



All Theses and Dissertations

---

2009-03-19

# An Overview of Instructional Activities Used Before, During, and After Reading to Scaffold Guided Reading and Shared Reading Instruction

Stacey Lea Hoopes

*Brigham Young University - Provo*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Psychology Commons](#)

---

## BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Hoopes, Stacey Lea, "An Overview of Instructional Activities Used Before, During, and After Reading to Scaffold Guided Reading and Shared Reading Instruction" (2009). *All Theses and Dissertations*. 1708.

<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/1708>

This Selected Project is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact [scholarsarchive@byu.edu](mailto:scholarsarchive@byu.edu), [ellen\\_amatangelo@byu.edu](mailto:ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu).

AN OVERVIEW OF INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES USED  
BEFORE, DURING, AND AFTER READING TO SCAFFOLD  
GUIDED READING AND SHARED READING INSTRUCTION

by

Stacey L. Hoopes

A master's project submitted to the faculty of

Brigham Young University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science

Department of Instructional Psychology and Technology

Brigham Young University

April 2009

Copyright © 2009 Stacey L. Hoopes

All Rights Reserved

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE COMMITTEE APPROVAL

of a master's project submitted by

Stacey L. Hoopes

This project has been read by each member of the following graduate committee and by majority vote has been found to be satisfactory.

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

David D. Williams, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

Richard R Sudweeks

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

\_\_\_\_\_

Janet R. Young

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

As chair of the candidate's graduate committee, I have read the project of Stacey L. Hoopes in its final form and have found that (1) its format, citations, and bibliographical style are consistent and acceptable and fulfill university and department style requirements; (2) its illustrative materials including figures, tables, and charts are in place; and (3) the final manuscript is satisfactory to the graduate committee and is ready for submission to the university library.

---

Date

---

David D. Williams  
Chair, Graduate Committee

Accepted for the Department

---

Date

---

Andrew S. Gibbons  
Department Chair,  
Instructional Psychology and Technology

Accepted for the College

---

Date

---

Richard K. Young  
Dean, College of Education

## ABSTRACT

### AN OVERVIEW OF INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES USED BEFORE, DURING, AND AFTER READING TO SCAFFOLD GUIDED READING AND SHARED READING INSTRUCTION

Stacey L. Hoopes

Department of Instructional Psychology and Technology

Master of Science

The purpose of this study was to investigate the use of instructional activities that take place before reading, during reading, and after reading in guided reading and shared reading routines in elementary school classrooms in Utah school districts. This project used extant data from classroom observations to answer questions about how the observed activities were used as part of guided and shared reading routines in second and third grades within the five school districts of the Brigham Young University-Public School Partnership.

The results of this study showed that there were differences in how teachers implemented the before reading, during reading, and after reading activities for guided and shared reading. The average teacher devoted more time to instructional activities

during the reading portion of guided or shared reading than to instructional activities used before reading or after reading as part of the guided reading or shared reading routines. Differences between frequencies for instructional activities done after reading in guided reading differed significantly between second and third grade classrooms in the study. This study determined that school districts in the study had significantly different frequencies for instructional activities implemented before, during, and after reading in guided reading. These significant results and the results of other comparisons were used to provide insights about the possible implications of this study.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Throughout my time spent working on this project, I have benefitted greatly from the attention and help of others. First, I thank my committee chair, David Williams, for guiding me through seemingly endless ideas and iterations of proposals. His insights and help as a teacher, scholar and friend have been invaluable over the years. I wish to also thank Richard Sudweeks and Janet Young for helping me meld together my ideas about instructional research and literacy. I thank Barbara Lawrence for being the first to help me learn to love the field of literacy when I was working with her doing observations in schools. I am also grateful to her for letting me use the existing observation data for this project. I thank Charles Fetzer for inspiring me to attend graduate school in the first place. I wish to especially thank all of my family members and in-laws for their support across the miles, as it has meant so much to me.

