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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the consistency between Chapter I teachers' theoretical orientations and instructional practices related to preactive planning and interactive decision-making. Twenty-three Chapter I teachers were administered screening instruments that included: (a) a biographical survey, and (b) instruments focusing on teachers' theoretical orientations about reading and instructional choices. Primary consideration for selection included educational and professional experience, beliefs about reading, and instructional decision-making. Based on this information, four Chapter I teachers, each with a reader-based orientation, were purposively selected to participate in this study.

For each participant, the researcher selected a pull-out class (6-10 students) to observe during 10 separate Chapter I instructional sessions. During the observations, the researcher wrote field notes.
audiotaped the lessons, and collected relevant learning materials. At the conclusion of each observation, the researcher held a brief interview with each teacher about that day's lesson. Additionally, each participant's principal and a cooperating teacher were interviewed and completed the screening instruments for the purpose of gaining insight into each school's reading program.

All data were qualitatively analyzed using concurrent flows of analysis: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. Data sources were triangulated to validate an occurrence and to control for biases from other sources. Final interpretation was achieved following searches for meaningful patterns across, between, and within participants, involving multiple perspectives of the research team.

Results indicated that: (a) teacher A's beliefs were consistent with his stated planning; however, his decision-making, which stemmed from a text-based explanation of reading, was not; (b) teacher B's planning and decision-making reflected a text-based explanation, which did not match her reader-based
beliefs about reading; (c) teacher C's beliefs were inconsistent with her skill-driven planning, but consistent with her interactive decision-making; and (d) teacher D's reader-based beliefs were consistent with her planning and interactive decision-making, except when she had to abandon her favored instructional practices to prepare her learners for state-mandated tests. These findings support the premise that, although teachers may share similar beliefs about reading, there is great variation in their instructional practices related to preactive planning and interactive decision-making.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Teachers' actions and observable effects are greatly influenced and even determined by their thinking (Clark, 1988). In particular, teachers' theoretical frames of reference "represent the rich store of knowledge that teachers have that affects their planning and their interactive thoughts and decisions" (Clark & Peterson, 1986, p. 258). As Brousseau, Book, and Byers (1988) argued, "A first step toward understanding how to affect the process of schooling would be to understand the values and beliefs of those who drive the processes" (p. 33).

Although several studies have investigated teachers' theoretical orientations (e.g., DeFord, 1985; Duffy, 1977; Kinzer, 1988), researchers have not specifically examined Chapter I reading teachers' beliefs and how those beliefs influence their instructional practices. This study, therefore, attempted to extend previous research findings by addressing the consistency between Chapter I reading teachers' theoretical orientations and their relationship to pedagogical practices.
Review of Related Literature

For a definition of terms related to this study, see Appendix A. For a complete review of literature, see Appendix B.

In 1965 Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which marked the beginning of Title I compensatory education in the United States. The purpose of Title I was to provide fiscal support to local school districts for compensatory education services for children who are economically and educationally disadvantaged. Sixteen years later the program was revised as Chapter I of the Educational Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) of 1981. As a result of the revision, local school districts were given greater flexibility in Chapter I program planning; however, the overall purpose and goals of the program remained the same. (For the purpose of this study, both programs will be referred to as Chapter I.) Today, more than $4 billion is allocated annually to approximately 90 percent of the nation's school districts; roughly 20 percent of the elementary pupils of these districts receive Chapter I services. Furthermore, 85 percent
of the children served receive instruction in reading or language arts.

The original goal of the Chapter I reading program was to enhance the reading achievement of the disadvantaged students it served by providing supplemental assistance. With a focus on the remediation of basic reading skills, supplementary instruction typically has been provided in small classroom settings (6-10 students), often with an instructional aide to assist the Chapter I teacher. Furthermore, the program has been based on the belief that environmental factors underlie reading failure and greatly influence a child's ability to learn to read (Allington & McGill-Franzen, 1989). Therefore, Chapter I schools are selected based on poverty criteria (i.e., free lunch eligibility) and low standardized achievement scores. Within selected schools, students who are reading below grade level may receive Chapter I services.

Although Chapter I began with much optimism, researchers (e.g., Allington, 1987; Cooley, 1981; Kaestle & Smith, 1982; Levin, 1977) argued that the program has not successfully achieved its original goal of improving reading achievement of economically
and educationally disadvantaged students. In particular, a comprehensive study of compensatory education conducted by Carter (1984) indicated "that although the program is a massive funding program, it does not represent a unified and coherent treatment program" (p. 11). In sum, Carter argued that Chapter I is better described as a program that provides financial assistance, rather than instructional treatment.

Other researchers (Allington, Stuetzel, Shake, & Lamarche, 1986) described the nature of Chapter I reading programs and identified aspects of Chapter I that may be problematic. These researchers concluded that: (a) there is no standard and/or coherent program, (b) Chapter I does not have a clear and effective method to monitor student progress, (c) there is little curriculum congruence between Chapter I and regular classroom instruction, (d) there is very little direct instruction with connected text, and (e) organizational problems contribute more to Chapter I's lack of success, rather than the inability of individual teachers.
Even though Chapter I has received much criticism, quality remedial reading programs do exist and have produced improvements in reading achievement of disadvantaged students (Allington, 1986). It seems that these Chapter I programs are influenced by the following factors: (a) strong instructional leadership from support staff (e.g., reading specialist) and/or administrators, (b) effective learning environments, which include quality classroom management and organization, (c) goals that are clearly defined, articulated, attainable, and measurable, (d) continuous monitoring of student progress, with this information used to improve educational programs, and (e) large amounts of student time spent engaged in purposeful learning activities (Allington, 1986; Cooley & Leinhardt, 1980; Crawford, 1989; Fraatz, 1987; Mackenzie, 1983).

The majority of the research previously described on Chapter I reading programs has been descriptive in nature, discussing what takes place in poor as well as good remedial reading classrooms. That is, researchers have focused on the observed teacher and student behavior--what they said and did during the act of schooling. By studying only the visible
behaviors of teachers, however, researchers have failed to consider teacher knowledge as an important part of teacher effectiveness (Duffy & Ball, 1986). As Clark and Peterson (1986) noted, "Thinking, planning, and decision-making of teachers constitutes a large part of the psychological context of teaching" (p. 255).

Specifically, researchers have not investigated Chapter I teachers' theoretical orientations about the reading process and reading instruction and how those beliefs influence instructional practice. Thus, in this study the researcher's concerns were teacher beliefs, thought processes, and practices that underlie the decision-making process of Chapter I reading teachers.

Need for the Study

The National Institute of Education (1975) pointed out that "what teachers do is directed in no small measure by what they think" (p. 3). In their review of research on teacher planning and decision-making, Duffy and Ball (1986) supported this view by arguing that teacher cognition is a critical and important aspect of teacher effectiveness. Furthermore, it is believed that teacher decisions are greatly influenced
by their personal beliefs or theories about teaching and learning (Clark & Peterson, 1986).

Therefore, a major aim of research on teachers' cognitive processes is to develop a deeper understanding of why and how the teaching process works as it does (Clark & Peterson, 1986). Specifically, the decision-making process of teachers is characterized by reflective thought, "involving selection from among alternative hypotheses based upon the data collected and the parameters of the teachers' theories or belief systems" (Duffy & Ball, 1986, p. 164).

Research on teacher thinking has investigated teachers' personal belief systems about teaching and learning. For example, Harste and Burke (1977), discussing reading, stated that "teachers are theoretical in their instructional approach to reading" (p. 32). This is supported by Rupley and Logan (1984), who concluded that elementary teachers' theoretical orientations about reading influence their instructional decisions.

On the other hand, Kinzer (1988), using instruments that targeted three explanations about the reading process, identified and compared preservice
and inservice teachers' theoretical orientations. These explanations are presented as models of the reading process and are termed text-based (Gough, 1985), reader-based (Goodman, 1985), and interactive (Rumelhart, 1985). Text-based models of reading assume that the meaning comes from the text and that the reader must make sense of the text. In contrast, reader-based models of reading assume that the meaning comes from the reader's mind, and thus the goal of the reader is to bring meaning to the text. Interactive models of reading assume that the meaning is both in the text and in the reader, that an interaction occurs, and that the goal of the reader is to use prior knowledge along with the text to construct meaning.

Kinzer (1988) concluded that preservice and inservice teachers are likely to share the same theoretical orientations; however, inservice teachers' beliefs tended to be inconsistent with their instructional choices. Others (e.g., Duffy & Anderson, 1982; Duffy, Roehler, & Johnson, 1986) supported Kinzer's viewpoint by arguing that the environmental realities of the classroom cause teachers to mitigate their belief systems.
Furthermore, teacher behavior and decision-making during instructional interactions with students (the interactive phase of teaching) are influenced by what they think during the preactive phase of teaching, that period when teachers prepare for instruction.

Reading research of the 1980's has included many investigations of teacher thought processes. However, only a small part of the literature on teacher thinking concerns teachers' theoretical orientations, and none concerns that of Chapter I reading teachers. As Kinzer (1988) stated, "The areas of teacher beliefs and their influence on teacher decision-making remains an important area of investigation" (p. 370).

In this study, then, the researcher examined Chapter I teachers' theoretical orientations and thought processes and their relationship to pedagogical practices. Specifically, the major questions of interest were:

1. What are Chapter I teachers' beliefs about how one reads and how reading ability develops?

2. Is there consistency between Chapter I teachers' beliefs and preactive planning?
3. How do Chapter I teachers implement their instructional plans during the interactive phase of teaching?

4. Is there consistency between Chapter I teachers' beliefs, preactive planning, and interactive decision-making?
CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

Participants and Setting

Four primary level Chapter I reading teachers, including three females and one male, were purposively selected to participate in this study. Each teacher taught at a different school within the same school district, located in a large, southern metropolitan area. Approximately 26,000 students (64% black and 36% nonblack) were enrolled in the school district; 14,083 of those students (66% black and 34% nonblack) were enrolled at the elementary level.

According to school district policy, all Chapter I teachers were required to obtain state certification as reading teachers. For certification, a teacher must have completed 9+ hours of undergraduate and/or graduate study in reading education and have scored at least 510 on the reading subtest of the National Teacher Examination. From the pool of qualified reading teachers, Chapter I teachers were selected
according to an examination of their educational backgrounds and professional experiences to determine their "knowledge, commitment, and dedication to effective schooling" (M. H. Mosley, personal communication, May 14, 1990).

For the purpose of this study, only those schools where the Chapter I reading program was deemed successful were considered for participation. In this district, a Chapter I program is considered successful based upon students' gains in achievement test scores. Out of 32 elementary schools, 21 met this criterion.

From this pool of successful Chapter I programs, four teachers were selected based on data obtained from four screening instruments. (See Procedure for teacher selection process.) These included: (a) a biographical survey, (b) an instrument focusing on teachers' beliefs about how one reads, (c) an instrument focusing on teachers' beliefs about how reading ability develops, and (d) sample lesson plans involving different target areas of reading. Primary considerations for selection included educational and professional experiences, beliefs about the reading process, and instructional decision-making. A brief
description of each teacher follows (teachers' real
names are not used).

Teacher A. Jim, the youngest teacher, was
selected to participate in the study because his
responses to the screening instruments were
consistently reader-based. He had earned the highest
degree (Educational Specialist) among the teachers
selected. His graduate work had been completed in
1987 at a major research institution, under an
established reading researcher. In addition, Jim had
five years teaching experience, of which three were as
a Chapter I reading teacher. Although his school
primarily used a traditional basal approach to reading
instruction, Jim had initiated and participated in
several school-wide programs that focused on the
reading of literature. His school, located in an
integrated, lower to middle class neighborhood, had an
enrollment of 456 students (64% black and 36%
nonblack).

Teacher B. Mary was chosen to participate in the
study because her responses to the screening
instrument were consistently reader-based. She had
erned a masters degree in elementary education in
1973, and her most recent graduate course, completed
in 1985, was focused on the language experience
approach to reading. Mary, a veteran teacher with 25 years of experience, had been a Chapter I reading teacher for 13 years. A traditional basal series was used by all teachers for reading instruction at Mary's school, along with a library enrichment program. Mary's school was located in a middle-class neighborhood, with a total school enrollment of 513 students (61% black and 39% nonblack).

Teacher C. The third teacher, Emily, was selected to be a participant in the study because her responses to the screening instrument were consistently reader-based. She had earned a masters degree in reading education in 1972, which was the year of her last graduate course in reading education. Emily was a veteran teacher with 22 years of experience, of which eight were as a Chapter I reading teacher. The school's reading program, a traditional basal approach to reading instruction, focused primarily on the learning of isolated reading skills. Her school was located in a middle to upper-middle class neighborhood, and its population consisted of 479 students (50% black and 50% nonblack).
Teacher D. Deana was selected to participate in the study because her responses to the screening instrument were consistently reader-based. She had earned a masters degree in reading education in 1983, the year of her last graduate course in reading education. Deana had 15 years teaching experience, with 13 years as a Chapter I reading teacher. She taught at a school that was nontraditional in that it used a literature/whole language approach to instruction. The school, located in a black, lower-income neighborhood, had 236 students, including 235 black and 1 nonblack.

The Chapter I reading program at each school was organized around two models: (a) a pull-out model, wherein students left the regular classroom for remediation with the Chapter I teacher, and (b) a push-in model, wherein the Chapter I teacher instructed individual students in the regular classroom. For the purpose of this study, the researcher focused primarily on pull-out classes in these elementary schools where small groups (6-10 students) were used. Generally, the small group instruction was provided during 30-minute sessions three to four times a week. In addition, the
researcher selected one student from each group to observe as he or she received individual instruction from the Chapter I teacher in the regular classroom via the push-in model.

Materials and Data Sources

A pilot study was conducted in order to determine the feasibility of the planned procedure and to determine the clarity of the directions and items on the screening instruments. For a complete description of the pilot study, see Appendix C.

Materials included instruments for teacher selection, instruments for collecting observational and interview data, and materials pertinent to the teachers' instructional planning and implementation. These materials are described below; sample instruments are included in the Appendices.

Teacher selection. Four different instruments were used to select the teachers. The first instrument was a Professional Information Form which asked the teachers for information concerning their educational background, specific courses in reading education, and teaching experience. The purpose of this instrument was to obtain biographical information to identify similarities and differences among the
teachers' educational and professional experiences.
(See Appendix D for a sample copy.)

The second and third instruments were based on Leu and Kinzer's (1987) assumption that teachers' theoretical orientations can be identified by having them respond to statements focusing on: (a) how one reads, and (b) how reading ability develops. Specifically, the second instrument was designed to identify teachers' beliefs about how one reads. Based on three different models of reading, it consisted of 15 statements that described how reading takes place; five statements exemplified a text-based model, five statements exemplified a reader-based model, and five statements exemplified an interactive model. In this set, teachers were asked to select the five statements that best represented their personal beliefs about how reading takes place. (See Appendix E for a copy of this instrument.)

The third instrument was designed to identify teachers' beliefs about how reading ability develops (Leu & Kinzer, 1987). It also consisted of 15 statements, based on the three reading models; five statements exemplified mastery of specific skills (text-based), five statements exemplified holistic
language (reader-based), and five statements exemplified differential acquisition (interactive). Again, teachers were asked to select five statements that best represented their personal beliefs about how reading ability develops. (See Appendix F for a copy of this instrument.)

For the second and third instruments, a majority of statements in one model area (e.g., text-based/mastery of specific skills or reader-based/holistic language) indicated agreement with that theoretical orientation, while statements selected across model areas indicated an interactive/differential acquisition orientation (Leu & Kinzer, 1987). The purpose of these instruments was to determine the teachers' theoretical orientations about reading that possibly influenced their instructional decision-making.

The last instrument included three sets of lesson plans that focused on the areas of syllabication, vocabulary, and comprehension (Kinzer, 1988). Within each set were three kinds of lessons, based on the three theoretical orientations: (a) text-based/mastery of skills, (b) reader-based/holistic language, and (c) interactive/differential acquisition.
Teachers were asked to select one lesson per set that they deemed most realistic to use with an average second-grade class. A majority of lessons in one model area indicated agreement with that theoretical orientation, while lessons selected across model areas indicated an interactive/differential acquisition orientation (Kinzer, 1988). The purpose of this instrument was to determine teachers' potential instructional practices. (See Appendix G for copies of the lesson plans.)

