report which would guide them to focus on the specific needs of each child.

Clay reports that the follow-up testing showed that children who had been already discontinued from the program and returned to classroom at the end of the program were performing above the predicted level. However, children who still were in the program by its end were performing at a
low reading level. Furthermore, Clay discusses the teachers' change throughout the program toward a view of reading as an interactive, strategic and meaning-based process. However, the descriptions of the teachers' changes remain rather general.

Motivation and affect are clearly present in the tutorial sessions through such activities as teaching within what a child could do before introducing new material, and reading quantities of easy and meaningful material. However, motivation and affect are not discussed as important dimensions of the learning environment, nor are they assessed, perhaps because these are not crucial variables in this study, in which the readers have not yet developed a history of failure (Stanovich, 1986; Johnston and Winograd, 1985). In fact, even if she studied these variables, her findings could have been different from findings obtained from studying children with such a history of reading failure.

Along similar lines, Paris and his colleagues (Paris and Oka, 1986; Paris, Cross, and Lipson, 1984; and Paris and Jacobs, 1984) designed and tested in regular classrooms a reading instructional program they called Informed Strategies for Learning (ISL). This program is based on three principles of effective teaching: (1) students' need for understanding the operations they are expected to learn, and for knowing how, when and why to use them; (2) students'
need for opportunities to make public their thinking and feelings about what they are supposed to learn, and (3) students' need for being guided and coached towards an increasingly better and more independent performance (Paris, 1986).

The program included twenty modules designed to emphasize comprehension strategies involved in the construction of text, such as elaboration, inference, integration, activation of prior knowledge, and summarization; and in comprehension monitoring, such as rereading, self-questioning, checking consistencies, and paraphrasing (Paris and Oka, 1986). Paris and his colleagues did not focus upon children experiencing reading difficulty; nevertheless, the program was found to enhance poor readers' knowledge about strategies and their metacognitive awareness (Paris, Cross and Lipson, 1984; Paris and Jacobs, 1984; Paris and Oka, 1986). According to Paris (1986), Informed Strategies for Learning (ISL) combines skill and will because the program emphasizes the basic value of strategic reading. That is, it emphasizes students' understanding of what they are learning, and students' appreciation of the value of making the extra effort required to use cognitive strategies.

Paris, Cross and Lipson (1984) and Paris and Jacobs (1984) report successful results of an intervention study in which one of the researchers (Lipson) taught third-graders (whole classes) using ISL (Informed Strategies for Learning)
instructional methods during 30-minute lessons, twice a week for fourteen weeks. The results showed that the children benefited from the teaching, since it enhanced both their metacognitive awareness, and their knowledge and use of comprehension strategies.

Paris and Oka (1986), continuing the above research, worked throughout the school year with fifth-graders. To conduct this study, 26 volunteer teachers were trained in four workshops and periodic meetings throughout the year. These teachers received a package of instructional materials which included the modules, worksheets and reading passages for sixty lessons. Tests administered in fall and spring of the school year showed that children in experimental classes had greater gains in awareness about reading and demonstrated better strategic behaviors than children in control groups. However, despite efforts to influence will, Paris and Oka further found that overachievers (children who achieve beyond what is expected based on their verbal aptitude scores) retained positive self-perceptions of reading and of themselves as readers, and high expectations for themselves. In contrast, underachievers retained a negative view toward reading, and toward themselves as readers, and also lower expectations for themselves. These findings show limits on the will component for this group of students insofar as their low affect and motivation were not affected.
by the instructional practices. Unfortunately, while Paris and his colleagues identify skill and will as important factors in teaching and learning, they fail to specify the role these factors played in the learning processes of their subjects.

Palincsar and Brown (1984) conducted a study to provide seventh-grade remedial readers who were good decoders (read grade-level material with 80 word-per-minute and two or fewer errors) with opportunities to become good comprehenders. Palincsar and Brown trained students, in tutorial sessions, to use strategies considered important to effective comprehension and comprehension monitoring (Brown, Palincsar and Armbruster, 1984), such as predicting, summarizing, generating questions and clarifying, using reciprocal teaching methods. Reciprocal teaching is defined as interactive teaching in which teacher and students cooperate to construct the text meaning. Teacher and students take turns asking questions, summarizing the segment of the text, reading silently, clarifying the meaning and making predictions for the upcoming segment. The teacher's role is to guide the student (Rogoff, 1986) to increasingly more independent work through modeling, probing, and corrective and supportive feedback in the context of classroom dialogues. Although students who participated in this study improved in reading as measured by test scores, these researchers studied read-
ers who only had comprehension problems. There is another
subgroup of poor readers who have both comprehension and
decoding difficulties, about whom we have little informa-
tion.

In a series of related studies, Palincsar (1987) worked
with nonvolunteer remedial teachers (three-days inservice
training sessions) training them to use reciprocal teaching
methods with their six-grade remedial readers who were good
decoders but poor comprehenders (Palincsar and Brown, 1984).
The strategies of predicting, summarizing, generating ques-
tions and clarifying were again emphasized.

The program consisted of twenty days of reciprocal
reading instruction, with sessions that lasted 40 minutes
each, followed by the administration of an assessment pas-
sage. After the first ten days of instruction, Palincsar
found great improvement in experimental students' accuracy
with the recall and interpretation of the material. Only 3%
of the students failed to indicate any gains compared to 60%
of the control group.

Palincsar's work provides no description or discussion of poor readers' motivation to read and perform, or of the
reciprocal effect of the teacher and the students on the
teaching and learning. However, when describing her work
with the teachers, Palincsar emphasizes that only three of
the six teachers were, in her view, successful in applying
the program as it was designed. In contrast, the other three had to receive constant help from the researcher during the first fifteen days. For example, one of the teachers seemed to be affected by her students' (the poorest reading group) difficulties in participating in the discussions, and developed a very mechanical and directive behavior. Furthermore, reciprocal teaching seems a powerful program to enhance students' motivation and affect, since it is based on collaboration among peers and teacher, on the participation of all, on providing students with supportive and positive feedback and with opportunities to become task-involved. In spite of that, no information is provided about changes in students' motivation or self-concept as readers, and in their expectations for future outcomes, although these aspects have been considered as crucial to strategic reading development (Paris et al., 1983; Paris, 1988).

As discussed by Paris (1988) and suggested by the research reviewed, we do not have much information about the reciprocal effect of skill and will in situations in which cooperation and learning rather than competition and the correct answer are emphasized. Indeed, as Clay worked with beginning readers who had not yet developed a history of reading failure, motivation and affect were not crucial variables in her study. However, Palinscar's subjects were middle-school remedial readers and, yet, the influence of
these factors on students' responses to the opportunities offered to become better readers is not discussed. In fact, the interactions between skill and will in remedial readers' learning and their effect on the these readers' responses to remedial programs that offer them opportunities to learn and to become task-involved still remain unclear.

**Working with Teachers**

Recent work on teaching and learning in classrooms has emphasized ways of working with teachers which may empower them by providing these teachers with opportunities to reflect on their work as teachers, on their purposes, goals and motivations to teach, and on their teaching practices (Kemmis, 1987; Stake, 1987; Rudduck, 1987, Doyle, 1987, Gitlin, Siegel, and Boru, 1988; Florio and Walsh, 1978). Reflection is understood as a process of self-inquiry in which the teacher systematically thinks about and analyzes concrete and particular examples of his/her instructional practices and ties these practices to his/her beliefs, values, purposes, goals and motivations to teach (Kemmis, 1987). This process of self-inquiry works toward the teacher's emancipatory interests, since it provides the teacher with opportunities to reflect on his/her understanding of her/his role and work as teacher, and on ways of tying purpose to practice. It also provides the teacher opportunities to further change reality. The concept of
emancipatory interest is understood as working to empower the teacher to gain control over his/her thinking and actions, and to develop an instructional practice which may also empower the students by providing them with opportunities to think and act (Kemmis, 1987; Gitlin, Siegel, and Boru 1988).

Gitlin and his colleagues argue that a crucial aspect of research aimed at empowering the teacher is the choice of methodology which enables the establishment of a dialogical process between the researcher and the teacher during which they share and discuss the mutual understandings, values, beliefs and intentions that mediate their practices. Such a process, in which the teacher and the researcher share the thinking and the action in planning and conducting everyday instruction practices may promote reflection, since each participant has to explain his/her ideas, and plans to the other. In this process of thinking, sharing and discussing to reach a consensus on what to do and how to conduct the instruction, each participant in a joint project will gain understanding of the other's ideas and problems, and will also stimulate and assist the other in relating purpose to action.

The literature on teaching and learning in classrooms provides examples of research work developed within this conceptual framework. For example, Florio and Walsh (1978)
developed a study in which a researcher and a kindergarten teacher gradually shared the thinking about and the teaching during daily instructional practices, and contributed to each other's change. Indeed, throughout the study their distinct roles of researcher and teacher became gradually indistinct and overlapped. The teacher became increasingly engaged in the research process, rather than being just a source of data for the researcher. She learned how to become an observer in her own classroom—how to look at the classroom problems and reflect on them, on what she already knew about her classroom, and how to find alternative ways of interpreting familiar events. In summary, she learned how to be an outsider in her own classroom. Similarly, the researcher, by participating in the daily classroom activities, learned how to look for and focus on problems which were important to the teacher, and how to be, simultaneously, an insider and outsider in the classroom's practices.

Despite this recent emphasis on the role of a teachers' reflection in his/her instructional improvement, a separation between understanding and action is often observed in educational research, independently of the kind of methodology used to gather and analyze data. In the majority of quantitative methodology studies conducted to examine the teaching and learning of reading (e.g., Paris, Cross and
Lipson, 1984; Paris and Jacobs, 1984; Paris and Oka, 1986; Palincsar, 1987; Duffy, Roehler and Rackliffe, 1986), researchers come as experts who dominate the thinking about the important problems to emphasize, about the teaching and learning processes. In addition, these researchers typically train the teachers to do the necessary action. As argued by Gitlin, Siegel and Boru (1988), this separation between understanding and action is also observed in most educational ethnographies, which equally "objectify" the teacher by treating him/her as an object of the study, someone who is "understood" (e.g., Murphy, 1989, 1987; Rist, 1970; McDermott, 1977).

Gitlin and his colleagues argue that a researcher interested in conducting a study which serves to the teacher's emancipatory interests has to choose a method that best fits his/her intention, and work within a framework in which both the teacher and the researcher will be involved in the development of theory and in applying this theory to classroom practices. Both should participate in the understanding of the problems and in the interpretation of reality. This process does not mean that teacher and researcher will have the same understandings, but that they will have equal chances to share and reflect on their ideas, and both teacher and researcher will come to a negotiated understanding of teaching and of teaching practices which
best fit their purposes.

Research Questions

To reach our aim, we will examine two set of questions:

I. The first set of questions focuses on the nature of the collaboration between the teacher and the researcher and their work discussing, creating and implementing a reading program.

   A. What is the focus of the collaboration between teacher and researcher? Does this focus change across time?

   B. What teacher and researcher beliefs are expressed during the collaborative work? Do these beliefs change across time?

II. The second set of research questions focuses on instruction and on the students' responses.

   A. What kind of opportunities do the teacher and the researcher provide the students for learning about the reading process and about reading strategies?

   B. What kind of opportunities do the teacher and the researcher provide that may guide students to focus on learning and to develop positive beliefs about themselves as learners? Do these opportunities change across time?

   C. What are the strategies students use to accom-
plish reading tasks? Do these strategies change across time?

D. What are students' motivations to accomplish tasks? Do these motivations change across time?
CHAPTER 2

Design of the Study

In this chapter, the researcher discusses the choice of methodology used for data collection and data analysis, the setting in which the study was conducted, and the elements of the design: the participants, the methods and procedures used for data collection, and the methods and procedures used for data analysis.

Choice of Methodology

Ethnographic methods were used to collect and analyze data in this study. These methods are especially suitable for this study, since ethnographic research in education is centrally concerned with providing rich, descriptive data about the contexts, activities, thinking, and beliefs of participants as they occur and change across time (Erickson, 1986; Biklen and Bogdan, 1982; Goetz and LeCompte, 1984). In this case, an ethnography of a single classroom enabled us to focus on a small subset of a larger cultural system, and supplied us with the tools necessary for the examination, understanding and description of processes and changes in teacher-researcher’s practices and in students’ learning, motivation and self-concept as readers (Goetz and LeCompte, 1984). Furthermore, as discussed by Eisner (1988) and Stake (1987), a crucial aspect of research on teaching and learning in classrooms is the choice of a methodology which can
provide vivid descriptions to supply the reader with vicarious experiences. According to Eisner and Stake, these experiences have the essential role of promoting the reader's reflective thinking about his/her own practices, which is a necessary condition for changing and growing.

However, this study differs from traditionally designed ethnographic studies, since it was planned and conducted as a collaborative effort to be carried out by the researcher and a Chapter One teacher. Both the teacher and the researcher worked as a team and developed a reading curriculum designed to provide students with opportunities to develop skill and will. Therefore, although the data collection strategies and data analysis techniques were similar to those used by ethnographers, the purpose was different. The role of the researcher as ethnographer was not limited to understanding and describing the reality, but it also included working with a teacher and reciprocally understanding, assisting, stimulating and challenging each other's interpretations of reality.

Florio and Walsh (1978) argue that there are "ethical, epistemological and pragmatic" reasons why this collaborative methodology is valuable. It treats the participants not as objects of the study, but as active thinkers, whose opinion are valued and essential parts of a reflective and emancipatory process. Furthermore, both the teacher and the
researcher are seen as agents of reflection and change (Gitlin, Siegel, and Boru, 1988).

Due to this choice of method, this study emphasizes the researcher's bias differently from traditional ethnographies. Rather than being worried about influencing the setting or about being too immersed in the setting and losing objectivity (Goetz and LeCompte, 1984), the researcher focused on working with the teacher towards developing a relationship based on mutual trust and support, in order to stimulate, share, and reflect on their beliefs about reading, reading failure, and working with poor readers that each of them brought to the study. At the same time, the teacher and the researcher negotiated a reading instruction which might develop poor readers' skill and will (Gitlin et al., 1988; Florio and Walsh, 1978).

To conduct this study, the researcher selected a case study, a detailed examination of a collaborative experience between the researcher and a Chapter One teacher, who together worked to offer a reading instruction which would help poor readers become strategic readers. As discussed by Shulman (1981), a case study can give the researcher the possibility to document these everyday experiences with teaching and learning to read.

**Setting of the Study**

This study was conducted at a school located in a rural
area of a county in the southeastern United States. The students of this school, although showing diversified socio-economic status, typically came from lower socio-economic levels. The students from the remedial reading group studied were representative of the school socio-economic status.

In this school, students whose reading ability was considered "below grade-level" were pulled twice from their classroom for reading instruction. They had they regular reading instruction in another teacher's classroom, and the compensatory reading instruction with a Chapter One teacher. The compensatory reading period for the group selected was held Monday through Friday between 8:30 to 9:00.

Participants

The participants in this study were a volunteer Chapter One teacher, two fourth-grade and four fifth-grade students from one of this teacher's classes, and the researcher as a participant observer. The teacher's and the students' names are not their real names but pseudonyms.

Teacher Selection

A Chapter One teacher was selected as participant in this study for several reasons. First, the researcher was interested in examining poor readers' responses to reading instruction aimed at developing these readers' skill and will. A Chapter One teacher typically works with a small
number of poor readers at one time, which is particularly suitable for our purposes. Second, compensatory reading programs in which students are pulled out from their regular classrooms represent a typical situation in most of American public schools (Allington, Stuetzel, Shake, and Lamarch, 1986), and thus are appropriate to build a case study on (Shulman, 1981). Finally, effective reading is considered the essential condition for achieving academic success and for getting a good job later (Johnston, 1985). Compensatory reading instruction may offer poor readers the opportunity to become strategic readers, if this instruction is designed to develop these readers' skill and will (Paris, 1988; Paris, Lipson, and Wixson 1983).

The Chapter One teacher selected was first contacted by school officials, according to the specified criteria (1) she was an experienced Chapter One teacher (she had been teaching in Chapter One for five years); (2) she was considered a good teacher by school officials and her peers; and (3) she was interested in developing students' cognition and motivation. The teacher was contacted, read a summary of the researcher's proposal, talked with the researcher, and demonstrated a willingness to participate in the study.

The teacher: Vera holds a bachelor's degree in elementary education and a bachelor's and master's degrees in music. She taught both elementary and secondary education
for eight years in a nearby state. Vera moved to Chapter One when the Director of Chapter One programs invited her to teach in the remedial reading and math programs. She taught Chapter One for three years. She moved to this school, two years before this study was conducted, because her husband started a new job in a nearby city. In this school, Vera also taught remedial reading and math programs.

Student Selection

Fifth-grade poor readers were selected for this study for two reasons. First, these readers have typically developed a negative and interactive cycle of cognitive, motivational, and affective variables that researchers call a history of reading failure (Hiebert, Winograd and Danner, 1984; Nicholls, 1983; Francis, Frieze and Hanusa, 1983; Stanovich, 1986; Allington et al., 1986; Johnston and Winograd, 1985; Winograd and Niquette, 1987). Having a history of reading failure was an essential criterion, since we wanted to examine the interactive effect of skill and will on poor readers' learning. Secondly, fifth-graders are generally able to talk about their experiences, feelings, and thinking (Baker and Brown, 1984; Paris and Oka, 1986, Paris and Jacobs, 1984; Pressley, Forest-Pressley, Elliot-Faust, and Miller, 1985). Since the researcher would ask students to think aloud and describe the mental operations they used during task completion, and their feelings, goals, and moti-
viation to read and participate during instruction, this ability was critical to the success of this study.

The researcher selected as participants in this study the only group in which Vera worked with fifth graders. This class included four fifth graders and two fourth graders. In the fifth week of the study, one fourth-grade student and one fifth-grade student were moved to other reading groups.

Selection of Focal Students. Four fifth graders were selected as focal students. These students differed in their reading abilities and motivations to read and learn, and all demonstrated a willingness to talk about their instructional responses. Selecting readers who differ in their reading skills and in their will to read and learn maximized the range of differences among focal students, thereby providing a broader picture of students' learning and motivation. The students' willingness to talk was important too, because the interview was a critical data gathering device of this study.

The researcher's selection decisions were based on the teacher's experience with the students, the teacher's and the researcher's consideration of the data collected in the first weeks from instructional sessions, the students' initial interviews, and the students' individual reading sessions.

Although four students were selected, data about
Melanie were collected only during the first phase since Melanie was moved to a higher reading group. Below, a brief description is provided of the three students with whom the researcher and the teacher worked more closely throughout the study.

**Carol.** Carol was an 11.3 year old, shy, and quiet girl. She lived with her grandmother, a younger uncle, and her cousin, Beverly, a fourth grader, also in this remedial reading group. According to Carol, her mother had two jobs and for this reason she (Carol) lived with her grandmother. Carol was enrolled in both remedial reading and remedial math programs. She had been in this school for six years, had failed kindergarten and had been in Chapter One since first grade. Carol had some speech difficulty. She stammered mainly when she was nervous or anxious.

**Doris.** Doris was an 11.9 year old, talkative girl. Her parents had just divorced. Doris and her older brother and sister lived with their mother. According to Doris, her mother did not work, and her father worked for a nearby county. Doris was also in the remedial math program with Vera. Doris had been in this school for six years and had failed fourth grade. She had been in Chapter One for two years.

**Denorah.** Denorah was 11.5 year old. She had failed first grade. According to Denorah, she had been in Chapter
One for two years. Her mother had just married again and the family (Denorah had an older brother and a younger brother) had moved. Denorah entered an open school near her new house, but returned to this school because her grades were too low. Unfortunately, Denorah became very ill after the third week of the study. During the study conduction, she missed classes frequently, was often late for school and for sessions with the researcher. Since Denorah demonstrated frequent unwillingness to participate during both instruction and sessions with the researcher, she was offered chances to withdraw from the study. As Denorah stressed her willingness to participate, she was included as such during data collection and analysis.

The Researcher

The researcher, currently a graduate student in a College of Education of a southeastern university, had taught Portuguese for fourteen years in Brazilian middle and high schools. During that period, the researcher became interested in helping poor readers develop strategic reading skills. In the USA, the researcher further observed and worked with poor readers in a university reading clinic. She designed her tutorial sessions to promote skill and will development and she believed that she was successful in doing so in that tutorial setting. She also believed she had much to learn about how these abilities can be promoted.
within more conventional public school settings, such as Chapter One reading settings.

Data Collection Procedures

This study was conducted over eleven weeks, during which the teacher and the researcher worked with students in daily, thirty-minute remedial reading sessions, for a total of forty-five sessions (some sessions were lost, typically due to the school calendar). The choice of study duration was made based on research results (Palincsar, 1987; Clay, 1982), and on our experience with tutoring poor readers who, after the first month, showed observable improvement in their strategic reading abilities. Furthermore, the decision of working daily with the teacher and her students was based on the researcher's desire to gain a rich understanding of the instructional sequence and coherence (Doyle and Carter, 1984)--a goal which would be unattainable with a non-daily data collection schedule.

The data for this study were collected through the processes of participant observation during both instructional and reflective/planning sessions. Data were also gathered during teacher-researcher conversations; during teacher, researcher and student interviews; during reading assessment sessions; from document collection; and from the researcher's journal. A summary of data sources is provided in Table 1 (p. 75).
Participant Observation

Participant observation is a technique of gaining access to data in which the researcher takes part in the daily activities of the participants and then reconstructs their interactions and practices in field notes (Denzin, 1978; Goetz and LeCompte, 1984). Through participant observation, the researcher wanted to achieve a dual purpose: to understand the situation from the practitioner's point of view (as an insider), and to watch this situation as an observer (as an outsider, Spradley, 1980). The researcher acted as participant observer in the thirty-minute daily instructional sessions of a Chapter One reading program, and in weekly one hour reflective/planning sessions.

Instructional Sessions. The researcher's role as participant-observer in the instructional sessions varied from day to day, and became more active as the researcher became more familiar with the situation (Spradley, 1980; Florio and Walsh, 1978). During the four initial weeks, the researcher was mostly observer. During the remaining seven weeks, the researcher modeled for the teacher how to assist students in learning about comprehension strategies. As an observer, the researcher focused on the opportunities the teacher and the researcher were providing for the students to become strategic readers, and to get interested in learning. In addition, the researcher sought to assess her joint work with
the teacher. To guide the researcher observation during instruction, specific guidelines were written (see Appendix A).

The form of the field notes taken during instruction varied according to the researcher's participation in the instructional practices. These notes were written or expanded immediately after the instructional sessions. The researcher attempted to write these notes as concrete observations, using verbatim language (Erickson, 1986; Spradley, 1980).

The instructional sessions were videotaped, except for the data collected during the first week, because the researcher did not want to introduce too much novelty at once. The researcher watched the videotape for each instructional session on the same day it was taped. She compared the field notes from classroom instruction with the videotape, and expanded on the notes. The researcher also selected instances to discuss with Vera.

Vera also watched the videotapes from instruction. She watched the tapes by the end of the week, or during the following day, and selected instances she wanted to discuss with the researcher.

Reflective/Planning Sessions. On Monday afternoons, at 2:30, the teacher and the researcher usually met for one hour approximately. These sessions were designed to allow
the teacher and the researcher time for reflection and discussion. These weekly sessions started in the fourth week of our project, and lasted approximately one hour each. During these sessions, the teacher and the researcher discussed the instances from the videotapes of instructional sessions each of them had selected while watching the tapes individually for a more careful analysis. We did not watch these instances again due the short time we had available. Instead, we described and discussed them. The teacher and the researcher also discussed the instances the researcher proposed to use during the retrospective interviews.

These sessions were also designed to allow time for planning upcoming instruction. Indeed, planning and reflecting did not happen in a linear way, but, in contrast, they typically formed a recurrent process. These sessions were audiotaped and transcribed.

The researcher was also a participant-observer in these sessions. As a participant, the researcher engaged in reflection and planning, together with the teacher, and in offering the teacher opportunities for reflection. As an observer, the researcher reflected on the teacher/researcher joint work, and on her own and the teacher's reflective processes. The researcher also reflected on her own efforts to provide the teacher opportunity for reflecting and learning during these sessions.
Although reflective/planning sessions were planned to take place once a week throughout the study, the first session was held only during the fourth week, due to Vera's busy schedule. In addition, during the eighth week we did not meet for this session. Throughout the eleven weeks we met seven times, each time for one hour approximately.

**Conversations.** The researcher and the teacher normally held daily brief conversations of approximately five minutes each in the mornings, before and after class. The initial purpose of these conversations was to allow the teacher and the researcher time to become acquainted with each other. During these conversations, the researcher and the teacher talked about their families, about aspects of the study, about instruction and students' learning. The researcher typically wrote field notes to keep record of these interactions.

**Interviews**

**The Teacher Interview.** In the third week of the study, the researcher conducted an interview with the teacher. The main purpose of this interview was to allow the teacher to communicate the beliefs and values she brought to the study. This interview collected initial data about the teacher's (1) academic background; (2) beliefs about reading, reading failure, reading strategies, and teaching remedial reading; (3) current teaching practices and the goals, values and
motivations underlying these practices; and (4) view of students' learning.

The same interview was also conducted in the last week of this project, in order to allow the teacher to reflect on the changes in her beliefs as a result of this study. Both interviews were audiotaped and transcribed. Proposed guidelines for the teacher interview are provided in Appendix B.

The Researcher Interview. At the beginning and at the end of the study, a researcher's peer conducted an interview with the researcher. The same questions as those used in the teacher interview were utilized. The purpose of this interview was to have parallel reports on the ideas both participants brought to the study so that their initial and final agendas could be compared. These interviews were also audiotaped and transcribed.

The Student Initial Interview. In the second week of the study, an initial interview was conducted with each of the fifth-grade students in order to establish the initial closer contact with them and mainly to allow them to talk about their ideas about the reading process and about themselves as readers. The interview provided information about the students' (1) personal data, (2) value attached to reading, (3) knowledge about reading and about reading strategies, (4) goals and motivation to read, and (5) self-concept as readers and expectations for future performances. This
interview aimed at collecting baseline information about the students at the beginning of the study. In the last week of the study, this interview was repeated in order to collect information about the students’ changes. These interviews were audiotaped and transcribed. Guidelines proposed for the student interview are in Appendix C.

**Student Retrospective Interview.** During weeks 6, 8, and 11, the researcher conducted retrospective interviews with each focal student. During these sessions, the researcher and each student watched preselected instances of previous instructional sessions in which the teacher/researcher intended to engage this student in a particular kind of reasoning. (The researcher and the teacher had previously confirmed their goals for these particular points during the reflective/planning sessions.) The student was asked to explain what she was doing, thinking, and feeling in that particular situation. These interviews aimed at examining the students’ cognitive operations, their goals, motivations, and feelings during task completion throughout the study.

Retrospective interviews, like all assessment sessions, typically lasted approximately twenty minutes each and were conducted when students arrived in school, before Vera’s remedial session with this group of students which began at 8:30. This time was suggested by Vera in order to use stu-
ments' transitional time. Only one student was interviewed each day.

As discussed by Marx, Winne, and Walsh, 1985, two tasks are involved during these stimulated recalls—an instructional task accomplished by the student in the classroom, which involves cognition, affect, and motivation; and an investigation task, which involves examining, recognizing, and recalling these cognitions, motivations and affects. Both of these tasks would affect the student's performance. Variables which seem crucial in assuring the student's recognition and recall of the reasoning used during the instructional task are the student's familiarity with both tasks performed and the kind of feedback he/she received to facilitate recognition and recall. The extent to which the student is familiar with each task will affect his/her allocation of cognitive resources between the two tasks (Marx et al., 1985). Similarly, the feedback used by the researcher to facilitate the student's recognition and recall may direct the student to choices that change the instructional task accomplished in the classroom (Marx et al., 1985).