The person who has shouldered the burden of this project with me is my husband, Jeff. He has selflessly has seen fit to put my needs above his own so that I could see this project to completion. He has believed in me from the start, dried my tears along the way, and I could never have finished this without his love and support. I dedicate this project to Jeff, our son Jacob, and our soon-to-be-born daughter. My children have inspired me immeasurably to finish what I started so that I could learn and grow into the person I need to be to be a better mother.

*Where it was dark now there's light; where there was pain now there's joy.*

*Where there was weakness, I found my strength — All in the eyes of a boy.*



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	viii
LIST OF TABLES .....	x
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION .....	1
Importance of Before, During, and After Reading Activities in Reading Instruction ....	1
Impact of Balanced Literacy Instruction .....	2
Purpose and Research Questions .....	3
Definition of Terms .....	5
Instructional routine .....	5
Guided reading .....	5
Shared reading .....	5
Instructional activity .....	6
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....	7
Background of Balanced Literacy .....	7
Guided Reading .....	9
Shared Reading .....	10
Scaffolding .....	11
Instructional Activities for Reading .....	14
Before reading .....	14
During reading .....	15
After reading .....	17
Summary .....	18
CHAPTER 3: METHOD .....	19
Participants .....	20
Instrumentation .....	21
Procedures .....	22
Data Analysis .....	23
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS .....	26
Comparison of Percentage of Time Spent on Instructional Activities .....	26
Comparison of Routines .....	29
Comparison by Grade Level .....	32
Comparison by School District .....	35
Shared reading .....	35
Guided reading .....	37

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS .....	40
School and District Differences .....	40
Percentages of time .....	41
Instructional routine differences .....	42
Grouping Effects .....	43
Developmental Differences .....	44
Study Limitations .....	45
Further Research Ideas .....	47
Summary .....	48
REFERENCES .....	49
APPENDIX A .....	53

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Average Time Spent on Instructional Activities in Classrooms.....	28
Table 2: Average Time Spent on Shared Reading Instructional Activities by District ....	28
Table 3: Average Time Spent on Guided Reading Instructional Activities by District ...	29
Table 4: Instructional Activities Used Before Reading in Guided Reading and Shared Reading .....	30
Table 5: Instructional Activities Used During Reading in Guided Reading and Shared Reading .....	31
Table 6: Instructional Activities Used After Reading in Guided Reading and Shared Reading .....	31
Table 7: Instructional Activities Used Before Reading in Guided Reading by Grade .....	33
Table 8: Instructional Activities Used Before Reading in Shared Reading by Grade.....	33
Table 9: Instructional Activities Used During Reading in Guided Reading by Grade.....	34
Table 10: Instructional Activities Used After Reading in Guided Reading by Grade.....	35
Table 11: Instructional Activities Used After Reading in Shared Reading by Grade .....	35
Table 12: Instructional Activities Used Before Reading in Shared Reading by District.....	36
Table 13: Frequency of Instructional Activities Used During Reading in Shared Reading by District.....	36
Table 14: Instructional Activities Used After Reading in Shared Reading by District ....	36
Table 15: Instructional Activities Used Before Reading in Guided Reading by District.....	38

Table 16: Instructional Activities Used During Reading in Guided Reading  
by District..... 38

Table 17: Instructional Activities Used After Reading in Guided Reading by District ... 38

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Reading instruction is made up of many different elements that teachers use in an attempt to meet the needs of their students. One approach to literacy instruction exists in balanced literacy teaching, wherein several types of *instructional routines* are designed and used to aid students in becoming better independent readers and writers. Two of these routines are *guided reading* and *shared reading*; each of these includes *instructional activities* that act as instructional scaffolds to be used before reading, during reading, and after reading as part of the overall routine.