Observational, interview, and related data.

Observational, interview, and related data were collected throughout the research study. Observational data included handwritten field notes and audiotapes of individual pull-out classes, as well as handwritten field notes of Chapter I instruction that took place in the regular classroom via the push-in model. Interview data included handwritten field notes and audiotapes of discussions with the teachers following each pull-out class. Interview questions were not predetermined but were based on the results of observations and related data.
Materials pertinent to the planning for and implementation of instruction were also collected. These included, but were not limited to, the teachers' lesson plans, small group instructional materials, and evaluation instruments. The purpose of these materials was to examine the teachers' preactive and interactive thought processes and instructional behavior.

In addition to the above interviews, the principal at each school and one cooperating teacher were interviewed and completed the screening instruments at some point during the observational period. The interview sessions were unstructured, but focused on each school's reading program and the professional relationship between: (a) the principal and Chapter I teacher, or (b) the cooperating teacher and the Chapter I reading teacher.

Procedure

Data collection occurred over a 7-week period. The first 2 weeks were devoted to teacher selection; the remaining 5 weeks focused on observations and teacher interviews. Also, the researcher administered screening instruments to and conducted interviews with principals and cooperating teachers during the final 4 weeks of the data collection period.
Teacher selection. During the first week, 24 Chapter I teachers in the school district received the four screening instruments in a packet via school district mail. On the Professional Information Form, they were asked to provide information concerning their educational and professional experiences. On the belief instruments, the teachers were asked to carefully examine each set of 15 statements about reading and then to choose five statements per set that best represented their personal beliefs about the reading process. For the lesson plan selection, they were asked to carefully read each set of lesson plans, focusing on decoding, vocabulary, and comprehension learning activities, and then to select one lesson from each set that they believed to be most appropriate for a group of average, second-grade students. Of the 24 packets distributed, 23 were returned via district mail or were personally obtained by the researcher; the last packet was never completed.

During the second week, the researcher examined the teachers' responses to the four instruments. The purpose of this examination was to find similarities and differences among teachers on educational and
professional experiences, beliefs about reading, and instructional decision-making. For example, teachers had limited/extensive teaching experiences, as well as had interactive/reader-based orientations. The intent was to select subjects who potentially differed along some or all of these four dimensions.

Responses by the 23 Chapter I teachers on the three instruments indicated that: (a) 8 were consistently reader-based, (b) one was consistently interactive, and (c) fourteen were inconsistent (e.g., a reader-based explanation for how one reads but a text-based/mastery of specific skills explanation for how reading ability develops). Because the intent was to select participants whose responses consistently reflected the same theoretical orientation, the participants whose belief inventory pairings were inconsistent were not considered for participation. Of the remaining nine, three (2 reader-based and one interactive) were not selected because they each shared a classroom with another Chapter I teacher. This left a pool of six possible participants whose beliefs about reading stemmed from a reader-based/holistic orientation. From this pool the researcher purposively selected four teachers as participants,
based on differences in educational and professional experiences.

Upon completion of the teacher selection process, the researcher scheduled a time to meet with each teacher to discuss the purpose of the research study and its procedure, and to secure the teacher's participation. After agreeing to participate, each teacher recommended one small group in a pull-out class to be observed over ten 30-minute instructional sessions; the researcher then devised a data collection schedule based on these recommendations.

In addition, during the data collection period, the researcher administered the screening instruments to the cooperating classroom teachers who provided reading instruction in the regular classroom to some or all of the Chapter I students observed for this study. The researcher also conducted brief interviews with each cooperating teacher that focused on: (a) the relationship between the teacher's theoretical orientation and classroom reading program, and (b) the relationship between the cooperating teacher and the Chapter I reading teacher. The total amount of time spent administering the instruments and conducting the interviews was about 2 hours.
The principals at each school also completed the screening instruments and were interviewed by the researcher. The interviews focused on each school's reading program and the principal's relationship with the Chapter I reading teacher. Approximately 2 hours were spent administering the instruments to and conducting interviews with the principals.

**Preactive and interactive data collection.** Prior to observations, the researcher obtained lesson plans from each teacher for the selected pull-out classes. These plans provided a basis for observations during the interactive phase of teaching, as well as for the teacher interviews that immediately followed.

After examining teachers' lesson plans, the researcher observed the teachers as they implemented their plans during small group instruction. Specifically, three teachers were observed with the same group of students during ten separate 30-minute teaching episodes; one teacher was observed only 8 times as he was absent from school due to illness. During the classroom interactions, the researcher collected data by means of handwritten field notes and audiotapes, as well as obtained teaching/learning materials used during instruction. The total time spent collecting observational data was 24 hours.
In addition, the Chapter I teachers were observed as they provided individual instruction to selected students in the regular classroom. In a manner similar to the small group instruction data collection procedure, the researcher collected data via handwritten field notes and obtained pertinent teaching/learning materials. However, the researcher did not audioclip the Chapter I teachers as they interacted with the students. Three of the teachers provided instruction to one learner during the instructional period in the regular classroom, whereas one teacher provided individual instruction to four students. The total time spent collecting data during individual instruction via the push-in model was 2 hours.

Post-observation interviews. At the conclusion of each observation, the teachers participated in individual interviews with the researcher. The interviews focused on the teachers' preactive and interactive phases of teaching, particularly in terms of their theoretical orientations. Specifically, questions addressed consistency/inconsistency among lesson plans, actual instructional implementations, and theoretical orientations. Following each
interview, audiotapes were transcribed for future analysis. The researcher spent approximately 30 hours collecting data for the study, 400 hours transcribing/editing audiotapes, and an additional 80 hours writing/editing descriptive summaries of each observational session and organizing all data for analysis.

**Analysis.** Observational, interview, and other related data were analyzed for emerging patterns using Miles and Huberman's (1984) qualitative analysis methodology. Data analysis was conducted by the researcher and two trained doctoral students with expertise in reading education; as a team, they read, discussed, and interpreted all data.

In accordance with Miles and Huberman (1984), the data were analyzed using concurrent flows of analysis: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. In this process, the data were examined recursively and displayed in matrices that were driven by the research questions. The spatial format permitted the data to be systematically and simultaneously organized in order to lead to valid and meaningful interpretations. Data sources were triangulated in order to validate an
occurrence and to control for biases from other sources. The final interpretation of data was achieved by searching for meaningful patterns across, between, and within participants.
CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

Through the development of matrices that were driven by the research questions, strong patterns emerged across, between, and within participants. The following discussion of the results is organized around the four research questions.

For the first research question, two sets of statements and three sets of lesson plans were used to determine Chapter I teachers' beliefs concerning reading. The first set of statements presented choices about how reading takes place; the second set focused on how reading develops. The sets of lesson plans were used to determine if there was consistency between the Chapter I teachers' beliefs concerning the reading process and potential classroom practices. A discussion of the first research question is reported below.

Question 1: What are Chapter I teachers' beliefs about how one reads and how reading ability develops?

Responses to the two sets of statements indicated that the four Chapter I teachers' beliefs about how
reading takes place and how reading develops stemmed from a reader-based explanation. For the lesson plan selection, Jim and Emily chose reader-based/holistic lesson plans across all three areas covered by the plans (i.e., vocabulary, comprehension, and syllabication). However, Mary and Deana selected reader-based/holistic lesson plans for vocabulary and syllabication instruction but an interactive/differential acquisition lesson plan for comprehension instruction.

For the second, third, and fourth research questions, the researcher and two trained doctoral students with expertise in reading education analyzed observational, interview, and other related data for emerging patterns. Data sources were triangulated to validate an occurrence and to control for biases from other sources. Final interpretation was achieved following searches for meaningful patterns across, between, and within participants, involving multiple perspectives of the research team. Following is a report of the results related to the final three research questions.
Question 2: Is there consistency between Chapter I teachers' beliefs and preactive planning?

To determine if the Chapter I teachers' beliefs were consistent with their preactive planning, the research team analyzed observational, interview, and other data that were related to preactive planning. For three of the four teachers, the research team examined written lesson plans and oral comments; for one teacher who did not keep written lesson plans, the team examined oral comments. Findings that relate to research question two are presented below.

Teacher A. Jim was the one teacher who did not write lesson plans. Therefore, it was difficult to determine if there was consistency between Jim's beliefs concerning the reading process and preactive planning. Generally, Jim planned for the next day's instruction at the conclusion of each class session. In particular, Jim would make notes in code in his grade book that served as a guide for where to begin the next instructional session. As he stated during an interview: "I am more likely to write down what I did after the lesson than I am before."
However, from what he did say during interview sessions with the researcher, Jim's rationale for using trade books as his curriculum was consistent with a reader-based explanation. He purposively selected materials that required his first-grade learners to engage in meaningful and holistic experiences with print. Specifically, Jim stated:

Essentially, I've got a shelf of books, of sets of books, of hundreds of sets, and that's my lesson. That book is my lesson and a white piece of paper and we're going to write about it. That's my lesson. So, I've got records of what I've done and I could convert the (coded) records into points and grades if I wanted to. I can quickly give a parent some feedback on what their kids are doing and what stories they were doing. Every story has a pattern. Every story has a topic. So, the books I have and keep are my lesson plans and we deal with things as they come up.

During a subsequent interview, Jim was asked if he ever used workbooks as instructional material. He responded with the following statement:
No. Those are test format and the test items have become our structural objectives. I think that's what's destroyed our curriculum. You know, matching, multiple choice, fill in the blanks. That stuff is a waste of paper. Those are test items. Those are meant to rank people. That's a way of describing something. It's not a teaching method. How it's become one I'll never know.

Well, I know, but it's a mistake. We've disassembled reading supposedly and created something that's like reading, and we give them all these millions and millions and millions of pieces of language. How many skills are there in a basal series? There are easily 30 to 40 at each grade level. Nonsense. We've dissected the curriculum until it has no meaning. The parts do not equal the whole...It's not a method of generating language. It's a method of dissecting language. Kids are forced to focus on increasingly smaller and smaller segments of print. And, they may well learn how to take it apart. But, they are not learning how to put it together.
Overall, Jim viewed reading as a holistic process and, as a result, his statements that pertained to preactive planning reflected a reader-based/holistic explanation for how one reads and how reading develops. As he stated during an interview: "I'm trying to have everything remain connected...I'm not going to break things up into individual reading skills."

Teacher B. Results from the data analysis revealed that, even though Mary's view of the reading process stemmed from a reader-based explanation, her preactive planning focused on the use of learning activities that reflected a text-based/mastery of specific skills explanation of reading. A prime example of this was when Mary's instructional plans focused on teaching how to distinguish between short and long vowel sounds. At one point, Mary explained why she chose to include this lesson in her plans. She stated:

It helps them in word attack to sound out the new words, if they are familiar with patterns. It will also help them in spelling...Another reason is because they are tested on it in almost every magazine test they have at the primary grades and it's in their (basal) workbooks.
Furthermore, during several post-observation interview sessions, Mary emphasized that: (a) she focused on the teaching of separate reading skills, and (b) the skills she taught were the skills that were going to be on the state-mandated achievement test and were a part of the basal reading program of the school. Specifically, Mary stated:

I have an IEP (Individual Education Plan) for each student, and it really is based on the skills that are being taught in a particular (basal) reader that they are in. It's very much like what the classroom teacher has on her magazine test (of the basal series), the skills that are indicated there. Okay, the IEP pretty well follows that. These are the skills that the children are being instructed on in the classroom and tested on. If they have been tested, then I have those test results and I know what skills they are deficient in. If I am instructing in the regular classroom, or if I am sitting in on the reading group in a classroom, I can see what reading skills they are working on and what children are having difficulty with that particular skill.
In short, Mary's beliefs concerning reading favored a reader-based explanation, while her preactive planning favored a text-based/mastery of specific skills explanation. Typically, Mary chose to focus on the teaching of individual reading skills that were a part of the regular classroom reading program and planned instruction that prepared her second-grade students for the state-mandated achievement tests.

Teacher C. Findings from the data analysis indicated that Emily's view of reading stemmed from a reader-based explanation, whereas her preactive planning stemmed from a text-based/mastery of specific skills explanation. It is interesting to note that during the data collection period, Emily's instructional plans read the same for each observational session. Specifically, Emily wrote in her lesson plan book the name of the skill book, the skill to be taught (e.g., locating the answer), and the level of the skill book that was to be used during the interactive phase of teaching. Furthermore, Emily explained during one post-observation interview that her instructional plans were based on information she received from the regular classroom teachers. She stated:
I decide what I want to teach from the teachers and our talking together. I talk to them or give them a skill sheet to fill out and they give the skill sheet back to me. The skill sheet tells me what the teachers would like for me to work on in my classroom.

Additionally, with the knowledge that the state-mandated achievement and minimum performance tests were to be administered in the near future, Emily focused attention on planning instructional activities that prepared her third-grade students for these two tests. As Emily stated:

We're getting close to MAT6 (Metropolitan Achievement Test - 6) and the state's minimum performance testing period...and these students need some lessons or skills on how to go back into the story and find their answers. This is one reason why I chose to work in Locating the Answers skill book when I did. It is real good about teaching them to go back into the story to look for their answers.

In sum, there was inconsistency between Emily's reader-based belief concerning reading and her preactive planning, which favored a text-based/mastery
of specific skills explanation. Emily specifically planned learning activities that reinforced the regular classroom teachers' skills-based instruction and prepared her third-grade students for the state-mandated tests.

**Teacher D.** Overall, Deana's belief about reading, which stemmed from a reader-based explanation, was consistent with her preactive planning. However, at times during the data collection period, Deana's preactive planning reflected a text-based/mastery of specific skills explanation. The inconsistency was due to: (a) the need to prepare her third-grade students for the state-required achievement and minimum performance tests that were to be administered district-wide in the near future, and (b) the need to re-administer the school district's magazine test of the basal reading series. (Although Deana's school used a nontraditional literature/whole language approach to instruction, the students were still required to take the basal magazine tests.)

Generally, when Deana's preactive planning was not constrained by the need to prepare for state-mandated achievement tests or basal magazine tests, she focused her attention on instructional activities that
required her third-grade students to become active participants in holistic experiences with print. For example, the following activities were a part of Deana's written lesson plans: (a) a student-generated circle story; (b) using the circle story for content, the students drew illustrations to make a big book; and (c) a writing activity that required the learners to retell a story that Deana had read to them. Furthermore, rather than having a specific objective for each class session, Deana stated that her objective was always to create life-long readers. In particular, during one post-observation interview, Deana stated:

There is never a day that I say, 'Today I'm going to teach the short a sound,' like I might have in the old days with the skills-driven program. My objective is always a global thing in that I'm always working toward the development of life-long readers.

During a later post-observational interview, Deana elaborated further on her philosophy of instruction by stating:
We remediate here in the entire building. We remediate weaknesses through the student's strengths. We do formal and informal observations, evaluations, use different instruments, whatever. We look at where that child has some strengths and what they are. You know, we delve into his writing, his reading, his life views, you just name it, whatever. Then, we decide how to go about teaching him. So every child, I feel like, is such a valuable individual here. I think that's one of the strong points—the dignity of the individual is respected.

And research is telling us now that all dialects are acceptable and that dialect does not interfere with comprehension. And that's just fresh ammunition to all of us who have always thought and taught that way. But a lot of people who don't know that research, you know, will say that when you do language experience that the Black dialect does not sound as 'educated' and, therefore, it is not what we want for the world out there. For us at this school, that's our vehicle for getting to that end point of creating a life-long reader.
Typically, Deana used the school's **Core Literature List** as she planned her holistic learning activities for her Chapter I students. As she stated:

> Since we don't use the basal reader, whatever we do here becomes our reading curriculum and that's why good children's literature is so important to us. We want it to have the elements of a good story so that the kids will internalize all that stuff and not end up not knowing what makes up a story of a particular type of literature.

However, on days when Deana focused on preparing her learners for the upcoming state-mandated achievement and minimum performance tests, her planned instructional activities reflected a text-based/mastery of specific skills explanation of reading. For example, activities on these days consisted of the use of flash cards to teach how to change a word from singular to plural and/or how to change a word's meaning by adding a prefix or suffix.

**Question 3:** How do Chapter I teachers implement their instructional plans during the interactive phase of teaching?
To answer this question, the research team examined all data related to the implementation of instructional plans during the interactive phase of teaching. The following is a discussion of the results related to research question three.