The methodology of this study was designed to deal with both aspects of the retrospective procedure as efficiently as possible. The recall task started in the sixth week of the study. The students had had some time to become familiar with making their reasoning overt. Furthermore, before the
first protocol interview, the researcher provided each student with a trial session during which the student practiced the tasks to be accomplished. To assist the students in accessing their own cognitions, motivations, and feelings during instructional task accomplishment without at the same time influencing their answers, the researcher asked general questions, such as, *What is going on here?*, *What are you doing?*, *Why are you doing this?*, *What do you think you're supposed to do?*, *Why do you think so?*, *How do you feel when___*, and *Why do you feel like that?*

Each interview session was audiotaped and transcribed. During transcription, some preliminary analysis was conducted to understand the students' cognitions and motivations.

**Student Protocol Interview.** On weeks 4, 7, and 10, the researcher conducted protocol interviews with each focal student. These sessions aimed at examining the focal students' cognitive operations, goals and motivations to read, and beliefs about themselves as readers throughout the study (Marx, Winne and Walsh, 1985). Each student was asked to think aloud while reading a text chosen by the researcher and retelling the most important ideas of the story. The student was asked to say aloud everything she was thinking, doing, or feeling while reading aloud the text or retelling the most important ideas.
This method of data collection, as discussed during stimulated recall, also involves the performance of two tasks which, in this case, are accomplished simultaneously. Familiarity with the tasks and the feedback from the researcher may also change students' results in accomplishing the task. To make the task familiar to the students, the researcher provided each student with a trial session during which they practiced this procedure, before data collection. In addition, the researcher used prompts to probe the child to reveal her thinking, such as Tell me what you are thinking, feeling or considering; Tell me what happened here; or Tell me why you ____.

Texts for these assessment sessions were selected from the Cricket magazine. The Raygor readability estimate was used to select beginning fourth-grade level texts. The researcher chose this level, after an initial trial using third-grade level text (the level in which the children were considered to be reading) revealed that these texts were too easy for the children.

Two texts were chosen for each session. Doris and Denorah read different texts. By doing this, the researcher attempted to avoid a problem which might be caused by the students' talking among themselves about the texts read. According to Vera both girls were close friends. Doris and Carol read the same texts, since the researcher had observed
they were rarely seen talking with each other.

Each protocol was audiotaped and transcribed. During transcription, some preliminary analysis was conducted to understand the kind of students' miscues (oral errors) and their understanding, selection and organization of important ideas read. The purpose of this analysis was to understand the students' use of strategies.

**Reading Assessment Session**

In the second week of the study, the students were asked to read aloud texts selected by the researcher from *McGraw-Hill Reading*, (Level L, 1989). Raygor readability estimate was used to confirm the fourth-grade level of the texts selected. Each student read a different text. After reading, the student was asked to retell all the ideas of the story she could remember. After retelling, as the students typically experienced great difficulty with selecting and organizing the information read, the researcher asked them probing questions, following an outline prepared previously. This outline contained points considered important to the understanding of the story. The questions probed the students' ability to remember the information read without providing them with additional hints. For example, the researcher would say, "OK, let's start thinking about the story again. What happened at the beginning of the story that is important to the understanding of the story?...What
happened next?" The questions were built upon the students' answers and helped them to rethink the organization of the content read. To check on the reliability of the researcher's selection of the important ideas, she asked a peer to read the texts used and to select ideas she believed were important. The reliability percentage was measured using the formula (Miles and Huberman, 1986, p. 63):

\[
\text{Reliability} = \frac{\text{number of agreements}}{\text{total number of agreements plus the number of disagreements}}
\]

The reliability percentage varied from 87% to 93% depending on the different texts used.

Transcriptions of this session included some preliminary analysis of the quality of the students' miscues (oral "errors") performed to determine the strategies each child was using to read, and of the quality of the students' retelling. These data aimed at providing baseline information about the children's reading and comprehension at the beginning of the study.

This assessment session was repeated in the last week of the study to determine changes in the students' strategic reading. Texts for these final reading sessions were selected from the Cricket magazine.

Document Collection

All materials used by the teacher and the researcher or produced by the students during the instructional sessions
were collected to provide additional information about the aspects the teacher and/or the researcher were actually emphasizing during instruction, and to indicate what the students could or wanted to do during task accomplishment.

The Researcher Journal Writing

In addition to the data collected through videotapes, audiotapes, and fieldnotes, the researcher kept a journal, in which she recorded her ideas, fears, confusions, problems, reactions, feelings, reflections and decisions (Spradley, 1980). This journal helped the researcher determine and understand her feelings, views, biases and insights about her work with the teacher, and about the teacher's and the researcher's work with the students. It helped the researcher understand how she affected and was affected by the study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FOCUS</th>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
<th>RECORDING STRATEGY</th>
<th>RESEARCH QUESTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third Week</td>
<td>TEACHER</td>
<td>Initial Interview</td>
<td>Audiotapes</td>
<td>1. B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Week</td>
<td>RESEARCHER</td>
<td>Final Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Week</td>
<td>RESEARCHER</td>
<td>Initial Interview</td>
<td>Audiotapes</td>
<td>1. B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Week</td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a Week</td>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
<td>Reflective &amp; Planning</td>
<td>Audiotapes</td>
<td>1. A, B,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCHER</td>
<td>&amp; TEACHER</td>
<td>Sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. A, B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday</td>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
<td>Instructional Sessions</td>
<td>Videotapes</td>
<td>1. A, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; TEACHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. A, B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field Notes</td>
<td>2. D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Week</td>
<td>FOCAL</td>
<td>Initial Interview</td>
<td>Audiotapes</td>
<td>2. C, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Week</td>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
<td>Final Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 6, 8, 11</td>
<td>FOCAL</td>
<td>Retrospective Interview</td>
<td>Audiotapes</td>
<td>2. A, B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks 4, 7, 10</td>
<td>FOCAL</td>
<td>Protocol Interview</td>
<td>Audiotapes</td>
<td>2. C, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Week</td>
<td>FOCAL</td>
<td>Reading Assessment</td>
<td>Audiotapes</td>
<td>2. C, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Week</td>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday</td>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
<td>Conversations</td>
<td>Field Notes</td>
<td>1 A, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; TEACHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
<td>Document Collection</td>
<td>Creating File</td>
<td>1. A, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; TEACHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. A, B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday</td>
<td>STUDENTS</td>
<td>Researcher's Journal</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>1. A, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; TEACHER</td>
<td></td>
<td>Creation</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. A, B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analysis Procedures

The data for this study were analyzed separately by source and by weeks, in order to follow changes across time. A variety of analytic techniques were combined and used to analyze the data. Two major analytical procedures were used—constant comparison (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Goetz and LeCompte, 1986; Bogdan and Biklen, 1982) and discrepant case analysis (Erickson, 1986).

Constant Comparison.

Transcripts for each data source were first read and summarized so the researcher could get a global understanding of the data. The piece of data summarized was then examined through the process of constant comparison. Constant comparison is a strategy proposed by Glaser and Strauss (1967) that combines inductive category coding (searching data for categories) with simultaneously comparing the new data with the data already recorded and coded. While each transcript was read, units concerning their meaning were identified and signaled. Comments were written on the margins. The units were then chunked together according to their common properties and sorted into categories which organized data related by topic according to the research questions—teacher-researcher collaboration, beliefs, instruction, and students' strategic reading—and filed in a computer. As new data were organized, the catego-
ries already generated were searched. Through a process of constant comparison and contrast the data were sorted under the categories. During this process of constantly comparing and contrasting, new categories were created, others were joined, and others were eliminated or deemphasized and patterns emerged. For example, the focus of Vera’s instruction on decoding was understood from the data collected during the initial meetings and observations. However, decoding as a means to facilitate comprehension was learned only after the first interview on the third week. Goetz and LeCompte compare this process of gathering data together to putting together a "jigsaw puzzle". That is, the researcher cuts the collected data into pieces, organizes them into categories, and gathers the data together again to form a coherent whole.

Discrepant Case Analysis

In addition to the analysis just discussed, we conducted a discrepant case analysis proposed by Erickson (1986), in which a list of assertions or statements was generated for all sources of data collected through examining the corpus of data. The first assertions were usually descriptive (low level assertions). For example, after the first meeting with the teacher the researcher made the assertion: The teacher said she cannot change her program because this program was prepared in collaboration with the
students' reading teacher (see Appendix E for a list of assertions).

Lists of assertions were developed for each piece of data, compared with the lists of categories for the same source, organized under the topics for the research questions, and filed in the computer with the data that supported each assertion. During the process of comparison across methods, we realized that sometimes there was a mismatch between the lists. We then reviewed the data and made the necessary changes.

To establish an evidential warrant for the assertions, the data corpus was repeatedly tested for disproving evidence as well as for confirming evidence for the assertions generated. After the general search was completed, the researcher returned to the discrepant cases for closer investigation. The data were reviewed for an examination and understanding of these cases. For example, during the first phase of the study, the researcher made the assertion that Vera occasionally provided Doris less time to come to a successful answer because of her belief about the student's inattentive behavior and lack of trying. Searching for disconfirming information, the researcher realized that Vera sometimes behaved like that with other students as well. The researcher then realized that this behavior was related to the amount of time spent practicing a skill and students'
consequent difficulty in providing adequate responses concerning a skill practiced for large amount of time. As the data corpus was searched to generate and test assertions, the researcher was continually looking for "key linkages" among the data collected from the various sources to form patterns.

Data collected during each week for each topic were reduced (Miles and Huberman, 1984) and organized into charts which compared the data for each research question across the week. It was the researcher's purpose to check on the changes in patterns for the research topics. According to these changes, the researcher separated the analysis into three phases. Phase One encompassed the four initial weeks. Phase Two grouped the middle four weeks together and Phase Three—the three final weeks. For example, when we realized that the patterns for the teacher-researcher collaboration, and for instruction had changed in the fifth week, we stopped the analysis for Phase One.

Data were then organized by weeks and phase. Assertions about the data for each research question were organized into extended charts by days and weeks (instruction and teacher-researcher collaboration) or by phase (the teacher's and the researcher's beliefs and the students' responses). In addition, we organized summary charts for each of these extended charts (see Appendix F for examples of these
charts). The researcher then started writing tentative answers for the research questions. The researcher proceeded similarly with the second phase and with the third phase.

**Establishing Trustworthiness**

Validity in ethnographic research is concerned with the accuracy of the research findings, whereas reliability is concerned with the replicability of the research findings (Goetz and LeCompte, 1984). Lincoln and Guba (1986, 1985) suggest parallel criteria of trustworthiness to judge the characteristics of the data collected and analyzed with the use of ethnographic methods. Lincoln and Guba suggest four terms—credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability—as the naturalistic equivalents for the conventional terms—internal validity, external validity, reliability and objectivity (see Chart on Appendix G).

**Credibility**

Credibility is an analog to internal validity. It refers to the extent to which credible findings and interpretations will be produced. In this study, the credibility of the research findings was addressed by using four kinds of activities suggested by Lincoln and Guba: (1) activities which increased the probability of high credibility; (2) an activity which provided an external check on the inquiry process; (3) activities aimed at refining the working hypotheses; and (4) an activity designed to test findings.
and interpretations.

Activities which Increased the Probability of High Credibility. In this study, the researcher used activities aimed at providing the study high credibility: persistent observations and triangulation of data sources, such as interviews, protocol interview, reading assessment sessions, instructional sessions, document collection and journal writing; data gathering procedures such as audiotapes, videotapes, fieldnotes, document file, and write notation; and two procedures of data analysis (Lincoln and Guba, 1986, 1985). The researcher spent eleven weeks in the field, during which she learned about the context and built trust. The researcher also acted as participant observer in everyday instructional sessions, conversed with the teacher, shared her ideas, listened to the teacher's reflections in reflective/planning sessions, conducted interviews with the teacher and the students, conducted assessment sessions with the students and collected documents. Finally, the technique of triangulation, as discussed by Goetz and LeCompte (1984), Miles and Huberman (1984), and Denzin (1978), strengthened the internal validity of the study, since it enhanced the scope, density, and clarity of the constructs developed during the study.

An Activity Aimed at Providing an External Check on the Inquiry Process. Lincoln and Guba suggest peer debriefing as
a technique to provide an external check on the inquiry process. The authors define peer debriefing as the process of exposing oneself to a disinterested peer in order to explore aspects of the inquiry for multiple purposes: to expose oneself to searching questions by an experienced protagonist, to explore meanings, to clarify bases for interpretations, and to test working hypotheses. According to Lincoln and Guba, there is no formula to prescribe how this session should be conducted except that the "debriefer" must be someone who is an expert in the researcher's area.

In this study, the researcher asked a peer who knows a great deal about the area of this inquiry to read the data pertaining to the researcher's first interview and to teacher-researcher first reflective/planning session, as well as a transcript of an instructional session randomly selected. The researcher's peer read the data, made an outline with constructs derived from the data read (see outline in Appendix H), talked about her ideas and questioned the researcher about her interpretations. In response, the researcher talked about her ideas and working hypotheses for this phase of the study. This session provided the researcher with an opportunity to test her initial working hypotheses.

Activities Aimed at Refining Working Hypotheses. The choice of a method for analyzing data which involved the search for discrepant cases worked to refine the working
hypotheses.

An Activity Designed to Test Findings and Interpretations. Since in this study the teacher and the researcher worked as a team, throughout the study they shared their views concerning the opportunities they were creating to develop the students' strategic reading and motivation to learn and concerning the students' cognitive and affective-motivational changes across the study. The researcher further provided and discussed with the teacher transcriptions and preliminary analysis of the students' assessment sessions. The researcher also shared the research findings with the teacher for an additional comparison with her view, and offered the teacher the opportunity to write a report of her views to be added to the dissertation (Denzin, 1978; Miles and Huberman, 1984). An instance in which the teacher expressed a concern that the researcher had misunderstood some information was corrected.

In addition, the peer debriefing session also worked to test the data categorized until then, concerning the teacher's beliefs and instruction provided and the teacher-researcher collaboration. Although no reliability formula was used, the outline (see Appendix H) demonstrated the match between both the researcher's and the peer's understandings of the data concerning the teacher's beliefs and focus of instruction for Phase One (see Appendix F for the Summary
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Transferability

Transferability is an analog to external validity—the extent to which the findings are generalized. Lincoln and Guba explain that the naturalist can only put working hypotheses together with a description of the time and context in which these hypotheses were found to hold. The researcher cannot specify the external validity of an inquiry, but only provide the thick description necessary to permit an interested researcher to make a transfer in order to reach a conclusion about whether transfer is possible or not. As Shulman (1981) suggests, to claim that one is conducting a case study means to assume that the case chosen represents a family of individuals and/or events. Thus, if the researcher chooses a case he/she believes is representative of other cases, and documents the characteristics of the individuals studied and the procedures used for data collection and data analysis, the reader can decide whether the reported findings can be generalized to refer to other groups of individuals he/she is interested in. Similarly, when reporting a setting or a task, the researcher, by providing detailed descriptions, will allow a reader concerned about the general applicability of a task to make informed decisions.

In this study, the researcher chose the reading setting
of a compensatory reading program, in which poor readers are pulled out from their regular classrooms—a practice typical of most of American schools (Allington, Stuetzel, Shake and Lamarche, 1986). In addition, the instruction initially offered to the students was described by research as typical of remedial settings (Allington, Stuetzel, Shake and Lamarche, 1986; Allington, 1984, 1983, 1981, 1980, 1977). Furthermore, the researcher comprehensively described the participants, the setting, the dialogue between the teacher and the researcher, the researcher participation in the study, and the procedures of data collection and data analysis. So, the reader can make an informed decision about to whom the study findings may apply.

**Dependability**

Dependability is the analog criterion for reliability which refers to the extent to which the study can be replicated (Goetz and LeCompte, 1984). Lincoln and Guba point out that some techniques used to demonstrate credibility can also be used to establish dependability. In this study, dependability threats were addressed by (1) writing field-notes using verbatim language, (2) describing events concretely, (3) using peer examination of the initial data collected to assess whether the researcher's working hypotheses were reasonable, (4) using mechanically recorded data which will make data available for second analysis (Goetz and
LeCompte (1984), and (5) using two methods of analysis.

Confirmability

Confirmability is an analog to objectivity. The techniques which established confirmability in this study were making data available for reexamination upon request, the researcher's reflective journal writing; and providing detailed information about the teacher/researcher joint work, students' responses, and the procedures for any data collection, the procedures and methods used for data analysis. Taken together, these efforts should increase the confirmability of the study.
CHAPTER 3

Findings of the Study

The purpose of this chapter is to present findings relevant to the study. That is, the researcher will present findings about the teacher and the researcher, the students, and the changes that occurred across the eleven weeks of the study. Two dimensions of the teacher's and the researcher's work will be reported: (1) the nature of the collaborative process between the teacher and the researcher including the focus of their efforts and the beliefs they expressed about teaching less successful readers and (2) the reading instruction they offered to students. Concerning students, the researcher will report on their cognitive and affective responses in the classroom and in the sessions with the researcher. Teacher, researcher, and student changes pertinent to each research question will be presented.

Three phases were derived from data. Phase One grouped data for the initial four weeks of the study. Data from this phase describes baseline information about (1) the teacher and the researcher collaboration and beliefs about teaching poor readers, and (2) the instruction offered to the students, the students' awareness of strategic reading and the students' affect and motivation.

Phase Two encompassed data for the middle four weeks. Data from this phase describes changes in the teacher and in
the researcher collaboration, the teacher's increasingly more reflective behavior and growing awareness about the instructional emphasis introduced by the researcher. During this phase changes also occurred in the instruction offered to students and in the students' cognitive and motivational-affective patterns.

Phase Three grouped data for the three final weeks. Data from this phase describes the teacher's and the researcher's more egalitarian relationship, the teacher's increasing reflective behavior and her continuing learning about working with poor readers. Continued changes in the instruction offered and in students' cognitive and motivational-affective pattern were revealed during this final phase.

Phase One

The Nature of the Collaborative Process

During the initial four weeks of the study, Vera and I met at the times already established by my research schedule. For example, in the second week of the study, I conducted an interview with Vera. The purpose of this session was to encourage Vera to communicate her beliefs about the reading process, reading failure, and teaching poor readers. During the fourth and fifth weeks, Vera and I also met for approximately one hour to conduct reflective/planning sessions. These sessions provided us time to reflect on our
concepts of reading, reading failure, poor readers, and instructional practices, and to plan for the upcoming instructional sessions.

In addition to these scheduled meetings, we also held two informal ones. Our first informal meeting gave us an opportunity to introduce ourselves, talk about the study, and establish a schedule for data collection. I conducted another meeting in order to determine how I might introduce myself to fifth graders and explain the study to them. In addition to these informal meetings, Vera and I usually had brief and informal conversations every morning, before and after class. In my view, these conversations were necessary if we were to become acquainted with each other and understand and appreciate each other's perspectives and practices. During these conversations, Vera and I discussed aspects of the study, talked about our families, students' performance and learning, our views of reading and teaching reading, and texts and activities to be emphasized during the instructional sessions (see Appendix F).

Focus of Our Efforts. The nature of the collaboration between Vera and me changed considerably during the ten weeks of the study. Throughout this period, each of us developed new ways of thinking about how to help poor readers in Chapter One and how to conduct classroom research. During the initial three weeks, however, Vera and I focused
on becoming acquainted with each other as individuals and teachers, and on building a sense of trust between us.

Our initial relationship was influenced by our different understandings of the nature and the purpose of the study. That is, I thought about the study as a collaborative endeavor in which the teacher and the researcher would share the planning and the development of an instruction which would promote poor readers' learning. In my view, both the teacher and researcher would reflect, as partners, on students' cognitions and motivations and we would use our understandings of the students to design and conduct reading instruction. However, Vera did not share my conception of our work. Indeed, during our first meeting, she explicitly stated she believed my role would be one of the observer of her teaching and of students' learning. For instance, she stated, "I'm going to teach and you're going to observe, right?"

Individually, we each worked to maintain our views of the study. For my part, I articulated my understanding that Vera and I would modify our instructional practices to reflect our joint conceptions about the students. For her part, Vera expressed her difficulty with modifying her instruction because it was "locked" by the coordination with the students' regular reading teacher. (Less successful readers had their regular reading instruction with a class-
room teacher who was not their regular classroom teacher.) Furthermore, Vera revealed her difficulty with allocating time for the study due to her busy schedule in school and at home.

Vera clarified her expectations of our work on several occasions. During the second reflective/planning session, Vera stated she had thought I was only going to observe her instruction, and to videotape some of the instructional sessions. Vera also explained she had not expected she would be asked to reveal and reflect about her thoughts and actions. Similarly, in the fourth reflective/planning session, Vera elaborated:

But you don’t really understand. I did read through the paper that you gave me but I have never been involved in anything like this and he [School Official] had told me that I would just teach and you would be sitting there and observing for so many weeks and maybe once or twice we would have a meeting ... and I didn’t know that we were going to be videotaping every day.

Our different ideas about the nature of the study evoked strong reactions in both of us. For instance, a conversation after my first observation of Vera’s instruction exemplified Vera’s initial discomfort with my presence in the classroom and her protective attitude toward her teaching. After this session, in which Vera asked students to draw inferences from individual texts (each student had a different text) and indicate correct responses to multiple choice questions, Vera sought my opinion about the session.
I responded by emphasizing that the skill focused on, drawing inferences, was important to facilitate comprehension. Vera replied by focusing on her students' poor performance, despite the extensive time she had spent emphasizing the topic. In response, I proposed that the students might have experienced difficulty understanding the meaning of their texts and suggested that using a single text and modelling how to draw inferences might have been a more successful approach to facilitate understanding. Vera justified her approach by explaining that some of the girls' performance was usually better than what I had observed. She added that her use of several different texts was necessary to verify each student's performance.

During the fifth week, in our second reflective/planning session, Vera confirmed her great discomfort and nervousness about the idea that her teaching and thinking were the subject of the study. She stated:

...when there is somebody sitting here, watching me day after day, I get nervous and I just talk and talk, and the more I feel at home with somebody, ... I talk when I'm real nervous. And, I was not used to having you sitting here, and that first week I probably talked their heads off...I did not know you're going to tape every day, and when I think about everything that I said on that tape...

For my part, I, too, developed concern about the study. Vera's different ideas about it were surprising to me. When she expressed resistance to the idea of altering her instructional practices, I felt frustrated and dismayed. I
began to question whether a study such as the one I envisioned could be successfully conducted within this context. My uncertainty about what would happen made me react in several ways. To deal with Vera's resistance to the idea of modifying her curriculum, I suggested we might focus our reflections on both her choice of curricular topics and on the instructional emphasis to be used to teach them. For instance, I wrote in my journal after our first meeting:

I realized conducting the study as I had envisioned would be more difficult than I thought. I decided to focus on the skills Vera considered important and to emphasize how to treat them as strategies, during our discussions. Having this in mind, I asked if Vera had some flexibility to discuss her choice of curricular topics and how to teach them.

I also cogitated on ways to allow us time to become acquainted with each other's interests, problems, and views about working with poor readers. I decided to be initially an observer rather than a co-teacher in Vera's instructional sessions in order to learn more about her and about the reading instruction she provided, and to reduce the discomfort my presence caused her. I also decided to postpone the use of the camera until the second week, thereby limiting the number of novelties Vera would immediately experience. At the same time, I would attempt to build a sense of trust between us by arriving very early in the morning, before the classes started, and sometimes remaining a little bit after class in order to converse with Vera.

Despite her concern and discomfort, Vera did not with-
draw from the study. Instead, she appeared to understand the study as a learning opportunity. For instance, during our first meeting Vera said the study would be an important opportunity for her to learn about the students' learning. Similarly, during a conversation before class in the first week, after I expressed my appreciation to Vera for her participation in the study, she replied she was glad to have this opportunity because there was much to learn.

During this period, Vera demonstrated willingness to cooperate in the study. For instance, she offered suggestions concerning the choice of the focal students. That is, Vera suggested that Carol might not be a good choice because she was too shy and had great difficulty revealing her thinking. Vera also helped to determine a time for the students' assessment sessions. Actually, she expressed concern about pulling the students from their classrooms for the assessment sessions and suggested these sessions might be conducted during her instructional time. As I explained that such an arrangement would not be possible due to the great number of assessment sessions, Vera, perhaps concerned about suggesting an alternative time without the principal's consent, advised me to talk with him. In fact, after Dr. Brown (the principal) recommended that we talk with the classroom teachers, Vera suggested conducting the sessions before her class, at the beginning of the school sessions, to make use
of the transitional time during which students typically get prepared for the school day. Also, she talked with the classroom teachers and made other arrangements for conducting the sessions. Moreover, because she had only one hour per week available for the reflective/planning sessions, Vera proposed that she could watch the tapes of the instructional sessions at home.

During the third week of our study, Vera demonstrated her willingness to cooperate in the study by declaring that she had altered her teaching methods during instruction in ways she felt would assist the study. For example, she had not focused on activities usually emphasized, in which students worked individually in different places of the classroom, because she believed it would be difficult for the videotaping of the session. Similarly, Vera had not emphasized silent reading or reading for the students, although she believed these activities to be important. She presumed these activities would limit my observation of the students' reading difficulties and, principally, I was there to listen to the students' reading and not to hers.

The conversations between Vera and me provided a daily opportunity to learn about each other as individuals, to discuss aspects of the study, students' learning and our beliefs about how to help these students become strategic readers. For instance, we talked about our families. Vera
shared information about her children and stories about her family. I talked about my daughters, and my difficulties arriving at school at 7.30. We also talked about our problems with teaching poor readers. I talked about my history of failures and successes in helping students with reading difficulty. I tried to let Vera know that I, too, was a teacher and my goal was to understand how we could help poor readers become strategic readers. For her part, Vera shared her beliefs about the students' learning and motivations, and her views about instructional materials she had or was interested in obtaining.

During these times, I tried to cooperate with Vera in different ways. I listened to Vera's apprehension regarding the students' performance and learning, and shared ideas about how to deal with these situations. For instance, Vera shared her concerns about Derrick's reading difficulties and low self-esteem, Carol's learning difficulty and low self-confidence, Melanie's lack of motivation and Doris' attention problems. At one point, Vera explained:

... I don't think Melanie pays attention, I don't think she is a good listener, she doesn't focus on what I am saying most of the time...She can do it. She just thinks she can't...Carol stammers, but a lot of times it's because she has low self-confidence. Several times she knows the answer but it's hard to get any answer because she is not confident...Carol really concerns me... I do not know how to reach her...You can ask a question to Doris and get a totally different answer. She wants to answer first. She doesn't think...She can't attend a longer time to something...Derrick has self-esteem problems...He has difficulty with sounding the words out...All the time I think about
doing something I think it will be too difficult for Derrick.

I responded to Vera's questions talking about my experiences working with poor readers. For example, during our second informal meeting, Vera demonstrated interest in learning how to help students with reversal problems. I responded by relating my experience with helping a first grader monitor his understanding of texts and reread texts in order to gain control over his comprehension processes and to correct his problems with reversals. I described my use of a variation of cloze procedure, in which a student is asked to read a text whose every fifth word is deleted except for its initial letter. I explained to her that the design of the text encourages the child to rely on the meaning and the initial letter.

As we worked together, Vera gradually began feeling comfortable with my presence in her classroom. During the fourth reflective session, Vera revealed her growing acceptance of my presence in her classroom by relating the development of her feelings of nervousness. She stated:

I was just nervous, and I didn't want the kids to look so bad. But talking to you and realizing that you were used to this, that you have been working with slow kids like these for many years...I felt, at first, I had done something wrong. And after realizing that you were used to this, I realized you knew they were just showing you what they could do and I understood it was necessary for you.