### *Importance of Before, During, and After Reading Activities in Reading Instruction*

Classroom reading instruction can be broken down into smaller amounts of time to include what takes place before, during, and after reading. Dowhower (1999) refers to these times in relation to actual reading — (a) prereading, (b) active reading and (c) postreading. To prepare students for reading, teachers will often engage learners in prereading activities to set the stage for the actual reading of a book or selection. This time spent before reading allows students to have the support they need to be able to gain as much as possible from the actual reading, and is an appropriate time for teachers to provide helps for individual learners or the class as a whole (e.g., Beed, Hawkins, & Roller, 1991; Graves, Graves, & Braaten, 1996; Pearson & Fielding, 1991). Active reading is the time for teachers and students to discuss and interact with a reading selection (Dowhower, 1999). Carefully done, this experience keeps students engaged because they know that the reading is not a passive exercise but is purposeful and is a chance to put the appropriate strategies to use. Active reading is often followed by other activities to revisit ideas and concepts discussed before and during reading. These

postreading activities provide an additional opportunity for teachers to support and reinforce reading instruction (e.g., Fall, Webb & Chudowsky, 2000; Graves, Graves & Braaten, 1996; Pinnell, 2002).

These three periods for instructional activities allow teachers time to use instructional scaffolds to help students improve their skills as independent readers. Though there are many methods for its use, scaffolding is touted extensively as being a useful instructional tool (e.g., Cazden, 1992; Rosenshine & Meister, 1992; Sweet, 1993). Teachers who scaffold reading instruction with appropriate before, during, and after reading instructional activities have been shown to be effective (Pressley, 2002). Though scaffolding can be useful in many different instructional settings, this study focuses specifically on the before, during, and after reading instructional activities used as part of guided reading and shared reading, both of which are components of balanced literacy that incorporate differing levels of teacher support.

#### *Impact of Balanced Literacy Instruction*

One implementation of balanced literacy instruction began about a decade ago in grades K–6 in the five school districts that are a part of the Brigham Young University-Public School Partnership (BYU-PSP). The initiative was funded with Federal Goals 2000 funding made available through the Educate America Act, and was developed by individuals in the school districts and BYU literacy faculty (Center for the Improvement of Teacher Education and Schooling [CITES], 2007). The major purpose of balanced literacy instruction in the BYU-PSP schools is to provide sufficient experience for students at their appropriate instructional levels through classroom activities centered on reading and writing to, with, and by students. Instructional routines may include shared

reading, shared writing, interactive writing, teacher read-aloud, guided reading, independent reading and independent writing. Through these classroom routines the balanced literacy approach to literacy instruction empowers students and enables children to develop strategies to help enhance and nurture their ability to read and write independently.

Studies of the BYU-PSP Balanced Literacy Initiative completed by researchers and evaluators in the last decade have mainly examined overall implementation of balanced literacy and its effects. For example, one part of a balanced literacy evaluation looked at trends in student achievement on state criterion-reference tests (CRT) and offered balanced literacy instruction as the possible explanation for rising CRT scores for grades 3–5 from 1997–2000 in the BYU-PSP (e.g., CITES, 2007; Jesse, n.d.). While those results appeared promising for showing the overall effects of balanced literacy, the results of that and other past studies conducted outside of the BYU-PSP in general were not intended to address the more specific aspects of balanced teaching, such as the use of before, during, and after reading instructional activities as part of guided reading and shared reading routines.

#### *Purpose and Research Questions*

Though the overarching goals of the initiative have served as important guidelines over the years, past studies reveal that the schools and districts implement balanced literacy in a variety of ways. Research, however, has not shown specifically where differences occur—whether it is in how often certain instructional activities occur or how much time is spent on those activities. Although research has been conducted about the benefits of balanced literacy instruction there are generally not a lot of rich data available

about what is happening in individual classrooms where balanced teaching of literacy is put into practice, particularly about what happens before, during, and after reading instruction within guided and shared reading routines. The purpose of this study, then, was to investigate the use of instructional activities that take place before, during, and after reading for guided reading and shared reading routines.

The following research questions guided this study:

1. In the observed classrooms, what percent of total time spent on guided and shared reading routines did teachers devote to instructional activities before, during, and after reading instruction?
  - a. How much total time was spent on instructional activities done before, during, and after reading instruction for guided and shared reading routines?
  - b. To what extent do the average percentages of total instructional routine time spent on instructional activities differ for guided reading and shared reading?
  - c. To what extent do the average percentages of total instructional routine time spent on instructional activities differ between school districts?
2. How do the types of instructional activities conducted before, during, and after reading instruction as part of guided reading compare to those done in shared reading?
3. How do the types of instructional activities conducted as part of guided and shared reading in second-grade classrooms compare with those conducted in third-grade classrooms?