Teacher A. This question was difficult to answer because the books Jim used during the interactive phase served as his lesson plans. However, when asked how he planned for instruction, Jim stated:

I do it qualitatively in that, basically, the books are my curriculum...I go with predictable books. Fairy tales are predictable. I go with repetition. I like poetry. I like things with a lot of repetition in them for the primary grades. I like cumulative books, although, I don't use them as much any more for some reason. I look primarily for a story with some meat in it.

At another point, the researcher asked Jim what his primary concern was as he planned instruction. Jim's response:

My primary concern is probably the story. I want it to have a beginning, a middle, and an end...I use quality literature. I use Caldecotts a lot. I use Dr. Seuss a lot. Not the ones where he tried
to control the vocabulary because those are a mess. I mean, only because he was Dr. Seuss did *The Cat in the Hat* work. Only because he was Dr. Seuss did *Green Eggs and Ham* work. But the rest of them, you know, *A Great Day For Up, My Foot Book*, those are trash. They really are. You can take Dr. Seuss and put his books into two stacks.

Anyway, I basically write my list up after I do it because things come up, you know. Everybody is at a different place. When we share a book, we've all got a copy of it. We've got something we've read or are reading. And things come up. Questions come up. The problems they are having all turns into a lesson then and there.

When asked if he ever wrote anything down before a lesson, Jim stated:

Yeah, in my book I'll write down what we did last time. I've got a copy of what we were doing last time. If we're reading, we talk about the book. With a more difficult book, we may have to read it 15 times...There's a stack of books I use with each grade level and I just pull them...It's not a drill and practice thing.
However, during the interactive phase of instruction, Jim used teaching methods that favored a text-based/mastery of specific skills explanation of reading. Typically, Jim and his first-grade students chorally read and discussed children's stories (e.g., *Goldilocks and the Three Bears*). As they read the stories, Jim stopped periodically to direct a discussion that focused on the story content. Following the shared reading experience, Jim guided his students as they engaged in a writing activity that related to the story read. For instance, during three consecutive observational sessions using writing journals, the students wrote their own version of *Goldilocks and the Three Bears*. It is interesting to note that during the writing exercises, Jim continuously assessed the students' work and placed much emphasis on the correctness of spelling and the appropriate use of grammar rules (e.g., beginning a sentence with a capital letter).

**Teacher B.** Mary, who focused her attention on the teaching of the skills that were a part of her school's basal reading program, consistently followed her written lesson plans. Typically, Mary introduced her lesson by asking questions that tapped her
learners' prior knowledge. For instance, during one instructional session Mary began by asking, "Can you think of times in which your listening might save your life?" Following an introduction, Mary explained to her second-grade students the learning activity for that day (e.g., completing skill lessons in a workbook or listening to a tape recording of a story and then completing a follow-up worksheet). At the conclusion of each instructional session, Mary summarized and asked questions that required her learners to focus on key aspects of the lesson that was presented.

As Mary instructed her second-grade students, it was typical for her to focus on correctness, and the need to follow her classroom procedures. For example, during one observational session, Mary instructed her students to answer her questions in complete sentences. During the post-observation interview for that day, Mary explained her rationale:

I always require them to give me the answer in words first, and then they can tell me the letter. (When Mary's learners were required to answer a multiple choice question by using the letters a, b, or c, they had to first answer the question in a complete sentence.) One of the main reasons for
that is because children at this age are prone to answer in one-word or two-word answers. I ask them in English to make complete sentences using words...They don't really understand what a sentence is until we require them to do it over and over and over...I think they need to get in the habit of doing it so they understand the difference between a phrase and a sentence.

During a subsequent post-observation interview, the researcher asked Mary why she used skill books as learning materials. Her response:

For one thing, you have a book for each child, using the same thing, so that you can use it as a group situation. In other words, we're not trying to test them right now, we're trying to teach them. They are not threatened when they are working as a group and they don't feel they are being tested. As you can see, we've done ten units of the skill book, and most of those have been done together.

Overall, Mary followed her detailed written lesson plans during the interactive phase of teaching. To begin her lessons, it was typical for her to ask questions and/or present material that tapped her
students' prior knowledge. However, after an initial introduction, her lessons tended to be teacher-generated and skill-specific. Further, as Mary monitored the learners' behavior, she tended to emphasize correctness of work and the need to follow classroom procedures.

Teacher C. Emily, whose written lesson plans reflected a text-based/mastery of specific skills explanation of reading, implemented her instructional plans by providing a foundation for learning that stemmed from a reader-based/holistic explanation of reading. For example, during the first instructional session observed, Emily selected vocabulary words from a passage in the *Locating the Answer* skill book, discussed with her learners the meanings of the words, and then required them to independently write sentences using the words. After this particular observation, Emily explained to the researcher why she chose this instructional approach:

I thought it would make the lesson more interesting. Again, it builds upon their experiences, makes it more interesting, and they can look back up and identify the word that they had put in a sentence when they see it in a book.
During the second observation, the students orally read the passage of the skill book and independently answered questions that required them to locate answers in the passage. As a follow-up activity during the third observation, Emily required her learners to write their own stories using the vocabulary words. At the conclusion of the observation, Emily explained why she assigned a creative writing activity. She stated:

It's very important for them to create their own stories and to use their imagination. I think we've gotten away from that a lot. And if they create their own stories and use their imagination and use the vocabulary words that they have gone over, it makes everything more meaningful to them.

Other instructional sessions were similar in that Emily presented material that required her learners to use their prior knowledge to set a foundation for learning. As Emily instructed, she continuously monitored her learners to determine their level of understanding of the material presented. It was typical, for example, for Emily to require her learners to summarize a passage read in their own words or to relate it to a prior experience.
Furthermore, although Emily's lesson plan for each Thursday of the observational period stated that the students were to complete an assignment in a specific skill book, she always read the students a children's book and provided a special treat (e.g., chocolate candy) for good behavior. Emily explained during a post-observation interview that she read the students a story because she thought it was important to set time aside for a fun activity, rather than a working activity.

Teacher D. Findings from the data analysis indicated that when Deana's instructional plans reflected a reader-based/holistic explanation of reading, she engaged her students in meaningful, holistic experiences with print and learning occurred in an inductive manner. In particular, on these days, Deana's learners were involved in activities that were student-generated (e.g., the students wrote and illustrated a big book). As she instructed, Deana generally continuously assessed the learners' behavior and encouraged all to contribute their ideas to the holistic learning activities.
However, on days when Deana focused on preparing her students for the upcoming state-mandated tests and the basal magazine tests, she taught in a deductive manner. That is, the instruction was teacher-generated and skill-specific. For instance, as Deana taught her students how to change the word *berry* to *berries*, she stated, "The rule is change the *y* to *i* and add *g*-s."

During several post-observation interviews, Deana explained that her instructional approach differed from her typical holistic classroom practices because the regular classroom teacher asked her to plan learning activities that prepared her students for the upcoming state-mandated tests. In particular, Deana stated:

> If I choose to do another activity, then I don't really feel like I'm backing Lynn (the regular classroom teacher) and helping her. And above all, Sam (the principal) wants me to be aware of what's going on in the classroom...I think that everybody that touches the kid, from the counselor on down, should be responsible and should sign off that they've done everything they can for that kid. So, even though I don't have to teach that
way, in my mind, if I'm not doing something like that, then I'm not valuable to Lynn.

In short, Deana's instructional practices stemmed from a reader-based/holistic explanation of reading, except when she felt she had to abandon her regular teaching methodology to prepare her students for upcoming state-required achievement tests. When her instructional practices deviated from her beliefs, learning activities tended to be skill-specific and teacher-generated.

**Question 4: Is there consistency between Chapter I teachers' beliefs, preactive planning, and interactive decision-making?**

To answer the final research question, the research team examined all data related to Chapter I teachers' beliefs, preactive planning, and interactive decision-making. From their analysis, several meaningful patterns emerged and the results are discussed below.

**Teacher A.** Overall, there seemed to be consistency between Jim's reader-based belief and his stated intentions concerning preactive planning; however, during the interactive phase of teaching, his beliefs concerning the reading process tended to be
inconsistent with his decision-making. Specifically, during most of the instructional sessions, Jim directed his students as they chorally read teacher-selected stories from a primary-level book. When asked why he used choral reading as an instructional tool, Jim stated:

In the choral reading, what happens is, some of the kids don't do well with choral reading, it's distracting for them, but for most of the kids, choral reading will cue them. They don't have to stop and start. I mean, they don't lose comprehension that way. When they get to a word that they don't know, and they probably don't know half the words until we go through it. But they are cuing each other...In choral reading, everybody is using their best strategy. Nobody has to stop and make sounds, so they don't ever lose their focus on the story.

Similarly, when the first-grade students were required to engage in writing activities, Jim focused more on the mastery of specific skills. In particular, during the writing activities, it was typical for the students to ask Jim how to spell a word. Generally, Jim responded by saying, "Sound it
out," or "What does it start with?" During an interview session, Jim explained his reasoning behind this instructional approach. He stated:

In writing, that is where I teach sounds and decoding. Because, in writing, that is where it is perfectly appropriate to use phonics. A good writer stops and starts and reads and rereads. That's when it is appropriate to make sounds and stuff. So, I encourage them to invent spellings and that's where they are going to get that play with sound.

Furthermore, at one point, Jim stated that he encouraged his students to invent spellings as they wrote; however, during several observational sessions, he failed to do this. In fact, one day he placed so much emphasis on the correctness of spelling that the researcher asked him why he did so during the post-observation interview. Jim's response:

I move in and out of totally supporting them to getting them to be on their own. At some point, we need to move on. But when we're sounding it out— I switch back and forth, don't I?— I wanted to support what they were doing a lot today. I wanted to make some real progress in getting the
story down on paper...I wanted to move on to the plot line. Perhaps I felt a little pressured to get a little farther with the plot. Correct spelling? They have multiple sources. They have their book to look up any words. They have their list (a student-generated list of words that pertained to the story). I want them to sound out some of the function words. I want them to use each other as a resource. Sometimes I spell part of the word and let them spell part of the word.

In short, Jim's announced intentions about planning may have reflected a reader-based/holistic explanation of reading, however, during the interactive phase of teaching, Jim's interactive decision-making tended to be more consistent with a text-based/mastery of specific skills explanation because instruction was teacher-generated and skill-specific.

Teacher B. The research findings indicated that there was inconsistency between Mary's beliefs about reading and preactive planning, and there was little consistency between her beliefs and interactive decision-making. In particular, Mary's preactive planning reflected a text-based/mastery of specific
skills explanation of reading because she focused on teaching skills that were a part of her school's basal reading program and planned instructional activities that prepared her students for the state-mandated achievement tests.

At times, during the interactive phase of teaching, Mary's decision-making reflected a reader-based/holistic explanation of reading. Specifically, as Mary introduced her lessons, she generally asked questions and/or used material that activated her learners' prior knowledge. Mary explained her reasoning behind this instructional approach during one post-observation interview:

I try to include things that are life-like to build more interest...I think if you don't do that, you know, set the stage for what they are about to do, then you don't always get their attention.

Although Mary's interactive decision-making at the beginning of her lessons reflected a reader-based/holistic view of reading, the majority of her interactive decision-making favored a text-based/mastery of specific skills explanation. In particular, Mary generally focused on the following:
(a) reading fluency, (b) following directions, (c) the importance of correctness in assignments, (d) legibility of writing, (e) the need to complete and grade all assignments, (f) the importance of following her classroom procedures, and (g) the need to follow her detailed written lesson plans.

Overall, Mary's preactive planning and interactive-decision-making stemmed from a text-based/mastery of specific skills explanation of reading. Findings from a global analysis of data indicated that Mary's instructional practices, for the most part, focused on the teaching of specific skills that were taught directly by her.

Teacher C. Emily's preactive planning stemmed from a text-based/mastery of specific skills explanation of reading, which was inconsistent with her reader-based view of the reading process. Typically, Emily's written lesson plans focused on the teaching of specific skills that were a part of the regular classroom reading program. As she stated during a post-observation interview: "The skill sheet that the teacher fills out for me tells me what the teacher wants me to be working on."
However, during the interactive phase of instruction, Emily's decision-making tended to reflect a reader-based/holistic explanation of reading. For instance, throughout the data collection period, Emily's interactive teaching focused on tapping the students' prior knowledge to facilitate the learning process. For example, before her third-grade students read a passage in the Locating the Answer skill book, Emily provided meaningful experiences to build a foundation for learning by relating the topic of the passage to the students' lives. Specifically, to develop insight into the topic of sugar and its relevancy to their lives, Emily used pictures and content from an encyclopedia. During that day's post-observation interview, Emily explained why she chose this instructional approach. She stated:

I thought they needed to know what the sugar plant looked like and the encyclopedia was one place that I could go to find a reference that showed a picture of the plant. I would like to have had a larger picture. I would like to have had a sugar plant to show them.
During the same observational session, Emily emphasized to her learners that sugar was a substance they used every day. In particular, Emily related sugar to their lives by discussing breakfast foods (e.g., cereal). At one point, Emily explained her reasoning for this activity by stating:

I began by talking about how they could relate to sugar and how they use sugar to make it interesting to them...We went into the fact that what they had for breakfast had sugar in it.

An overall analysis of Emily's preactive planning and interactive decision-making revealed that her reader-based beliefs about reading tended to be inconsistent with her planning. On the other hand, Emily's interactive decision-making, as a whole, was consistent with her beliefs concerning reading. During one post-observation interview, Emily explained why she focused on the students' prior knowledge during her classroom interactions. Emily stated: "If they can draw on their past experiences with words they do not really know, they can retain it if it has meaning, based on those experiences."
Teacher D. From a global analysis of the data, Deana's reader-based belief tended to be consistent with her preactive planning and interactive decision-making. However, when her planning and instruction focused on preparing her third-grade students for upcoming district-wide testing and the administration of the basal magazine test, Deana's beliefs about reading were inconsistent with her practices. In particular, as she prepared her students for testing, Deana focused on specific skill development that reflected a text-based/mastery of specific skills explanation of reading.

During one post-observation interview, the researcher asked Deana why her instructional practices varied as they did. Deana responded:

If I had my druthers in an ideal situation, the kids would come in here and strictly write for me. Okay, that is, most of the time they would be writing. Then, I would take things out of their writing to use for instruction. However, with this group, if Lynn's (the regular classroom teacher) estimation is that they need this way of doing it as well as everything else we've tried--she's an excellent teacher--then I feel like I need to do what she asks me to do.
However, on days when Deana's beliefs were consistent with her preactive planning and interactive decision-making, her instructional practices focused on engaging her students in holistic experiences with print. That is, Deana's preactive planning and interactive decision-making stemmed from a reader-based/holistic explanation of reading.

Results of Across Teacher Analysis

Given these findings, strong patterns emerged across participants. Generally, the four Chapter I teachers appeared to vary in their consistency between their beliefs concerning reading and their instructional practices. In particular, all four participants' view of the reading process stemmed from a reader-based/holistic explanation of reading; however, instructional practices that pertained to preactive planning and interactive decision-making varied significantly across teachers. A brief discussion of the across teacher analysis is presented below.

Jim's reader-based belief tended to be consistent with his statements concerning preactive planning, for his intention was to involve his learners in holistic experiences with print during instructional episodes. As he said:
I am taking those kids where they are. I'm totally tailoring the instruction to them because I'm developing something we all know. We have this background. I don't have to do all this assessment...I don't want to do all this testing and stuff. I mean, drill and practice and keep a record of dittos. I want to develop a bunch of things that we all know.

As for Deana, when she was not constrained by the need to prepare her students for upcoming state-required tests, her beliefs tended to be consistent with her preactive planning. On the other hand, Mary and Emily's reader-based beliefs tended to be inconsistent with their preactive planning, as their planning favored a text-based/mastery of specific skills explanation of reading. Both Mary and Emily stated that their instructional practices supported their respective school's basal reading program. Although, Deana's reading program was nonbasal, her instructional practices were consistent, as a whole, with her school's literature/whole language approach to teaching.
Findings from the second research question indicated that differences and similarities existed across teachers in terms of how they implemented their instructional plans. In particular, all four teachers generally introduced their lessons by presenting material and/or asking questions that tapped their students' prior knowledge.