During a conversation at the beginning of the fourth week,
Vera also expressed her appreciation of working with me. She commented that she was learning, and, in addition, my presence was an opportunity for the children to learn about other countries. She went on to say that I also fitted perfectly in the classroom, since she liked to joke and I was always joking and laughing.

Through our talks, I learned about Vera's concerns and decided to use those concerns as a springboard for our work together. For example, I learned Vera was interested in using texts from a recently published reading series for classroom instruction. Knowing that the reading specialist had some new series, I told Vera of their availability. When Vera expressed concern she wouldn't be allowed to copy the texts due to the copyright law, I went to the library, read the law, discussed it with the librarian and confirmed that Vera could copy the texts to use them for classroom instruction. (Vera subsequently obtained the books and copied excerpts for all reading levels.) I also brought Vera several issues of the Cricket magazine in which I had found interesting texts. Vera copied and used several stories from these magazines during the eleven weeks of the study.

Vera also showed interest in the instructional emphasis I was stressing during our discussions. For instance, she asked me to bring her examples of the modified cloze procedure, in which students are asked to read texts from which
every fifth word has been partially deleted (except for the initial letter in the word). She also asked me to bring her an article about the reading instruction which emphasized the process approach that I was stressing.

In response to her requests, a reciprocal pattern developed. That is, in response to her request for information, I brought her an article by Roehler, Duffy and Meloth (1986). The article contrasted an emphasis on content alone (instruction which only implicitly informs students about the reading process) and emphasis on content-into-process (instruction which explicitly informs students about the cognitive processes successful readers use to comprehend a text). Also, in response to her questions about the students' difficulties, I brought Vera a book by Vacca and Vacca (1987) on reading and learning to read.

My attempts at providing Vera these materials were designed to create a conflict within her. To do that, I intended to promote Vera’s understanding of the reading instruction I was stressing, which, I believed, would introduce doubt and reflection. Vera was emphasizing aspects of reading I considered crucial for facilitating poor readers' comprehension. For instance, she introduced students to predicting, summarizing, clarifying, and rereading. I was, however, less comfortable with the way she used these processes in her instruction. That is, she limited attention to
declarative knowledge rather than showing students how and why to predict, summarize, reread or clarify as they worked in comprehending a text. Further, I was dissatisfied with what I interpreted to be her considerable attention to decoding.

Vera's comment on the Duffy and his colleagues' article suggested that her reading of the text had stimulated disequilibrium. During our first reflective/planning session, Vera reported that reading this article made her think she had never explicitly modelled for students the use of any reading processes. In addition, when we were discussing the possibility that the students were unclear about the relationship between their classroom instructional experiences and the reading process, Vera revealed her conflict between the new ideas introduced to her and her old beliefs supported by the school reality in which both instruction and assessment were removed from actual reading. Vera explained:

I know what you mean. I read this in the book. You're contrasting emphasis on content and on process. It seems to me it's an important point. I realized it's crucial. But their testing is in multiple choice.

During this first phase, Vera's and my role taking during the first reflective/planning session also suggested our mutual efforts to develop cooperative work. For her part, Vera willingly reflected on aspects of her instructional sessions, although it appeared it had been painful.
for her to watch her own teaching for the first time, as
demonstrated by the focus of her observations and her expla-
nations of her behavior. Vera began her analysis by focusing
on aspects of her interactions with students which appeared
in conflict with her beliefs and on her discovery of certain
aspects of her behavior while teaching, such as talking too
slowly, repeating too much. Vera also stressed aspects she
wanted to change if I agreed, in order to promote some stu-
dents' on-task behavior. Vera revealed:

I realized I called on Derrick and Melanie a lot. Melanie is
always yawning in front of me, and she might not feel well. I
decided to change Doris' and Melanie's places if it's Okay
with you. Doris has a hard time to think, she tries to
answer all the time... I call on Carol very little... I talk
so slowly and repeat so many times but that's because they
do not pay attention, because they do not learn.

Vera also inquired about my views on instructional matters
about which she appeared to hold conflicting beliefs. For
instance, she asked me if I thought that interrupting a stu-
dent to correct him/her or allowing him/her considerable
time to sound out words would disrupt his/her thinking. Vera
further elicited my views about reading for students—a
practice which she enjoyed and valued and about which her
students were enthusiastic, but which she had discontinued
because of my presence.

For my part, I tried to illustrate the collaborative
dimension of our work through my actions. Knowing that Vera
was concerned with the tape recorder, I decided I would not
turn it on. Further, I had been observing and listening to Vera carefully looking for a match between Vera's interests and the approach to teaching poor readers I believed important. I wanted to find a dimension Vera was interested in reflecting on in order to help the situation out. When I became aware that Vera was interested in promoting comprehension, I was delighted. This realization gave me the opportunity to work on something we both considered important. I then focused on the students' difficulty in comprehending and on their lack of awareness about how to proceed to control their comprehension of the text--characteristics which I had observed both during instruction and in my individual work with them. Also, I emphasized my views that predicting, context clues, and finding the main idea--the curricular topics Vera was focusing on--were important skills for facilitating the students' comprehension. In addition, when we decided to work with the cloze procedure, I offered to look for texts, since I knew Vera was very busy. And I reassured Vera concerning the collaborative aspect of our project.

Vera appeared to be influenced by the ideas we discussed. She appeared to combine ideas I had expressed with those she already held. For example, when planning instruction during the fourth week of the study, Vera expressed her doubts that cloze procedure might not help students to use
context clues. Our interaction in reflecting about this procedure motivated Vera to decide to use the cloze with partial deletion:

Vera: We've done many cloze procedures and they still do not use this process when they read.

Cecilia: Cloze procedure depending on the way it is stressed is also something unreal. Think about yourself reading. When you come to a word you do not know, do you say blank, read till the end of the sentence and reread? And the students work with cloze procedure as a procedure to choose a right word to fill in the blanks of paragraphs, what might make it more difficult for them to associate this procedure with real reading situations.

Vera: You're right. I look at the word, skip it, and reread. I think you're right about the multiple choice too.

Cecilia: The students might look at cloze as a work to be accomplished not as a process to follow when reading.

Vera: What we can do is to use the cloze with partial deletion and do not tell them to say blank as I've been telling them.

Vera also decided to help her students learn to summarize after I stressed a need for providing the students strategies which would facilitate their comprehension and organization of the information read. Vera expressed concern that this practice would disrupt students' comprehension. I emphasized it would provide the students a strategy they could use to keep track of comprehension. After consideration, Vera decided she would focus on summarizing while continuing her emphasis on phonics and other skills the students were having difficulty with in their regular reading instruction and on multiple choice tests.
Besides holding different conceptions of the procedures for the study and different conceptions about appropriate instruction, Vera and I held different beliefs about our roles. Vera appeared to see me as a researcher who knew the "right answers" and who was going to provide her these answers. In addition, Vera revealed she had not expected to be asked to reflect and articulate her thinking and the relationship between her thoughts and actions. As she stated during our second reflective/planning session:

I just did not realize that I would have to verbally tell you what I'm thinking, what I'm doing. I thought that it was you that was going to be telling what you thought.

For my part, I believed I had a lot to offer in collaborative work with a teacher, since I came to the study with well defined concepts about how to work with poor readers. On the other hand, I also believed I had much to learn, largely because teaching Chapter One was a new situation for me. However, after observing Vera's reading instruction which emphasized decoding and skills in isolation of the reading process, I began to question just how much I would learn.

My behavior during our early meetings revealed my doubts. That is, I worked to provide Vera with "the right answer". During our conversations and the reflective/planning sessions, I tried to reveal my views about the relationship between her instructional emphasis and the stu-
dents' learning difficulties. My emphasis was on developing an understanding and then communicating that understanding to Vera, together with ideas about how we could deal with the situation. For instance, during a conversation in which Vera expressed her beliefs that the students were slow learners, I responded that I believed their difficulty in learning was in part related to their lack of awareness of the reasoning they needed to use to facilitate and control their reading. Also, I suggested that we had to be more explicit about how they could use the reading skills emphasized while actually reading.

My approach contributed to Vera's general discomfort about our work. Her comment during the second reflective/planning session suggested her uneasiness:

I mean, with you I feel like you're saying, "Maybe we should do this." and I have done that before and I don't think that it worked. Or I have done that so many times and I feel that the students do that and maybe they don't. But I feel like sometimes...that you feel like I have not done any of these things or I have not said any of these things. Do you ever get the point that you have told somebody how to do something specifically so many times and after a while they or you don't notice any difference?

Vera's expressions of discomfort and frustration caused me to rethink my motives and behavior. I began to see my work with Vera as a type of indoctrination and to question its appropriateness for a collaborative project, unless it were to be only an initial step, meant to introduce doubt and promote reflection. Instead of providing Vera opportuni-
ties to reflect on her teaching, I had explicitly noted my judgments about the weaknesses of her teaching. Vera's frustrated reaction suggested that, although some conflict had already been established within her, she was unclear about the instructional distinctions I was making.

Vera's attempts to introduce the instructional changes discussed further demonstrated her confusion. That is, Vera seemed to restructure her teaching in order to combine both approaches toward teaching reading. She added explicit comments about processes which might facilitate students' reading, which I was emphasizing, to her emphasis on declarative knowledge. For instance, during the third week, before reading a text, Vera explained:

Vera: If you find a word you do not know, you can sound it out. If you can't sound it out, let's see if you can read the rest of the sentence and figure out what it might be. Use your what?

Beverly: Imagination
Doris: Main ideas
Vera: Your context
Students: Clues

Vera did focus on summarizing the content read after each paragraph as we had planned during our first reflective/planning session. While she asked the students about the content of each paragraph, she did not explain or explicitly model how, when, and why to focus on the important information of the paragraph. Vera inquired:

Vera: Okay, now we need to know what the roots do for the trees, Doris.
Doris: Hold trees on the ground.
Vera: What else, Melanie?
Melanie: Feed trees.
Vera: Yes, there are nutrients on the ground and the roots take these nutrients.

In observing Vera’s work and her frustrated reaction during our second reflective/planning session, I realized that I had not modeled for Vera the kind of teaching I had in mind. Consequently, I decided to start that same day, during the instructional session, modeling how to emphasize the process I believed important in helping students to learn and how to relate the skill emphasized to the reading process. (The nature and circumstances of this modeling will be discussed during the second phase.) My purpose was to clarify for Vera the approach towards teaching reading that I had been stressing. The modeling, I believed, would give Vera more information about the kind of teaching I had in mind.

In our sessions and conversations, I decided my role would be, as I had originally proposed, to facilitate Vera’s reflection on her teaching rather than to pressure her to follow the direction I believed was correct. My reflections led me to believe that my own behavior was motivated by my anxiety about providing students the opportunities that I believed would facilitate their learning. I decided that a more appropriate role for me was one of helping Vera to build her personal, unique "world-picture".
This first phase of our study was rife with struggles and misunderstandings. Nevertheless, neither of us abandoned her desire to better understand the other and to develop a collaboration. While my behavior caused Vera to react with frustration, it also established a conflict between the beliefs she held and the new ideas I was introducing. Concomitantly, her reactions caused me to revise my approach to this work. I realized I had already learned from Vera.

**Beliefs.** When I started this study, I held several beliefs about teaching poor readers. I believed that to help these readers to become strategic, independent learners it was necessary to develop reading instruction in which skill and will were tightly interwoven. For me, skill was the ability to choose and use cognitive activities to reach a desired goal, and to control for tasks' outcomes and one's own learning. In terms of skill, I believed reading instruction for poor readers had to include the teacher's explicit descriptions of strategies for comprehending text and the teacher's explanations of why, how, and when to use these strategies. Furthermore, to achieve success teachers should provide students opportunities to practice the strategies with real texts and to reveal their thinking, so teachers could help them make necessary adjustments.

In terms of will, I believed teachers had to establish classroom conditions in which risk was low. Such conditions
would allow students to concentrate on learning the strategic behaviors emphasized during instruction rather than on protecting their egos. I believed all the students would learn if we provided them with such opportunities.

Vera also believed that skill and will were the two major factors in teaching poor readers. However, her concepts of skill and will were a bit different from mine. For Vera, skill was the ability to complete such tasks as using graphophonic cues to decode words, distinguishing root words from prefixes and suffixes, selecting a statement which embodies the main idea of a passage, and using context clues to supply the missing word in a sentence. Vera seemed to believe, as her instructional emphasis showed, that these skills, as well as others which were difficult for the students in their regular reading instruction, should be taught and practiced in isolation of reading.

In addition, Vera appeared to believe strongly in emphasizing comprehension, though, in her view, it could be achieved by helping students become better decoders. For instance, when explaining her goals for the year, Vera elaborated:

My goal for this year was on comprehension and understanding...My goal for this year was to help them [students] to become better readers as far as understanding what they read.

As I demonstrated surprise and expressed my understanding
that she was emphasizing decoding, Vera explained how she saw the two as compatible:

That [focus on decoding] is to help them [students] with their comprehension because some of them can’t read the words and make several mistakes...I think they need to go through the words...If they go through the words, they can decode a little better and getting through the words will help them to get the meaning a little better.

Vera elaborated on her belief about the importance of decoding as she explained her use of interesting texts:

If they are reading something they are interested in, they are more active because they will be more motivated to try to figure out the words.

Vera considered herself responsible for making the students enjoy reading and for motivating them to read in and outside her classroom. In Vera’s words:

And [my goal for this year was] also making them enjoy reading, becoming more avid readers or wanting to read.

Vera appeared to hold two different, yet related beliefs about developing students’ motivation. She believed it was crucial to provide the students with an environment in which they would feel comfortable working and would not have to protect their egos. To create this environment, she worked to develop a personal relationship with her students. For instance, before class, she usually asked students about their families, and gave them time to talk about themselves. During instruction, Vera usually related the content of the text to her students’ personal experiences. For example,
Denorah was supposed to read and fill in the blank of the sentence "The ____ runs on gasoline." When Denorah could not find the word to fill in the blank, Vera probed:

Vera: What do you have home that runs on gasoline?  
Denorah: Cars  
Vera: What is another word for car?  
Denorah: [no response]  
Vera: Auto  
Denorah: Automobile

Besides Vera frequently used the students' names in stories designed to evoke correct responses. For example, she probed Denorah and Doris to provide words with the suffix ous:

Vera: Be ready to go caving. Your mother says, "Denorah, I wish you did not go. It is very"  
Denorah: dangerous  
Vera: Doris says, "Mother don't worry I'm very"  
Doris: careful  
Vera: I'm very coura  
Doris: [no response]  
Vera: courageous

Vera also believed that to motivate students to enjoy reading and become avid readers she had to provide opportunities for them to read and/or listen to interesting texts. She dedicated class time to these endeavors and encouraged independent reading outside of school. Vera usually dedicated Fridays and eventually Thursdays to instructional sessions she referred to as "fun sessions". During these sessions, Vera read trade books to the students, or the students read and/or listened to tapes of orally presented stories. In addition, Vera had books on subjects popular among students. She allowed her students to check out these
books every Friday.

While the students were encouraged to read the books, Vera never obliged them to do so. She showed this latitude in her interactions with Derrick whom I never saw borrow or return a single book from Vera's collection. Every Friday Vera would ask him if he wanted to read a book. When he responded negatively, Vera would reply with "That's Okay", or some other non-evaluative response. Her words never hinted at irritation or frustration.

During our conversations, Vera frequently reiterated her beliefs about skill and will. For instance, she often asked me if I thought the students felt comfortable in her classroom. She revealed her belief that praising the students' successful performance would motivate them to perform. Vera showed concern about providing all the students with equal opportunities for interacting during instruction by asking them to raise their hands to volunteer their participation. In addition, she frequently expressed her concerns about particular students. She talked about Derrick's low self-esteem and reading difficulty, about Carol's low self-confidence and her difficulty in learning and thinking, about Melanie's lack of motivation and Doris' difficulty attending to classroom discourse.

Vera defined reading as a means to achieve at least two separate ends. That is, reading is having skills one needs
to reach his/her purposes. For instance, reading was a means
to understand a menu, the food labels in the grocery store,
a book and a newspaper, or to get a job. As Vera stated dur-
ing Interview One:

Reading is having the survival skills that you need to get
along in the world successfully, to get a good job, to read
a newspaper ... to be able to go to a restaurant and to the
grocery store and read the food labels.

Vera also believed reading was a means of enjoyment.
She explained:

...to me reading is not only a survival skill we should make
these children learn but enjoyment is a part of reading,
too. I think that it is really important that these kids
learn to enjoy reading. My daughter does not like to read
and that bothers me.

Vera appeared to believe that reading difficulty was a
problem of comprehension, mainly caused by the students'
difficulty with decoding. In fact, her decision to emphasize
sounds and words during reading instruction were aimed at
improving the student's decoding skills as a step toward
improved comprehension. Vera's beliefs about reading failure
were reflected in the surprise and sense of disequilibrium
she experienced when confronted with a discrepant situation,
in which one of her students demonstrated reasonable compre-
hension despite his difficulty with decoding. In Vera's
words,

It's amazing. He's with me for two years now, and it's
really interesting. I know he processes, but he does not
know the words, and even if he uses context clues, he still
does not know the words. But he still does well in a test.

Vera appeared to hold two major beliefs about teaching Chapter One. She believed it was her responsibility to coordinate instruction with the students' regular reading teacher. She also believed she had to reinforce the skills students found difficult during classroom reading instruction or testing.

Vera expressed contradictory feelings about coordinating her teaching with that conducted by the classroom reading teacher. On the one hand, she believed this coordination would help the children, providing them additional opportunities to learn difficult skills. In fact, she appeared to see this coordination as crucial to any improvement in the students' performance. For instance, when describing her role as Chapter One teacher during Interview One, Vera stated:

I'm a trouble shooter, basically my job is just to help to reinforce the skills children are having trouble with. So they can fully understand and their test scores will show.

On the other hand, Vera also believed that coordination with the classroom teacher created a time problem. It reduced the time she could devote to reading-as-enjoyment activities or to skill activities, in which she emphasized skills different from the ones the students' classroom reading teacher wanted her to stress. This sentiment is
reflected in Vera's discussion of the tension she felt between her views and those of the classroom teacher:

I feel it is my job to help them enjoy reading. As I said, it is miserable if kids don't like to read, or are not motivated at all, and I... I would say these kids have a basic problem of comprehension, and I think they need comprehension skills, maybe to help them to have better comprehension. But I'm kind of stuck. I'm working with the teacher, and there is a difference between what I want to do, and what I have to do. Some days, as I said, I say, "Let's just read a story," but sometimes, I'm so busy with the things I know they need help with. The teacher might say, "These children need help with the main idea," and that's what I do. But there are weeks when I'm looking to their skills in their reading test. And, there are a lot of skills but some are known skills. So, that gives me a couple of days in which I can do something different. And that's nice.

Vera believed that Chapter One programs could benefit poor readers by providing students with a low risk environment, in which they would feel comfortable learning and performing. The importance of a safe environment is reflected in Vera's comment:

Children meet in a small group, having the flexibility to be free to speak up, because some children who are having difficulty in a big group, they do not open their mouth. They come here, they really want to talk. They don't feel like people are going to laugh at them if they say the wrong thing; somebody is going to smile. So I think it brings children up and gives them some chance of figuring out why they're thinking the wrong way, if they're doing something incorrect because they're not... you know, they know that their peers are making As and Bs and they are doing Cs and Ds. So it gives the kids a chance to open up a little bit. I hope it gives them a feeling of security... You know, they feel really secure here that they can do their best.

Vera expressed two major beliefs about the students' learning. She believed they had difficulty learning the con-
tent taught. And she also believed they easily forgot what they had learned. In fact, Vera's beliefs about the students' difficulty with learning and remembering caused her to conclude that the students needed an instruction characterized by constant repetition and drill-and-practice activities. In Vera's words, "... they need a constant repetition, a constant drill."

Although she saw all the focal students as "slow learners", Vera distinguished between them, based upon her perceptions about their levels of difficulty and about their particular approaches to learning. For instance, she considered Carol to have the most difficulty learning and remembering the information taught. Vera stated, "Carol is the slowest of the girls in our group." When we were deciding which girls to choose as focal students, Vera suggested that, if I had to let someone out of the study, she would suggest Carol because Carol had a hard time making her thinking clear. She described the girl as an auditory learner (Vera got this description from a learning style inventory she had administered to students). She also described Carol as a self-motivated student:

Carol is a good listener, and she pays attention. She learns better by listening. That's her way of learning and remembering. If you see Carol in math working in any problem, she can sit and work for a long time. She just can't remember. She can remember today's work, but what she saw last week she can't remember.
Vera considered Doris to be a better reader than Carol. However, Vera saw Doris as having difficulty in concentrating on classroom discourse and organizing her thinking during oral tasks. Vera described Doris vividly:

Doris is not a good listener. Doris is a child who likes to write. She likes to put everything on paper, and in Math she does fine. She’s a busy writer. But two weeks from now, if she has to remember what she had, she’s lost. She has to get physically involved and that’s what she enjoys. Doris has attention problems, and you may ask her a question and get a completely different question because she is not thinking. She just wants to be the first to answer.

When Doris demonstrated poor performance during a reading session with me, Vera characterized that performance as atypical, explaining that Doris’ performance might have been a result of her feeling uncomfortable because she was reading all by herself and in a new situation. Vera asserted that Doris, as well as Melanie, should be in a reading level above the one in which she had been placed.

Vera’s beliefs about the students and about the ways to help them guided her approach to turn taking during classroom instruction. For example, because of her belief that Derrick would profit from frequent opportunities to learn and to become motivated to perform, Vera called on him more often than on the other students. In fact, despite her insistence on students’ raising their hands to volunteer for participation, Vera often called on Derrick although he had not raised his hand. Also, in one instance, when the stu-
udents were going to read a play, Vera offered Derrick the father's part, a long part that Derrick had great difficulty reading. Her purpose, which she clarified after class, was to motivate the boy by giving him an important male part.

Similarly, Vera frequently called on Melanie, who was usually sleepy during instruction, in order to stimulate the girl's participation. After watching the videotapes of classroom instruction for the first time, Vera realized she interacted differently with different students. She explained her behavior as an attempt to motivate both Derrick and Melanie to pay more attention to instruction. Further, during recitation, Vera frequently called on Doris to check on the girl's thinking and on how much attention she paid to the topic being discussed.

It appeared that, when Vera believed that a student would not profit from frequent opportunities to respond, or when she was unable to determine how to help a student, she interacted with that student less frequently during instructional episodes. For instance, Vera believed Carol, although a very slow learner, was "self-motivated" and did not need to be called on to attend to classroom discourse. Further, Vera believed she might embarrass Carol by calling on her often. According to Vera,

Carol is a stammerer. And, when she is real nervous it is worse, and a lot of times when you call on her for an answer, if she does not feel like she knows it, she stammers real badly and you can't understand her.
Reading Instruction

During the initial four weeks of the study, my role in Vera's classroom was primarily one of the observer. I usually sat at one end of a big, rectangular table and took fieldnotes. I occasionally participated by helping the students with seatwork or recitation activities. For instance, I guided Derrick and Melanie to attend to the meaning of the sentence while choosing between words which sounded the same but differed in meaning (homophones or homonyms) in order to complete a fill-in-the-blanks activity. On another occasion, Derrick was reading during seatwork correction. He read, "Shark live in water." Vera repeated the sentence the way he said and inquired, "Is that right, Derrick?" Derrick stared at the text and remained silent. It appeared he had not realized what he had done wrong. I pointed to the s at the end of the word shark in his worksheet, and Derrick self-corrected.

In addition, I volunteered comments, either to reinforce or to suggest a different emphasis on the information Vera was providing. For instance, Vera commented on the "tricky" quality of the paragraph the students were reading in order to find the main idea. I suggested the difficulty occurred because the main idea of the paragraph was not explicitly stated and both answers B and C were
plausible statements of the main-idea. As a result, Vera, although guiding the students to understand the reasons one answer was more acceptable than the other, told them she would consider both correct. Building on Vera's explanations, I stressed to the students that asking themselves what the paragraph was about was more important than finding the right answer.

Only on one occasion was my participation greater. That instance occurred when I guided students' reading of connected text for a few minutes, while Vera attended to something outside the classroom. During this instance, Derrick was reading, and I supplied several words which appeared difficult for him.

Vera planned and conducted all the instructional sessions. The instruction provided to the students during this initial phase reflected Vera's stated beliefs about working with less successful readers in Chapter One.

**Opportunities to Learn About Reading.** During the initial four weeks, Vera's instruction emphasized three aspects of learning to read. That is, Vera focused most of her instructional sessions on providing the students opportunities to drill sounds and words and to practice skills in isolation from the reading process. The third and less stressed focus of Vera's reading program was on reading connected texts.
During instruction, Vera provided her students many opportunities to drill sounds in isolation and to practice them by reading single words from the board or from a sounds foundation chart. This type of activity was usually held during the five initial minutes of classroom instruction, although occasionally it continued throughout an instructional period. In addition, Vera explicitly informed the students of reasons for working with sounds and words. Also, she provided them opportunities to show their knowledge of sounds and of the reasons for working with them. For instance, the following fragment illustrates both the opportunity students had to reveal their thinking and the way Vera provided them with explicit information about her purpose for focusing on sounds and words. Vera stated:

Vera: Doris, why are we working with sounds and words?
Doris: Can help us to read better.
Vera: It can help us to read better. It can help us to figure out new words.

Moreover, Vera explicitly advised the students to sound out words they did not know when reading connected texts. For instance, she stated, "When we find a word we do not know, we can sound it out, we can look for a small word inside of a big word."

During reading more extended texts, such as sentences, paragraphs or passages, Vera primarily guided the students to sound the words out and to remember the sounds and their
key words they had practiced. The following dialogue illustrates Vera's approach as she assisted Denorah in decoding the word *innocent*:

Vera: Denorah, cover everything except for the first three letters at the beginning. Did you see the letters at the beginning?
Denorah: Yes.
Vera: Did you see what comes after that?
Denorah: /sant/
Vera: /sant/ is at the end, what is in the middle?
Denorah: /a/
Vera: Put them all together.
Denorah: nocent
Vera: innocent, Kevin is innocent.

Vera also focused on context clues as an alternative technique for unlocking a word while reading. That is, Vera first guided the students to recognize the sounds and to remember their key words, or to break the word into small parts, looking for smaller words within them. If difficulty persisted, she would guide students to read the sentence on till the end, to say *blank* for the word they could not decode, and then to reread it. The following instance illustrates these procedures:

Vera: What do you think it [attention] might be? We always look for a small word inside of a big word. Do you see a small word inside of that word? Look in the middle of that word. Do you see a word that you know?
Derrick: [no response]
Vera: Do you see *ten* in the middle of that word?
Derrick: *ten*
Vera: What about the beginning? How do you say? /at/...?
Derrick: /at/
Vera: Now put these together and see if you can figure out the word.
Derrick: [no response]
Vera: Pay blank. Pay /at/...
Derrick: [whispers]
Vera: What does /sian/ say? /sian/ is a letter combination we are going to work in our next sheet. /sian/ says what?
Derrick: / asian/.
Vera: Don’t forget the ten, attention.
Derrick: attention
Vera: Again.
Derrick: / asian/
Vera: attention
Derrick: attention

When working with context clues, Vera often provided the students with opportunities to reveal and reinforce their knowledge of contextual clues as a second choice procedure to follow when they found a word they could not sound out. Her approach is illustrated in the following dialogue:

Vera: Beverly, What do you do when you come to a word you do not know?
Beverly: Sound the word out.
Vera: What if you try to sound it out and you can’t?
Beverly: I would look for...
Vera: Do you know you can read a sentence and leave that word blank? And when you read the sentence, you look for what in your sentence, Denorah?
Denorah: Context clues.