4. In what ways do the instructional activities done before, during, and after reading instruction as part of guided reading and shared reading routines vary across school districts?

Answers to these questions will help to provide a richer description of actual classroom practices for instructional activities before, during, and after reading within guided and shared reading routines which will, in turn, allow for comparisons to be made about how classroom practices compare with recommendations made in the literature about balanced literacy instruction.

#### *Definition of Terms*

*Instructional routine.* Instructional approaches for literacy, including balanced literacy, are made up of different routines that address the various facets of helping students to become literate. Examples of instructional routines are guided reading and shared reading.

*Guided reading.* During this routine, a teacher works with small groups of usually no more than eight students who have been tested and found to be at the same or similar reading levels. Students typically each have their own copies of the text to use during guided reading and teachers may have students read all of the text selection or read portions of it on consecutive days. Students might choral read the text together or the teacher may listen to individual students quietly read aloud on their own. This gives the teacher an opportunity to offer help as needed on a group or individual basis.

*Shared reading.* Shared reading is an instructional routine in which students and their teacher all have access to the print. Students may have a copy at their desks, or there may be a book or poster with large enough text that the students can all see. The key in

shared reading is that the students and teacher read together with the teacher taking the lead so that he or she can model fluency and expression. This affords an opportunity for an active exchange of thoughts and ideas between the teacher and students.

*Instructional activity.* Instructional activities are the specific things teachers might do within an instructional routine. In this study, instructional activities are discussed in relation to when they take place within an instructional routine, and are used before, during or after reading instruction as part of an overarching routine. Examples of instructional activities are assessing comprehension, having students make predictions, and teaching vocabulary.

## CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

To enable increased understanding about the context of a study that answers questions about instructional methods in a literacy setting, it is practical to first give an overview of the literature relevant to this study. This literature review focuses on the history and role of balanced literacy and the need for instructional scaffolds, and it provides insights into the instructional methods common to guided and shared reading routines, as well as a discussion of methods for instructional activities used before, during, and after reading instruction.

### *Background of Balanced Literacy*

Balanced literacy has an extensive history that began with the application of documented techniques based on the research of Holdaway (1979), the New Zealand Department of Education (1985), Clay (1991) and Mooney (1990). The New Zealand Department of Education, now the Ministry of Education, supported a substantial overhaul of their literacy approach based on the work of Don Holdaway. Holdaway shaped balanced literacy significantly with his expertise in “shared book experience, language experience, and the developmental model of literacy instruction” (Strech, 1995, p. 31). Speaking of what transpired, Holdaway (1979) wrote, “The New Zealand Department of Education encouraged and supported these movements, providing opportunities for grass-roots research and development and providing the resources for massive in-service re-education of teachers” (p. 8). Previously, teachers in New Zealand had been trained in providing literacy instruction which involved using a variety of instructional materials. When the “Ready to Read” series, written by local authors, was adopted by the Department of Education as core materials to use in classrooms, a balance

had to be created between using those materials and keeping a previously used approach intact as well (Strech, 1995). Balanced literacy was the result, and it grew out of a need for a more focused, more consistent, and more literature-based approach to literacy instruction than the other commonly used methods used before the late 1980s, some of which were basal programs, eclecticism, and look-say and sentence understanding approaches (Holdaway, 1979).

Balanced literacy is summarized in part by Mooney as the idea that good reading instruction includes an abundance of reading to, with, and by children each day (1990); the BYU-PSP expanded this notion to include writing to, with and by children as part of this instructional approach as well. The instructional routines embedded in balanced literacy are guided reading, reading aloud, shared reading, independent reading, shared writing, students writing and response sharing (Davidson, 1990; Mooney, 1990). During these activities, “The skills of literacy are developed, practiced and reinforced in the context of actual reading” (Rigby, 1989, p. 3).