However, differences in implementation were found as the research team examined the data. For instance, Deana and Emily usually focused on involving their learners in holistic reading and writing experiences, except when Deana abandoned her favored teaching practice to prepare her students for the state achievement and minimum performance tests. Jim, whose statements about preactive planning seemed to favor a reader-based/holistic view of reading, implemented his instructional plans using teaching methodologies that reflected a text-based/mastery of specific skills explanation. Furthermore, of the four Chapter I teachers, Mary was the only one who strongly emphasized correctness, reading fluency, the importance of following classroom procedures, and the need to follow her detailed lesson plan.
The results related to the final research question concerning the consistency between the Chapter I teachers' beliefs, preactive planning, and interactive decision-making also varied across teachers. Specifically, Deana's preactive planning and Jim's stated preactive planning was consistent with their reader-based beliefs about reading, except when Deana deviated from her usual holistic instruction to prepare her third-grade students for upcoming state-mandated testing. In comparison, Mary's and Emily's preactive planning consistently reflected a text-based/mastery of specific skills explanation of reading throughout the data collection period.

However, during classroom instruction, Deana's and Emily's interactive decision-making, as a whole, tended to be more consistent with their reader-based beliefs. As for Jim, although his stated instructional objectives stemmed from a reader-based explanation of reading, his reader-based belief tended to be inconsistent with his interactive decision-making. Finally, the one teacher who seemed to have the most inconsistency between her reader-based belief and interactive decision-making was Mary, who presented her lessons by asking
questions and/or using material that tapped her learners' prior knowledge. However, after Mary's initial presentation, her interactive decision-making stemmed from a text-based/mastery of specific skills explanation of reading.

Based on the research findings, it seemed that all four Chapter I teachers varied considerably in terms of the consistency between their beliefs about reading and their instructional practices related to their preactive planning and interactive decision-making. Essentially, all were inconsistent to some degree. However, all four teachers' view of the reading process stemmed from a reader based/holistic explanation, and it appeared that their instructional practices were influenced by various aspects of the school environment in varying degrees. Chapter Four will discuss these findings in relation to the literature previously reviewed and will focus on possible constraints and opportunities that influenced the Chapter I teachers' beliefs about reading as they carried out the act of teaching.
The purpose of the present study was to examine the consistency between Chapter I teachers' beliefs about reading and their instructional practices related to preactive planning and interactive decision-making. In taking into consideration the generalizability of the results of the study, the following limitations should be considered. First, due to the participation of only four Chapter I teachers, the results are not generalizable to the total population of Chapter I reading teachers. Second, due to data collection methods that required audiotaping, interviewing, and observational notetaking, the participants were aware that they were being observed and may have altered their behavior to produce inaccurate or distorted results. Third, only a small number of teaching episodes were observed and audiotaped by the researcher; as a result, the data are not a total representation of each Chapter I teacher's instructional practices. Finally, data were collected as the Chapter I teachers instructed
primary-level pull-out classes; thus, the results of this study are not representative of their instructional practices in intact classes or at the upper-elementary grades.

Given the limitations of this study, several conclusions can be drawn. In particular, the consistency between the four Chapter I teachers' beliefs and instructional practices related to their preactive planning and interactive decision-making varied considerably. The variation among participants was thought to be a result of the following factors: (a) they differed in educational and professional experiences, (b) the students, personnel, and overall climate of the schools in which they taught differed in many ways, and (c) various constraints and opportunities impinged on the teaching process. A complete discussion of the results is presented below.

Chapter I Teachers' Beliefs

The four Chapter I teachers' responses to the instruments that targeted the theoretical positions concerning how reading takes place and how reading ability develops indicated that their beliefs stemmed from a reader-based explanation. Similarly, when paired with the sets of lesson plans, the four
participants, as a whole, chose plans that were consistent with reader-based/holistic explanations.

The similarities in beliefs about reading may have been due to the fact that all four teachers, in varying degrees, had educational and professional experiences that emphasized reader-based/holistic instruction. Specifically, Jim and Deana were knowledgeable about the current movement toward whole language instruction. Jim had completed his Educational Specialist degree under an established reading researcher who favors a holistic approach to instruction. Although Deana had not completed her graduate work at a major research institution, she was very well-read and informed about research that supports holistic language learning. In fact, Deana had established a professional relationship with another leading reading researcher who advocates literature/whole language instruction. Further, Deana had co-authored a chapter in a soon-to-be published book that focuses on whole language learning; her professional colleague was the editor. Also, it may be safe to assume that the literature/whole language instructional approach used at her school greatly influenced Deana's reader-based belief about reading.
As for Mary and Emily, both participated in activities that enhanced their professional development as reading teachers. In particular, Emily was an avid reader of a major journal of reading education that generally presents research that focuses on holistic instruction and, as a result, her instructional practices may have been influenced by her knowledge of current research. Mary's reader-based beliefs may have been influenced by her most recent graduate course in reading education, which focused on a language experience approach to instruction.

The four Chapter I teachers' reader-based responses to the screening instruments seem to support Harste and Burke's (1977) hypothesis that teachers have a personally held belief system toward reading that can influence their instructional decision-making. Further, the four participants, as a whole, chose lesson plans that were consistent with their reader-based beliefs about reading. This finding seems to support Rupley and Logan's (1984) argument that "beliefs about reading influence elementary teachers' decisions" (p. 15).
However, the consistency between the teachers' beliefs about reading and their instructional practices that pertained to preactive planning and interactive decision-making varied across teachers. To some extent, this finding refutes Clark and Peterson's (1986) assertion that "a teacher's cognitive and other behaviors are guided by and make sense in relation to a personally held belief system" (p. 287). Although their beliefs provided some influence, other factors also affected instructional behavior. For this reason, a discussion of the consistency between the four Chapter I teachers' beliefs and instructional practices follows.

**Consistency Between Chapter I Teachers' Beliefs and Instructional Practices**

The following discussion is organized on a continuum indicating degree of consistency. At one end of the continuum is Mary because her instructional practices, which favored a text-based/mastery of specific skills explanation, were the most inconsistent with her reader-based belief. Next is Jim, who stated that he planned holistic learning activities; however, his interactive decision-making generally reflected a text-based/mastery of specific
skills explanation of reading. Following Jim on the continuum is Emily, whose preactive planning stemmed from a text-based/mastery of specific skills explanation, while her interactive decision-making favored a reader-based/holistic explanation. At the other end of the continuum is Deana, whose belief about reading, preactive planning, and interactive decision-making consistently reflected a reader-based/holistic explanation, except when she deviated from her usual instructional practices to prepare her third-grade students for state-mandated testing or to readminister the school district's basal magazine test. Throughout the discussion, the researcher will focus on possible constraints and opportunities, two aspects of Clark and Peterson's (1986) model of teacher thought and action.

Teacher B. At one end of the continuum is Mary. Her reader-based belief about reading was inconsistent with her preactive planning, which favored a text-based/mastery of specific skills explanation of reading. Similarly, there was little consistency between Mary's belief concerning reading and her interactive decision-making. Several explanations for these inconsistencies are possible.
First, Mary may have been constrained by Chapter I program guidelines, as well as by her school's structured basal reading program. During an interview session with the principal, it was learned that, in addition to the federal guidelines, Mary had to also follow guidelines imposed by her school district. Specifically, the principal stated:

I feel like in this district they have put too much structure on it (Chapter I) and have told the teachers what they can do and what they can't do. They have given guidelines that are in addition to the federal guidelines...I think that puts a little more pressure on them...Like in reading, they have to spend a certain amount of time in the classroom, as well as working in the media classes...I don't think you need to tell someone how much time you need to spend in those rooms. I think there is a professional decision that the people doing it should make.

Secondly, the school district's and state's emphasis on testing was evident at Mary's school. This may be why Mary's instructional practices pertaining to preactive planning and interactive decision-making focused heavily on preparing her
second-grade students for upcoming state-mandated tests. For example, when asked how she measured the success of her Chapter I reading program, Mary's principal stated:

We do an extensive amount of testing. Mary does pretesting and posttesting individually. Plus we do the MAT 6 (Metropolitan Achievement Test 6), and then we do performance tests...We give the Johns, and she gives a couple of other tests.

Thirdly, during post-observation interviews, Mary emphasized to the researcher that her instructional planning was influenced by the need to teach the reading skills that were a part of the school's basal reading program. At one point, Mary stated:

What I'm trying to do is help the children in the areas in which they are deficient and hoping that it is going to carry over to help them become more successful in the (regular) classroom.

Information obtained from Mary's principal also indicated that the Chapter I teacher's role was to support the regular classroom teachers' basal reading instruction. A pertinent example was when the principal stated:
If they're (the regular teachers) getting ready for testing and a kid's weak in a certain skill, it's up to the regular classroom teacher to tell the reading teacher if she would like for her to go to work on that (skill). And she will. They want to work together. Mary likes to go into the regular classroom and observe the kids working, and maybe pick up on some things from watching them in the classroom that might help her know what to do when she has them in a little group.

Further support for the argument that Mary's instructional practices were influenced by the need to support her school's basal reading program was found as Mary instructed a student in the regular classroom. Specifically, on the day the researcher observed Mary in the regular classroom, Mary chose to abandon her planned lesson with the learner because the regular classroom teacher (a substitute) asked her to review that day's regular classroom assignments in writing, spelling, and grammar.

Finally, from an examination of the principal's and regular classroom teacher's (a substitute) responses to the instruments that targeted the theoretical orientations toward reading as well as the
sets of lesson plans, it appeared that both favored a reader-based/holistic explanation of reading. Their responses, however, were not as consistently reader-based as Mary's. The lack of consistency between Mary's, the principal's, and the regular classroom teacher's reader-based beliefs and the school's skill-driven reading program may have been due to constraints (e.g., the requirement to follow district and federal guidelines). As a result, the environmental realities of the school may have prevented the three from implementing their belief systems in instructional decision-making.

The findings related to the lack of consistency between Mary's reader-based belief and instructional practices pertaining to preactive planning and interactive decision-making are supported by earlier research conducted by Fraatz (1987). Specifically, Fraatz argued that:

The pressure to 'coordinate' with the classroom program makes (regular) teachers the primary planners; reading teachers rely on teachers to tell them when their help is wanted, what kind of help is needed, and which students should be the targets of their help. (p. 79)
In sum, the lack of consistency between Mary's reader-based belief about reading and instructional practices may be due to her perception, as well as that of her principal, concerning her teaching responsibilities. From the data obtained, it appeared that Mary's job was to provide instruction that supported the school's basal reading program and, as a result, Mary's instructional agenda coincided with the regular classroom teacher's plans, not her own beliefs.

Teacher A. Following Mary on the continuum is Jim. His reader-based belief was consistent with his stated instructional planning and inconsistent with his interactive decision-making. A discussion of these results follows.

The consistency between Jim's reader-based belief and stated preactive planning was thought to be a result of his knowledge of current research that supports whole language instruction. However, the lack of consistency between Jim's beliefs about reading and his interactive decision-making may be due to his lack of thoughtful planning. That is, Jim had a grasp of the theory that underlies whole language learning; however, he failed to adequately plan for
instruction so that he could put the theory into practice in the classroom. Several factors influenced Jim's instructional practices, and they are presented below.

First, Jim focused much of his attention on developing school-wide programs that enhanced the learning environment. Therefore, one possible explanation for the inconsistency between Jim's reader-based belief and interactive decision-making may be that he had very little time to plan instruction for his Chapter I students. Data obtained during an interview with Jim's principal support this argument:

Jim is extremely innovative. He puts in a lot of his own time. He stays after school (for his programs). He's got the Newspaper Club, the Future Teachers' Club, the Readers' Theater. He does just so many things around here. He also writes a lot of grants. He has brought a lot of money into this school...He puts in a lot of hard work.

Second, the lack of consistency between Jim's beliefs and decision-making may have been due to his having the opportunity to carry out his professional
role as a teacher in a manner that was suitable to him. Specifically, it was learned during a post-observation interview that Jim's principal rarely, if ever, transgressed on Jim's autonomy in instructional decision-making. Jim stated:

The principal backs me a 1000%. Well, it's not like I don't have reasons for what I do. I can explain (what I do). It's not as if I'm lazy. It's not as if I'm trying to avoid something or trying to get by. I have reasons for what I do, and I constantly monitor and adjust.

Data obtained during an interview with Jim's principal also support the argument that he performed his job with a large degree of autonomy and discretion. The principal stated:

One of the things that Jim and I talk about a lot is that he is very into research and so on. He's very up on things...I understand Jim and I agree with most of what he says. I think his ideas are certainly sound.

At another point during the interview, the principal explained why she supported Jim's instructional practices. She stated:
He does things a little bit differently. He deals a lot with the actual reading. He keeps good records. That's something that has to be done. Even though you say that it is more important that they're reading, you still have to keep some type of record of what they are doing...That's what they're always asking for, especially if it's a federal program, you know, there are federal guidelines.

He reads along with the kids and has them read along with him. He does a lot with the reading and writing connection, which I really like. He will have them read a story and then have them write about it. I think that's something we need to stress.

Thus, it appeared that Jim, in his principal's opinion, was a valuable asset to the school's academic success. This finding supports Fraatz's (1987) argument that principals' rewards are based largely on the positive relationships they have with their teachers. Cohen and Murnane (1985) described this as a skewed dependency relationship. Specifically, they stated:
Principals depend on teachers more than they depend on them... A good principal can help teachers, of course, but good principals are not required for teachers to do their jobs. Principals, by contrast, need teachers who do good work if their school is to run well-- and if the principal is to be seen as doing a good job. A pack of poor teachers can probably do more to wreck a principal's working life, and perhaps his reputation, than poor principals can do to damage teachers' work and reputations. (pp. 25-26)

The principal at Jim's school depended on him to direct the school-wide learning programs and was most appreciative of his hard work. As a result, Jim was granted a great deal of autonomy and discretion in carrying out his role as a Chapter I reading teacher.

Third, the regular classroom teacher appeared to have little, if any, influence on Jim's instructional practices in the pull-out class. From statements made during an interview session with the regular teacher, it was learned that the two communicated on a regular basis; however, it seemed that Jim attempted to supplement her classroom reading instruction using methods and materials that he thought were appropriate
(e.g., the choral reading of trade books).
Specifically, the regular classroom teacher stated:

We communicate on a daily basis. He'll tell me things that they are doing and lots of times he'll come back in the room and show the rest of the kids things they have done. Especially if they've done something super neat that day...I think he reinforces it (reading instruction that takes place in the regular classroom) or goes over it in his own way, whatever type of thing we are working on.

The only exception to this occurred when Jim instructed in the regular classroom via the push-in model. For instance, as Jim provided in-class instruction, his attention focused on guiding a student as he completed a skill-driven practice sheet for the Metropolitan Achievement Test 6. (It is important to note that this constraint was placed on the classroom teacher and Jim by officials at the state and local school district level.)

Finally, it is interesting that the principal's and regular classroom teacher's responses to the two instruments that targeted the theoretical positions about reading, as well as their choice of lesson
plans, were similar to Jim's responses in that they were both consistently reader-based. The similarity in beliefs about reading may have contributed to Jim's large degree of autonomy in instructional decision-making. That is, the principal's and the regular classroom teacher's view of reading and their acceptance of his stated instructional practices may have contributed to the rapport among them.

In sum, the consistency between Jim's reader-based belief and stated preactive planning may have been due to his knowledge of current research that supports whole language learning. The inconsistency between his beliefs and interactive decision-making may have been due to his focusing too much attention on school-wide programs. As a result, Jim had very little time to plan adequately for instruction so that he could put whole language theory into practice. Further, it seemed that Jim had the opportunity to carry out his professional role as a Chapter I teacher in a manner that was suitable to him, except when constraints were imposed by officials at the state and district level.
Teacher C. Next on the continuum is Emily. Her reader-based belief about reading was inconsistent with her preactive planning but consistent with her interactive decision-making. A discussion of the results that relate to Emily's instructional practices follows.