However, the students did not succeed in decoding a word using this procedure. In fact, Vera concluded that the students had not learned how to use context clues despite the strong emphasis she had placed on their use. Nevertheless, perhaps encouraged by my emphasis on the importance of being explicit about the use of context to facilitate reading, Vera began to instruct her students explicitly to use
context clues to facilitate decoding when they could not sound out the word. For instance, during the third week, before reading a text, Vera for the first time explicitly told her students both to sound out words they did not know and, if they still could not unlock them, to read till the end of the sentence saying blank for the missing word, return and use the context to decode the word. The following dialogue illustrates Vera’s approach:

Vera: If you find a word you do not know, you can sound it out. If you can’t sound it out, let’s see if you can read the rest of the sentence and figure out what it might be, use your what?

Beverly: imagination
Doris: main ideas
Vera: your context...
Students: clues

However, Vera did not attempt to demonstrate explicitly for her students how to reason about the context clues as a way of identifying unknown words. During reading, she still focused on guiding students to sound out the words they could not decode.

Besides placing the emphasis on "sounding out" unknown words, Vera presented information about the skills with which students were having difficulty in their regular classroom. Vera focused primarily on finding the main idea of a paragraph, on context clues, on distinguishing root words from prefixes and suffixes, and on homophones.

Vera’s approach during instruction was on providing
students with the explicit definition of a concept, such as main idea, context clue, or affixes and root words. She rarely showed students how they could use these skills to promote comprehension. Instead, she used analogy, mnemonics and recitation to help students learn how to explain these terms and how to complete worksheets. For example, the following dialogue illustrates an instance in which Vera explicitly informed students about base words, prefixes and suffixes:

Vera: Yes, the base word is a word. Remember the face? [Vera drew a face on the board and added some details to it.]
Vera: We can add some details to the face and we can add some details to the word. What can we add to the word paint?'
Doris: ing
Vera: Right, what is it called?
Students: [no response]
Vera: Does someone remember the word affix? There are two kinds of affixes, one that comes at the beginning of the base word and one that comes at the end of the base word. Raise your hands if you know which one this is.

To help her students distinguish between prefixes and suffixes, Vera presented a mnemonic device. She informed them that the p comes before the s in the alphabet and, in alphabetizing the words, prefix comes before the suffix. Doris frequently used this information to justify her answers.

Also, Vera's approach to finding the main idea of a paragraph emphasized definitional meaning rather than the
use of the main idea to facilitate comprehension:

Main idea is a general statement. It tells all about the story...It is what the story is all about.

Sometimes Vera led a discussion of how a skill might be used in comprehension. For instance, Vera stated:

Context clues would help you to figure out the words you did not know. You're learning to be good detectives, learning to see all the clues in the sentence to help you to figure out the words you did not know.

However, she did not model the use of the skill or the conditions in using this skill. For instance, she emphasized context clues as part of a procedure needed to find the right words to fill in the blanks. Similarly, finding the main idea of a paragraph was used as a way of selecting the correct alternative on a worksheet.

To a very limited extent, Vera taught her students how to use affixes and root words to improve their writing and their comprehension of paragraphs and passages. For instance, Vera twice related the information about prefixes, suffixes, and base words to the students' writing activities in their regular classes and informed them they could use these notions to separate syllables. In one of these instances, Vera even drew a page on the board and wrote a phrase a student volunteered to illustrate her meaning. Also, during reading, when students had difficulty with sounding a word out, Vera would direct them to take the suf-
fix or the prefix off and look for a smaller word.

When Vera worked with connected texts, she principally used questioning to direct the students to use processes which would facilitate their comprehension. Before reading, Vera typically directed her students to read the title, look at the pictures, and predict the upcoming events. She also worked to relate the upcoming content to the students' own experiences. For instance, when the students were going to read a text about monopoly in China, Vera read the beginning of the story and inquired, "How many have monopoly at home?" She then guided the students to talk about the details of the game, such as the colors and the names of the streets. Next, she asked them to imagine what the colors and names of the streets would be in China.

After providing the students some opportunities to talk about their predictions for the content of the story to be read, Vera typically stated a purpose for the reading related to the predictions made by the students. For instance, concerning the text about monopoly, Vera stated, "Let's read to see if we're right." Or, as in another occasion, "Let's find out about these people, if they're real people and about this giant tree."

After reading, Vera questioned her students about the information read. She usually asked them questions about story details, which required students to draw text-based
inferences. If the students could not answer these ques-
tions, Vera directed them to the part of the text or to the
pictures in which they could find the information necessary
to answer the question. When the students read and listened
to The Emperor and the Nightingale, Vera asked:

Vera: Why do you think the people liked the mechanical
      bird so much?
Beverly: Because he is rich.
Vera: Why?
Beverly: [no response]
Vera: Let’s open our books on page... Look at the pic-
      ture. Let’s read again this part.

After discussing the text, the students eventually individu-
ally completed worksheets with multiple-choice, fill-in-the-
blanks and true/false activities about the text information.

In the last day of the fourth week, Vera began asking
her students questions which required them to summarize the
information read after each paragraph. I had encouraged Vera
to teach students to summarize each paragraph as a way of
noting and organizing the information they were constructing
from text. In helping her students learn about summary, Vera
discussed the idea, but did not actually model how she would
go about developing a summary.

Students’ Responses. The students’ oral reading
reflected Vera’s instructional emphasis on decoding. That
is, when reading in Vera’s classroom and in the assessment
sessions, the students concentrated on identifying the words
in a selection. To unlock an unknown word, they would sound
it out, or stare at the word and ask or wait for help. For example, Denorah stopped and stared at the word *Wayne*:

Vera: Think about it. Do you see a blend, a combination of letters we worked with in the middle of that word? What does it say?

Denorah: /ei/

Vera: Okay, let's read the word.

Denorah: Wayne

Students' answers during Interview One showed they lacked awareness about being strategic during reading. That is, the students revealed their use of two activities to solve their problems during reading: asking for help and sounding out words (graphophonic cues). When questioned about pre-reading strategies, the students reported there was nothing they could do before reading to facilitate their reading. During reading, the students revealed they would sound out the word they could not read and, if difficulty persisted, they would ask Vera or a peer. After reading, if they had difficulty understanding the story read, they would read it again or ask Vera's help.

During the reading sessions with me, some of the students revealed that, although they had declarative knowledge about the importance of reading the title and looking for the most important ideas, they did not use this information to facilitate their understanding. For instance, Doris and Denorah explicitly stated that the title of the text would help them to summarize the story read, however, they had not
read the title. Also, Doris declared that to summarize she had to find the main ideas, which, she explained, were ideas the text was all about. However, she was not able to actually select or generate these ideas. Furthermore, Doris, Denorah and Carol used the same activities to retell or summarize the text read. For example, in both instances, Doris and Carol silently read parts of the text and talked about them, showing a disorganized product which emphasized the ideas they had just read rather than those which older or more sophisticated readers might select as important. Denorah’s retelling/summarizing presented organized, though general, information. Melanie was the only student to present a complete and well organized retelling and a summary in which she focused on the most important ideas.

In addition, the students demonstrated difficulty comprehending the assigned texts when reading in both classroom and assessment sessions. During the assessment sessions, their retellings focused on disconnected trivial information. Also, Carol’s retellings showed ideas which elaborated on or distorted the text. In the classroom, while responding to Vera’s questions or completing worksheets, the students also revealed inadequate understanding of important ideas of the information read. For instance, when reading Does a Giant Redwood Tree have Giant Roots?, the students responded in the following way:
Vera: What's your answer, Melanie? "Redwood trees have deep roots, have no roots, grow close together."

Melanie: Redwood trees have deep roots.

Vera: Paragraph 3 tells you that redwood trees grow close together. Do you see, Melanie, why your answer can't be right? [reading] "These trees have root that are ONLY, ONLY 8 feet deep." This only shows you it is unusual.

Vera: Carol, "Redwood trees grow in rocky ground." True or False?

Carol: False

Vera: Carol, look at paragraph 2. "...But these huge trees grow on rocky ground."

Carol: True

Opportunities for Developing Positive Affect and Students' Responses. Vera appeared to have created an environment in which many, but not all of the students felt comfortable responding. In general, her students volunteered frequently during instruction, although Derrick, a poorer reader, rarely volunteered to participate. His responses suggested that most of the tasks were too difficult for him. Also, Carol, a very quiet girl and less effective decoder than the other girls, demonstrated a reluctance to volunteer. Nevertheless, the students typically seemed comfortable asking for Vera's help during seatwork completion and seemed willing to reveal their answers during seatwork correction. Further, during Interview One the focal students expressed enjoyment about working in this classroom. According to Denorah, "Mrs. Feldman is the only teacher I like to work with."

Several factors contributed to the students' comfort.
According to Vera, their comfort was high because the group was small and remained together for two years (except for Derrick), which allowed the students to become familiar with each other. Also, Vera made efforts to create a safe environment. She attempted to relate personally to her students before and during instruction. She encouraged students to participate by being very clear about the declarative knowledge of the skills emphasized, about the task to be accomplished, about the steps to follow to complete successfully the activity stressed, and by patiently probing and supporting students' efforts to accomplish tasks. On a few exceptional occasions, Vera did demonstrate some irritation with students' answers. She responded in this way when students failed to provide acceptable answers on topics frequently drilled and practiced.

Although Vera called on other students when a responding student did not supply a correct answer, this practice did not appear to distress the students. Doris reported feeling "Okay" when Mrs. Feldman called on someone else to respond to a question she had failed to answer, because Doris herself had helped other students to find answers difficult for them. The girl went on to say, "It's Okay to make mistakes, everybody makes mistakes." As suggested by Doris's response, perhaps the small size of the group and the constant rotation of receiving and providing help diminished
the negative impact from this routine. However, Doris's elaboration also suggested that this approach directed students' attention to producing an answer rather than to trying to make sense of a text.

In addition, Vera appeared to promote comfort by discouraging classroom criticism among her students. She seldom overtly criticized a student who provided an answer she considered unacceptable. She also discouraged her students from shouting out answers by emphasizing the practice of hand raising as a signal of their desire to participate. For instance, during Derrick's oral performance, the children remained silent. Nobody laughed or corrected him despite his slow and painful reading. According to Vera, when Derrick arrived, the girls used to laugh at him and correct him. She then told them that Derrick needed their help and that's what they should provide him.

In fact, Derrick's reading difficulty may have contributed to the other students' confidence. Although the students recognized that they had some problems with reading, they described themselves as average readers (except for Doris, who rated herself as a good reader). It appeared they felt successful working in Vera's classroom, perhaps because they could compare their own performance with Derrick's. This rationale is revealed by Denorah's self evaluation:
I'm [a reader] in the middle. I'm not the best, but I know how to read. See, like Derrick. He has trouble. But it is not his fault. He has trouble reading...He does not know how to read just simple words. Hard words he knows but simple words he does not know...Reading is easy for me, at least at this level.

The students' causal attributions of success and failure, emphasized both effort and help from the teacher. That is, the students attributed success in reading to their own effort--reading every day, practicing, and knowing the sounds and words--and to the teacher's help. In addition, they attributed failure in reading to their lack of effort, or to not asking for teacher's help.

Vera often encouraged her students to increase their effort to learn a skill by arguing that they could use their learning to improve reading and writing. For instance, she explicitly explained that students' knowledge of skills such as distinguishing sounds and words, prefixes, suffixes and base words could help them to unlock words while reading, to spell words, and to separate syllables while writing.

It appeared that Vera's students did learn how to produce correct answers to worksheets. That is, students' behavior during interactions seemed to demonstrate their attention to finding a right answer. For instance, Vera usually praised a right answer and/or repeated it with a high intonation, clarified and restructured an unclear or incomplete answer, and repeated slowly an unacceptable answer.
During classroom instructions, the students usually reacted to these clues provided by Vera’s behavior by changing an answer they believed was wrong, as illustrated in the following dialogue:

Doris: Look carefully on the backs of gloves. You will see lines or stitches there. These remain from long ago when gloves were flat on their backs.
Vera: [slowly] The gloves were flat on their backs.
Doris: laced

**Phase Two**

**The Nature of the Collaborative Process**

During the four weeks of the second phase, Vera and I followed our established meeting pattern. With one exception, we continued meeting for approximately one hour on Monday afternoons to conduct the reflective/planning sessions. These sessions provided us time to reflect on our concepts of reading and teaching poor readers, on the instruction offered to students, and on students' learning and motivations. We also planned upcoming instructional sessions.

Vera and I also talked frequently in the mornings, before my assessment sessions with the students, or before and after the instructional sessions. The purpose of these conversations changed somewhat from the first phase. Instead of working to know each other, during these conversations Vera and I focused principally on the aspects of the instructional sessions that we believed needed discussion,
on students' learning and motivations, and, eventually, on planning upcoming instruction.

Focus of our Efforts. During the four weeks of the second phase, Vera and I developed a cooperative working style, devoid of the tension we felt during the first phase. This phase revealed Vera's growing conceptual conflict between two approaches to reading instruction and her attempts to solve this conflict by considering solutions which would accommodate her new views to her old beliefs. During this phase, my behavior also changed. I supported Vera's efforts to implement the instruction she believed was important and I created opportunities for reflection about instruction, about students' learning, and about our own learning.

Throughout this phase, Vera and I contributed to building collaboration. For instance, Vera, proposed to help the students organize their thinking about a wordless picture book by having them create a story while they were looking at the pictures. She suggested that we divide the students into two groups. Each of us would work with one group. I responded enthusiastically, suggesting we might give the students time to think about the story and to dictate it to us. I also volunteered to locate the books. (I found several books in the school library and in the public library of a nearby city.)
Together, we tried out this activity during two instructional sessions in the seventh week. After both groups had dictated their stories, I typed them, xeroxed the books, pasted the dialogues under their corresponding pictures, and organized the books. My purpose was to model a way in which to organize students' products, so they could appreciate the results of their efforts. When Vera saw the books, she was very pleased and shared them with the reading specialist and with the principal, stressing my work in their preparation.

Rather than show the students their books before I arrived (I was a few minutes late working with Carol in an assessment session), Vera read a chapter of *Blubber* by Judy Blume, a book she had begun reading to the children several weeks earlier. (Vera had developed a pattern of reading parts of this book every time I was a bit late for class.) When I arrived, Vera showed the students the results of their work. They were delighted and expressed their desire to read their stories again. Vera asked each of the two pairs of students to share the reading of the story they had created. After reading, the students asked Vera's permission to show the books to their reading teacher. Vera agreed.

It appeared that our successful work with wordless picture books was not only an important event in our collaboration, but it attracted attention from other members of the
school community. For instance, some time later, the students' reading teacher told me she had enjoyed the books and was impressed with the students' good work. She also expressed her interest in implementing this activity in her own classroom and asked me about the books I had used. The following day, Dr. Brown, the principal, came to Vera's classroom to listen to the students read their stories. He sat behind each pair while they read, asking himself questions about what might happen in the story which the children read. The students were very pleased. After the readings, Dr. Brown said he had enjoyed the stories, and suggested the students ask the kindergarten teacher permission to read their stories to the kindergarteners—a suggestion which delighted the students.

Several other instances revealed Vera's efforts to contribute to our work. For instance, at the beginning of the fifth week, Vera changed the arrangement of the classroom but inquired whether the change interfered with the videotaping of the sessions, and offered to return the table to its original position. During the reflective/planning session in the sixth week, Vera explained that her instructional emphasis on helping students use context to read was a result of her interest in my work. In Vera's words,

I'm trying to do this a little more for you so you can get some results for your paper...
Vera's support was also apparent in the way she assisted me in working with one of the student participants. When I expressed concern about Denorah's willingness to participate in the study, Vera offered to talk with the students about the purpose and importance of the study and get feedback about Denorah's willingness to participate. During instruction, Vera reminded the students that the purpose of our work was to learn how to help students become better readers. She emphasized the importance of their participation and the necessity of meeting me as soon as they arrived in school. All the students said they enjoyed participating in the study, and that sometimes they were late because they were unsure about whose turn had come. To assure Denorah's privilege to withdraw from the study, several times throughout the study I offered her the possibility to withdraw but she chose not to do it.

Vera revealed increased interest in several facets of the project such as reflecting on instruction, collaboratively planning for upcoming sessions and discussing students' learning. She also expressed a growing interest in learning about the students' performance during the assessment sessions and considering this performance. Vera often inquired about their performance, and we frequently spent some time talking about their learning and motivations. In addition, Vera demonstrated increased interest in my work.
with the students. Observing this interest, I invited her to be present during an assessment session, or even to conduct an assessment session herself. Vera declined my offer, expressing concern that the students might feel uncomfortable with her presence.

For my part, I also worked to improve our collaboration. For instance, I assisted Vera in implementing instructional dimensions she planned. Knowing that Vera wanted to have a greater choice of books her students could check out, and that she also enjoyed the *Cricket* magazine, I asked the librarian about the old volumes of this periodical. As she replied that they were available to teachers to be used in classrooms, I informed Vera she could request this material.

I tried to create conditions which would support Vera's learning of the instructional emphasis I had been stressing. I worked to provide a scaffold by modeling and giving Vera support and time to reflect on her beliefs about teaching and learning. For instance, during the fifth week, I modeled an instructional strategy. The students were reading a text from which some words had been partially deleted, except for the first letter (cloze procedure with partial deletion). I explained:

... the reason we are doing this activity is to help you all to become better readers. Sometimes you're reading and come to a word you do not understand. What should you do? You can look at the first letter of the word and read on. When you come back and read again, it will be easier for you to understand the word you had difficulty with because you can
use information that you read to help you to understand the meaning of the word.

For the first time, I actively participated during instruction, clarifying for the students the meaning of the frequently used phrase "using your context clues."

In the same session, when Vera asked the students about the content of each paragraph, I twice called their attention to self-inquiry, the strategy Vera had implied. I also helped the students transfer the use of this strategy to other reading situations:

...When you're reading on your own ask yourselves questions such as the ones Mrs. Feldman is asking to keep track of the meaning. Don't just read and read. Stop after each paragraph and ask yourselves, "What are the important ideas I read?"

...

When you're reading or studying in your science or social studies books, stop sometimes and think about what you read. You may even write. Stop, think, and write, if you like, about what the paragraph is about. This will keep you understanding the text, keeping track of the meaning. If you realize you are not understanding, reread the paragraph. Do not keep reading on.

Vera reacted to my participation by supporting my discourse. When I explained the use of context clues, she agreed, "The reason we're doing this she just explained to you." Vera also confirmed the importance of self-inquiry to summarize the ideas read, particularly in cases in which readers are frequently interrupted by their own difficulties or by their teachers' comments. In her words, summarizing was important, "Specially when we stop too much and inter-
rupt our thoughts."

By the end of this instructional session, Vera demonstrated that she had internalized some of the reasoning I was emphasizing. That is, Vera explained how the processes used to read the text in which some words had been partially deleted could facilitate students’ decoding and comprehension:

Vera: Sometimes you have difficulty in understanding a text you have read by yourselves, don’t you?
Students: Yes.
Vera: So, what we are doing is something that you can do to help you. Use the other words of the sentence to help you to understand the words you do not know.

Throughout the four weeks, I continued to use modeling to emphasize processes I believed needed to be stressed. For instance, to follow my earlier work with context clues, I explained the processes I used to read:

Any time I’m reading and I do not understand a word, I look at the first letter of the word I do not know and ask myself, "What makes sense that starts with c or t?" I read on and read again. I’m looking for a word which makes sense in the text.

I also modeled how to provide the students with opportunities to reveal their thinking. For instance:

Cecilia: Carol, what made you decide to choose C?
Carol: Because it [the paragraph] describes the largest bird and the first sentence says "The ostrich is the largest bird."

Cecilia: What can you do to understand a story you read?
Students: Read again.
Cecilia: What if you do not have time to read the story again?
Doris: Remember.

... 

Cecilia: What made you understand that Jack is tired, Doris?
Doris: Jack sat up quickly and tired [tried] to... 

As I continued participating in this way, Vera began to use my discourse as a springboard for stressing the aspects of reading she believed to be important. She supported, clarified, and/or expanded on the ideas I emphasized. On one occasion, Vera explained that her use of story frame, besides being a strategy to summarize and enhance comprehension of the important ideas of a story, was a means for finding the main idea:

Cecilia: You see, this [story frame] helped you to understand the story you read because you understood the most important ideas, the main ideas of the story read.

Vera: See, we did not say we were going to find the main ideas, but that's what we did, because the main ideas are what the story is all about.

More and more frequently throughout the second phase, Vera engaged in behaviors I encouraged. She provided her students with clear explanations of the reasoning we wanted them to learn; she encouraged the students to monitor their thoughts during reading to determine whether they understood the text; she also thought aloud, so the students could become aware of the processes she was using; and she provided the students with opportunities to reveal their thinking. For example:

Vera: [Beverly read something incorrectly.] Does it make sense, Beverly?
Beverly: No.
Vera: So, read again.

... 

Carol: We've ... [paused]
Vera: Look, "We've es..., said Mrs. Large..."
Carol: We've escaped said Mrs. Large...
Vera: How did you figure out the word, Carol?
Carol: When you read the sentence aloud.
Vera: So, that's one thing you can do. Read it aloud with
the first letters of the word you have difficulty
with.

... 

Vera: Do you remember what helped us to write our story
the other day?
Doris: The pictures.
Vera: [Pointing at the pictures.] Look at these pictures.
They show us what the kids are doing. Look at this
picture. She seems to say, "Don't touch me." So
pictures are really helpful to help us to remember
a story.

During the reflective/planning sessions, Vera seemed to
be more comfortable talking about her instruction and her
students' performance. Vera also brought her notes about the
dimensions of instruction she had reflected on and planned
to discuss with me. Vera's discourse revealed a conflict
between two approaches to teaching reading. That is,
although she stressed the importance of our collaborative
emphasis on meaning and on the processes used to read, Vera
also expressed concern that the students were forgetting
their sounds. To resolve her conflict, Vera proposed empha-
sizing all three cueing systems of the language (syntax,
semantics and graphophonics). Vera elaborated:

One thing I noticed when I watched the tapes. When we did
the story about the elephants, I thought that it was a good
lesson and I do think that it will make them a little more
aware of what they are reading. I noticed two things. That is, one that they are so busy concentrating on the context clues that they are forgetting that they do know what certain blends sound like and they are forgetting that they know that there is another way they can figure out the word... Maybe we can tell them to use all kinds of things that might help them to read. We can tell them to use the context, the sounds, everything that can help them.

Vera's concern about her students' ability to remember letter sounds became more salient for her as our work continued. By the end of the eighth week, although Vera continued to emphasize looking for semantic cues as the principal strategy to facilitate decoding, she also provided the students with explanations about how to use letter sound knowledge to decode words. When Doris read *signed* instead of *sighed*, Vera interjected:

Vera: sighed, sighed [Vera goes to the board.] Let's look at *sign*. How do I write sign?
Doris: s-i-g-n [Vera writes on the board.] Which sound is silent?
Doris: *
Vera: [Vera writes *sigh* on the board.] What's this word?
Students: *sigh*
Vera: Which letter is silent?
Students: *
Doris: sighed is the past tense.
Vera: Right.

Further, during the last two instructional sessions of this phase, Vera emphasized drilling sounds and their key words from a sounds chart, an activity frequently stressed in phase one.

Similarly, during the seventh week, Vera worked to arrive at some compromise between a skills emphasis to read-
ing and an instruction which emphasized strategies to be used during actual reading:

...we can't read every day. I love to do that because there are so many stories and good literature ...but sometimes depending on what they really need out of the text that they are reading, we have to kind of stick to that and take a skill the teacher says that they need help with. Although I like to read every day, you just can't do that. But I think that at least two days a week you ought to read, sometimes three. And a lot of times the skills that you are doing you can incorporate in what you're reading...I think they have to acquire an understanding of why they are learning something too...

During both reflective/planning sessions, Vera, upon my request, reflected on the instructional opportunities we were offering the students. She explained we were offering them more opportunities to become independent readers. That is, Vera said she realized that during instruction she was able to explain more clearly the reasoning she wanted her students to use and to provide them with rich opportunities to think and explain their thinking. She described these dimensions as crucial to students' learning. When reflecting on a session in which she had focused on reading maps, Vera said she realized that during that session she had not provided the students with enough opportunities for learning about reading.

Vera reported learning during our collaboration. For example, she said she had learned the value of being more explicit about the thinking she wanted students to learn. In her words:
I am learning a lot from you. And I have learned, I think, that maybe the more that you tell them exactly what to do, what to say, what to think, maybe that will help them because when we did the cloze procedure—we have done the cloze procedure where there is a choice of words and I think that they had a worse time with that than they had with the first letter given—and I think that now they are thinking about the meaning of the word. Before they were just sounding out the three words that were given and deciding which one to choose. Now, I think there is more meaning connected in this type of cloze and I think this helped them...I think it stimulated more thinking on their part.

Vera also explained that she had learned that some skills could be incorporated into reading. In fact, she incorporated several skills, previously studied in isolation, into lessons with connected texts. That is, she helped the students focus on the ways in which they could use main ideas, context clues, and word structure to help themselves recognize difficult words and understand what they were reading. The following exchange was typical of Vera's efforts in this regard:

Doris: ...which had a resources [reassuring] new smell.
Vera: Does it make sense, Doris? Read on and read again.
Doris: [Reads on, rereads and stops before reassuring.]
Vera: Use your finger and see if you can find a base word.
Doris: reassuring
Vera: Good Doris, What did you do?
Doris: I took off the suffix ing.
Vera: ...If you find a big word see if you can find a base word, prefix and suffix...

According to Vera, she also learned to be more aware of students' learning and thinking. She could see the importance of giving them opportunities for more thinking and for revealing their reasoning processes. Vera elaborated:

As far as what I'm doing I was not doing before, I think I'm
giving them more opportunity to do more thinking and that's the big difference in my instruction... I think they have to acquire an understanding of why they are learning something... I'm becoming more aware of what they are thinking and how they are thinking...

Vera's increased awareness of her students' learning apparently went beyond her work with the four students in our session. Vera's report about her second grade group indicates the impact her thinking and effort had on her work with students:

...I had the class read a story silently and the title was left out, and we were working on finding the main ideas. And we talked about it, and I said, "While you're reading the story silently I want you to write down what you think the title could be"... four out of five had a good title. The fifth was totally off base. We read the story aloud, and when we read the story aloud that child understood... What I wanted to see was if anybody did not get the meaning from reading silently and she did not get the meaning but, when we read it out loud, she understood. So, whether she did not know the words or whether she is one of these people who reads and does not think about what she is reading but just reads the words, I don't know... The minute that we read the story [aloud] she said, "I don't know why I put that title."... and I think that is why she has a hard time in her room reading silently and doing things that require that.

For my part, during our reflective/planning sessions, I identified three aspects of Vera's instruction which I saw as changing in the ways I wished to encourage. I reported that Vera was providing (1) the students with more explicit explanations about the reasoning she wanted them to carry out and about the importance of that reasoning; (2) time for the students to articulate this thinking; and (3) explanations about how reading skills could be used during reading to promote comprehension. However, I also encouraged Vera to
use the instructional techniques I held to be important. So, for example, I emphasized the importance of showing students how to construct meaning while reading by: (1) explaining and demonstrating the use of prediction and summarization as comprehension strategies; (2) arguing for the use of successful reading comprehension as the primary criterion of success in the reading classroom; (3) encouraging Vera to provide the students with the opportunity to reveal their reasoning during reading; and (4) demonstrating through "think alouds" how a successful reader might tackle a reading task.