There are three language systems that are developed during balanced literacy reading instruction periods, and they include “semantic [word meaning], graphophonic (letter and sound relationships), and syntactic (the structure of language)” (Strech, 1995, p. 25). Guided reading and shared reading, both important aspects of balanced literacy instruction, can foster the development of these important cueing systems that young readers need, particularly when the technique of scaffolding is used during before, during, and after reading in reading instruction. To better understand how scaffolds can be used as part of literacy instruction, it is useful to first describe in detail guided reading and shared reading.

### *Guided Reading*

A major focus of this instructional routine is to teach comprehension-building skills that students can transfer to the other reading they do, particularly independent reading (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996). Students outside the guided reading group are usually engaged in completing other tasks throughout the classroom or at their desks; a rotation system is often used so that a teacher can meet with multiple guided reading groups during a regular school day. The texts used during guided reading are carefully matched to the instructional levels at which the students are reading. According to Fountas and Pinnell (2001), students should be able to read texts with a teacher's introduction and assistance at a 90% accuracy level (p. 6). Throughout the year during guided reading, texts and tasks are to become increasingly challenging as students become more able to meet those challenges (Fountas & Pinnell, 2001). Burns (1999) provides an excellent description of guided reading:

Guided reading has several variations, but the common factors seem to be that everyone in a small group reads a relatively short passage that offers only a slight challenge. Most words, concepts, and reading skills are known. To promote reading for meaning, the students and teacher discuss what was read and discuss the strategies that were used. Fix-ups are done on the spot, a comprehension strategy is taught just when it needs to be applied, and when the meaning is secure, everyone goes on to the next passage. (p. 82)

Burns (1999) provides further description of the important role that a teacher plays during guided reading instruction, and remarks that teachers can support and encourage students, but that students must learn to use strategies on their own.

Pinnell (2002) gives appropriate attention to each portion of a typical guided reading framework, suggesting that teachers do the following before, during, and after reading as part of guided reading as appropriate — introduce the text, read the text, revisit and discuss the text, teach for processing strategies, extend the meaning of the text, and lead students in word work.

As they prepare to work with smaller groups of students during guided reading periods, teachers are able to provide necessary scaffolds to help individual students. Guided reading should enable students to improve as independent readers, thus the use of scaffolds greatly supports this goal of guided reading. Guided reading and its accompanying scaffolds can be very effective when used in conjunction with shared reading.

### *Shared Reading*

Shared reading provides a chance beyond what guided reading offers to expose young readers to other instructional scaffolds and types of texts. Holdaway (1979) made particular mention of shared reading instruction in his writings, also referring to it as “shared book experience” (1982, p. 293). In classrooms today an observer may find large-print books that all students can see or a copy of the same book on every desk in the room, whereas at the time Holdaway (1979) was implementing balanced literacy in New Zealand schools, teachers were writing out texts on large posters so that students up to fifteen feet away could read the words well.

Suggestions offered for shared reading instruction include teachers choosing enjoyable texts, being genuinely excited about their text choices, using songs and other chant-like sequences to keep children involved, and implementing other activities that

would bridge children's understanding of books read or strategies learned in other instructional settings (Holdaway, 1982). Shared reading is a good setting for teachers to help students fine-tune the skills that will help them when they read on their own, such as sounding out words (Phenix, 2000), and fostering decoding and comprehension skills (Eldredge, Reutzel & Hollingsworth, 1996).

### *Scaffolding*

Shared reading and guided reading are both better carried out when instructional scaffolding is used routinely and effectively. Instructional activities that take place before, during, and after reading in guided and shared reading may be considered instructional scaffolds. Educational researchers (e.g., Rosenshine & Meister, 1992; Slavin, 2000) adopting a constructivist approach to teaching and learning address the benefits of scaffolding. With scaffolding, teachers can provide help for their students when necessary, but equip students with skills to be able to help themselves in the future when the scaffolds are taken away, much like ancillary supports are erected when a building is being worked on in construction, but then taken away when they are no longer needed.