The lack of consistency between Emily's reader-based belief and preactive planning was likely due to her need to support the school's basal reading program, while the consistency between her beliefs about reading and her interactive decision-making was a result of having the opportunity to choose her own teaching methodology and materials. During an interview with Emily's principal, the researcher obtained information to support this argument. The principal stated:

Emily, the reading teacher, does small group reading. She also does planning with the teachers on individual needs of children with skills. She extends the skills that they are working on rather than just pulling children and working on her own program of skills. So there is a correlation between what students are doing in the classroom and what they are doing in small groups.
Here Emily plans with teachers. She takes time in her schedule and goes and talks to the teachers about individual students. Emily asks, 'What are you working on in reading that I need to reinforce?'...Here there is a lot of interaction between the regular teacher and Emily. I think that is the real strength to the program. So if a child is working on something in the classroom, he's also being reinforced with that in his small group area.

Additionally, it was apparent that the principal placed importance on the achievement tests that were administered district-wide. For instance, when asked how she determined if the Chapter I reading program at her school was successful, the principal replied:

Part of that is done with individual conferences with teachers...and of course we look at testing information.

Therefore, it seemed that the principal's perception of Emily's professional role was to reinforce the school's skill-driven basal reading program, and this may be one explanation as to why Emily's instructional planning focused on supporting the regular classroom reading instruction.
Similarly, the regular classroom teacher perceived that Emily's instructional role was to support her skills-based reading program. The following statement from the regular classroom teacher supports this argument:

On a regular basis each week, Emily is informed as to what skills we're working on in the classroom, skills that the children need extra one-on-one help with, or help that she can give them. She has a form that we fill out. It's great because she's real good about reinforcing all of the skills that the kids need extra help on, as well as the minimum skills that they are going to be tested on.

Further support for the argument that Emily's purpose was to support the regular classroom teacher's instructional agenda was found as Emily instructed in the regular classroom. In particular, on the day that Emily was observed in the regular classroom, she worked with four of her students individually on regular classroom assignments. For instance, Emily examined and discussed with the learners their basal workbook and spelling assignments.
As for the consistency between Emily's reader-based belief and interactive decision-making, this was due to her having the opportunity to use teaching methods and materials of her choice. The following statement from the principal supports this thought:

You can pretty much do what you want with the (Chapter I) program. You can take it as far as you want or do as little with it as you want.

Furthermore, it seemed that Emily worked at maintaining rapport with the regular classroom teachers and, at times, this appeared to be a possible constraint. For example, during one observational session, the regular classroom teacher chose not to send her learners to Emily's room for instruction. When asked how she felt about the regular classroom teacher's decision, Emily stated:

I don't like that, but I am the reading teacher and I am here to work with those teachers and if sometimes they feel like what they are doing is a little bit more important to them than what I am doing, I don't cause any waves. But I think they really should set aside time for me and I don't like it. But, I'm easy to work with.
I do run into problems like that from time to time, especially from the third-grade (teachers) because the teacher is so uptight over the Minimum Performance Test that her students have to pass. Very uptight...They (the regular teachers) want to know that they are the ones doing it (teaching). They want to know, 'Hey, I'm teaching these skills. I want them in here while I'm teaching them. You can do it just as well, but I want to know that I am doing it.'

The need to tread lightly on the regular classroom teacher's turf is supported by research conducted by Fraatz (1987). Fraatz argued that the Chapter I reading teacher is virtually powerless, if the regular classroom teacher decides not to take advantage of the program's services. This suggests that the Chapter I teacher is somewhat more dependent on the regular classroom teacher's discretionary decisions. As a result, the influence the Chapter I teacher has on the school's reading program is diminished.

Additionally, the principal's and regular classroom teacher's responses to the instruments that targeted the three explanations of reading were, as a whole, reader-based. Their responses, however, were
not as consistently reader-based as Emily's. The lack of consistency between the principal's, the regular classroom teacher's, and Emily's reader-based beliefs about reading and the school's skill-driven basal reading program may have been due to overriding factors (e.g., the need to use district-required materials and the need to follow state and local school district policy). However, within Emily's classroom domain, she had the freedom to select her own teaching methods, as well as materials. This supports Fraatz (1987) argument that the policy decisions from outside the classroom are mediated by those who are inside the classroom.

In summary, the inconsistency between Emily's reader-based belief and preactive planning may be due to her need to plan instruction that supported the school's skill-driven reading program, while the consistency between Emily's beliefs and interactive decision-making may likely be due to her freedom to implement her instructional plans in a manner that was suitable to her.

Teacher D. At the other end of the continuum is Deana, whose reader-based belief was consistent with her preactive planning and interactive
decision-making, except when she was constrained by the need to prepare her learners for state-mandated testing. Following is a discussion of the results that pertain to the consistency between Deana's beliefs and instructional practices.

The consistency between Deana's beliefs and instructional practices was likely a result of her school's literature/whole language approach to instruction. On the other hand, the inconsistency between her reader-based belief and instructional practices was a result of constraints placed on the teaching process at the state and local level. Interview data obtained from the principal and regular classroom teacher, as well as Deana, suggested that all three felt restricted by policy decisions made by those outside their school. However, it was up to the school's faculty to decide how they would implement school district policy. The following statement made by the principal supports this argument:

We are obligated to teach the objectives that the district wants us to teach. Because if we don't do that then we are not really doing what we are supposed to be doing according to district guidelines. We have to make sure we are teaching
things for the requirements of the state. You know, we have to teach the different skills. How we teach it is up to us, we feel, as long as they are taught.

Similarly, the regular classroom teacher shared her thoughts concerning the emphasis on following state and local policy. Her concern focused on testing. The regular teacher stated:

So many of the tests are biased against our children. I gave a practice test for the MPT (Minimum Performance Test) the other day and creek was on there and half the class came up and asked me what a creek was. Yet, they were supposed to supply a synonym for creek...They do know synonyms in their writing all the time. They do word webs with synonyms...They keep little books of synonyms for their own thesaurus...It's terrible that one test could carry so much weight.

Furthermore, the professional relationship between the principal and Deana, as well as Deana and the regular classroom teacher, influenced Deana's instructional practices. For instance, Deana felt that it was important that she support the regular classroom teacher's reading instruction. Interview
data obtained from the regular classroom teacher support this claim:

We're just a wonderful team. She works with us. She started out the school year working in the classroom more than pulling the students out. That worked really well, but I told her that since the MPT (Minimum Performance Test) was coming up and as much as we dislike the thing we are still held accountable. Unfortunately, our district puts all this weight on it. Because of that, I asked her to pull-out some kids and really work with them on skills that I had found they needed help on. She does what I say to do.

Further support for the claim that Deana's role was to support the regular classroom teacher's instructional agenda was found as Deana provided individual instruction via the push-in model. Specifically, as Deana worked one-on-one with a learner, her instruction focused on a practice sheet for the upcoming Minimum Performance Test that was to be administered district-wide. Deana chose to abandon her usual holistic instructional practices because the regular classroom teacher asked her to do so.
Additionally, the structure of the Chapter I reading program influenced Deana's instructional practices. As the principal stated:

We're revamping it (Chapter I), and it's becoming a support program rather than a pull-out program. I think it's been good for the children. The children have more time on task because they are not roaming the hallways going to the Chapter I room and then going back...We gain probably 15 minutes in instructional time.

The support program allows the Chapter I teacher to see what's going on in the regular classroom so we can give that child some support to succeed in the regular classroom rather than just feeling success in this isolated area. That person can become even more a part of the regular classroom. So I think it's working well.

Recent research (Meyer, Gelzheiser, Yelich, & Gallagher, 1990) supported the notion of in-class help via a push-in model. These researchers posited that this type of program design increases coordination between regular classroom instruction and Chapter I instruction and reduces the amount of time that Chapter I students spend away from regular academic instruction.
Although Deana's role was to support regular classroom instruction, she had the opportunity to decide how she was going to carry out her role as a Chapter I reading teacher. This was evident during the instructional sessions observed by the researcher, as well as by the following statement made by the school principal. He stated:

I do support their (the teachers') efforts. I do support the risk-taking and the experimentation. They know that if they try something out and it fails, that that's all it was. That is, they tried something and it failed.

But, they also know that I expect them to figure out what went wrong and correct it. Because it may have been a good idea, just something went wrong. Or, I expect them to look at it and say, 'This was a terrible idea and I'm never going to do it again.' They are professionals, and it should be up to them to decide how things go, not just me.

It is interesting to note that the principal's responses and regular classroom teacher's responses to the instruments that targeted the three explanations of reading were similar to Deana's in that they were
both consistently reader-based. It may be safe to assume that their belief systems were greatly influenced by their knowledge of current research that supports whole language learning, as well as the overall structure of the school's holistic approach to instruction. The similarity in beliefs may explain why Deana's professional relationship with the principal and regular classroom teacher was so positive. All three were strong advocates of whole language instruction and offered each other assistance and support as they carried out their professional responsibilities.

In short, the consistency between Deana's reader-based beliefs and instructional practices was due to the structure of the reading program at her school, as well as the professional support system that was operating within her school. However, when Deana's instruction stemmed from a text-based/mastery of specific skills explanation of reading, it was apparent that this was a result of constraints that were imposed on Deana, the principal, and regular classroom teacher at the state and local school district level.
Conclusions

The findings that are reported here are clearly related to previous research investigations that focused on Chapter I reading teachers, as well as studies that examined teachers' beliefs about how one reads and how reading ability develops (e.g., Allington et al., 1986; Fraatz, 1987; Kinzer, 1988). A discussion of how earlier findings relate to this investigation follows.

Kinzer (1988), who examined the consistency between elementary preservice and inservice teachers' beliefs and potential instructional practices, found that the two groups are likely to share the same theoretical orientations; however, inservice teachers' beliefs tended to be inconsistent with their potential instructional practices. In particular, Kinzer argued that the inconsistency may have been due to state and/or district level curriculum requirements to use a skills-based approach to instruction. Therefore, the inservice teachers' instructional practices may have reflected more of what is done, rather than what the teachers thought ought to be done.

Similarly, the findings that pertain to the Chapter I teachers of this study suggest that, in varying degrees, the teachers' belief systems were
constrained by state and local school district requirements. A good example of this was Deana, whose preactive planning and interactive decision-making consistently favored a reader-based/holistic explanation, except when she had to abandon her favored practices to prepare for state-mandated testing. Other researchers (e.g., Allington, 1986) have reached similar conclusions.

Additionally, it appeared that at each school, the Chapter I teacher's role was to support the school's regular reading program. As a result of the support system that existed at three of the schools, the data of this study fail to support previous research conducted by Allington et al. (1986). Specifically, Allington and his colleagues argued that there was little congruency between the regular classroom instruction and Chapter I instruction. In this district, there was a concerted effort on the part of three of the Chapter I teachers to offer instruction that was congruent with that of the regular classroom. This was most evident at Deana's school, where the Chapter I reading program was organized around a push-in model, for the most part. However, Jim's instructional agenda focused on his reading
curriculum, rather than that of the regular classroom teacher.

Ideally, the coordination of Chapter I instruction with that of the regular classroom teacher is needed, especially because the purpose of Chapter I is to supplement a child's reading instruction. However, Fraatz (1987) cautioned that by increasing coordination and requiring teachers to go into the regular classroom, schools may be creating an unintentional effect. Specifically, Fraatz stated:

Rather than permitting reading teachers to exert more systematic influence over teachers, 'coordination' helps teachers to exert more power over reading teachers. It permits the teacher to do a better job of informing the reading specialist (teacher) of her plans for the children having difficulty, and puts the teacher in a better position to obtain the reading specialist's (teacher's) consent and cooperation with her efforts...With the teacher's consent, reading specialists (teachers) can indeed provide 'help;' the question is whether the help they give teachers can also help students. (p. 83)
In interpreting the results of this study, the inconsistency between Mary's beliefs and decision-making and Emily's beliefs and planning may be a result of the power the regular classroom teachers appeared to have over their Chapter I instruction. At Mary's and Emily's respective schools, a strong emphasis was placed on the need to support the school's skill-driven reading program. As a result, the Chapter I teachers' plans appeared to be subordinate to those of the regular classroom teachers.

On the other hand, the Chapter I teachers of this study also had the opportunity, in varying degrees, to use teaching methods and materials that were consistent with their reader-based beliefs. For instance, Emily's preactive planning reflected a text-based/mastery of specific skills explanation of reading, but her decision-making stemmed from a reader-based/holistic explanation. This indicates that, although Emily's role was to support the regular reading program at her school, she had the opportunity to decide how this was to be done within her classroom domain. This finding supports Carter's (1984) argument that the type and content of Chapter I
instruction is largely at the discretion of those within individual schools.

In summary, the findings reported support the argument that the teaching culture lacks uniformity (Brousseau, Book, & Byers, 1988). Specifically, even though the four Chapter I teachers' view of the reading process stemmed from a reader-based/holistic explanation of reading, considerable variation existed between their beliefs and instructional practices. The differences that existed among the participants were a result of varying social, psychological, and environmental realities of the participants' respective schools that either created an opportunity for or constrained the teachers from implementing their reader-based beliefs in their instructional decision-making.

Although the research may be limited because only four Chapter I teachers participated, the results generally confirm previous research findings (e.g., Charlesworth, Hart, Burts, Hernandez, & Kirk, 1990; Duffy & Anderson, 1982; Duffy, Roehler, & Johnson, 1986; Hatch & Freeman, 1988) that indicated that the environmental conditions of a school may mitigate teachers' belief systems. Research on teacher
thinking is still in its infancy; thus, the study of teachers' theoretical orientations remains an important area of investigation. Recommendations for future research include extending the observational period, probing for more information concerning beliefs and ideal practices, observing additional Chapter I teachers at the primary-level, and addressing beliefs and practices of Chapter I teachers at the upper-elementary level.
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For the purpose of this study, the following terms are defined:

Chapter I reading programs (formerly Title I)—a federally funded compensatory education program intended to provide supplementary instruction for children who are educationally and economically disadvantaged (Allington, Stuetzel, Shake, & Lamarche, 1986).

differential acquisition—an explanation of reading development that suggests reading ability evolves differently depending on the individual ability of the learner. For less able readers, the development is skill-specific and teacher-generated; for more able readers, development is skill-general and student-generated (Leu & Kinzer, 1987).

holistic language learning—an explanation of reading development that is based on two beliefs: (a)
development takes place as students engage in purposeful and meaningful holistic learning activities, and (b) learning occurs largely in an inductive manner. That is, learners are thought to make generalizations as they read that are based on prior experiences with print and observations of others reading (Leu & Kinzer, 1987).

**interactive model of reading**—an explanation of reading that suggests an interaction occurs between the reader and the text (Rumelhart, 1985). This explanation assumes: (a) meaning exists in the reader as well as in the text; (b) reading involves translation and the formulation of hypotheses about meaning; and (c) knowledge sources interact simultaneously as one reads (Leu & Kinzer, 1987).

**interactive phase of instruction**—that period of instruction when teachers are interacting with students as they implement their instructional plans (Clark & Peterson, 1986).

**mastery of specific skills**—an explanation of reading development that is based on two beliefs: (a) reading
development is a result of direct instruction in specific reading skills, and (b) direct instruction is conducted by a teacher in a deductive manner (Leu & Kinzer, 1987).

preactive phase of instruction—that period when teachers prepare for instruction that will occur during the interactive phase (Clark & Peterson, 1986).

teacher beliefs—a cognitive structure of personally held perceptions about the causes of student performance (Clark & Peterson, 1986).

teacher thought processes—the thinking, planning, decision-making, implicit beliefs that underlie teacher behavior (Clark & Peterson, 1986).

theoretical orientation—a personally held belief and value system that guides individual teachers' thought processes (Clark & Peterson, 1986).

text-based model of reading—an explanation of reading that suggests a reader translates a written message into sounds to discover meaning in a text (Gough,
1985). Three assumptions underlie this explanation of the reading process: (a) meaning exists more in the text than in the reader; (b) reading consists of translating printed words into sounds and then sounds to meaning; and (c) readers begin at the lowest level of knowledge (decoding) and move sequentially to higher levels (vocabulary, syntactic, discourse) of knowledge (Kinzer, 1987).

**Reader-based model of reading**—an explanation of reading that suggests a reader's prior knowledge is used to predict meaning from print (Goodman, 1985). Three assumptions underlie this explanation of reading: (a) meaning exists more in the reader than in the printed message; (b) rather than translating words into sounds and sounds into meaning, the reader makes guesses or forms expectations about upcoming words; and (c) readers begin at higher levels (vocabulary, syntactic, discourse) of knowledge (Leu & Kinzer, 1987).
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This review of the literature first discusses the implementation of Chapter I reading programs and includes a review of research investigations that focused specifically on these programs. Next is a discussion of teacher thought processes, a relatively new area of study. In particular, this section is organized around three categories that make up the domain of teachers' thought processes: (a) teacher beliefs, (b) teacher planning, and (c) teachers' interactive thoughts (Clark & Peterson, 1986). The review then concludes with a discussion of research that examined the consistency between teachers' beliefs about the reading process and their instructional practices.