During these sessions, Vera and I negotiated instructional conditions and emphasis each of us believed to be important. For instance, during the sixth week, while I emphasized the importance of focusing on meaning, Vera stressed the importance of eliciting from the students all the language cues they could use to facilitate their reading. She also stressed her need for working with cause and effect and with reading maps, difficult skills for the students in their regular reading instruction. During the seventh week, Vera supported my earlier suggestions, such as working with cloze procedure with partial deletion and using a form of summarizing. She also emphasized instructional components which she thought necessary, such as the use of letter/sound information during reading.
The students' reading difficulties were also a recurring subject of our reflections and conversations. Vera often referred to the students' difficulties with learning and to their forgetfulness. For instance, she explained that the students had difficulty remembering more than one language cue which might facilitate their reading. They were learning how to construct meaning from the text, while, at the same time, they were forgetting their sounds. Vera also occasionally expressed her belief that by observing students' difficulty in learning I could better understand her discomfort with my initial comments on her students' lack of awareness about reading and reading strategies.

Vera explained that our work had influenced her in several ways. For example, she admitted that her decision to suggest Melanie's promotion to a higher reading group and Derrick's moving to a lower one was a result of our collaboration. She also attributed students' successes (such as Beverly's increased willingness to participate during instruction, and both Carol's and Beverly's apparent ability to solve their reading problems) to our work. Vera attributed my influence on her teaching to my "book learning" and my perspective as an "outsider." In Vera's words,

... because you had more book experience than I have had with your readings...and I think that any time you go into a classroom...there is always a different situation and you have a chance to watch and see what you would like to change. I feel a better teacher just from having you looking at the group from an outsider's point of view and see things
in these kids that maybe I didn't see because I work so closely to them every day.

During this phase, my sphere of influence in the school grew. Since I spent each Monday working in the teacher's room or in the library, I had frequent opportunities to interact with the students' classroom teachers and with their reading teacher, Mrs. Anderson. I learned that Mrs. Anderson was attending a class on reading in a nearby College, where she was studying an instructional approach similar to the one I espoused. We began to exchange information and ideas. I informed her that she could obtain copies of an important professional journal, The Reading Teacher, in the school library. I also offered to lend her some of my books.

During this phase, I also learned an important lesson by observing the results of my supportive work with Vera. That is, I learned the crucial importance of being patient and of creating conditions for reflection and learning rather than stressing weak points of instruction as I had done with Vera during the first phase.

Beliefs. During this phase, I realized that although skill and will were tightly interwoven, the role of will in learning seemed more important than I had previously thought. The interaction between skill and will and the powerful role of will could be observed both in Carol's and Beverly's evolving success in using the strategies emphasized and in Denorah's and Doris's frequent difficulties. In
fact, Doris and Carol were powerful examples of how cognitive and affective/motivational dimensions were interlaced.

Doris had been a successful performer in an instructional program which emphasized recall of letter sounds, declarative knowledge about reading skills, and the production of correct responses on worksheets. When Vera and I shifted the instructional emphasis to meaning construction during reading, Doris exhibited difficulty making the transition. Although on several occasions Doris demonstrated declarative and procedural knowledge about the strategies under study, she showed no signs of using them while reading.

Doris's difficulty in being successful appeared to be caused by a spiral of negative interactions to which several students, as well as Vera and I, contributed. Frustrated by observations of Doris's frequent off task behavior and by her own unsuccessful efforts to assist Doris in reading for meaning and in explaining how she read, Vera came to believe that Doris was not thinking while reading or before responding in class. Consistently with this interpretation, Vera's interactions with Doris became increasingly more strained. The following dialogue well characterizes the situation:

Doris: It's super [supper] time.
Vera: Doris, does it make sense to you? What's super time?
Doris: supper time
Vera: Think about what you're reading, Doris. That couldn't make sense to you. I know you're not thinking while you're reading, because you did not stop and self-
correct. If you’re thinking about what you read, you’d have noticed that what you said did not make sense and you’d have stopped and self-corrected. [Doris, by this time, had lowered her head and the movement of her hands suggested nervousness.]

Over time, Vera began to provide Doris with fewer opportunities to respond orally because she became convinced these opportunities would not help Doris reveal her thinking. In Vera’s mind, Doris would either make responses which appeared senseless to Vera or remain silent. Vera explained:

Yeah, but when you call on her in class to figure something out and if she blurts out an answer and you go back and ask her to tell how she got that answer, she fumbles for the words because she just guessed and then she was not processing...

I also contributed to Doris’s low self-esteem. During assessment sessions, I provided her with additional opportunities to watch videotapes of instructional sessions during which she was unsuccessful. My purpose was to learn more about instructional processes by helping students observe and reflect on their thoughts and actions during instruction, on the purpose of tasks completed, and on Vera’s and on my discourse during instruction. During these sessions, Doris expressed her dislike for watching herself on TV.

For her part, Doris reacted with frustration, particularly after Melanie was moved to a more advanced group and several of her attempts at learning the new approach were unsuccessful. Doris began to show physical manifestation of discomfort. She would cover her face with her hands, or
lower her head and stare at a spot on the text or worksheet.
Vera interpreted this behavior as a demonstration of Doris's anger and frustration and a sign that "you would not get any other answer from her." It became increasingly more common for Doris to spend much of an instructional session, or the entire session, without volunteering any participation.

One exception to this pattern occurred when Doris, Carol, and I worked with wordless picture books. During that session, Doris contributed to the instructional dialogue and worked eagerly to complete tasks. As Vera suggested, "...Doris had a great and successful day." The following dialogue illustrates an instance during which Doris experienced success:

Cecilia: Why do you think so?
Doris: Because he is afraid she'll yell at him.
Cecilia: I thought it happened in another way. He put the paper on the wall on purpose to have time to escape.
Doris: Look at his face, It seems he just discovered he had put the paper on the door.
Cecilia: [attending to the character's surprised look at the door] That's right. See, two persons can come to different story looking at the same picture. And your interpretation makes a lot of sense, Doris.
Carol: I think that, too.

Reciprocal cycles were observed for other students as well. In Carol's case, the cycle was a much more positive one. Carol successfully used the opportunities to focus on meaning construction during reading. Although she had been a slow decoder, she seemed able to use the comprehension
strategies to improve her comprehension of a text. Encouraged by instances of Carol's success, Vera provided Carol with increasingly more frequent opportunities to reveal her thinking. Carol appeared motivated to succeed and to use the strategies Vera and I were emphasizing. She demonstrated self-confidence by more often volunteering to participate, and to talk about her thinking processes.

During the second phase, many of Vera's stated beliefs persisted. For instance, Vera maintained that failure to read was caused by factors inside the reader. On several occasions, she explained that the students' difficulty with spelling was due to their problems with hearing sounds. Similarly, Vera explained that the students' problems with reading maps were caused by a difficulty in visually processing graphs. Vera stated:

Some kids have a real visual problem. They can't see a graph. I mean, they are well physically... It's not that they don't understand it, it is just that they can't see it.

On the other hand, Vera appeared to have also considered alternative beliefs. Vera reassessed the value of her emphasis on sounds as the primary approach to comprehension. When reflecting on her learning, Vera emphasized the importance of providing students' with a clear picture of the processes we wanted them to use during their reading. Vera also expressed her belief that our work with cloze procedure with partial deletion had given students the opportunity to
understand the reading process by offering them practice in attending to both semantic and graphophonic cues when they were faced with a word recognition problem.

The importance of decoding remained crucial to Vera. Her emphasis during the students' oral reading was on the words. While she realized the emphasis on using cues from context to facilitate word recognition was increasing students' comprehension, she worried that the students were forgetting their sounds. Perhaps to remedy the problem, at the end of the eighth week, Vera engaged her students in practicing sounds and the key words to which they were linked.

During the second phase, Vera emphasized beliefs about Chapter One she had stressed earlier. She explained the necessity of working with the skills suggested by the reading teacher or by students' scores on reading tests of those skills. During the sixth week Vera reported:

Now, there will be times when the teacher will say, "I need you to work with slips of sentences, but not necessarily in the story form", and that's what I will do...I'm not doing those isolated skills, and it's not because you're here, but it is because...their stories [reports] are not calling for that. Right now they're working with literary elements or fact, fiction and fantasy and things like that, so it is not just because you're here, it's because their tests have not called for that. But, now, next week, if their stories are saying that they are having a hard time with something there will be a day where we'll do something like that...

During this phase, Vera also attempted to restructure her old beliefs about working with poor readers to accomo-
date several alternative views I expressed during our sessions. These efforts sometimes contributed to Vera’s feelings of disequilibrium. She reported having difficulty deciding whether to use instructional time for working with reading skills or for helping her students read connected texts. She decided to read at least twice or three times a week, since it would not be possible to read every day. Vera asserted the crucial importance of being explicit about the reasoning we wanted the students to learn and of providing the students time to practice and reveal their reasoning during reading. She further noted that some skills could be incorporated into reading connected texts. Moreover, Vera reported incorporating these beliefs into her instructional practices with this group as well as with her other reading groups.

Vera also maintained several beliefs evident during Phase One. She highlighted the importance of providing students with a safe environment and opportunities to develop a good self-concept. Vera elaborated:

I have tried to tell them "Don’t be afraid to say the wrong answer; just say your answer." And nobody will end up talking if everybody is afraid, and I think in a small group I don’t think that they feel threatened. I mean, I certainly don’t get upset, and the other kids don’t laugh at them unless it is really something funny and we laugh with them. I don’t encourage the kids to make fun.

Indeed, during instruction, Vera often revealed to students that she, too, had experienced difficulty with some tasks
they were completing, and it was "Okay to make mistakes."

When the students had to do a written assignment, Vera typically expressed her interest in the quality of their thoughts rather than in the accuracy of their spelling. For instance, Vera would say, "Don't worry about your spelling. I'm interested in your thinking, not in your spelling."

During this phase, Vera's discourse about the students' learning revealed the beliefs about slow learners she had maintained. For instance, Vera explained:

> When we first started working and you said, "They don't know how to use the words in a sentence" and I'm thinking that we have done that before. And, now, that we are done on that and we are working specifically on using context they can't remember that we have done something else.

Vera also revealed changes in her beliefs about students' learning and reading. She reported that the shift in the instructional emphasis to reading as meaning construction had increased opportunities for students to think and reveal their thinking. According to Vera, this shift helped her to become more aware of students' thinking and difficulties. For instance, during the fourth week, Vera revealed her preoccupation with Carol's learning difficulty, and with finding a way to reach her. In the fifth week, Vera stated that Carol was more vocal. By the sixth and seventh weeks, Vera explicitly talked about Carol's improved reading performance and problem solving skills, and about Doris's uniqueness as the student who appeared to have learned
little. Vera stated:

I can see progress in everybody...Carol is doing a lot better, Doris is continuing the way she was. She is the only one I don't see much change in.

By the end of the fourth week, Vera had changed her beliefs that Doris was as good a reader as Melanie. Although she proposed that the reading specialist retest Melanie to determine the wisdom of assigning her to a higher reading group, she did not proceed similarly with Doris. Vera also explicitly revealed she had been reflecting about Doris’s difficulty attending to classroom discourse and actively joining in on task completion. Vera interpreted Doris’s responses as a habit of answering without thinking, and explained that habit as a way to get attention:

If I could get Doris settled in so that she really listens and thinks, but I don’t know. I tried for a while to stop her from doing that by telling her not to answer because number 1 she was answering without thinking, and number 2 she was telling everybody else to blurt out the same answer and they were not thinking. And, I don’t know whether I’m going to get her out of that or not because she has such a bad habit. So, she wants so much attention. That is the problem. ...She is just kind of moody like that...some days she will come in and if you say something to her and she does not like it she will sit there and pout the whole time...and, if you correct her, somedays in math I will say, "Now Doris, don't answer anymore" because she will shout out the answer and I try to get her to raise her hand and I'll say, "Don't answer anymore, let someone else have a chance to think" and she will get so mad and she will sit there with her hands just like this [covering her face]...She is very defensive. She does not like criticism and, if you hurt her feelings, then, she is going to pout.

In Vera’s view, Doris learned better by writing because writing allowed her to control her anxiety:
In writing, when her hands are busy...I have thought a lot about it, as long as her hands are busy her mind can think...I think that she is hyperactive. I think as long as her hyperactivity has been satisfied by moving that pencil then, she can settle enough to think about what she is doing... If somebody would just come in and sit down she seems motivated. She is always blurring out the answer and she is very actively physically involved but she is not mentally involved.

When comparing both Carol's and Doris's learning, Vera stated she believed both girls differed in their motivations to learn rather than in their cognitive abilities. Vera explained:

It [the difference between Carol and Doris] has nothing to do with IQ or anything like it. It's that Carol is motivated and Doris is not.

**Reading Instruction**

During the second phase, my role in the instructional sessions became more that of a participant. I typically sat opposite Vera at the end of the long worktable where I acted as both observer and participant. That is, I carefully observed and recorded field notes during instruction while interacting with the students to model the instructional processes I espoused.

Vera typically conducted the instructional sessions. The curricular topics and activities emphasized during instruction were chosen by Vera, and were apparently influenced by our collaboration, by her discussions with the students' reading teacher, and by her personal views of the students' needs.
Opportunities to Learn About Reading. During this phase, instruction changed. That is, in most of the instructional sessions Vera and/or I explicitly identified strategies which might help students while they are reading. We explained the utility of these strategies and the conditions for using them. The students were given opportunities to use these strategies while reading and to reveal their thinking about these processes. Instruction continued to include attention to decoding and skills that the students' reading teacher or Vera believed students needed to learn.

During this phase, Vera and I attempted to explicate for the students the processes that they could use to facilitate the recognition of difficult words while constructing meaning from a text. To achieve our purpose, Vera chose tasks likely to provide the students with opportunities to practice the mental activities we wanted them to learn. For instance, Vera focused more frequently on reading connected texts. She also chose working with the cloze procedure with partial deletion to give the students opportunities to learn about using graphophonic, syntactic and semantic cues to facilitate the decoding of difficult words. In addition, Vera and I tried to be explicit about the cognitive processes we wanted the students to use and about the conditions and purposes for using them. Our work with cloze procedure with partial deletion also exemplifies these
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attempts. At the beginning of the instructional session, I explained:

...the reason we are doing this activity is to help you to become better readers. Sometimes you come to a word you do not know. What should you do? Look at the first letter of the word and read on. When you come back and read again, it will be much easier for you to understand the word you had difficulty with because you can use information that you read to help you to understand the meaning of the word...We're trying to show you something that can help you to understand better the texts when you're reading by yourselves.

To reveal explicitly my thinking about using these mental processes I thought aloud:

Any time I'm reading and I don't know a word, I look at the first letter [of the word] and ask myself "What makes sense that starts with c or t?" I'm looking for a word that makes sense in the text.

Vera explained how these processes could be used in other reading situations:

Vera: Sometimes you have difficulty in understanding a text you have to read by yourselves, don't you?
Students: Yes
Vera: So, this that we're doing is something that you can do to help you. Use the other words of the sentence to help you to understand the words you don't know...

The instructional patterns observed while Vera and/or I worked with connected texts showed both dimensions already stressed during the first phase and Vera's and my attempts to provide the students with additional information, tutorial support and guidance in the using and learning of reading strategies. For instance, when introducing a story to be read, Vera directed the students to read the title, look at
the pictures, make predictions about upcoming events and set a purpose for reading as observed during the first phase. Predicting was further used when the students were going to restart the reading of a new paragraph after an interruption for discussing the information read, or because class had ended.

Before reading, Vera and I typically presented or reviewed explanations about the strategies the students could use to inform their reading. Further, we provided opportunities for the students to review the focal processes. Such a review is illustrated in the following dialogue:

Vera: When we read our stories, we can use different ways to figure out the meaning of the words we don’t know. Beverly, what do we do when we do not know what a word is?
Beverly: Cover up part of the word and look for prefixes and suffixes.
Cecilia: Very good strategy if the word is big.
Vera: Carol
Carol: Cover the word except for the first letter.
Vera: And what else can we do?
Carol: Read the rest of the sentence and read again.
Vera: Okay, you’ll get your context clues. What else, Doris?
Doris: You can try to sound the word out.
Vera: Remember the story of Mr. and Mrs. Large? What helped us to figure out some of the words we did not know?
Students: We looked at the pictures.
Vera: What else?
Students: The title.
Beverly: The title is in the story.
Vera: Right.

During reading, Vera focused her interactions with her students primarily on inviting the students to be metacogni-
tive by reminding them to keep track of the meaning or to choose a strategy which could help them recognize an unrecognized word. She also offered them explanations. Throughout this phase, these interactions revealed Vera's focus on decoding (accurately pronouncing the words) in addition to meaning clues. The following dialogues illustrate these aspects:

Beverly: ...she liked to be big enough to be connected [counted] on.
Vera: Does it make sense, Beverly? To be big enough to be connected on?
Beverly: continued on
Vera: Does it make sense? What can you do?
Beverly: Cover the end of the word.
Vera: How do you say /kau.../
Beverly: counted...Being big enough to be counted on.
Vera: Good!

... 

Carol: She turned the face to a stupid [sturdy] boy with a// v... [visor]
Vera: Read on Carol.
Carol: ...turned up and a white tee shirt with a long word printed across the front.
Vera: Read again and ask yourself, 'What is he wearing that is turned up?' Look at the picture. This is a situation in which looking at the picture can help you.
Carol: a visor
Vera: Okay. Now, is the boy stupid? How do you know he is stupid?
Carol: Because he is kicking her back.
Vera: It makes sense, but I don't think that word is stupid. Let's read again.
Carol: ...sturdy...

Although her focus on decoding persisted, Vera demonstrated that comprehension was more important than decoding. When the students hesitated or mispronounced a word, Vera typically first guided them to attend to meaning by asking
students if the word made sense to them. She then suggested one of several strategies they might use to pronounce the word. For instance, she might encourage them to attend to the first letter of the focal word, to read on and reread to consider context clues, to look at the pictures or divide words into parts such as prefixes, suffixes and base words. If difficulty persisted, Vera would direct the students to sound the word out. Such a progression of suggestions is exemplified by the dialogue above.

Indeed, Vera’s focus on word recognition during reading motivated her growing concern throughout this phase with the students’ difficulty in recognizing sounds previously practiced. During the eighth week, Vera increased her emphasis on probing the students to use graphophonic cues and on being more explicit about sounds they had failed to recognize while reading. For instance:

Denorah: She did not want anything to spoil this relaxing [exciting] day.
Vera: Look at the beginning of the word, and the meaning of the sentence, Denorah.
Denorah: [no response]
Vera: What kind of day would it be?
Denorah: [no response]
Vera: What’s the word?
Students: exciting
Vera: [goes to the board] This i has to be long because
Doris: It’s between two consonants.
Vera: Doris, raise your hands to answer. What do we do to the second e of excite, Beverly?
Beverly: We knock it off.
Vera: Right, what happens if we keep the e there?
Beverly: A weird word
Vera experienced increasingly more concern about the students' difficulty with using graphophonic cues to facilitate word recognition. During the last two instructional sessions, she dedicated the entire session to drilling sounds and their key words. To complement this instruction, she relied on a sounds foundation chart. For example:

Vera: Let's read number 111, _st_ in _star_. Beverly, what's another word?
Beverly: /sti:1/
Vera: How do you spell it?
Beverly: s-t-i-a-l
Vera: No, Carol [had raised her hand]
Carol: s-t-e-a-l
Vera: Right [goes to the board and writes steel – steel] What do we call these words?
Students: [no response]
Vera: Are they synonyms?
Students: Yes
Vera: Do they mean the same?
Students: No
Vera: They do not mean the same. Are they antonyms? Do they mean the opposite?
Students: No
Vera: What are they?
Students: They sound alike.
Vera: They are homonyms or homophones. Who has another word?

Vera's interactions with the students during reading were typically supportive. She usually assessed the students' difficulties and provided them probes or more information as support. If the student remained unsuccessful, Vera would call on other students. On rare occasions, Vera reacted with frustration to her students' difficulties. This pattern was observed in her interactions with Doris and, to a lesser extent, with another student's reiterative diffi-
ulty to choose a strategy independently. The following dialogue exemplifies this type of reaction:

Vera: Doris, does it make sense to you? What's supper time?
Doris: supper time
Vera: Think about what you're reading Doris. That couldn't make sense to you. I know you're not thinking while you're reading, because you did not stop and self correct. If you're thinking about what you had read, you would have noticed that what you said did not make sense and have stopped and self corrected.

Comprehension, selection, and organization of the most important ideas were also emphasized during and after reading. That is, Vera and/or I worked to provide the students with strategies they could use to note, organize, and learn the important information read. Vera developed several efforts directed toward this purpose. For instance, after reading each paragraph, Vera typically asked the students questions to direct them to note and to check on their understanding of the important information read. For example:

Vera: What happens in this part?
Doris: It has the title in it.
Vera: What does it mean All in One Piece?
Carol: all together
Beverly: all the family together
Vera: Okay, think about their own experiences when they are so busy.
Doris: She wants to go by herself.
Vera: You all think she herself wants to be all in one piece.
Beverly: She wants to use a nice dress.
Vera: Look at the picture. What does she do?
Doris: She curls her hair.
Beverly: But she doesn't.
Vera: How do you know?
Beverly: By the pictures [Beverly shows the last picture in
which the elephant goes out with paint on her
dress].
Vera: What do you think is going to happen next?
Carol: She is going to sit on the painting.

For my part, I tried to complement this instruction by
explaining to the students how these processes could help
them to organize and control their comprehension:

When you’re reading on your own, ask yourselves questions
such as the ones Mrs. Feldman is asking to keep track of the
meaning. Don’t just read and read. Stop after each paragraph
and think about the important ideas you read...This keeps
you understanding the text, keeping track of the meaning. If
you realize you are not understanding, reread the paragraph.
Do not keep reading on.

In addition, Vera explicitly provided the students
with strategies which could facilitate their selection and
organization of the main ideas of the story. Vera emphasized
the analysis of the title and the pictures to predict story
line. She provided the students time to practice such analy-
sis while they were reading wordless picture books and other
extended texts. For example,

Vera: Let’s talk about what this story is about. Let’s
look at the title, Ramona’s First Day in School;
let’s look at the pictures to help us remember what
the story is about, Beverly.
Beverly: It’s Ramona’s first day in school.
Vera: Is she in kindergarten?
Beverly: I don’t know.
Vera: Let’s skim through the text to figure out. Don’t
read all the words... Let’s talk about her fa-
mily... Look at this picture. What does it tell
us?

Moreover, Vera and/or I focused on helping the students
perceive the structure of the text and use it to improve
their organization and retention of the most important
ideas. In order to work with these dimensions, Vera focused on activities such as organizing ideas from a scrambled text and summarizing ideas using a story frame. The following instance illustrates Vera’s approach:

Vera: Could you read the first, Melanie?
Melanie: Once upon a time, on a winter afternoon, a bear met a sly old fox carrying a string of fish on its back.
Vera: What tells you this is the beginning of the story?
Melanie: Once upon a time
Vera: This is the beginning of the story, right?
Let’s think about the sentence and see if we can figure out what comes next. [She read the story again.] Now, what do you think is going to happen when the bear meets the fox?
Beverly: I wish I could catch a fine string of fish like the one you have said the bear to the fox.
Vera: Why does it come second? What gave you the clues?
Beverly: carrying a string of fish

Vera worked with the story frame to provide the students a strategy for summarizing the important text information. She guided students to use the elements of a story, such as characters, setting, plot, and problem resolution to facilitate their choices and organization of main ideas. Vera provided the students with a simple outline (Vacca and Vacca, 1987) to direct them to think about the plot and ask themselves questions about the events. However, Vera’s work with the frame emphasized accomplishing the task. That is, Vera discussed the characters and setting of a text already read. Next, she introduced the frame:

Vera: What the problem is? By problem I mean the plot, something that is to be solved. What is the problem we’re working to solve here?
Demosra: Grocer Badge is scaring everybody.
Vera: All right. The problem starts when Grocer Badge started scaring people. That's what I mean by problem. I'm not concerned about your spelling. Write one more sentence telling about how the story starts. [Doris shows Vera her answer.] Look at the beginning of the story. That tells you about the scaring of other animal. What character is the story all about?

Beverly: The elephant.

Vera: Could we have the story without the elephant?

Doris: No

Vera: Then,

Beverly: The elephant moved in.

Vera: Okay. The elephant moved in. Let's think more about the elephant. Look at your story. Do not write yet. What happened next in our story? What did the animals do?

Doris: Scare the elephant.

Vera: Next, the animals tried to scare the elephant. See if you try to remember one way to scare the elephant. The problem is solved how? Do not write; just think. [The students started working individually on the written assignment. Doris asked for assistance.] Look at your story, Doris. How do they accomplish what they want to?

Indeed, the students' responses during the following instructional session demonstrated to Vera that they were not clear about the purposes for the strategy provided or about the conditions for its use. Vera and I provided additional information, clarifying for students when and why to use the strategy. The students' difficulties are evidenced in the following instructional excerpt:

Vera: Why do you think we did this, Denorah?

Denorah: To learn how to write a story.

Vera: Why is it important to know the sequence in which the things happened, what the problem is, how it was solved, Doris?

Doris: Because if you get a job you have to know this.

Vera: Let's think about how it is important now.

Denorah: So, when you grow up you'll know.

Vera: How is it going to help you now? How is it going to help you when you come back to your room with
your books?
Carol: It will help us to read better.
Doris: To write a story.
Beverly: We can know better the story.
Vera: Yes, it is a way to write a summary of the story read. You know pretty well your story now, don't you?
Students: Yes.
Vera: What did we do?
Denorah: We read our story, understood the words.
Vera: What else did we do?
Doris: We made our story.
Vera: What for?
Doris: To find the main ideas.
Vera: Good, to find the main ideas.
Cecilia: You see, this [story frame] helped you to understand the story you read because you understood the most important ideas, the main ideas of the story read.
Vera: See, we did not say we're going to find the main ideas, but that's what we did, because the main ideas is what the story is all about.
Cecilia: That's something you can use to organize the ideas you read on a text when working with me. When I tell you, "Now tell me the most important ideas of the text."

Throughout this phase, Vera showed her students how to use skills to improve their text comprehension. She did this with main ideas, context clues, and word analysis. At other times, she used the same approach to skills she had typically used in Phase One. That is, she taught skills as responses to worksheet instruction. For example, when helping the students to improve their skills to read maps, Vera distributed a text entitled Map Talk. She then introduced the idea that symbols and pictures convey information students could read as they read words. Next, the students completed a worksheet, matching map symbols and pictures to their meanings. The following dialogue describes an instance
of seatwork correction:

Vera: Doris, number 9.
Doris: radio tower (incorrect answer)
Vera: Does it look like a tower, Doris?
Doris: [no answer]
Students: No.
Vera: What's the radio tower?
Students: number 10
Vera: Why?
Students: It looks like a tower.

**Students' Responses.** The students' performance in both instructional and/or assessment sessions revealed some change when compared with their behavior in the previous phase. That is, the students showed increased knowledge about methods they could use to solve their reading problems, although they had difficulties using these processes independently. Individual students differed in their attempts to use the processes emphasized and in their awareness of the purposes and conditions for strategy use. Doris and Carol represent a vivid contrast along these dimensions. Carol's growing understanding is evident in her interactions during an assessment session, in her products (e.g., oral summaries), in her oral reading, and in her class performance (see Figure 2, p. 172).

On the other hand, Doris experienced considerable difficulty in becoming aware of our effort to teach the students the processes emphasized during instruction. Doris continued using sounding out words and asking for help as
Carol: They can give you context clues.

Cecilia: What does context clues mean?

Carol: It's a clue from the sentence that helps you to say the word.

Cecilia: What can help you to understand a text you are reading?

Carol: The title, the picture, read on and read again and the context clues.