Chapter I Reading Programs

In an effort to fight the effects of poverty in America, Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. One of the ESEA's main goals was to improve educational opportunities of children who were educationally and economically disadvantaged. To achieve this goal, local school
districts were given federal fiscal support through the ESEA's Title I program so that they could provide supplemental instruction to children in economically poorer regions of the nation. Sixteen years after its inception, Title I became Chapter I of the Educational Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) of 1981. (For the purpose of this review of literature, both programs will be referred to as Chapter I.) As a result of the change, individual school districts were given more freedom in Chapter I program planning; however, the overall purpose and goals of the program remained the same.

Over the past 25 years, Chapter I has grown to the point that almost every school district (approximately 90%) across the nation receives federal funding through ECIA for remedial instruction; roughly 20% of the elementary students of these districts participate in Chapter I programs. To date, billions of dollars have been spent (over $4 billion a year) and millions of students have received Chapter I program services. As Allington, Steutzel, Shake, and Lamarche (1986) noted, "remedial reading programs are a pervasive aspect of American elementary schools" (p. 15).
Based on the belief that environmental factors underlie reading failure and thus greatly affect a child's ability to learn to read (Allington & McGill-Franzen, 1989), Chapter I attempts to achieve its purpose of enhancing the reading achievement of disadvantaged children by providing supplemental assistance. Therefore, Chapter I schools are selected based on economic criteria (i.e., free lunch eligibility) and low standardized achievement test scores. Within selected schools, students who are reading below grade level may receive Chapter I program services.

Chapter I program services have traditionally been provided in small group settings (6-10 students). The most common program design is the pull-out class, which requires Chapter I students to leave the regular classroom for additional instruction. Typically, students who qualify for program services leave the regular classroom at a scheduled time and go to another location within the same school building to receive additional reading instruction from a Chapter I teacher. Some school districts also use a push-in design, wherein the Chapter I teacher provides
instruction to eligible students in the regular classroom.

However, despite the fact that the federal government has spent billions of dollars over the past two decades in an effort to foster the literacy development of economically and educationally disadvantaged children through ECIA's Chapter I program, research indicates that the program has not reached the level of success that people had hoped it would have (Cooley, 1981).

**Overview of Research on Chapter I Reading Programs**

Although Chapter I began with much optimism, several researchers have argued that the program has not achieved its original goal of fostering the reading achievement of the children it serves. For example, Carter (1984), who conducted a comprehensive 6-year study of Chapter I programs, examined the interaction between the regular school program and Chapter I compensatory education.

Specifically, Carter collected data on roughly 120,000 students in a representative sample of over 300 elementary schools throughout the nation. Using a complex research design, Carter collected various
sources of data that consisted of (a) student achievement scores, (b) student attitude measures, (c) reports of teacher and principal practices, (d) ethnographic material of high-poverty schools, (e) measures of economic status, (f) measures of parental attitude toward learning, and (g) information on the resources and services that were provided to each student during Chapter I instruction. From his analysis, Carter indicated that Chapter I is better defined as a massive federal funding program, rather than a unified and cohesive educational program. Specifically, Carter stated that "Title I is a funding program and the resulting educational treatment is as varied as can be imagined" (p. 12).

Allington (1986), in his review of research on Chapter I programs, agreed with Carter's argument by stating: "The current structure of compensatory reading programs has seldom been guided by research on effective instructional practice and more often influenced by policies designed to ensure compliance with program regulations" (p. 262). Other researchers also concurred with Carter's argument. For example, Levin (1977) indicated that "the ostensible inability
of Title I programs to create even a nominal impact on student scores in basic skills seemed to be endemic to the program" (p. 156). Kaestle and Smith (1982) summed up their assessment of Chapter I's effectiveness by stating: "Title I program stands primarily as a symbol of national concern for the poor rather than as a viable response to their needs" (p. 400).

Other researchers (Allington et al., 1986) described the nature of Chapter I reading programs and identified components of the program that were problematic. These researchers concluded that: (a) Chapter I programs lack coherence, (b) the methods used to monitor student progress are ineffective and unclear, (c) regular classroom instruction tends to be incongruent with Chapter I instruction, (d) very little direct instruction takes place with connected text, and (e) organizational factors have a greater influence on Chapter I's lack of success, rather than the inability of individual teachers.

The pull-out class has probably received the most criticism from researchers (e.g., Allington, 1986, 1987; Allington & Broikou, 1988; Johnston, Allington,
& Afflerbach, 1985; Kaestle & Smith, 1982; Kimbrough & Hill, 1981; Meyers, Gelzheiser, Yelich, & Gallagher, 1990). This type of program design separates remedial instruction from the core curriculum and, as a result, learners do not see a relationship between regular classroom instruction and remedial instruction (Allington & Shake, 1986).

Moreover, the segregation of remedial reading from the regular classroom reading may lead to cognitive confusion (Vernon, 1958), which is a principle related to curriculum congruence. That is, poor readers are likely to become confused if they participate in remedial reading programs that require them to have separate teachers, separate curricula, separate instructional locales, and separate materials. As a result, gains in reading achievement will not reach an optimal level (Allington & Shake, 1986; Allington et al., 1986).

Although Chapter I reading programs have received a great deal of criticism, students have benefited from the program's services (Allington, 1986). It appears that effective Chapter I programs are influenced by the following factors: (a) strong
instructional leadership from support staff (e.g., reading specialists) and/or administrators, (b) classrooms that have good management and organization, (c) clearly defined, articulated, attainable, and measurable goals, (d) an on-going monitoring of student progress, with this information used to improve educational programs, and (e) purposeful and meaningful learning activities (Allington, 1986; Cooley & Leinhardt, 1980; Crawford, 1989; Fraatz, 1987; Mackenzie, 1983).

From the studies discussed above, researchers have provided much insight into the instructional effectiveness of Chapter I reading programs; however, we still know very little about the thought processes of Chapter I teachers and their relationship to instructional practices. In particular, the majority of research previously discussed has been descriptive in nature, discussing what takes place in poor as well as good remedial reading classrooms. With a focus on only the observable behaviors of Chapter I teachers and students, reading researchers have failed to consider teacher thinking as an important influence on teacher effectiveness (Duffy & Ball, 1986). As Clark
and Peterson (1986) noted, "Thinking, planning, and decision-making of teachers constitutes a large part of the psychological context of teaching" (p. 255).

Teacher Thought Processes

The study of teacher thought processes, a relatively new area of investigation, is based on the belief that teachers' actions are affected by what they think (National Institute of Education, 1975). This approach to the study of teaching assumes that teachers' beliefs, planning, and interactive decision-making greatly influence their pedagogical practices in the classroom (Clark, 1988; Clark & Peterson, 1986). By examining teachers' thought processes, researchers develop "understandings of the uniquely human processes that guide and determine their behavior" (Clark & Yinger, 1979a, p. 231).

Philip Jackson, in his book Life in Classrooms (1968), was the first to bring attention to the importance of the study of teacher thought processes. His descriptive report, in sharp contrast to the then-popular process-product research designs, focused on the complexities of classroom life and the conceptual distinctions of the preactive and
interactive phases of teaching. Jackson argued that the mental life of teachers greatly influences their instructional effectiveness. Specifically, he stated that "beneath the surface of classroom events lies the complex world of individual psychology" (p. 172).

After Jackson's (1968) major contribution to the research on teaching, Clark and Peterson (1986) developed a model of teacher thought and action. The model, which provides a framework for organizing research on teaching, describes two important domains that are a part of the teaching process: (a) teachers' actions and observable effects and (b) teachers' thought processes. The action domain is concerned with observable phenomena and consists of: (a) student achievement, (b) students' classroom behavior, and (c) teachers' classroom behavior. Typically, process-product researchers have focused primarily on the relationships between these three variables in this domain.

In contrast, the model's domain of teachers' thought processes focuses on phenomena that are unobservable, and it is divided into three separate categories. These categories are: (a) teacher
planning, which includes teacher thinking prior to instruction (the preactive phase of teaching), as well as teacher thinking that occurs after instruction (the postactive phase of teaching); (b) teachers' thoughts during instruction (the interactive phase of teaching); and (c) teacher beliefs, that personally held knowledge that guides teachers' thoughts and actions. The research methods used to study the domain of teacher thought processes differ from the process-product paradigmatic approaches that were characteristic of previous research studies. Generally, researchers who focus on this aspect of the teaching process use methods that probe teachers' thoughts and decisions. (For a complete discussion of research methods used to study teacher thought processes, see Clark & Peterson, 1986.)

Clark and Peterson's model (1986) of teacher thought and action also includes constraints and opportunities as two important factors that influence the process of teaching. That is, factors such as educational facilities, available learning materials, school politics, and pressure from the school district's administrative personnel or local community
may constrain or empower teachers as they carry out the task of teaching. Findings from research suggest that the degree of responsibility and involvement given to teachers (i.e., constraints and opportunities) in the decision-making process has a great effect on productive schooling (Brophy & Good, 1986; Maeroff, 1988).

In short, Clark and Peterson's (1986) model identifies two important domains of teaching: (a) teachers' actions and observable affects and (b) teachers' thought processes. The study reported here focuses on the three categories that make up the domain of teachers' thought processes (i.e., teacher planning, teacher interactive thoughts and decisions, and teacher beliefs). For this reason, these categories will serve as organizing topics for the remainder of this review of literature. Teacher beliefs, which is the central focus of this study, will be reported first. Then, the researcher will discuss teacher planning, followed by teacher interactive thoughts and decision-making. The concluding discussion will concern research that has focused specifically on the consistency between
teachers' beliefs about the reading process and their instructional practices.

Teacher Beliefs

The study of teachers' thought processes is based on the assumption that their thinking and behaviors are governed by their personally held belief systems (Clark & Peterson, 1986). These belief systems represent knowledge structures, "that is, reasonably explicit 'propositions' about the characteristics of objects or object classes" (Nisbett & Ross, 1980, p. 28). In turn, the knowledge structures that form teachers' belief systems guide their perceptions and behaviors. According to Smith (1988):

What we have in our heads is a theory of what the world is like, a theory that is the basis of all perceptions and understanding of the world, the root of all learning, the source of hopes and fears, motives and expectancies, reasoning and creativity. And this theory is all we have. If we can make sense of the world at all, it is by interpreting our interactions with the world in the light of the theory. (p. 7)
Research on teachers' belief systems examines the psychological context in which the teachers plan and make instructional decisions. Clark and Peterson (1986) posited that the psychological context of an individual teacher is made up of "a mixture of only partially articulated theories, beliefs, and values about his or her role and about the dynamics of teaching and learning" (p. 287). Thus, inquiry of teachers' beliefs makes explicit the theories and beliefs which act as frames of reference for individual teachers to perceive and process information.

Harste and Burke (1977), who were among the first to argue that the teaching of reading is theoretically-based, defined theoretical orientation in reading as "a particular knowledge and belief system held toward reading" (p. 32). Drawing on their observational and interview data of students and teachers, Harste and Burke argued that this belief system establishes expectancies and influences teachers during the preactive and interactive phases of reading instruction. In short, Harste and Burke stated that "both the teaching and learning of reading are theoretically based" (p. 39). Rupley and Logan
(1984) agreed with this viewpoint by stating that "beliefs about reading influence elementary teachers' decisions" (p. 15).

A study conducted by Duffy (1977) examined teachers' conceptions of reading. The study, which consisted of two phases, first described the teachers' conceptions of reading based on six separate approaches to instruction. These approaches were: (a) basal text, (b) linear skills, (c) natural language, (d) interest, (e) integrated whole, and (f) confused/frustrated, which was later added. Results indicated that 37 of the 350 teachers possessed strong unitary conceptions of reading. From the pool of 37, Duffy selected 8 to participate in the second phase of the study.

The purpose of the second phase of Duffy's (1977) study was to compare the teachers' beliefs with their actual classroom practices. Based on an analysis of ethnographic field notes and postobservation interview data, Duffy found that four of the teachers' belief systems were consistent with their classroom practices; the other four teachers' belief systems, in varying degrees, were inconsistent with their
classroom practices. Overall, Duffy concluded that the teachers who departed from their beliefs may have been constrained by the required school curriculum and the level of student abilities.

Subsequently, DeFord (1985) developed and validated an instrument to determine teachers' theoretical orientations in reading instruction. The instrument, the Theoretical Orientation to Reading Profile (TORP), categorized the theoretical orientations of reading into three broad groups. These theoretical orientations were: (a) phonics, (b) skills, and (c) whole language. DeFord pointed out that while the three types of theoretical orientations were characteristically different, they were to be viewed as points on a continuum of instruction, with phonics and whole language falling at the two extremes and skills falling in the middle. DeFord further explained that there were points of overlap in instructional practices, specifically in areas in proximity to another orientation. That is, the phonics and skills orientations had a tendency to share practices, as did the skills and whole language orientations.
DeFord's (1985) research supported Smith's (1988) argument that we construct a theory of the world, and we make sense of our interactions with the world in light of the theory. Thus, in the teaching of reading, teachers' theoretical orientations toward reading "act as filters in perceiving, understanding, organizing and acting upon experiences in that world" (DeFord, 1985, p. 363). In short, DeFord's instrument (TORP) provides a means to identify teachers' beliefs about reading. However, as DeFord pointed out, to develop a better understanding of teacher belief systems in particular and teachers' thought processes in general, researchers need to examine teachers' thoughts and decision-making in light of their theoretical orientations during the planning and interactive phases of teaching. For this reason, a discussion of teacher planning follows.

**Teacher Planning**

Teacher planning, which occurs during the preactive phase of instruction, has been defined as "a set of basic psychological processes in which a person visualizes the future, inventories means and ends, and constructs a framework to guide his or her future
actions" (Clark & Peterson, 1986, p. 260). Research on teacher planning assumes that teachers' plans are influenced by their beliefs about the learning process, their perceptions of the instructional task that is to be carried out, and the information they have about their students (Borko, Cone, Russo, & Shavelson, 1979).

Teacher planning, an integral part of teachers' professional lives, can be viewed as a psychological process as well as a practical activity (Clark & Peterson, 1986). Furthermore, findings from research investigations on teacher planning indicate that planning serves a variety of purposes. For instance, Clark and Yinger (1979b) identified three functions of teacher planning: (a) to meet immediate individual needs (e.g., to foster confidence and security, as well as to find a sense of purpose and direction); (b) to determine a means to an end of instruction (e.g., to organize and determine time and activity flow); and (c) to serve as a direct function during instructional interactions in the classroom (e.g., to formulate a systematic and organized instructional framework).
Although some researchers have focused their investigations on why teachers plan, others have examined the connection between teacher planning and teacher behavior during classroom interactions. For example, Zahorik (1970), who conducted one of the initial studies of teacher planning, studied two groups of teachers to determine the effect of planning on the teachers' actual classroom behavior. He gave one group a lesson plan two weeks before it was to be taught; it included a list of objectives and an outline of the material to be discussed. The other group was asked to reserve an hour of their instructional time to perform a task for the researcher, but the group was not told the nature of the task. The teachers of the two groups, those who were prepared and unprepared, then taught a lesson that was audiotaped by the researcher. In his analysis of the lessons, Zahorik focused on the teachers' sensitivity to their learners, which was defined as "verbal acts of the teacher that permitted, encouraged, and developed pupils' ideas, thoughts, and actions" (p. 144). Overall, Zahorik concluded that: (a) teachers who planned were less sensitive to their learners' creativity than those who had not planned,
and (b) teachers who did not plan made more interactive decisions that sparked their learners curiosity and originality.