Daniel and Chip are playing with a teddy bear. They say he is dead and they are going to bury him. First he asked if he had a shoe box. He said, "Yes, under the bed." They put the teddy bear in it. And, then, they went under the cabbage in the garden and bury him.

Carol: Toys can't have bones. But he didn't sound too cartoon;/ [Carol rereads] Toys can't have bones. But he didn't sound too certain.

Cecilia: What happened here?

Carol: I had to come back because it didn't make sense.

Doris: The best? [baby]

Vera: I don't know. Let's see. Read on.

Doris: cr [crept]

Cecilia: Read on, Doris.

Doris: into the bedroom.

Vera: Let's go back and read again.

Doris: The b/

Vera: [Beverly and Carol had raised their hands] Carol.

Carol The baby crept into the bedroom.

Vera: How do you know?

Carol: The picture can tell you and babies creep.

Vera: Good, babies creep. Good for you! You're really thinking, Carol.

Figure 2. Examples of Carol's Responses
Cecilia: Tell me something, Doris. We just saw Mrs. Feldman saying to you, 'Read on, Doris, reread.' Why, do you think, is she saying this?
Doris: To help me finish reading.
Cecilia: Do you think she may have another reason?
Doris: No.
Cecilia: Why should you do that?
Doris: Because you have to know all the words to keep on reading.
Cecilia: How does this help you?
Doris: To know the word.

Doris: I stopped because I couldn't read a word.
Cecilia: What did you do?
Doris: I sounded out the word and asked you.

The teddy bear died...he said he had bones, but he didn't...But Chip said he did not have bones because he was a doll. The name of the bear was Just Bear. The other name was Brenda. The football... They buried the bear in a shoe box under a plum tree. The bear is sitting on the shelf.

Vera: Doris, how did she [Ramona] get in trouble by that time?
Doris: She was pretending to be a mermaid.
Vera: Ramona? Carol [The girl had raised her hand.]
Carol: She said she should have stopped Willa Jim.
Vera: Like being a babysitter, isn't it?

Figure 3. Examples of Doris's Responses

strategies for solving her reading difficulties. Her prob-
lems comprehending and organizing the ideas read are shown by her interactions during an assessment session, by her oral reading, by her products (e.g. oral summaries), and by her class performance (see Figure 3, p. 173).

Opportunities for Developing Positive Affect, and Students' Responses. An important goal for Vera and me was to help the children feel like capable readers. I frequently discussed the idea that as children gained control of their reading comprehension process they would feel more successful as readers and learners. Increased success would encourage student interest and perseverance. Vera agreed with my line of thinking, and together we worked to help the students use comprehension strategies. We encouraged them to think about these strategies rather than worry about related concerns, such as spelling accuracy. On such occasions, Vera would say, "I'm not concerned about your spelling, just about your thoughts."

Moreover, we provided the students with many opportunities to feel good about themselves and to notice their own good work by calling their attention to their successful thinking during instruction. For example:

Carol: Ah, Mrs. Feldman, I know about number one.
Vera: Good, Carol. That's the one you're mixed up, right?
    How did you figure it out?
Carol: I looked at the picture and see [makes a gesture to show the bridge and the river].
Vera: So, you looked at the picture and it helped you to figure it out.
Carol: Yes.
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... Vera: What does Jack play? Beverly: [I could not understand.] Vera: Right. How do you know that? Beverly: Because it crashes and clings. Vera: Good! the sounds tell us what he plays.

We also complimented them for completing classroom tasks. For instance, when Vera returned the students' summaries, she stated:

I liked everybody's answers. Denorah, yours is very good even if you did not finish. Let's listen to everybody's answers.

Instruction was not equally effective with all students. Beverly and Carol showed progress in controlling their comprehension and became more confident and enthusiastic about reading instruction. On the other hand, both Doris and Denorah experienced difficulty with our instruction. Throughout the collaborative period, Denorah was frequently sick and absent. Her behavior suggested a lack of motivation to learn, which was apparent not only in our class but in her other school environments. Denorah's physical health was a confounding factor in our efforts to assist her. Furthermore, despite Vera's efforts to provide Doris with opportunities to learn how to construct meaning from text, Doris appeared to hold low expectations about herself as a reader. For instance, during the assessment sessions, Doris repeatedly expressed her reluctance to think and talk about her own performance. She also said she did not like to watch
herself on TV. After a session with me in which we had watched tapes of the instructional session, Dcris reported her feelings about the work accomplished. In her words, "I don't think I did a good job."

**Phase Three**

**The Nature of the Collaborative Process**

During the three weeks of the third phase, neither the pattern nor the purpose of the meetings between Vera and me changed. We continued meeting for approximately one hour on Monday afternoons to reflect on our concepts and practices related to reading instruction offered to the students and on the students' cognitive and affective learning. We also planned upcoming instructional sessions.

Vera and I continued to converse before and/or after class in order to discuss aspects of the instructional sessions. During this phase, each of us initiated topics for discussion. The topics Vera selected often occurred to her as she watched the videotapes of her lessons or transcripts of the assessment sessions. (In response to Vera's request, I had begun supplying her the videotapes on a daily rather than weekly basis.) During these sessions, we occasionally planned upcoming instruction and discussed the articles or books I had shared with Vera.

During the last week of the project, I conducted a final interview with Vera. This session was designed to
encourage Vera to reflect on and communicate changes in her beliefs and values concerning the reading process and teaching poor readers.

**Focus of our Efforts.** Throughout this third phase, Vera and I intensified our partnership and developed an egalitarian relationship. Vera demonstrated increasingly more frequent efforts to teach in ways that were consistent with the ideas we discussed. She also spoke about her ideas and perspectives with increasing ease and clarity. For example, she contrasted the focus of our collaborative work on meaning construction with the school's emphasis on letter sounds and skills taught in isolation. To explain why a student relied on phonics as a preferred strategy for decoding, Vera said:

> It [students' use of letter sounds as their principal reading strategy] happens because their basal reader is all built around phonics. And they are still on third grade reader and phonics is really thick for the third grade. ...but you know, even in English, they teach skills in isolation, lesson after lesson.

I continued to encourage Vera's learning by creating situations in which I explained and modeled ways to help students learn how, when, and why to use comprehension strategies. My modeling typically emphasized dimensions of Vera's teaching which I believed needed clarification or extension. For example, during a reflective/planning session, I explained my use of modeling during an instructional
session:

I modeled today how to use predicting...I showed the stu-
dents how I thought while predicting because...I think that
sometimes they...do not know exactly how to think to pre-
dict. We were not clear about that. I wanted them to know
exactly how I thought.... Sometimes, when a student has
difficulty with understanding a word or the meaning of a
paragraph we can show him/her how we think to solve our dif-
ficulties...

I also provided opportunities for Vera to express her
thinking and learning, and I supported her attempts to
implement the instructional activities she proposed, such as
circle stories and group story writing. The following
excerpts show instances of Vera's reflections about her
learning:

I always thought I was aware of why they [students] were
doing things but I think that it has helped them that we
review why we do things and exactly what we are doing. ...I
really didn't think that much about it because I never
dreamt that they thought that we were doing this [using
story frame to summarize a story] so that when they went to
high school they could do that better or whatever.

...

I think a lot of times they [students] just read the story
and they did not think about all of the little things that
they were doing as they read... We are teaching them how to
think now, and it is not easy to teach someone how to think.

During this phase, as I learned about Vera's interests,
I continued making adjustments in the focus of our collab-
oration. For example, as I noticed Vera's growing interest in
discussing her conflicting beliefs about several approaches
to teaching reading and about the students' learning from
our teaching, I worked to facilitate her reflections by
inquiring about her understanding of these dimensions and by explaining my thinking. For example, on one occasion I described my efforts to help my daughter learn to read. I described reading and rereading books, writing stories she composed and letters she dictated to her friends and to our family in Brazil. Vera explained she had taught her son to read by using a Dr. Seuss’ book and practicing family words and letter sounds. Vera further expressed some uncertainty about the extent to which her emphasis on letter sounds had helped her son to read. In Vera’s words:

...I don’t know whether he really learned to read that way, and then the phonics came later easy for him or what.

Our discussions during reflective/planning sessions also focused on the students' responses during both instructional and assessment sessions and on planning instruction so as to work with the dimensions we believed the students needed support with. As Vera frequently expressed her concern about the students’ difficulty in noting, organizing and retelling the important text ideas, we discussed and planned instruction to assist the students with these processes. The following dialogue illustrates the collaborative nature of our planning efforts:

Vera: I noted they had a real difficult time writing their main ideas thoughts...
Cecilia: That is right. It seems they had difficulty in understanding which are the important ideas and which are the details. They frequently show difficulty in focusing on the important ideas while
retelling the information read. Maybe we could focus on that. They can choose and write the main ideas of a text read, and later on provide the details for these ideas.

Vera: Do you know something that I would like to do? I think it will be fun for the kids to write a sequence for a story. You know, ...let's see if they can write what would happen next and... develop each one of those ideas into a paragraph... They would start just thinking of the main ideas... just like the circle story and... figure out what would be in each part of our pie... and then we could write something about each one of the ideas...

For my part, I continued providing Vera support for her efforts to learn about teaching students to be strategic comprehenders. At the same time, I was concerned that Vera's continued emphasis on word recognition might lead the students to view reading as a word pronunciation activity rather than a meaning construction activity. I also worried about whether the students were given sufficient opportunities to learn how, when, and why to use comprehension strategies. With these concerns in mind, I suggested that we emphasize ways in which students could keep track of the meaning while reading:

Cecilia: ...I think they [the students] still believe that reading is reading the words, and they do not appear interested in understanding the words but in reading the words. You know, even if they don't understand the meaning of the word, they don't stop reading.

Vera: I have never talked to them about that. Do you think that we need to focus on the understanding of the printed word...

Cecilia: I think... we really thought that we were accomplishing both things, and I thought it was on our minds we were doing both things. When we said "When you come to a word you can't figure out..." that
meant for us to understand the meaning of the word.

Vera: Last week we talked about why it was important to know the meaning of the words so we can get the meaning of the story.

Cecilia: We were not very explicit about that. That is the point. ...for us recognizing the word involved figuring out the meaning, not just pronouncing the word. We have to be more explicit about the strategies which students might use to keep track of the meaning.

I also started bringing Vera articles that described reading instruction which emphasized the approach to teaching reading I was stressing (e.g., *The Reading Teacher*, 1988, 1986 [Oct.], Jerry Johns, 1986, Martin, 1986). Vera reported enjoying and benefitting from such reading. For instance, she explained that an article on repeated reading by Koskinen and Blum (1986) had helped her to learn an activity she could use with both good and poor readers. In Vera’s words:

> It was a good article. And what I understood that I had not understood before was that, if you pair kids up to read, they reread the story to each other. And, it is not a waste of time for the better reader because the better reader is going to pick up as much as the poor reader.

When I brought Vera an article by Cora Lee Five (1986) on an innovative way to combine reading and writing, she expressed her appreciation for the article, explaining that the teacher had achieved her purpose of developing her students’ interest and enjoyment in reading and writing. Vera also reported she had given a copy of this and another one of these articles to the reading specialist because she
believed they conveyed important information.

During this last phase of our collaboration, Vera revealed her attempts to develop an instructional approach which would combine her old and new understandings. She integrated her ideas about the importance of phonics for improving students' word recognition and about the importance of comprehension strategies for increasing students' control of their reading. Vera explained that some emphasis on letter sounds would facilitate students' decoding. However, she also reported that from our collaboration she had learned about the necessity of introducing changes into her program. For example, she explained:

Well, I don't know, we were like reading two or three days a week, and now we are reading every day. And I think that is really better. We could read a story a week. It would take two days. And we would read something from a book, but we didn't involve everything that we did around the story... I think I am a firm believer that the more you read, the more words you will know.

Vera also concentrated her instruction on teaching the students to comprehend the text rather than on teaching them to complete skills sheets accurately. Vera described her emphasis on comprehension as a "global" approach to reading instruction. She contrasted this approach with her previous teaching:

I am doing it [a global approach to teaching reading] with all my reading groups except for my first graders. And even with first graders, when we are reading a story, we are doing a lot of comprehension... We are looking at the title, and they have no pictures in their books... After the story is over... we talk about it and they, sometimes, draw pic-
tures of what is happening in the story...We are reading more and more material in the other four classes that I have...I am looking more for texts that are interesting...Before, I did not look for a text as much. I had books they could read stories from. But now, I am looking for a text that has...well, they need to work with cause and effect, so I would look for a text that had something like that...We are doing a lot of comprehension unless the teacher says, "They are having a lot of trouble with this. Would you work with this?" But I am trying to incorporate all of the skills that I am working with in the text.

By the end of our work together, Vera explained her intention to continue with her new instructional emphasis. According to Vera, her decisions were motivated by her understanding that our work had helped students to become better and more motivated thinkers. Vera reported that her analysis of the videotapes and of the "written reports" (transcriptions and preliminary analysis of assessment sessions) contributed to her judgment. For example, Vera explained how the videotapes helped her to understand the students’ changes:

...Until you look at it and you think about it and you see and see back and take a real objective look at it. It is so different than sitting right here and actively being involved in their learning process. It is so much better to sit and watch it on the film and see it from a different perspective.

Vera's analysis also allowed her to be critical of our efforts. She reported that while we had been successful in helping the students to learn about reading and reading strategies, she had also observed that the students typically could not yet use these strategies independently. For
Vera, the study needed to be longer if we wanted to see how it would help students to become independent readers. In Vera's words:

I do think that it [our work] has worked. And I do think that the kids have improved. The thing that I wanted to see is if they can read on their own, without me sitting here saying, "Well, what can you do?"... Because you don’t always have somebody sitting near you telling you what to do. If you could stay another month or two, then we would really see.

Doris’ slower progress continued to be another frequent focus of our discussions on the students’ learning. Vera frequently explained her understanding that Doris’ difficulties were caused by the girl’s inattentiveness during instruction:

Doris entertains for the camera, and that goes along with her not attending. And even when I was reading a story one day about Blubber, she was looking at Denorah all the time and tried to get Denorah’s attention. And I really feel that she is missing a lot because she does not pay attention.

Vera frequently suggested that several times Doris would profit from a one-to-one instructional situation because it would then be easier to deal with her difficulty with attending to instruction. During these discussions about Doris, Vera and I often discussed and planned ways to support and motivate the girl to think and successfully accomplish instructional tasks. For example, on one occasion, Vera commented on a way to assist Doris:

Vera: Doris answered right today, and I almost said to her, "See, Doris, you didn’t have your hand up and you waited a while before you answered and you gave
a good answer", but I didn't. I should have done
that.
Cecilia: That's a good point...Calling her to attention any
time she shows good thinking will help her see her
successful thinking, realize activities which
helped her accomplish a task, and become motivated
to deploy these activities again.

Throughout this phase, Vera demonstrated she had become
more analytical in thinking about the school reading curri-
culum. She often contrasted our work with the curricular
approach taken by students' regular instruction. That
approach emphasized letter sounds and skills in isolation.
She also expressed her understanding that this difference
contributed to students' difficulty in becoming strategic
readers and to their continued reliance on sounding out
words as the primary strategy for solving their reading
problems. Vera explained:

But that is why they are so aware of their phonics because,
if you would let me show you their reading text I could show
you page after page of phonics that they do...And the thing
is I don't know whether they are that motivated in their
classroom to try all these things [strategies we were empha-
sizing]. Even in English, skills are taught in isolation.

Vera further tried to explain teachers' difficulty in intro-
ducing changes into their programs. According to Vera, this
difficulty was caused by the emphasis of the basal readers
and tests on letter sounds and isolated skills.

During this phase, Vera considered ways to introduce
some change at the school level. She discussed our approach
with the students' reading teacher and the school reading
specialist (Mrs. Johns). She gave Mrs. Johns two of the articles we had read.

Mrs. Johns repeatedly expressed support for our work. During the last week of this study, Mrs. Johns revealed that the students' reading teacher was also very happy with the progress of the children in our class. According to Mrs. Johns, on one occasion, they were the only students who demonstrated motivation to write a journal.

By the end of this study, Vera and I enjoyed working together and had become good friends. We had learned from each other by observing, thinking, doing and discussing about our ideas, actions and the students' responses. The students were also comfortable with me. They were accustomed to seeing me every day in their classrooms and to working with me in assessment sessions. During my last day in the school, Vera and the students prepared a surprise farewell party for me. The students brought flowers and cards. Doris wrote on her card, "Don't go. I like you very much." Earlier the same day, during an interview with Carol she said, "I'm sad because you're going." Vera gave me a photo of herself with all the children we had worked with. The school librarian thanked me for promoting the library and presented me with several book markers.

For my part, I also tried to show to Vera and all others in the school how much I had appreciated the opportu-
nity of working with them. I gave Vera four mystery books I had learned she wanted. I also gave a presentation about Brasil to the fifth graders, in response to their teachers' request. It was difficult to say goodbye; it seemed our work had only begun.

**Beliefs.** During this phase, I strengthened my belief about the usefulness of modeling. My modeling during instruction clarified for Vera the approach to teaching reading I was introducing. From observing the videotapes, I learned that Vera restructured her approach in response to my behavior. For example, on one occasion, I questioned the students about their understanding of Vera's purpose for asking them questions after they read each paragraph. Supporting the students' responses to my inquiry, Vera explained that she asked questions to check on the students' story comprehension. I, then, introduced another purpose for teacher questioning—to help students learn to use self-questioning as a strategy to facilitate the organization of the information read and the control of their comprehension. By the end of this interaction, Vera stated:

> When you finish reading a paragraph, you can ask yourselves, "What in this paragraph is important to know?" Don't go on if you can't understand a paragraph...

I also realized how busy teachers in elementary schools were. I believed that special arrangements were necessary to assist teachers in gaining professional information. Though
copies of *The Reading Teacher* were available in the school library, few teachers used them.

During this phase, Vera’s statements and practices showed that she had worked to restructure her initially stated beliefs in order to resolve the conceptual conflict she experienced as she considered the instructional approach I encouraged.

Vera’s definitions of reading and reading success and failure illustrate the change in her thinking. That is, Vera defined reading as understanding. She described a successful reader as a reader who knows about how and when to use different strategies to fix his/her comprehension problems during reading. Vera reported that she had reached this understanding as a result of our collaboration. In Vera’s words:

> Well, I think that he/she [good reader] uses different strategies to figure out things that he/she does not understand in the story...I think that he/she keeps track of his/her comprehension instead of waiting till the end of the story, basically from the work we have done together. I think that it is just that he/she [good reader] knows different strategies and things that he/she can do to help him/herself.

Vera also revealed her belief that the students’ failure in reading was to a great extent due to their low self-esteem. She further expressed her belief that by helping students to learn strategies which might facilitate their control of their comprehension problems, as we had done, we were helping them to develop better self-concepts. In Vera’s
words:

I think that they [poor readers] are not motivated. They have poor self-concepts. They have an inability to do whatever they are supposed to be doing, and a big part of it is their low self-concepts. Like with Carol. Maybe since she got a B in reading, that will push her on a little bit to do better because she will feel good about herself. But I think that a lot of kids just think that they are at the bottom of the barrel and they can’t do any better, and, consequently, they don’t. To help them we have to do just as we have done, teach them strategies they can use to help themselves...

Vera’s beliefs about working with poor readers in Chapter One revealed her decisions about how to deal with dilemmas and ambiguities she had identified earlier. That is, Vera still believed that a knowledge about letter sounds was important to facilitate students’ comprehension. In Vera’s words:

...I think that when you teach phonics...you are teaching it with the purpose in mind that they [students] are going to be able to figure out words and they are going to understand the meaning of the sentence.

However, Vera expressed her intention to combine this belief with dimensions of the instructional emphasis I had introduced. According to Vera, this approach helped students understand that reading was a process over which they could gain control. Vera explained how she had combined these beliefs:

I don’t think phonics is a total way to go...To help them [students], as we have tried to do, we have to teach them strategies, teach them to help themselves.

Vera also explained that she was now incorporating most of the skills suggested by the reading teacher into her
instruction with connected text.

During this phase, Vera maintained her existing beliefs about students' learning. She continued to view Carol and Beverly as more successful than Doris and Denorah. She worked to explain why Doris, who was so successful in her work with the reading teacher and who had been so successful before our collaboration, was currently experiencing difficulty. According to Vera, these differing degrees of success were a consequence of differences in instruction. When instruction required Doris to provide explicitly stated text information, she could succeed by looking at the text again. For Vera, Doris was a good decoder who could efficiently locate answers which were explicitly stated, but who had difficulty drawing inferences from text.

Reading Instruction

During the three weeks of the third phase, I continued to be a participant observer in Vera's instructional sessions. That is, I continued observing and recording field notes during instruction, while acting to (1) demonstrate how a more proficient reader could think aloud to reveal the thinking we wanted the students to learn, (2) provide the students with explicit explanations of the purposes and conditions for using strategies, (3) provide the students with frequent opportunities to use the strategies and explain their approaches, and (4) support, clarify and extend the
students' efforts. I also conducted two entire instructional sessions (Vera could not be present), and shared with Vera the teaching of circle patterned stories.

Vera continued to conduct the instructional sessions which usually emphasized dimensions chosen as a result of our reflections on the students' needs. Vera's approach to teaching reading during this phase reflected the integration of her initially stated beliefs about teaching reading with her new ideas about meaning construction.

**Opportunity to Learn About Reading.** During this phase, Vera and I continued to devote considerable instructional time to reading connected texts. As a result of Vera's analysis of instruction, we selected instructional tasks with at least two purposes in mind: (1) assisting the students in learning strategies for selecting and organizing information while they were reading and writing, and (2) assisting the students in learning strategies for distinguishing between important and less important text information.

Throughout the three weeks of this phase, Vera's work with connected texts differed somewhat from her work in the previous phase. For instance, Vera now guided the students in using prediction as a comprehension strategy. For my part, I explicitly modeled my thinking while predicting. I also invited the students to use prediction and to discuss reasons for such use. The following dialogues illustrate my
attempts to help the students understand how to predict and why prediction is a useful reading strategy:

When I am working with you, I always ask you to tell me how you think. Today I’m going to show you how I think while I predict what is going to happen in the story. [I picked the book.] Well, two words in the title The Runaway Bunny—runaway and bunny—give me clues. These words tell me that this story may be about a bunny that runs away. Let me look at the pictures to see if I have other clues about the story. [I looked through the book.] Hum, the bunny has a lot of adventures and his mother is always with him. I guess that this story will be about a bunny who runs away, and his mother will try to find him. Okay, let’s read the story to see if my predictions are true.

Cecilia: [after reading] Do you remember my predictions?
Students: Yes.
Cecilia: Did they happen?
Students: Yes.
Cecilia: Not quite. The bunny did not really run away. He just thought of doing it.

...  

Cecilia: When we read, there are some things we can do before we read, during reading, and after reading that can help us better comprehend the story we are reading and organize the ideas we read. What can we do before reading that can help us to read?
Doris: You can look at the picture.
Cecilia: Right. What else can we do?
Carol: You can read the title.
Cecilia: Right. What else can we do?
Doris: Find the main ideas.
Cecilia: Not yet, Doris. We are talking about things we can do before reading. We are not reading yet. Before reading we can look at the title, the pictures and predict what the text is going to be about. What is going to happen in the story. Why is doing these things going to help you to read better?
Students: [no responses]
Cecilia: Let’s think why doing all these things can help us?
Doris: To read better.
Cecilia: Yes, to comprehend better because we already thought about the story.
Vera also attempted to be more explicit while guiding the students to predict. She provided the students with more time for discussing their predictions, and encouraged them to go through all the pictures and to rethink their educated guesses. For instance:

**Vera:** Today we are going to start a new story *Slower than the Rest*. What do you think it is going to be about?

**Beverly:** A person who is slower than everybody else.

**Vera:** It could be. What else could it be?

**Doris:** I can't think of anything else.

**Vera:** Beverly said ... Does it sound right to everybody else?

**Students:** Yes

**Vera:** Okay, let’s look at the pictures.

... 

**Vera:** Let’s look on page 7. What do you think the boy is doing in this picture?

**Deborah:** He is in front of the class. I wonder why.

**Carol:** He is speaking.

**Vera:** Talking for a show and tell.

**Carol:** He is showing the turtle to the class.

**Vera:** He can very very well be. All right, so, what do you think the story is about, Carol?

**Carol:** It’s a story about a boy and a turtle.

**Vera:** Who is slower than the rest?

**Doris:** The turtle.

... 

**Vera:** Okay, let’s read now and see what happens. [after reading the first paragraph] Okay, so now what do we think the title was about? Who was slow?

**Beverly:** The boy.

**Vera:** We thought it was

**Students:** The turtle.

**Vera:** We discussed turtles are slow animals but now we know

**Students:** The boy was slow, too.

**Vera:** Now, let’s go on and find what’s going to happen.

Besides using prediction as a pre-reading strategy, we also continued the instructional approach we began during
Phase Two. That is, Vera and I encouraged the students to suggest strategies which they might use if confronted with difficulty with word recognition, or, to a lesser extent, with comprehension.

During reading, our emphasis changed somewhat. It contained some of the elements we had introduced earlier, as well as a new emphasis on self-questioning. We continued encouraging the students to use context clues as the principal means of improving word recognition. We also stressed the processes and conditions for using self-questioning at the end of each paragraph. We became more explicit about the processes used and about the conditions needed for using this strategy. We also provided the students with opportunity to reveal their knowledge about using these processes.

The following dialogue illustrates the approach we took:

Cecilia: Why do you think Mrs. Feldman stops once in a while, usually by the end of each paragraph, and asks you questions about the story?
Beverly: To see if we are understanding.
Vera: Right, if you are paying attention to what you are reading, you'll be understanding.
Cecilia: There is another important reason. It is to help you to think again and organize the information you got from the text. If you wait till the end of the text to see if you understood and to organize the information you read, you may have so much information that it will be difficult for you. But, if you stop once in a while and organize the information you read, by the end of the text you will have all the information you read about organized. So, it helps if you stop reading sometimes. I do that when I am reading. ...When do you understand your reading better? When you're reading all by yourselves, or when you're reading with Mrs. Feldman?
Denorah: When we are reading with Mrs. Feldman.
Vera: Why, Denorah? What are we doing that is helping you?
Denorah: We read and you ask us questions, and we discuss the information we read.
Cecilia: You can ask these questions to yourselves.
Vera: When you finish reading a paragraph, you can ask yourselves, "What in this paragraph is important to know? Don't go on, if you can't answer your question. You will be surprised how well you will remember the story read..."

Vera and I also focused entire instructional sessions on working with the students' difficulty separating important information from trivia. To help them make this distinction, we worked with retelling important ideas from a story read, using the story frame introduced during phase two. We also worked with circle patterned stories (i.e., stories which begin and end in the same setting). During instruction with this activity, I guided the students to become familiar with this pattern and to recognize the pattern in a particular story (*The Runaway Bunny*). We further provided them with opportunities to use the circle pattern to summarize the story by retelling the important ideas and recording those ideas as drawings on a pie chart. Finally, we asked the students to create another story using the circle pattern.

Vera's work with writing another circle story synthesized many of our earlier efforts. Through her instruction, the students had opportunities to (1) use the story frame pattern to understand and recall the sequence of the
story ideas; (2) judge the importance of ideas in a story; and (3) use and reveal their knowledge of predicting to facilitate reading and writing. The following dialogues illustrate Vera’s approach:

Vera: We have our character. We decided we’ll tell the adventures of a mouse and write each adventure in a part of the pie. What can we call the mouse?

Doris: Bea

Vera: Okay. Let’s call her Bea. Let’s think about the setting.

Doris: The mouse is in her house.

Beverly: What about a hole in a house.

Vera: Is it Okay with everybody?

Students: Yes.

Vera: Is there anything we can tell about the character or the setting?

Demorah: She got a husband.