Another study (Smith & Sendelbach, 1979) also indicated that teachers' plans influence their teaching behaviors during classroom instruction. Smith and Sendelbach, using four sixth-grade teachers as subjects, examined how the teachers transformed detailed and explicit directions found in an instructional unit of a teacher's guide into teaching plans for their respective students. The research findings indicated that the teachers formulated a mental picture of the lesson to be taught, which included a sequence of activities, and the responses that the students were likely to make. Smith and Sendelbach posited that teachers have specific expectations concerning their lesson plans, and instead of following the instructions found in the teacher's manual, teachers implement the plans held in their memories. Similarly, other studies of teacher planning have indicated that teachers formulate a task to carry out in their minds, and it functions as a mental image (cf. Morine-Dershimer, 1978-1979), a plan
(cf. Shavelson, 1973), or script (Schank & Abelson, 1977).

Furthermore, for the purpose of examining the relationship between the actual teaching behavior and the published curriculum material, Smith and Sendelbach (1979) observed one of the four science teachers while teaching the unit. From their analysis, the researchers concluded that the teacher's actual classroom instruction deviated from the instructional unit plan found in the teacher's guide and, as a result, instruction was less effective. Smith and Sendelbach argued that the deviations, both planned and unplanned, were due to: (a) the teacher's lack of knowledge of the subject matter, (b) the teacher's inability to locate pertinent information in the teacher's manual, and (c) the inclusion of concepts that were difficult to understand.

In the research literature on teacher planning, researchers have also provided descriptions of the planning process of teachers. For instance, after his initial 1970 investigation of teacher planning, Zahorik (1975) directed his attention to describing the teacher planning process in a study in which he
asked 194 teachers to list in writing the decisions they made before teaching and to specify the order in which the decisions were made. Zahorik concluded that the teachers focused primarily on pupil activities and instructional content rather than the development of lesson objectives and purposes. In sum, the teachers of Zahorik's study were more concerned with smooth activity flow during classroom instruction instead of pupil understanding of the material to be presented.

Peterson, Marx, and Clark (1978) continued this line of inquiry in a laboratory investigation by observing and audiotaping 12 teachers as they prepared an instructional unit for a small group of secondary-level students. During the planning sessions, the teachers were asked to think aloud, and their verbal statements were recorded and later coded into specific planning categories that included objectives, materials, subject matter, and instructional processes. Similar to other research findings (e.g., Goodlad & Klein, 1970; Zahorik, 1975), the researchers found that the teachers spent most of their time thinking about the content to be taught. After content, the teachers focused their thoughts on
instructional processes (i.e., strategies and activities). Finally, the least amount of time was spent planning instructional objectives.

The findings of Morine-Dershimer and Vallance (1976) were consistent with those reported by Peterson, Marx, and Clark (1978) and Zahorik (1975). Specifically, Morine-Dershimer and Vallance analyzed written plans for two experimenter-prescribed lessons that were taught by 20 teachers of second and fifth grades during small group instruction. One lesson plan was in the area of mathematics, and the other was in reading. From their analysis, the researchers concluded that the teachers focused little attention on lesson goals and objectives, diagnosis of students' needs, or alternative approaches to instruction. Rather, the teachers' written lesson plans tended to follow detailed outline formats.

These studies, taken together, indicated that the teacher planning process serves specific functions and influences what teachers do during classroom interactions. Overall, these research findings suggested that: (a) teachers focus more on the content to be covered, learning activities, and the
smooth flow of activity, rather than the development of pupil understanding; and (b) the creation of a mental image of a lesson during the preactive phase of teaching greatly influences what occurs during classroom interactions. Although research on teacher planning has contributed to our understanding of teacher thinking, to gain more insight into teacher thought processes, we must look beyond the planning process and study the ways teachers implement their instructional plans during the interactive phase of teaching.

Teachers' Interactive Thoughts

The study of teacher thought processes has also focused on the thinking that teachers do during actual classroom interactions with students. Typically, the study of teachers' interactive thoughts focuses on "the perceptions, reflections, interpretations, or anticipations that teachers have during teaching about any component of the teaching-learning process" (Armour-Thomas, 1989, p. 30). The rationale for such a focus is summarized in the following statement by Clark and Yinger (1979a):
The teacher is seen as constantly assessing the situation, processing information about the situation, making decisions about what to do next, guiding action on the basis of these decisions, and observing the effects of the action on students. (p. 247)

However, the thinking that teachers do during the interactive phase of teaching is difficult for researchers to study because it takes place in the complicated social and physical context of the classroom (Duffy & Ball, 1986). Despite this liability, researchers have attempted to learn more about teachers' thoughts during this important phase of teaching.

Specifically, those who examine teachers' interactive thoughts are concerned with the environmental cues as well as teacher characteristics that cause teachers to make decisions to change preplanned instructional activities or their classroom behaviors (Borko, Shavelson & Stern, 1981; Clark & Peterson, 1986). For instance, a teacher may choose to change the focus of a lesson based on the opinion that the students are failing to understand the subject matter, or a change in plans may be called for
if classroom behavior is inappropriate. In short, an interactive decision is defined as "a deliberate choice to implement a specific action" (Clark & Peterson, 1986, p. 274).

To increase our understanding of the decision-making processes of teachers during actual classroom instruction, two theoretical models have been designed. Peterson and Clark's (1978) model is based on the assumption that environmental stimuli (e.g., student behavior) trigger teacher decision-making. However, Shavelson and Stern (1981), in their model of teacher decision-making during teaching, suggested that teachers follow well-established routines.

Peterson and Clark (1978), who based their model on Snow's (1972) description of teacher thinking during the interactive phase as a cyclical process, begins with an observation of student behavior, followed by a decision of whether the student behavior is within tolerable limits. If student behavior is not within toleration, the teacher has two choices: (a) to continue the teaching process or (b) to select alternative teaching behaviors and strategies that are
stored in memory that will bring the behavior to desirable limits. However, if the teacher does not have knowledge of alternatives for instruction, then the lesson will continue as planned. In sum, according to Peterson and Clark, teachers' interactive decisions are based on student behaviors that serve as stimuli. Researchers (e.g., Duffy & Ball, 1986; Peterson & Clark, 1978) who have focused on teacher decision-making during the interactive phase indicated that teachers rarely take into consideration alternative courses of action when instruction is going poorly.

Based on studies conducted by Joyce (1978-1979), Peterson and Clark (1978), Shavelson (1976), and Snow (1972), an alternative model of teachers' interactive decision-making was proposed by Shavelson and Stern (1981). Underlying their model is the assumption that teachers follow set routines during classroom instruction and when student behavior deviates from the teacher's mental picture of the way classroom events ought to be, the teacher is forced to consider alternative courses of action. Shavelson and Stern posited:
Teachers' interactive teaching may be characterized as carrying out well-established routines. In carrying out the routine, the teacher monitors the classroom, seeking cues, such as student participation, for determining whether the routine is proceeding as planned. This monitoring is probably automatic as long as the cues are within an acceptable tolerance. However, if the teacher judges the cue to be outside tolerance, the teacher has to decide if immediate action is called for. (p. 483)

In comparing the two models, Peterson and Clark (1978) proposed that the interactive decision-making of teachers involves the observation of student behaviors, which serve as cues, to determine if the cues are within tolerance. In Shavelson and Stern's model (1981), the interactive decision-making process of teachers is triggered only when student behaviors fall below tolerable limits. Otherwise, the teacher follows a set of well-established routines.

Although the two models of interactive decision-making increased our understanding of teacher thinking during instruction, both assumed that the only cue
teachers use in making interactive decisions is student behavior. Due to this shortcoming, Clark and Peterson (1986), in their review of the literature concerning teachers' interactive decisions, argued that the two models are no longer sufficient. Instead, they posited:

A model of teacher interactive decision-making should reflect the finding that the majority of teachers' reported interactive decisions are preceded by factors other than judgments made about the student. These factors might include judgments about the environment, the teacher's state of mind, or the appropriateness of a particular teaching strategy. Thus, while a large proportion of a teacher's interactive decisions do seem to occur as a result of a teacher's judgment about student behavior, a model that focuses only on student behavior as the antecedent of teacher interactive decisions (as in the Peterson & Clark and Shavelson & Stern models) does not accurately portray the process involved in teacher interactive decision-making. (p. 277)
As Clark and Peterson (1986) pointed out, to be an accurate representation of decision-making, a model should identify other important factors that influence teachers' decisions about instruction. For example, a teacher's instructional decision-making may be affected by the educational facilities, available resources, school policies, pressure from the community or administration, the teacher's educational and professional experiences, as well as the teacher's beliefs concerning the learning process. Any of these factors could limit or extend the alternative strategies that are available for the teacher to use in a particular teaching episode (Borko et al., 1979; Brousseau, Book, & Byers, 1988).

Throughout this review of literature is the assertion that teachers are decision makers during the preactive and interactive phases of instruction. Furthermore, to gain a better understanding of the thought processes of teachers, researchers must examine: (a) how and why teachers make particular instructional decisions and (b) the relationship between teachers' decisions and classroom behaviors. In so doing, researchers must take into consideration teachers' personally held belief systems that govern their decisions and behaviors.
Research on teachers' theoretical orientations, for the most part, has been an attempt to identify and delineate their personally held belief systems. In the area of reading, the majority of research has focused on specifying teachers' beliefs about the reading process. However, few studies go beyond this point to determine the influence teachers' beliefs have on their instructional practices. Yet, to develop a useful and thorough understanding of teacher thinking, researchers must study the relationships that exist between teachers' beliefs, planning, and interactive thoughts and decisions. Realizing the need for research in this area, Kinzer (1988) investigated whether or not preservice and inservice teachers' belief systems differ and whether the two groups' potential instructional practices were consistent/inconsistent with their belief systems. To follow is a discussion of Kinzer's study.

Comparison of Teachers' Beliefs and Teaching Practices

Previous research findings (e.g., Griffin, Barnes, Hughes, O'Neal, Desino, Edwards, & Hukill, 1983; Magliaro & Borko, 1985; Tabachnick & Zeichener, 1985,
Zeichener & Tabachnick, 1985) indicated that preservice and inservice teachers' instructional practices differed. Specifically, researchers have argued that preservice and inservice teachers: (a) interact differently with students, (b) use contrasting classroom management systems, and (c) have varying planning behaviors. Based on these findings, Kinzer (1988) attempted to determine: (a) if the difference between these two groups was due to differing theoretical beliefs about the reading process and (b) if the two groups of teachers made instructional choices that were consistent with their individual belief systems.

First, to identify the preservice and inservice teachers' theoretical orientations, Kinzer (1988) used two instruments that targeted three explanations concerning the reading process. These explanations, presented as models of reading, are labeled text-based (Gough, 1985), reader-based (Goodman, 1985), and interactive (Rumelhart, 1985). Text-based models of reading assume that the meaning comes from the text and that the reader must make sense of the text. Reader-based models of reading assume that the meaning
comes from the reader's mind, and thus the goal of the reader is to bring meaning to the text. The interactive model of reading assumes that the meaning is both in the text and in the reader, that an interaction occurs, and that the goal of the reader is to use prior knowledge along with the text to construct meaning.

Second, to determine if the teachers' belief systems were consistent with their instructional practices, Kinzer (1988) provided each teacher with a packet that contained three sets of lesson plans that focused on the areas of decoding, vocabulary, and comprehension. Within each set were three kinds of lessons, based on the three explanations of the reading process: text-based, reader-based, and interactive. Individually, the teachers were asked to carefully read the lesson plans and then to select one from each set that they would ideally choose for a group of second-grade students.

Data analysis indicated that: (a) preservice and inservice teachers shared similar belief systems, although preservice teachers tended to be more reader-based oriented; (b) both inservice and preservice
teachers, whose theoretical orientations stemmed from a reader-based explanation, tended to select vocabulary and comprehension lessons that reflected their beliefs; and (c) teachers in both groups who had text-based or interactive orientations of reading did not select lessons that were consistent with their belief systems.

Overall, Kinzer (1988) concluded that preservice and inservice teachers are likely to share the same theoretical orientations; however, inservice teachers' beliefs tended to be inconsistent with their choice of lesson plans. Specifically, Kinzer posited that this may have been because most primary-level teachers are required to teach from what is basically a skills-based approach to reading instruction that is mandated by state or district curriculum management systems. Therefore, the teachers' responses may have reflected more of what is done, rather than what the teachers thought should be done. Similar studies (e.g., Duffy & Anderson, 1982; Duffy, Roehler, & Johnson, 1986) supported Kinzer's viewpoint by arguing that the environmental realities of the classroom cause teachers to mitigate their personally held belief systems.
Although Kinzer's (1988) study is an important contribution to the research literature on teachers' belief systems, he did not include classroom observations for the purpose of gaining insight into the relationship between the teachers' belief systems and actual instructional practices. Therefore, researchers need to continue this line of inquiry by examining the match between teachers' beliefs and instructional practices. As Kinzer stated: "Further research is needed to identify the effects of the specific explanations for how reading takes place and how reading ability develops on teacher decision-making" (p. 370).

Finally, the recent past has included many investigations of teacher thought processes. However, only a small portion of the literature on teacher thinking concerns teachers' theoretical orientations concerning the reading process, and none concerns that of Chapter I reading teachers. As Clark and Peterson (1986) stated, "Research on teachers' theories constitutes the smallest and youngest part of the literature of research on teacher thinking" (p. 285).
In this study, then, the researcher chose to examine Chapter I reading teachers' theoretical orientations and thought processes and their relationship to actual classroom practices. Specifically, the major questions of interest were:

1. What are Chapter I teachers' beliefs about how one reads and how reading ability develops?
2. Is there consistency between Chapter I teachers' beliefs and preactive planning?
3. How do Chapter I teachers implement their instructional plans during the interactive phase of teaching?
4. Is there consistency between Chapter I teachers' beliefs, preactive planning, and interactive decision-making?
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PILOT STUDY

The purpose of the pilot study was to determine the following information:

1. The amount of time needed for various facets of the study (e.g., time to complete the screening instruments).

2. The clarity of the directions and items on the screening instruments.

3. The feasibility of the planned procedure in collecting relevant data from multiple sources.

4. The appropriateness of the analysis methodology for examining the data collected.

The pilot study was conducted with Chapter I reading teachers who were representative of the target population. Specifically, the researcher administered the screening instruments to two, primary-level Chapter I reading teachers in a large, southern metropolitan school district and then she observed and audiotaped 2 instructional sessions conducted by each teacher. At the conclusion of each observation, the researcher conducted unstructured interviews that focused on the purpose of the study.
Materials that were relevant to the planning for and implementation of instruction were also collected during the pilot study. These included the collection of lesson plans and small group instructional materials.

Upon completion of the pilot study, those questions that were developed prior to the study were addressed. It was determined that: (a) the amount of time needed for various facets of the research study was feasible; (b) the instruments were self-explanatory; (c) the procedure for data collection was realistic; and (d) the planned analysis was appropriate for the purpose of the study.
APPENDIX D

PROFESSIONAL INFORMATION FORM
Professional Information Form

Name ____________________________________________

School ___________________________________________

Please list (a) each degree you have earned, (b) the year you received it, and (c) your major.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List each graduate course you have completed in reading education and the year it was taken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many years have you been teaching? ______________

How many years have you been a Chapter I reading teacher? ___________
APPENDIX E

HOW ONE READS INSTRUMENT
Please read the following 15 statements and then indicate which five from a classroom, instructional standpoint are most important or valid. It is vital that exactly five statements be chosen, no less, no more.

1. Before children can comprehend, they must be able to recognize all of the words on a page.
2. Children's knowledge about the world plays a major role in their comprehension during reading.
3. Children who are weak at word recognition skills can not overcome this weakness with strengths at other levels of the comprehension process.
4. Before young children read about something, it would be useful for them to share an experience similar to that depicted in the text.
5. There can only be one acceptable answer to a question from a story.
6. Teachers should give equal emphasis to instruction at each of the levels in the comprehension process.
7. If children are weak at one level of the comprehension process, it is still possible for them to read and comprehend.
8. The meaning of a story is a joint product of the text and reader.
9. We should expect and encourage children to have different interpretations of a story.
10. If readers do not comprehend a text in the way an author intended, we can say they have misunderstood the text.
11. Teachers should always find out what children know about the topic of each story before they begin reading.
12. When children retell a story, they should try to use the author's words.
13. Readers' expectations are as important as accurate word recognition during the reading process.
14. A child does not always read in the same way.
15. The best readers are those who have learned to be accurate in their expectations for upcoming text.

Of the above statements, which are the five most important, or most relevant for teachers? Please choose no less and no more than five, and write the numbers of your choices below.