Vera: Let’s see. [reading aloud] Bea the mouse lives in a hole in a house. She got a husband. Where does he live?

Students: With her in the hole.

Vera: who lives with her in the hole. Let’s draw a picture. What can we draw, Carol?

Carol: A house and the hole.

Vera: [drawing] Now, what is going to happen with these mice?

... 

Vera: Let’s come back. Let’s read the story till now. [reads] Let’s ask ourselves, ”The cat did what? What could the cat do that might put him in trouble?”

Beverly: Knocked a cup down from the table.

Vera: What’s going to happen?

Beverly: The owner comes in.

Vera: Why does that have to happen, Beverly?

Beverly: Cause if he do not come, how could the cat get into trouble?

Vera: Good. ... In our little story we got several paragraphs. Each one of these paragraphs is going to be about a main idea. See, with The Runaway Bunny we had the opposite. We read the story, drew the pictures, and found the main ideas. We wrote our main ideas, and tomorrow we’ll elaborate it a little bit, writing two or more sentences for each idea. ... Now, I want each of you to pick two
main ideas and write detail sentences... Do not be concerned with your spelling. We'll work on that later on. Write just two or three sentences.

Doris: Just add two or three sentences to this idea?
Vera: Yes, just a couple of sentences, and, when you finish, read again to see if it makes sense with the next main idea. Remember, before writing read again the main ideas we wrote. [students work]
Okay, that's what I want you to do. Underline the sentences you copied from the chart. Not the ones we made up now. Think about what these sentences are.

Denorah: Our main ideas.
Vera: What do we call these sentences that tell us about our main idea?
Denorah: Details
Vera: Details. All paragraphs are made of main idea and detail sentences, in your social studies book, science books, all kind of books...

Vera: Now, what we're going to do is to think how we wrote this story. I want you to think hard, and raise your hands if you want to answer. I want you to think about the answer before you raise your hands. Who can remember how we went about writing the story? What was the first thing we did when we wrote this story, Carol?

Carol: We got our main ideas.
Vera: Right. We decided and wrote which ones would be our main ideas. How did we get our main ideas, Denorah?

Denorah: From the story.
Vera: Did we have a story to get them from?
Denorah: No, we made them up ourselves.
Vera: Right,... And how did we come to them?
Doris: We guessed what would come first.
Vera: Good, Doris. We decided the characters and the setting, and we guessed what would happen first in our story and next, and next till we got the whole story, and finally came to the problem resolution. That is, the end of the story. Now, think carefully to answer how we got these paragraphs made of two or three sentences.

Beverly: We wrote some sentences to tell about the main idea.

**Students' Responses.** Students' knowledge about reading and reading strategies changed across the study. That is,
the students’ responses during instruction, assessment sessions and the final interview showed that they became aware of several new strategies for solving reading problems. All the focal students reported using meaning construction strategies, such as predicting, rereading and looking for context clues. For instance, Denorah stated:

    Cecilia: Is there anything you could do before reading that could help you to read better?
    Denorah: I look at the title, the pictures, and talk about things that happen and stuff.

The students’ reports of word recognition and comprehension strategy use showed stability as well as change when compared to their reports from Phase One. For instance, all three students continued to report that they would sound words out and ask for help to recognize a difficult word. They also reported covering "endings" or rereading to solve meaning construction problems. Denorah's description indicates that she combined old and new strategies:

    You sound out the word you do not know, and cover something. You read on and read again, and if you don’t understand that, then you ask somebody.

Carol also explained:

    You sound out words. You can look at the title, the pictures. They help you to figure out words and find out the main ideas. If you still can’t figure out or understand a word, you ask for help.

Similarly Doris reported:

    If you don’t know a word, then you just look at the pictures
or the title and they will give you some clues. You can read
on, sound out words, and ask for help.

Although all the students were able to discuss strategies they would use, their performances continued to reveal
individual differences in their knowledge about the conditions for using strategies and in their actual use of these
strategies. Carol and Beverly, and eventually Denorah
revealed more adequate knowledge of when and why to deploy
the strategies emphasized. Carol and Beverly also more
frequently exhibited actual attempts to use the strategies
during reading. Carol showed a growing ability to use
reading strategies more than other focal students. For
example before reading a story during the assessment ses-
sions, Carol typically read the title and spent some time
looking through all the pictures. The following dialogues
illustrate Carol’s use of letter sounds and rereading to
recognize difficult words:

Carol: I'm tired// I'm tired of you// I'm tired of you
picking on me.
Cecilia: What happened ?
Carol: I had problems with the word picking.

... 

Carol: She knew what the wet// s///tra///nd meant. She knew
what the wet strand meant.
Cecilia: Can you talk about what happened here?
Carol: Oh, I was trying to read it again.
Cecilia: Why, can you talk about that?
Carol: Because I was having a lot of trouble. A lot of
times, when I have problems to read a word or to
understand I read again.
Carol: She stopped and...
Cecilia: Can you talk about what you did here?
Carol: This word came out wrong.
Cecilia: What made you realize that?
Carol: Because stopped had just one o and stooped has two os.

In addition, Carol's retelling of the important ideas of the story and her explanations about the activities which helped her to retell the story exemplify her use of the processes emphasized. Carol's retelling:

The girl's name is Rachael. She is in the 7th. grade, and her class is having a speech context, and Rachael had to do a topic about sunrise. And in two minutes she has to talk about sunrise. She had a Daddy and two brothers. She also has a sheep called Stella. She had a baby, and Rachael named it Sunrise. She helped Stella.

Cecilia: Can you tell me what helped you to tell the story again?
Carol: I used the title.
Cecilia: How did you use the title?
Carol: It helped me in different ways. When I was reading, it helped me to know something about the story.
Cecilia: What about the story did it help you to know?
Carol: That the word sunrise would be there...The story would talk about sunrise.
Cecilia: What helped you to retell the story?
Carol: I read through the story and looked at the pictures.

Furthermore, several reports from outside Vera's reading instruction supported our conclusion about Carol's improved thinking processes. For instance, Vera reported that Carol had developed better thinking in math. Vera
described that during a math lesson, Carol had even offered to help a student who was experiencing great difficulty. Similarly, the reading teacher described Carol's improved performance in her instructional sessions and reported that the girl received a grade of B. In Mrs. Anderson words, "Carol flourished".

Throughout this phase, Doris displayed difficulty in learning to become a strategic reader. Her responses indicated confusion about when and under what circumstances strategy use might be helpful. She also seemed to lack a clear understanding of the purpose of particular strategies. Nevertheless, she was able to name several strategies and explain how to use them. She was observed using only two of the strategies studied—sounding out words and asking for help. The following dialogues illustrate her strategy use:

Cecilia: Okay, today I want you all to be teachers. What about that?
Students: [laughing]
Denorah: We're going to be a teacher and think like a teacher?
Cecilia: Right. You're a teacher, Beverly, and think like a teacher. Think, "What would Mrs. Feldman tell us when she gives us a new text?"
Beverly: She will tell us, "Look at the pictures and the title"
Doris: Cover the endings.
Cecilia: Doris, we are not talking about reading yet. We are talking about what to do before reading.
Beverly: and think about what the story is going to be about.

Cecilia: Tell me, why did you stop before rasped?
Doris: To figure out rasped.
Cecilia: What helped you to figure out the word?
Doris: I sounded it out.
Cecilia: Did you understand the meaning of this word?
Doris: No.
Cecilia: How can you figure out the meaning of this word?
Doris: I can read on and read again.

... 

Doris: Mr. McTavish's face beamed. Well co//gra//tu// [Doris stopped and stared at the word congraulations.]
Cecilia: What are you doing, Doris?
Doris: Sounding out the word. [pause] I cannot read it.
Cecilia: congratulations

... 

Although Denorah typically read the title and looked at the pictures before reading, her use of reading strategies was similar to Doris'. For example:

Denorah: You see the //hollow...
Cecilia: What happened here?
Denorah: I did not read it before because I was sounding it out.
Cecilia: What do you usually do when you find a word you had difficulty reading?
Denorah: I sounded it out.

... 

Denorah: It was Prevent Forest Fires week and the whole school was making posters, watching nature films,// [staring at the word imitating]
Vera: Read on.
Denorah: Smokey the Bear. It was Prevent Forest Fires week and the whole school was making posters, watching nature films,//
Vera: Can you take something off?
Denorah: [silently moves her lips, perhaps sounding the word out]
Vera: Say it out loud, Denorah.
Denorah: imating.
Opportunities for Developing Positive Affect and Students' Responses. As with Phase Two, instruction during this phase was designed to increase students' motivation for learning to become strategic readers. We created tasks that we thought the students could accomplish. We provided assistance when the students experienced difficulty, and we talked with the students in an encouraging and supportive manner. Finally, we recorded and displayed the students' successful accomplishments. The following dialogue illustrates a supportive interaction typical of instruction during this phase:

Vera: What's next in our story?
Beverly: The cup fell off the table.
Vera: If, as you said, the cat's tail is tied around the table leg, what could the cat do that caused the cup to fall off?
Beverly: Shake the table.
Vera: Right, the cat shook the table to get his tail loose and the cup fell down. Does it fit in the story?
Students: Yes.

Students' actual participation during instruction changed somewhat from the second phase. Beverly and Carol continued to participate enthusiastically. Doris returned to the pattern she exhibited during Phase One. She displayed great willingness to participate despite her difficulties. By the very end of the study, Denorah also participated more frequently and more enthusiastically than she had since the first few weeks of the study, at which time she became ill. While her responses were generally correct, her enthusiasm
was mild compared with the other students'.

The students' reports of their motivation changed slightly across the study. These changes are illustrated in the reports of Doris and Carol. Unlike in her earlier responses, during the final interview, Doris described herself as a "reader in the middle." She explained that reading was hard for her sometimes. Situations she defined as hard for her included taking tests (the students had just had their testing week), doing worksheets, and answering questions about the text. Reading situations she defined as easy for her included completing fill-in-the-blanks activities in worksheets and tests. Doris also confessed that there were some reading situations during which she felt particularly uncomfortable. Doris stated:

I do not feel good reading in front of the class... [because] I can read well only a little.

Carol's responses also indicated some change in affect. Carol's description of herself revealed she now held a somewhat better concept of herself as reader. She also admitted she did not like to read in front of the class. In her words:

I am a good reader most of the time, but I mess up sometimes... I'm happy reading in classroom most of the time. I'm not happy reading aloud, sometimes. I'm so shy, and if I loose the track, I become nervous.

It was, however, Denorah who provided the most
emphatic description of her feelings about classroom reading. Denorah described herself as a "middle reader because I am so slow and some words I don’t know." Denorah also reported that she did not enjoy reading, and felt embarrassed reading in front of the class. In her words:

I don’t like to read when I am tired, sick and sometimes ...I just don’t feel like doing it...I just don’t like to read social studies. Just when you go into the class and read a story and it is embarrassing to read it in front of the class. Like you sit and you read, and everybody is staring at you to see how you are reading. And I don’t like to read. If I have to read in front of Beverly, Carol and Doris (Vera’s reading group), I don’t mind to read. But, when I have twenty-two kids in the class, then, that is embarrassing because you get so nervous and you don’t know some of the words when you get nervous.

The students differed in their attributions of reading failure and success. For example, Doris continued to emphasize external support as a route to reading success. In her words, "Going to school will help you to become a good reader." During instruction, Doris continued to show signs of anxiety whenever Vera or I probed her to rethink an unacceptable response. In these situations, Doris showed difficulty in responding to the probes successfully. For example, while working with circle stories, Doris' displayed this response pattern:

Vera: Doris, you need to take this old man out of your story. We'll talk about the owner later on. You named the mice, but we had already named them. Let's think, Doris, What can you add to your story that can give you details about the story?
Doris: [no answer, staring at the text and moving her hands nervously]
Vera: Doris, close your eyes. Can you see this two story house. Imagine the cat chasing the mice everywhere (the main idea).
Doris: [after a while, in a low voice] The cat is trying to pull the cheese.
Vera: Doris, think about your next main idea.
Doris: [no answer, staring at her paper]
Vera: [looking at me] Could you work with Doris while I work with the others?

Other students focused on internal control as a means of achieving reading success. For example, Denorah and Carol emphasized effort. In Carol's words it would be helpful to "Read books." Similarly, Denorah stated:

To become a good reader you need to read a lot, read lots of books, read simple stuff, read stuff like magazines.
CHAPTER 4
Reflections on the Study

Focus of the Study

It was the purpose of this study to examine and describe the collaborative efforts of a teacher and a researcher teaching reading within a Chapter One reading setting. The instruction was designed to promote strategic reading.

The setting for this study is not unlike the pull out programs described by Allington and his colleagues (Allington, 1977; 1981; Allington, Suetzel, Shake and Lamarche, 1986). The teacher held a bachelor's degree in elementary education and had worked five years as a Chapter One teacher. The three focal students had reading instruction twice each day. They left their regular classroom for reading instruction with another classroom teacher who taught reading to students described as "below level" in reading. They left their classroom again for instruction with the Chapter One teacher. The reading instruction offered to these students in the remedial reading setting emphasized accuracy and skills practice. The students' responses during instruction and assessment sessions showed that they lacked awareness of the reading process and reading strategies generally encouraged by reading comprehension specialists (Cannney and Winograd, 1979; Johnston, 1985; Clay, 1982).
The findings of this study have some implications for ways in which university faculty and public school faculty can work together to construct environments for literacy learning. The findings also contribute to our knowledge of how collaborative experiences can assist teachers in becoming reflective and in using reflection as basis for their teaching. The findings can further be used to broaden our current understanding of how interrelationships between cognition and affect influence students' responses.

The Collaborative Process

The results of this study indicate that four dimensions of the situation are central to the development of collaboration between the teacher and the researcher. These dimensions are: (1) sharing information, (2) autonomy, (3) gathering and considering data to be shared, and (4) raising questions.

Sharing Information. The teacher and the researcher constantly shared their current knowledge. Vera gave the researcher information about the students. For example, she shared reports on students' learning styles and grades. Vera also shared information about the school and Chapter One routines, and her knowledge about the approaches to teaching reading emphasized in school.

The information shared by Vera was central for the researcher's understanding of the setting. Due to this
information, the researcher restructured her initial plans for the study conduction. For example, in response to Vera's information that the students were pulled out from their classroom several times (e.g., for regular reading instruction, for Chapter One instruction, and for math remedial instruction), the researcher restructured her plans for working with focal students in assessment sessions after their instructional sessions in Chapter One. (Conducting the assessment sessions after the instruction in Chapter One was important for some assessment sessions, such as the retrospective interviews.) The researcher accepted Vera's suggestion for conducting these sessions at the beginning of the school period and before her class, to make use of the transitional time during which students typically get prepared for the school day.

The researcher shared with Vera her knowledge about an approach to teaching reading which assisted students' learning of strategic reading. In order to give Vera a clear picture of this approach to teaching reading, the researcher acted in several different ways. During instruction, she modeled how to assist students' learning (e.g., thought aloud, interacted with the students in supportive ways, and provided the students opportunities to reveal their thinking). During the reflective/planning sessions, the researcher explicitly described her thinking, and instruc-
tional instances, in which the teacher or the researcher had supported the students' learning about using more efficient comprehension strategies. The researcher further shared with Vera some articles which described successful instructional experiences.

Vera's responses to these actions showed that they had provided her with the opportunity to rethink her approach to teaching reading while actually teaching. That is, Vera typically restructured her next action in order to include the dimension previously modeled. In addition, both Vera's reflections during the planning sessions and her teaching demonstrated she had thought about her actions. Furthermore, Vera's interest in discussing the articles shared with the researcher and in sharing some of them with the reading specialist showed the importance of this decision (Eisner, 1988; Stake, 1987).

Autonomy. Throughout the study, Vera and the researcher gave each other the autonomy of decisions and actions. Vera allowed the researcher to act independently during the instructional sessions, during the planning sessions, and during the informal conversations. Each situation provided the researcher and the teacher opportunities to act to provoke reflection and change.

The researcher allowed Vera to decide independently on the manner of watching and using the videotapes from
instructional sessions, and the transcripts and preliminary analyses from the assessment sessions. Vera could decide herself how and when to watch the videos, which instances to choose, and how to present and use them. Across the study Vera changed each of these aspects. That is, she changed from watching the videotapes weekly to daily. During the sixth week, she began taking notes on the instances selected to discuss with the researcher. Vera further began reflecting on these instances while planning the upcoming sessions.

The researcher's use of her own autonomy during conversations, instructional sessions, and planning sessions also changed across the study. During conversations, the researcher felt increasingly comfortable when talking with Vera about aspects of their teaching, and about the students' learning. During instruction, after the first phase, the researcher began modeling the approach to teaching reading she espoused. During the planning sessions, instead of describing the students' difficulties and relating them to Vera's teaching, the researcher began creating opportunities for reflection.

Providing each other autonomy gave the teacher and the researcher opportunity to share both the thinking and the actual carrying out of the study. The dialogical process established during both instructional and reflec-
tive/planning sessions allowed Vera to learn by experiencing and thinking while in action, by thinking about her actions, by sharing, and by restructuring her beliefs and action (Gitlin et al., 1988; Kemmis, 1987; Schon, 1987; Goodman, 1984; Florio and Walsh, 1981).

Vera learned more than just how to use activities. She restructured her concepts about reading (dis)ability and teaching poor readers. For example, unlike in the first phase, by the end of the study, Vera expressed the belief that a good reader was a reader who demonstrated awareness about how, when, and why to use different strategies to fix his/her comprehension problems while reading. Vera also expressed her belief that helping students to become better readers included assisting them to learn strategies which would increase their control over their comprehension. Vera further explained that by helping students to become better readers, the teacher and the researcher were also helping them to develop better self-concepts. Most importantly, this autonomy helped Vera to become increasingly reflective and to use this reflection as the basis for her teaching.

_Gathering and Considering Information._ Throughout the study, the teacher and the researcher attempted to gather and share data about the instruction they offered the students and about the students' responses to it. They watched the videotapes from instructional sessions, read the trans-
cripts from the assessment sessions, selected instances to share with each other and to reflect on while planning instruction.

This exploration made it possible for them to test and restructure their instruction in the light of new information. That is, while watching the videotapes of instruction, the teacher and the researcher realized that sometimes they had not reached their goals of being explicit about the purposes of and conditions for using strategies. Other times, they realized that students' responses during both instructional and assessment sessions revealed that some strategies needed to be emphasized. During the planning sessions or conversations, these instances were shared and discussed, while the teacher and the researcher considered ways in which they could restructure instruction to address these dimensions.

Raising Questions. Raising questions was a central condition for reflection and sharing of beliefs, doubts, and conflicts for both the teacher and the researcher. During the planning sessions, the researcher used questioning as a technique to provoke Vera's exploration of her beliefs about reading instruction and students' learning.

Similarly, Vera frequently questioned the researcher about the same topics. In fact, across the study, Vera changed the focus of her questioning. At first, she directed
questions to the researcher, apparently seeking the researcher’s view. Later, she raised questions which both of them could use as a basis for examining their instruction and the students’ responses.

**Reflection and Instruction**

The collaborative experiences influenced the reflection of both the teacher and the researcher. The teacher’s reflection changed in both content and process, reflecting and promoting changes in her instruction. During the first phase, Vera’s discourse was focused on technical issues, such as accountability, efficiency, and effectiveness. When Vera watched the tapes of instruction for the first time, she focused her reflection mainly on aspects of her own behavior and on the students’ engagement in the task. Vera also took for granted the importance of focusing on letter sounds and skills in isolation as a means to improve the students’ reading comprehension. Vera further took for granted the students’ difficulty in learning.

During the second phase, Vera used a different type of reflection. For example, Vera reflected on how much she had learned about the students’ learning and reading difficulties after she had introduced changes in her instruction, allowing the students time to reveal their thinking and learning. She further evaluated hers and the researcher’s efforts and the students’ learning of strategic reading. In
addition, Vera started looking for her own solutions, materials and activities for working with these difficulties.

During the third phase, Vera’s reflection changed again. She reflected on her work together with the researcher, and contrasted their emphasis on constructing meaning from text with the school’s reading instruction which emphasized letter sounds and skills taught in isolation. In addition, Vera reflected on the isolation of their work from the school’s approaches to teaching reading and on the effect of this isolation on the students’ learning of strategic reading. Vera further discussed how difficult it was for teachers to change their approach to teaching reading because of the focus of the manuals and tests on letter sounds and isolated skills.

The researcher also experienced an important shift in her thinking about the study. She progressed from seeing the study as an opportunity for teaching Vera about an instructional approach to seeing it as an opportunity for learning with Vera. As the researcher’s thinking shifted, she also changed her ways of interacting with Vera. Rather than evaluating Vera’s teaching as she did in the first phase, the researcher worked to assist Vera in her attempts to learn.

The Interrelationships Between Cognition and Motivation

The findings of this study show that the changes intro-
duced in instruction brought different responses in the students' cognitions and affect. For example, Carol's cognitive and affective changes through the study showed a transaction between affect and cognition typically described by research (Paris 1988). That is, Carol, an unsuccessful reader and learner at the beginning of the study, increasingly showed motivation in learning about new strategies, as well as a willingness to use such strategies and to reveal her thinking. Carol further expressed her feeling of increased control over her learning and some enhanced self-esteem and self-concepts.

Doris, however, showed a different pattern. At the beginning of the study, she was successful in the existing instructional approach which emphasized accuracy and skill practice. Although Doris learned about the strategies taught, she was not able to describe conditions for using most of them, or to actually use them. She kept using the same strategies observed at the beginning of the study. Doris's affect became more negative than positive, and she became easily threatened by classroom interactions.

Several variables from the teacher, the researcher, and the student appeared to interact to motivate Doris's responses. Doris had already developed strategies to cope with classroom instruction. When changes were introduced, Doris experienced difficulty in making the transition.
difficulty in being successful led her to lose reinforcement. In addition, both the teacher and the researcher showed some insensitivity to Doris's difficulties. Vera showed difficulty in understanding the causes of the girl's behavior. She attributed Doris's difficulty in learning and providing adequate responses during task accomplishment to her lack of attention to classroom discourse and to her lack of effort to think and try. The reseacher contributed to Doris's affective problem by working with her in assessment sessions, which provided Doris with additional situations to support her low views about herself as learner and reader.

This result shows the complexity of the interaction between skill and will during teaching and learning in classroom. It further shows that special attention has to be devoted to successful students when substantial changes are introduced in remedial reading settings. This is true even when the teacher is trying to promote reader control.

Recommendations

Findings from this study suggest several recommendations for future research concerning both working collaboratively with teachers and on teaching and learning in Chapter One.

Working Collaboratively with Teachers

1. Provide teachers with the possibility to gain control over the data and over the process of data collection.
The possibility to make decisions about data gathering processes will increase teachers opportunities for reflection and learning. In this study, the teacher gained control over the process. She chose how, when and where to watch the videotapes from instructional sessions. That is, she decided to watch the tapes at home which provided her a safe environment to watch and reflect on her teaching before a discussion with the researcher.

2. Continue to have contact with the school after the data collection is completed. This contact will help the researcher to understand the teacher’s learning from the study and will provide the teacher with an sustained audience for sharing, reflecting, and learning. In this study, the researcher would have lost important information about the teacher’s learning if such contact had not maintained. The teacher would have also lost opportunities to share her own learning and to gain a better understanding of the researcher’s perspective.

3. Be ready to learn things that are new and surprising. To develop collaboration, it is necessary that both the teacher and the researcher believe they will learn from each other. In this study a trustful relationship was established only when the researcher realized she had a lot to learn from collaborating with the teacher.

4. In a collaborative relationship telling, by itself,
is not sufficient. It is necessary to assist the teacher's learning by making the mental processes emphasized overt, and by creating opportunities for reflection and experiencing. In this study, until the researcher actually modeled her instructional emphasis, the teacher did not restructure her teaching.

5. Teachers' learning should not be judged in terms of the extent to which she reproduces the knowledge of the researcher. The researcher's judgement on the teacher's learning has to be based on the teacher's restructuring of her individual beliefs and actions. In this study the teacher's success was judged by her restructuring of her beliefs and instruction while seeking an instructional emphasis which made sense to her. The teacher did not reproduce the ideas introduced by the researcher. After the study conclusion, the teacher continued restructuring her instruction to combine her old beliefs, the knowledge introduced by the researcher and new ideas and information. This continued effort to learn may be a better indication of the success of the project than evidence of knowledge reproduction. By itself knowledge reproduction is a non-generative view of learning.

6. Developing collaborative research solves pragmatic and ethical issues of working with teachers. Approaching classroom research collaboratively lessens the pragmatic and
ethic difficulties associated with collaborative ethnographic research. This type of research treats teachers as colleagues and provides the researcher with opportunities to introduce change in the setting. In this study the collaboration provided both the teacher and the researcher with opportunities for learning from each other and developing instruction which promoted the students' learning of skill and will.

7. Provide the teacher with early and frequent opportunities to see the emerging research report and to interact during the interpretive process. This decision will address ethical and practical problems of developing qualitative research while also providing the teacher with additional opportunities for reflection and learning. In this study such an opportunity was not offered. This decision caused an ethical dilemma. When reading the final report, the teacher demonstrated initial surprise and dismay with the focus and nature of the analysis conducted. Though her reaction changed considerably after she had time to interact with the researcher and reflect on the document, the whole situations could have been avoided.

Teaching and Learning

1. When substantial changes are introduced into instruction, teachers have to be prepared to provide assistance to students who have been successful in the existing
instruction. These students may experience difficulty and frustration in becoming successful under the new emphasis. In this study a previously successful student revealed great difficulty in becoming successful when the teacher and the researcher changed the emphasis of the reading instruction.

2. Teachers should persist in offering unsuccessful students opportunities to learn about strategic reading. In this study the teacher and the researcher worked with students who had already developed a history of reading failure. Despite differences among the quality and amount of their learning, they all learned about strategic reading. Two students showed considerable improvement.

3. Studies conducted to investigate teaching and learning in classrooms should last more than eleven weeks. In this study, by the end of the eleventh week, the teacher and the researcher had only begun to discover variables which were interfering with the students' learning. In addition, the students were just beginning to develop a more strategic approach to reading.

4. Give the students opportunities to reveal their learning. Such opportunities help them to become better readers and also help their teachers to understand their teaching. In this study, as the students revealed their thinking, the teacher and the researcher were able to use
those responses to learn about the students' processing. Vera begun to understand students' difficulties and she restructured her teaching to meet the students' needs she perceived.

3. Researchers should not allow their research designs to interfere with opportunities to promote student learning. In this study, if the researcher had provided Doris with opportunities to become successful during the assessment sessions, she might have helped the student to succeed.
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Appendix A

Proposed Participant Observation Guidelines

Purpose: 1. Focus on the opportunities the teacher and the researcher create for the children to help them to develop effective reading strategies.

Questions: What kind of opportunities are created in classrooms for the children to help them to develop effective reading strategies?
What kind of activities are emphasized?
Do all the children have equal opportunities to participate in classroom activities?
In what ways does the teacher/researcher make clear to the children the reasoning they are supposed to engage in?
What kind of materials are used?

Purpose: 2. Focus on the opportunities the teacher and the researcher create for the children to become task-involved.

Questions: What kind of opportunities does the teacher/researcher create for the children to become motivated to learn and perform?
In what way is learning emphasized?
In what way is the children's active participation emphasized?
In what way is the risk level of classroom
instruction deemphasized?

In what way are cooperation and acceptance emphasized?

Purpose: 3. Focus on the children's responses to the opportunities offered.

Questions: What are the children's responses to the opportunities created by the teacher and the researcher?

In what ways do the children show their willingness to participate?

What is the children's behavior toward their peers?

What kinds of strategies do children use during classroom instructional sessions?

Purpose: 4. Focus on the teacher's and the researcher's collaborative work during instructional sessions.