Please return this sheet in the envelope provided.
APPENDIX F

HOW READING ABILITY DEVELOPS INSTRUMENT
Please read the following 15 statements and then indicate which five from a classroom, instructional standpoint are most important or valid. It is vital that exactly five statements be chosen, no less, no more.

1. It is important that teachers use direct, precise instructional methods during reading instruction.
2. Children should receive many opportunities to read materials unrelated to specific school learning tasks.
3. Understanding the nature of the skill you want to teach should determine how it is taught.
4. Reading, writing, speaking and listening are closely related reading tasks.
5. Children learn reading best when the task is broken down into specific skills to be taught by the teacher.
6. Children should be tested frequently to determine if they have learned what is taught. These tests should match very closely the nature of the instruction.
7. It is more difficult to use direct instruction to teach children how to reason while they are reading than it is to use direct instruction to teach them how to recognize a word like "because".
8. Children should be read to frequently when they are young so that they can acquire a "feel" for what reading is like.
9. Opportunities should be created in the classroom to provide children with a reason to read.
10. Children in the younger grades have different instructional needs when compared to children in older grades.
11. Teachers should have a list of separate reading skills appropriate for their grade level and should make certain that each student masters these skills.
12. Much of what children learn about reading can be attributed directly to what a teacher taught in the classroom.
13. One would present word recognition skills differently than one would present the "moral" of a fable.
14. Children learn a great deal reading by watching their parents at home.
15. There are some types of knowledge important for comprehension that students learn best by simply reading often and widely. Other types of knowledge are best learned under closely monitored instruction.

Of the above statements, which are the five most important, or most relevant for teachers? Please choose no less and no more than five, and write the numbers of your choices below.

Please return this sheet in the envelope provided.
APPENDIX G

SETS OF SAMPLE LESSON PLANS
DIRECTIONS FOR THE LESSON OUTLINES

Read each of the attached lessons (3 vocabulary, 3 comprehension, and 3 syllabication.) Decide which lesson in each group you would most like to teach to an average, second-grade class in an ideal situation. Then number your second and third choices. Place the numbers of your lesson choices in the blanks below.

VOCABULARY LESSONS
Lesson # ___ is the most realistic vocabulary lesson.
Lesson # ___ is my second choice.
Lesson # ___ is my third choice.
If you like please add comments: ____________________________________________

COMPREHENSION LESSONS
Lesson # ___ is the most realistic comprehension lesson.
Lesson # ___ is my second choice.
Lesson # ___ is my third choice.
If you like please add comments: ____________________________________________

SYLLABICATION LESSONS
Lesson # ___ is the most realistic syllabication lesson.
Lesson # ___ is my second choice.
Lesson # ___ is my third choice.
If you like please add comments: ____________________________________________

Also, please provide the following information:

1. What grade do you teach?
2. Counting this year, how many years have you taught?

Pleases return this sheet in the envelope provided. Thank you.
The words to be taught in this lesson have been identified by the basal reader teacher's guide as being new words that will appear in a story about a shipwreck and how a family solved the problem of getting off the ship and onto a nearby island. The words are:

  crash lifeboat float shelter waves jammed

The teacher has decided on the following procedure to teach the words.

1. Before the children read the story, the words and their meanings are provided by the teacher. The teacher writes each word on the blackboard and asks the students if they know its meaning. The meaning is written on the board, if correctly supplied by the students. It is supplied by the teacher if unknown to the students.

2. The teacher provides sentences containing the words. S/he reads these sentences to the students. The sentences are then written on the board, with the words underlined. Students are then asked to read sentences as they are pointed to, and then to state the meaning of the underlined word.

3. Give out a worksheet that has a matching activity, with the words down one side and the meanings down the other. Children are to draw lines between the words and their appropriate meanings.

4. Collect the worksheets. The teacher reads the words, one by one, to the students, asking for a definition after each one. Words should be read individually, without use in a sentence. If the children are unable to define a word, provide the definition, and return to this word to check for understanding.

After the above, children read the story. Following reading, the vocabulary lesson continues with this follow up:

1. Select the sentences from the story which contain the vocabulary words. Write each sentence on the board, but omit the vocabulary word it contains. Draw a line to show where the missing word should be placed. Underneath each blank, write the vocabulary word which belongs and one or two vocabulary words which do not belong.

   The high wind made the ______ very big.

   shelters lifeboats waves

   Students are to read each sentence and select the word which best fits in the sentence.

2. Students copy the individual words on cards or in their notebooks. Definitions are copied on the other side of the cards, or directly under the word in their books.

3. The next day, a quiz is given on the word meanings. It is a matching task, with words on one side of a page and definitions on the other. Students are to match the words and definitions.
VOCABULARY LESSON 2

The words to be taught in this lesson have been identified by the basal reader teacher's guide as being new words that will appear in a story about a shipwreck and how a family solved the problems of getting off the ship and onto a nearby island. The words are:

- crash
- lifeboat
- float
- shelter
- waves
- jammed

The teacher has decided on the following procedure to teach the words.

1. Before the children read the story, tell them that there may be some words in what they are about to read that they may not know. Write the words on the board and read them to the students. Stop after each word and ask the students to use the word in a sentence, if they know the meaning.

2. For each word, ask if they have had any experiences where the word can describe what happened. For example, ask if they have ever been to a swimming pool, lake or ocean. Ask if they have ever seen a water toy float? Have they ever seen a person float? Can they float? What does it mean to be able to float? Have children name things which can float. What might happen if a person couldn't float or swim? Who is there to try to save that person? Have them describe lifeguards and what they do.

3. Ask students if they know what a lifesaver might be. You may be told that it is a candy. If so, ask why a company might call a candy a lifesaver. Encourage them to think of people who might be called lifesavers. (police, firemen, doctors, nurses)

4. Next, ask them if they can think of things which are made to work as lifesavers. Give hints like the following: What is made to be a lifesaver in case a person wrecks a car? (safety belt) a plane? (parachute) a ship? (lifeboat). Explain how lifeboats are small boats which sometimes hang over the sides of large ships and are lowered if the big ships can no longer float. Continue to use the children's experiences to build connections and knowledge with the other vocabulary words.

5. After each of the new words have been discussed in this way, have the students write a story together, or individually, using all of the new words. Encourage them to illustrate their story. Stories might also be read by students and tape recorded for later discussion.

After students have read the story:

1. Select the sentences from the story containing the words. Write these sentences on the board and have students read the sentences, then make up new sentences using the word in ways that show its meaning.

2. Have the class make up another story containing the words. Write the story on the board.

3. Students copy their made-up story onto their notebooks. After they have copied the whole story, they go back and underline the words.

4. The next day, a quiz is given on the meanings. Students are given a sheet with the words. They are to provide a sentence for each word.
VOCABULARY LESSON 3

The words to be taught in this lesson have been identified by the basal reader teacher's guide as being new words that will appear in a story about a shipwreck and how a family solved the problems of getting off the ship and onto a nearby island. The words are:

- crash
- lifeboat
- float
- shelter
- waves
- jammed

The teacher has decided on the following procedure to teach the words.

1. Write the words on one side of the board and their definitions on the other. Read one word to the class, then read the definitions. Have the students stop you when you come to the definition for the word. Draw a line from the word to the definition.
2. Say each of the words one by one. Have individual students provide the definition.
3. Ask students if they have had any experiences that could be described using any of the words. Write sentences describing the experiences, with the words underlined, on the board.
4. Tell students the plot line of the story (e.g., it involves a shipwreck, etc.) and ask them to predict how each of the words might be used. Have them provide sentences using the words in ways that they might be found in the story. Write the sentences on the board.

After reading the story, check to see how accurate the predictions were.

After reading the story, the students did the following:

1. Give students a worksheet with the words down one side. Students are to provide the definition, but not a sentence using the word. For example:
   - shelter:
   - lifeboat:

2. On a second worksheet, students are given the words underlined in a sentence and are asked to write the definition for the word under the sentence.
3. Students copy the individual words and definitions into their notebooks. Under this story, they write a story using all of the words.
4. The next day, a two-part quiz is given. Part one asks students to match words and definitions. Part two provides the words and asks for a sentence on each.
COMPREHENSION LESSON I

Students will be reading a story about a shipwreck and how a family solved a problem of getting off the ship and onto a nearby island. The following outline is used to teach “comprehension” aspects related to the story.

1. Before reading the story, ask if anyone has ever been in a dangerous situation. Let the children tell you of personal experiences or experiences of others. Ask if anyone has ever been on a boat. What might happen on a boat that could be dangerous?

2. Discuss the picture at the beginning of the story. Ask students to describe what is happening in the picture from their own perspective. That is, how would they feel if they were in the picture, what would they do, etc.

3. Tell the students that the story is about a shipwreck and how a family solved the problem of getting off the ship and onto a nearby island. As a group activity, make up a story about a shipwreck. Write the story on the board. Have the class read the story with you in chorus.

4. Ask students what they do when they find themselves in trouble. Try to use their experiences to build the idea that planning may help you get out of trouble and sometimes prevent trouble.

After the children have read the story:

1. Have students copy the story that was written on the board before they read the assignment. Allow them to illustrate their shipwreck story using remembered scenes from the story they just read.

2. Students work in pairs to write questions about the setting, major characteristics, and important events. Children ask the teacher or other students their questions. Questions are written on the board as asked and answered.

3. Have students answer questions about the story. Questions range across literal and inferential questions. For example:
   1. What were the names of each of the family members? What would you have named each of the family members, now that you know how they acted in the story?
   2. How did the youngest boy save his pets? Would you have saved them in the same way?
   3. Where was the family going when the ship was wrecked? Would you like to go there?
   4. How did they get off the ship? Can you think of any other way they might have gotten off the ship?
   5. Why did the ship head straight into the storm? What would you have done if you were the captain?
   6. How would you have felt if you were the youngest boy? The mother? The father? The oldest brother?

4. Children illustrate the story by drawing scenes, drawing details or drawing characters from the story. Others may want to write a diary of the adventure as seen by a character. Others can write another story that is similar but different, perhaps the wreck of a spaceship, or being trapped in a building trying to get out.
COMPREHENSION LESSON 2

Students will be reading a story about a shipwreck and how a family solved the problem of getting off the ship and onto a nearby island. The following outline is used to teach "comprehension" aspects related to the story.

1. The teacher tells the students that they will be reading a story about a shipwreck and how a family solved the problems of getting off the ship onto a nearby island. Students are told the author intended the "moral" of the story to be survival. The teacher then reads the title to the students and states how the title fits with the story line that was outlined by the teacher.

2. Show the children the pictures of ships that were used during the time this story took place. Encourage the children to think of everything they know about these kinds of ships. List this information on the board. Then give them additional information about the ships and check to see if the students have been able to add this information to their own thinking, perhaps through creating a group story about a ship set in the appropriate time period.

3. Ask the children if they would know what to do if they were stranded on an island in 1985. What supplies would they hope they would have? How would they plan to be rescued?

4. Tell the children that they must try to get to an island. Have students predict how they think the family will get to the island, what supplies they will need to take, and what will probably be on the island.

5. After the story has been read, the teacher asks questions of the students. Some of the questions can be written on the board or on worksheets. The questions directly relate to the story and range across literal and inferential questions. For example:
   1. What were the names of the family members?
   2. How did the youngest boy save his pets?
   3. Where was the family going when the ship was wrecked?
   4. How did they get off the ship?
   5. Do you think there was any other way they could have saved themselves or have been saved?
   6. Since, in the story, the family was alone on the ship, where do you think the captain and crew were? What might have happened to them?
   7. Why did the ship head straight into the storm?
   8. What did the ship hit?
   9. Why did the family not try to swim to shore?

6. Answers are considered appropriate only if children can tell you how they thought of their answers. Which pieces of information in the story were used to decide on their answers? Did they use information from the story and information they already knew?
Students will be reading a story about a shipwreck and how a family solved the problem of getting off the ship and onto a nearby island. The following outline is used to teach "comprehension" aspects related to the story.

1. The teacher tells the students that they will be reading a story about a shipwreck and how a family solved the problem of getting off the ship and onto a nearby island. Students are told the author intended the "moral" of the story to be survival. The teacher then reads the title to the students and, after stating how the title fits with the story line that was outlined by the teacher, students are told to read the story.

2. After the story has been read, the teacher asks questions of the students. Some of the questions may be written on the board or on worksheets. The questions directly relate to the story and range across literal and inferential questions. For example:
   1. What were the names of the family members?
   2. How did the youngest boy save his pets?
   3. Where was the family going when the ship was wrecked?
   4. How did they get off the ship?
   5. Do you think there was any other way they could have saved themselves or have been saved?
   6. Since, in the story, the family was alone on the ship, where do you think the captain and crew were? What might have happened to them?
   7. Why did the ship head straight into the storm?
   8. What did the ship hit?
   9. Why did the family not try to swim to shore?

3. Students then complete a worksheet that has these major headings: Setting, Major Characters, Important Events. Make sure that they can defend their answers by finding specific words in the story to support their answers.

4. Go back and ask about specific details in the story. Choose questions about details that can only have one possible correct answer.

5. Check the students' answers. For those who have responded correctly, have them go through the story again until they can point out the place where the detail is given.
SYLLABICATION LESSON 1

The teacher has decided to teach a lesson on syllabication as a word attack strategy. The following words have been chosen as the basis for the syllabication lesson.

wave  raft  Tommy  swimmer

The following is an outline of the teacher's syllabication lesson. The words have been chosen as examples because they recently appeared in a story that was read by the class.

1. The teacher begins by talking about how words can be broken up into pieces, and that sometimes we can hear the pieces when we talk. Examples are given, e.g., the teacher says words like "wa-ter", "pi-rate" and "life-boat". Students are asked how many pieces they hear in each word.

2. Students are asked to remember the shipwreck story they have just read, and to think of words from the story or that might apply to the story. Some students are asked to say their words out loud "in pieces" and other students are asked how many pieces they can hear.

3. The teacher says that the pieces are called syllables, and that there are certain rules for dividing words into syllables.

4. The words "Tommy" and "swimmer" are written on the board. Students read them together with the teacher.

5. Students are asked which parts of the words make up each "piece".

6. Write the rule on the board. Ask students to see if it works -- does it tell them to divide the words the way they thought?

7. Once students agree that the rule works, they copy the rule into their books, along with appropriate examples using words that are and are not from the story.
SYLLABICATION LESSON 2

The teacher has decided to teach a lesson on syllabication as a word attack strategy. The following words have been chosen as the basis for the syllabication lesson.

walk funny day Tommy penny cake because

The following is an outline of the teacher’s syllabication lesson.

1. Several syllabication rules are written on the board. These include:
   1. The numbers of syllables is the same as the number of vowel sounds in a word.
   2. When there are two consonants in a word, divide the word between the consonants.

2. Students are asked to read the words and to state how many vowels they hear and then to state whether or not the word has a double consonant.

3. Students are asked to come to the board and draw a line between the letters where the word would be divided into syllables.

4. For each word, students are asked the rule which applies when dividing the word into syllables.

5. Additional words are provided. Students copy them into their books and then divide them into syllables. These words and syllables are checked.

6. To conclude this lesson, children copy their words, properly divided into syllables, into their notebooks. The appropriate syllabication rule is copied after each word.
SYLLABICATION LESSON 3

The teacher has decided to teach a lesson on syllabication as a word attack strategy. The following words have been chosen as the basis for the syllabication lesson.

walk funny day Tommy penny cake because

The following is an outline of the teacher's syllabication lesson.

1. The teacher begins by talking about how words can be broken up into pieces and that sometimes we can hear the pieces when we talk. Examples are given, e.g., the teacher says words like “res-tau-rant”, “caf-e-te-ri-a” and “com-pu-ter”.
   Students are asked how many pieces they hear in each word.

2. Students are asked to think of words (e.g., items around the room). Some students are asked to say their words out loud “in pieces” and other students are asked how many pieces they can hear.

3. The teacher says that the pieces are called syllables.

4. The words “funny, Tommy, penny” are written on the board. Students read them together with the teacher.

5. Students are asked which parts of the words make up each “piece”.

6. After the words have been divided, ask students to state a rule that might tell others where to divide such words.

7. Students might say that the rule is to divide between two letters that are the same. The teacher calls the letters consonants and says this is correct.

8. As a concluding activity, students copy their rule into their notebooks. They brainstorm other words that fit the rule and write these words under the rule.
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