Questions: What is the teacher's participation?

What is the research's participation

In what ways do they participate as a team?
Appendix B

Proposed Guidelines for Teacher Initial Interview

This interview aims at allowing the teacher to communicate the ideas she brings to the study about her/his academic background, her/his concepts about reading, reading failure, reading strategies and teaching remedial reading, the teacher's current teaching practices, goals, motivations and values, and her view of students' learning.

Purpose: 1. To obtain information about the teacher's training as a teacher and as a reading teacher, about how long she has been a teacher, and a reading teacher:

Question: Could you talk about how you got into Education?

Purpose: 2. To obtain information about the teacher's understanding of reading, reading failure, and reading strategies:

Questions: Since I'm interested in hearing more about reading, could you talk some about how you view reading?

Would you talk some about what a successful reader does in order to read?

How do you see your role in teaching a child to read?

Could you compare and contrast teaching a good or average reader to read with teaching a poor
reader to read?
How would you define reading failure?
What kinds of things, do you think, need to be
done to help a poor reader to become a better
reader?
Could you talk about your values as a teacher?

Purpose: 3. Getting information about the teacher’s current
teaching:

Questions: Could you talk about your job as a Chapter One
teacher?
How do you understand your role in Chapter One?
What do you see as benefits and constraints of
Chapter One programs?
How would you describe the major focus of your
current reading program?
Could you talk some about your decision to choose
this program?
How do you go about choosing materials?
Could you talk about some of the things that you
like or dislike about the program?
I’m interested in knowing if you considered
changing the program, or any parts of it? Could
you talk about that?

Purpose: 4. To obtain information about fifth-graders’
learning, goals and motivation to read:
Questions: Let's focus on your fifth-graders. Could you talk about how you see these students' learning?

Let's talk some more about your fifth-graders. How would you describe their goals and motivations to read.

What about their feelings about themselves as readers?

How would you connect all this to learning?

NOTE: Probes used:

1. Is there anything else you can tell me about that?
2. Can you tell me more about this?
Appendix C

Proposed Guidelines for the Initial Interview with Students

This interview aims at collecting data about students' (1) knowledge about the reading process and about reading strategies, (2) goals and motivation to read, (3) self-concept as readers, (4) expectation for future success, and (5) value for reading. These guidelines were developed based on Murphy (1987); Paris and Jacobs (1984); Paris, Cross and Lipson (1984); and Wixson, Bosky, Yochum, and Alvermann (1984).

Purpose: 1. To obtain information about the children's personal data:

Questions: I'm very much interested in knowing you better, so I'm going to ask you some questions. If you do not understand what I have asked, tell me and I'll repeat the question again.

OK.

Let's start with you telling me your name, age, and birthdate.

Could you tell me where your mother and father went to school?

Do you have brothers or sisters? How many?

Could you tell me what are the things you like to do most at home?
How long have you been in this school?
Have you ever repeated a grade?
How long have you been working on reading with a teacher that is not your classroom teacher.

Purpose: 2. To obtain information about the children's value for reading:

Questions: Now let's talk about reading. Are there some things that you like about reading? Can you talk about them?
OK. Now, let's talk about the things you do not like about reading? What are they?
Do you think it is important to know how to read outside school?
How important is reading for you in school?

Purpose: 3. To obtain information about the children's understanding of reading and of reading strategies:

Questions: What do you think reading is?
What is the most important thing to do when you are reading?
Before you start reading, is there anything special to do that may help you to read better?
What do you do when you find a word you cannot read?
What do you do when you read a whole sentence,
and you do not understand its meaning?

Is there anything you could do to remember better the text you have just read?

What do you do when you read a text, and realize you have not understood it?

Purpose: 4. To obtain information about the children's self-concepts as readers, and about their expectations for future outcomes, and their goals and motivation to read:

Questions: Why, do you think, do some children have difficulty in reading

What, do you think, does a child have to do to become a good reader?

Let's suppose you have to read a text to answer questions. The text is hard to read. What do you do?

Is reading hard for you?

How good a reader, would you say, are you? Why do you think so?

How do you feel when you read?

NOTE: Prompts to be used:

1. Is there anything else?

2. Can you tell me more about it?
Appendix D

Proposed Guidelines to the Retrospective and Planning Sessions

The teacher and the researcher will watch and reflect on the tapes of classroom practices. To guide this session, some questions will be proposed to (1) review the goals established when planning the class, (2) examine the reasoning that underlies the teacher’s and researcher’s practices, (3) examine the reasoning behind the students’ responses, (4) plan for the next classes. These guidelines can change through the study as a result of the teacher and the researcher joint work.

Purpose: 1. Reviewing the previous planning:

Questions: What were our goals when we planned this class?

Did we accomplish them?

What worked well? Why?

What did not work well? Why?

Purpose: 2. The reasoning underlying the teacher’s and the researcher’s practices:

Questions: What was your/my purpose?

Did you/I reach your/ my purpose?

Why? or Why not?

How do we know it?

Are we providing the students with opportunities to develop skill and will? Why? or Why not?
Purpose: 3. The reasoning and motivation-affect underlying students' responses:

Questions: How is a particular student responding to a task? Why is he/she responding in a given way? Is this student using the mental operations we wanted him/her to use? Why? or Why not? What are this student's goals and motivations to perform?

Purpose: 4. Planning the next teaching sessions:

Questions: What are we going to emphasize in the next classes? Is there something we need to change, or direct special attention to? How will we make this happen?

Purpose: 5. Discussing the instances selected from the videotapes of instructional sessions.

What were the instances from instruction selected? Why were they selected? What did they tell us?
Appendix E

List of Assertions from the Researcher-Teacher

First Meeting

Vera:

1. Vera believed the researcher would be an observer only in her classroom.
2. Vera said she could not change her program because this program was prepared in collaboration with the students’ regular reading teacher.
3. Vera stated she did not have much time to allocate to the study.
4. Vera declared it would be difficult to find time to pull students out of their classrooms for the assessment sessions.
5. Vera described students as "slow learners" who forget easily what is taught, and need lots of repetition of the content taught.
6. Vera expressed her belief that the study will be an opportunity for her to learn about her students' difficulties and about ways to help them.

Cecilia:

1. I explained I had planned to work with her as a partner to plan and conduct the instructional sessions.
2. I replied to Vera that we did not need to change her program. We might focus our efforts on discussing how to
teach her students the content she had decided with the reading teacher.

3. I became concerned about the conduction of the study and decided to arrive early every morning to converse with Vera so we could get to know each other better and build trust.
Appendix F

Summary Charts: Assertions for Phase One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chart: Chronological Depiction of Critical Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRST WEEK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera and I revealed different views about the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera said she could not change her planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I stressed the discussion of instruction and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students’ learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal Meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I worried about the study conduction as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had envisioned it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera revealed she saw the study as a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera proposed to watch the videos at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I proposed to start observing her classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera expressed concern about pulling students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from classroom for the assessment sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We discussed how to introduce the study to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We talked about our families and about the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students’ problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal Talking</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera demonstrated interest in learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how to work with reversals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talked about my work with reversals and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cloze procedure with partial deletion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera asked for a model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera suggested the assessment sessions might be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conducted in her classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera asked about my daughters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I conducted my first observation of Vera’s instruc-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tional session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After class, Vera asked my opinion about the ses-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera suggested Carol might not be a good choice as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a focal student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friday</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I started arriving very early to talk with Vera.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera suggested talking with the principal about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pulling the students out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECOND WEEK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera suggested conducting the assessment sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before her class to make use of transitional time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
She talked with the classroom teachers and made other arrangements for the assessment sessions.
I told Vera I appreciated her decision to work with me.
Vera stressed she saw the study as a learning opportunity.

Vera inquired about the students' performance during assessment sessions.

Vera asked for a copy of the transcriptions of the students' assessment sessions.
I explained her I would give her a copy of each one as soon as each transcription was completed.

Vera talked about the instruction she had planned: working with prefix, suffix and base-word

Vera and I talked about the students' performance during the assessment sessions.
I emphasized the students revealed lack of understanding about reading.

We set a day for our interview: the day to coming school session after school sessions.

Vera revealed her nervousness.
I tried to make her comfortable by emphasizing the informal nature of the interview.

Vera revealed her reasons for emphasizing decoding.
We disagreed about the extent of Doris' reading difficulty.
Vera demonstrated desire to use recent reading series.
I commented on my emphasis on grammar when I was teaching Portuguese in Brasil.
I felt I understood Vera better.

Vera suggested using 3rd. grade level texts in reading sessions.
Vera again talked about using recent reading series.

Vera took the tapes of her instruction home for the first time.
I brought her models of cloze procedure with partial deletion.

I explained how the cloze procedure could help students to understand the reading process better.
Monday

Conversation

Vera revealed she was enjoying working with me.
Vera commented on the tapes. She focused on her
behavior during interactions with the students. She
commented that she talked too much. She also focused
on the students’ task engagement.
I commented that I had observed she facilitated task for the
students doing most of the thinking for them.
I commented that the students were not relating the
skills practiced in classroom to the way they should
reason during reading.
I stressed stds. needed to be more explicitly told how to
proceed during reading.
Vera asked for an article that would help her to
know more about the approach to reading I was
stressing.
I talked about the recent reading series the school had.
Vera was interested, but not sure if she could use
the books due to the copyright law. I looked for the
copyright law—Vera could copy the texts.

Tuesday

Conversation

I brought an article by Duffy and his colleagues (1986).
Vera told me in the afternoon she had read most of the
article.

First

Reflective/Planning

Session

I decided do not to turn on the tape recorder.
Vera revealed she had been cooperating with the study.
I related the students’ lack of awareness about
reading to the need of relating instructional practices
to the reading process more explicitly.
Vera revealed she felt protective of her teaching.
Vera revealed conflict between both the view of teaching
reading I was emphasizing and her old understandings.
Vera expressed concern about the students’ difficulty
in learning to use context to unlock words.
I initiated a reflection on both the use of cloze procedure
and summarization practices.
Vera decided to focus the upcoming instruction on
aspects I introduced—cloze procedure with partial
deletion, and summarizing after each paragraph read,
and on her old views—letter sounds, skills difficult
for the students, and multiple choice activities.

Wednesday

Instruction

During instruction, Vera, for the first time, was explicit
about using both sounding words out and context
clues to unlock words, before reading a connected text.

Friday

Conversation

Vera attempted to apply the emphasis on summarizing discussed
during the first reflective/planning session.
FIFTH WEEK

Monday

Conversation
Vera enjoyed the book. She read all the book during the weekend.

Second
Vera revealed her expectations about the study.

Reflective/Planning Session
Vera revealed her frustration with my discourse.
Vera expressed her view that she was providing the students explicit information about how to reason during reading.
I realized I was focusing on pointing out to Vera her weaknesses rather than on guiding her to reflect on her teaching. I decided to start modeling during instruction.
Vera revealed her conflict between both types of instructional emphasis.

It was Valentine’s day. I gave Vera a card I had made myself. She also gave me a card.
I gave the kids a card and a little gift. Doris gave me a card too.
Chart: Chronological Depiction of Instructional Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK</th>
<th>OBSERVATION</th>
<th>ACTIVITY EMPHASIZED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Drilling sounds and their key words from a chart. Drawing inferences: multiple-choice activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sounding out words from the board. Reading <em>Sprint</em> (magazine): Reading a play and small texts. Guiding (implicitly modeling) students to predict from the title. Relating upcoming content to students’ experiences. Establishing purpose for reading. Focusing on decoding during reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reading sentences and paragraphs to find the main idea: multiple-choice activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Drilling sounds and their key words from flash cards. Differentiating among prefix, base-word and suffix Working with words in isolation. Stressing spelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Working with context clues: multiple-choice activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Differentiating among prefix, base-word and suffix. Working with the word in isolation. Relating to spelling and separation of syllables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Drilling sounds and their key words from a chart. Working with homophones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Drilling sounds and their key words from a chart. Playing Bingo with prefixes, base-words and suffixes. Working with context clues: multiple-choice activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEK</td>
<td>OBSERVATION</td>
<td>ACTIVITY EMPHASIZED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Before reading explicitly informing students to use both sounding out words and context clues (as a second choice) to unlock words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Reading/listening to a tape of a trade book: The Emperor and the Nightingale. Guiding the students to predict from the title and the pictures. Establishing a purpose for reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Filling in the blanks of sentences with words chosen from a list: working with context clues. Working with finding the main idea of a paragraph: multiple-choice activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reading Sprint (magazine) Guiding the students to predict from the title Establishing purpose for reading Being explicit about using both context clues and sounding out words out to decode difficult words. Working with activities from the magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Working with prefix, suffix and base-word Working with the word in isolation Reading connected texts Guiding the students to predict from the title and the picture (implicit modeling) Guiding the students to summarize each paragraph (implicit modeling) Multiple choice, fill-in-the-blanks, True/False and Categorizing activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chart: Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beliefs about</th>
<th>Vera</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Reading**  | (1) Reading is a means to get the skills we need to get along in the world.  
(2) Reading is a means to learn to enjoy reading |
|              | Poor readers can’t read or understand what they read.  
Their reading difficulty is mostly caused by their difficulty with decoding. |
| **Students’ Learning** | All the students are seen as slow learners who have difficulty learning, and who easily forget.  
The students differ among themselves as learners:  
Carol is the slowest learner.  
Doris and Melanie are considered faster learners.  
The students learn in different ways.  
Carol learns by listening.  
Doris learns by writing.  
Melanie does not appear to learn by listening—she is not a good listener. |
| **Students’ Motivations** | The students’ motivations to learn vary—they are aware they have reading problems.  
Carol is self-motivated.  
Carol stammers a lot of time because she has low self-esteem.  
She does not have confidence.  
Derrick has self-esteem problems.  
Doris has attention problems—she can’t attend to anything longer.  
She wants to be the first to answer.  
Melanie has motivational problems.  
She can do. She just thinks she can’t.  
Denorah is a trier.  
She is eager to learn.  
I was surprised when they said they were good readers.  
They know they have problems |
| **Students’ Reading Difficulties** | The students’ reading difficulties vary.  
Carol is the slowest reader.  
Carol worries me, I do not know how to reach her.  
Derrick has difficulty with sounds.  
Everytime I plan something, I think that Derrick will be lost...because he should be a level lower.  
Melanie and Doris are better readers). They should be a reading level above (Interview One, third week) |
Doris wants to answer first and doesn't think.
Most of Doris' answers are wrong or don't make sense
because she wants to be the first to answer (2nd
reflective/planing session).

Changes in Vera's beliefs toward Doris:
Vera asked the Reading Specialist to retest Melanie
since she wanted to promote the girl to a newly created
group which was reading a level above (second reflective
planning session).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Poor Readers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) It is a constant drill, a constant repetition of skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Poor readers need an emphasis on decoding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They need to go through the words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If they can't decode the words, then we have to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>find another way—context clues or whatever.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) It is also necessary to focus on motivating the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have to do a variety of things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can't read every day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They become bogged down easily. You have to keep them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have to read to them, let them read to you, do a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lot of different things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) It's necessary to help the students to develop good self-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esteem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They have to feel successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything they try they fail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working in Chapter One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) It is supplementing the work of the classroom teacher,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's important to coordinate it with the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) It is reviewing the skills the children have difficulty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) It is helping the students to enjoy reading by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. reading connected texts whenever she had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;free time&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. encouraging them to check out books on Fridays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Chapter One would help the children if:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. students are well placed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. it offers them a safe environment to learn .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. it reviews the skills they have problems with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Vera sees maybe one constraint in Chapter One— not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading every day. She is happy with her program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Her goal for this year is on comprehension and under-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standing and on making the students enjoy reading and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>becoming avid readers. Decoding is emphasized as a means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to improve comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) The material Vera uses reflects her emphasis on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills and on reading connected texts, with focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on questioning about the students' comprehension.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Working with Poor Readers

(1) Had to include teacher's explicit descriptions of strategies for comprehending texts, how and when to use them.

(2) Involved providing the students opportunities to practice strategies with real texts, and helping students to reveal and restructure their thinking.

(3) Involved the development of a safe environment which would motivate the students to learn and perform.
| Opportunities Provided | (1) Students volunteered often. Exceptions: Derrick, a very poor reader for whom the tasks were too difficult. Carol, a very quiet girl and poorer decoder than the other girls. Instances: First week, second observation. Second week, fourth observation. Second week, fifth observation. Second week, sixth observation. Third week, seventh observation. Third week, eighth observation. Third week, ninth observation. Fourth week, eleventh observation. Fourth week, twelfth observation. Fourth week, thirteenth observation. (2) The students' answers during the interview with me confirmed they enjoyed to work in Vera's classroom. Instances: Second week, first interview with the students. (3) Vera sought to relate more personally to each student before and during instruction by: (a) talking about their families, and problems before instruction, (b) relating the content read to the children's experiences, Instances: First week, second observation. Second week, third observation. Third week, seventh observation. Third week, ninth observation. Fourth week, eleventh observation. Fourth week, twelfth observation. (c) using their names and interest to build a context to facilitate their task completion. Instances: Third week, seventh observation. Fourth week, eleventh observation. (4) Vera encouraged the students to |
participate by patiently supporting their efforts to accomplish tasks.

Instances:
First week, second observation
Second week, third observation.
Second week, fourth observation.
Second week, fifth observation.
Second week, sixth observation.
Third week, seventh observation.
Third week, eighth observation.
Third week, ninth observation.
Third week, tenth observation.
Fourth week, eleventh observation.
Fourth week, twelfth observation.
Fourth week, thirteenth observation.

Exception: a few times Vera demonstrated some frustration with Melanie's and Doris's mistakes. Vera called on other students.

Instances:
Second week, fifth observation.
Second week, sixth observation.

Promoting motivation to perform

(1) Vera promoted acceptance of all.
(2) Vera tried to provide all the students equal opportunities to participate. After realizing she was not, Vera changed her behavior.
Fourth week, eleventh observation.
Fourth week, twelfth observation.

(3) Vera diminished the risk of performing in her classroom by facilitating the task for the students. Vera:
(a) did most of the thinking,
Instances:
First week, second observation.
Second week, third observation.
Second week, fourth observation.
Second week, fifth observation.
Third week, seventh observation.
Third week, eighth observation.
Third week, ninth observation.
Third week, tenth observation.
Fourth week, eleventh observation
Fourth week, twelfth observation.
Fourth week, thirteenth observation.

(b) guided the students to a desired answer by probing them through questioning, by relating the
content to their experiences, and by providing them clues, Instances:
First week, second observation.
Second week, third observation.
Second week, fourth observation.
Second week, fifth observation.
Second week, sixth observation.
Third week, seventh observation.
Third week, ninth observation.
Fourth week, eleventh observation.
Fourth week, twelfth observation.
Fourth week, thirteenth observation.

(c) provided them feedback about their performance.
Instances:
First week, second observation.
Second week, third observation.
Second week, fourth observation.
Second week, fifth observation.
Second week, sixth observation.
Third week, seventh observation.
Third week, eighth observation.
Third week, ninth observation.
Third week, tenth observation.
Fourth week, eleventh observation.
Fourth week, twelfth observation.
Fourth week, thirteenth observation.

(4) Most of the tasks the students accomplished in the classroom emphasize low cognitive level processes such as remembering.
Instances:
First week, second observation.
Second week, fourth observation.
Second week, fifth observation.
Second week, sixth observation.
Third week, seventh observation.
Third week, eighth observation.
Third week, ninth observation.
Fourth week, thirteenth observation.

(5) Vera worked to maintain students' success expectations by being very clear about the tasks to be accomplished and the procedures to be followed to complete the activities emphasized.
Instances:
Second week, third observation.
Second week, fourth observation.
Second week, fifth observation.
Second week, sixth observation.
Third week, eighth observation.
Third week, ninth observation.
Fourth week, eleventh observation.
Fourth week, twelfth observation.
Fourth week, thirteenth observation.

(6) Vera provided students feedback about their performance by praising the right answers, providing clues through her behavior, probing them to answer, restructuring and clarifying their answers. Instances:
First week, second observation.
Second week, third observation.
Second week, fourth observation.
Second week, fifth observation.
Second week, sixth observation.
Third week, seventh observation.
Third week, eighth observation.
Third week, ninth observation.
Third week, tenth observation.
Fourth week, eleventh observation.
Fourth week, twelfth observation.
Fourth week, thirteenth observation.

(7) Vera praised the students often. Instances:
First week, second observation.
Second week, fourth observation.
Second week, fifth observation.
Second week, sixth observation.

Promoting motivation to learn

(1) Vera provided the students opportunities to read interesting books—every Friday the children checked out; Vera read for the students, and the students read/listened to trade books by the end of every week. Instances:
First week, second observation.
Third week, ninth observation.
Third week, tenth observation.
Fourth week, twelfth observation.

(2) Vera aroused the children's interest in the text to be read by guiding them to predict the upcoming content and by relating the text content to their experiences. Instances:
First week, second observation.
Third week, ninth observation.
Third week, tenth observation.
Fourth week, twelfth observation.
Fourth week, thirteenth observation.

(3) Vera related the instructional topic emphasized to children's experiences and used their names and familiar situations to probe them to accomplish tasks.
Instances:
First week, second observation
Third week, seventh observation.
Third week, ninth observation.
Fourth week, eleventh observation.
Fourth week, twelfth observation.

(4) Vera related the content emphasized to the students' concrete needs, when working with:
(a) sounds,
   Instances:
   First week, second observation.
   Third week, seventh observation.
(b) prefix, suffix and base word,
   Instances:
   Second week, sixth observation.
   Third week, eighth observation.
(c) context clues,
   Instances:
   Second week, fifth observation.
   Third week, ninth observation
(d) homophones.
   Instances:
   Second week, seventh observation.
   Third week, ninth observation.

(5) Vera was very clear about the content to be focused on, providing in some occasions analogies and mnemonic devices to help memorization.
**Chart: Students' Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEW 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students' Value for Reading</td>
<td>All students expressed that they valued reading but no student cited reading among the activities they liked to do at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All students expressed that they believed reading was important outside school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students' attributions of the importance for reading outside school were different:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doris and Denorah explained that reading outside school would help them to become better readers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol described reading outside school as entertainment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' attributions of the importance for reading in school differed:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denorah believed it helped students to improve their spelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doris believed it helped students to read better in high school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol did not know why it was important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' understanding about reading varied:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' Understanding about Reading while reading.</td>
<td>Doris and Denorah focused on accuracy as the most important aspect to attend to while reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carol expressed that the most important aspect to attend to while reading is the meaning of the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' Understanding about reading strategies</td>
<td>None of the students showed awareness about strategies to use before reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During reading, the strategies used were:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. asking for help (the most cited),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. sounding out words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After reading, to remember the text, all students reported reading the text again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities used after realizing they did not understand a sentence or text read were:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. asking the teacher's help,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. reading again was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading again was cited as an activity to facilitate the comprehension of the text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students' Attributions of Success and Failure

- Students attributed reading difficulty to their not asking for help, and to their lack of effort.
- Students attributed reading success to their asking for help and to effort.

Students' Self-Concepts

- Students' feelings about themselves as themselves as readers differed:
  - Doris had difficulties in talking about herself as reader, and about her difficulties in reading. She defined herself as a good reader, and reading as fun. She said that she liked to read in all situations.
  - Denorah described herself as a reader in the middle. She did not like to read in all situations. She described reading as easy at this level in Ch. One. She compared her difficulties in reading with those of Derrick.
  - Carol defined reading as a hard task. She explained she had difficulty with reading most of the time. She could not evaluate herself as reader.

FIRST READING SESSION

- Doris was the best decoder of the three focal students.

Students' Reading

- No. of words read per minute:
  - Doris: 76
  - Denorah: 61
  - Carol: 57

- Pauses longer than one second (in min.):
  - Doris: 2.03
  - Denorah: 12.46
  - Carol: 2.08

- Range
  - 1.02" - 15.49"
  - 1.60" - 19.27"
  - 1.20" - 26.07"

The pattern of self-corrected miscues for all three students show that:

1. all the students appeared to keep some control of meaning at the sentence level or smaller unities.
2. students were relying on sounding out the difficult words. The uncorrected miscues looked like the word in the text but did not make sense in the text level.
(3) students kept reading on after
miscues that changed meaning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miscues that changed meaning</th>
<th>Self Corr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doris: 10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol: 10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denorah: 11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activities used: All students used the activities they had described during Interview 1 to decode the difficult words; they sounded words out, they asked or waited for help.

Doris and Carol did not read the title of the text.

Students' Retellings: Students' retellings differed:

- Doris and Carol showed a desorganized retelling focused on unimportant rather on important the ideas.
- Denorah showed a more organized product though too general.

With probing Carol and Denorah were able to retell more ideas of the story.

Not Doris.

Activities Used: Students reread part of the beginning and the end of the story and retold these ideas almost verbatim.

Denorah read the title of the story.

Protocol Interview: Only Denorah read the title of the story.

Sounding out words was the activity most used to decode words. Students also stared at the words waiting for help or asked for help.

Students showed difficulty in describing their thinking.

Students' demonstrated different knowledge about activities which could help them to understand and retell the most important ideas of the story read. Doris and Denorah showed awareness about the importance of using the title. But they could not explain how to use the title, nor how to use this information to facilitate their reading.

All students showed similar use of activities to read and retell the text. These
activities had already been observed
during the reading session and in their
performance in classroom.
The retellings differed. Den and Doris
showed a more organized product though
general. Carol showed a desorganized
product with insertions which changed
the text meaning.

| During Instruction | Students’ difficulties in accomplishing
|                    | the tasks in the classroom differed:
|                    | Melanie and Doris showed greater
|                    | accuracy during reading.
|                    | Although all students demonstrated some
difficulty with story comprehension,
|                    | Doris showed difficulty with all
tasks which encompassed comprehension.
|                    | Doris showed signs of anxiety and difficulty
to respond to Vera’s probes aimed at helping
her to restructure her inadequate
responses.
|                    | Doris, Derrick and Carol asked for help often
during task accomplishment.
Appendix G

TABLE. Summary of Techniques for Establishing Trustworthiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>(1) Activities in the field that increased the probability of high credibility:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) persistent observations: the researcher was daily a participant-observer throughout the eleven-weeks of the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) triangulations: data was cross-checked by the use of different sources of the same information, different data gathering procedures and two procedures of data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Activity which provided an external check on the inquiry process:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>peer debriefing: exposing samples of the data gathered to a disinterested professional peer, to check the developing working hypothesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Activity aimed at refining working hypotheses: discretionary case analysis--active searches for discrepant instances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Activities to test findings and interpretations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) member checks: soliciting a reaction of the teacher participant to the final report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) peer debriefing session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferability</td>
<td>(1) Thick descriptive data to inform someone interested in making a transfer of all, or part of, the findings to reach a conclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Choice of a typical case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>(1) Writing fieldnotes using verbatim language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Describing events concretely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Peer examination of the analysis procedure to assess whether a second reviewer would find the researcher's working hypotheses reasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Using mechanically recorded data which will make data available for second analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Using two methods of analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmability</td>
<td>(1) Making data available for reexamination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Keeping a reflective journal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Providing detailed information about the teacher/researcher joint work and the conditions created in the classroom, and the procedures and guidelines for any data collected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H

Outlines of Constructs from Teacher's Beliefs and Instruction Made by the Researcher's Peer

Outline A

- Work with the class from the home teacher
- Needs variety
- Letter & more fluent
- Comprehension for understanding
- Enjoyment
- Self-concept
- Skill
- Vocabulary
- Lots
- Own choice
- Motivated interest
- Need to want to learn
Outline B

- Reading is a means to get along in work
- Better & fluent readers
- Her job
- What's going on in the classroom
- Decoding
- Self concept
- Testing
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