Wood, Bruner, and Ross (1976) were among the first to discuss scaffolding in a metaphorical sense to describe how mothers interact with their children as they read to them. Whether used in settings involving a child and a parent or a child and a schoolteacher, scaffolds provide necessary and usually temporary support to aid learners in their Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) (Vygotsky, 1978). Vygotsky posited that children learn skills or tasks that fall into a few general categories based on the ability of the learner. There are those that can be performed by the learner with no help, those that

cannot be performed by the learner even with help, and those that can be performed by the learner with help. The latter category falls within the ZPD. Teachers who use instructional scaffolds appropriately engage students in their individual ZPD, which then prepares them to be able to do the same activity without help as described in Vygotsky's first point above. In like manner, Pearson and Gallagher (1983) describe their Gradual Release of Responsibility Model to show how learners move from viewing explicit modeling, to practicing with guidance, to achieving independence.

Research suggests that scaffolding can be accomplished in a variety of ways. Hogan and Pressley (1997) discuss five general scaffolding methods — modeling of desired behaviors, offering explanations, inviting student participation, verifying and clarifying student understandings, and inviting students to contribute clues. These methods can work independently or together, but instructional activities designed for scaffolding purposes can generally fall into one of these five categories.

Other authors address scaffolding as it relates to teaching reading. One study provides a leveled hierarchy based on the teacher's influence during scaffolding. Beed, Hawkins, and Roller (1991) look at how scaffolds help individual students learn to use the "Strategic Word Attack Technique (SWAT)" to help them read words they are not familiar with (p. 650). SWAT has five sequential steps:

1. Read to the end of the sentence
2. Reread and look at the pictures
3. Ask yourself, "What word that starts with this letter would make sense in this sentence?"



4. Look at the parts of the word and blend them together
5. Read on or ask for help (Beed, Hawkins & Roller, 1991).

Though they discuss a reading strategy, and not a general literacy activity, their attention to general scaffolding methods is noteworthy. They define scaffolds as being incidental or strategic, and the difference between the two is whether or not the scaffolding is planned as part of the instruction. They also define a certain type of instructional help as “contingent scaffolded instruction,” which includes “a pattern of responses for the withdrawal of the support” (p. 649). The authors point out that teachers using SWAT will offer varying amounts of assistance for their students, organized into five levels of scaffolding, going from most teacher involvement to least — (a) teacher modeling, (b) inviting student performance, (c) cueing specific elements, (d) cueing specific strategies, and (e) providing general cues (Beed, Hawkins & Roller, 1991).

McIntyre (2007) addresses the need to move the literature discussions that teachers have with their students from “explicit” and teacher-led to more “authentic” conversations focusing on what the students have to say (p. 610). As teachers help their students construct meaning with what they read, scaffolds strategically used and then gradually removed are of valuable import. Furthermore, the presence of scaffolds in first grade classrooms has been shown to be an important characteristic of literacy instruction methods for teachers labeled as being “effective” in their locations (Pressley et al., 2001, p. 36). The qualitative study completed by Pressley and his colleagues pinpoints what effective teachers do differently than other teachers. However, it does not provide rich descriptions specifically related to the use of scaffolding before, during, and after reading instruction as part of instructional routines.

### *Instructional Activities for Reading*

*Before reading.* Of utmost importance in creating active learning experiences for students during both guided reading and shared reading is what takes place before a text is read. Readence, Moore and Rickelman (2004) state, “Helping students realize the expected outcomes of instruction is a valuable type of instructional scaffold” (p. 7). Rog (2003) states, “The book introduction may well be the most critical aspect of the Guided Reading lesson” (p. 50). Research in several multiage classrooms looked at the dialogue between teachers and students and students and peers to determine how scaffolds were part of instructional conversations (Many, 2002). This research suggests that scaffolding is useful for conceptual understanding or strategy use. Appropriate prereading activities can focus on one or both of these areas of instruction so that the actual reading period is more effective. Activities specifically focused on strategy use before reading will encourage students to remember to use those strategies during reading, whether on their own independently reading or in the eminent guided or shared reading period. As Lenski and Nierstheimer (2002) write, “One of the characteristics of proficient readers and writers is their flexible use of reading and writing strategies” (p. 127).

In addition to using appropriate activities to lay a foundation for text reading and encourage strategy use during a reading activity, other purposes can be met through the use of prereading activities. Graves, Graves and Braaten (1996) focus on the help that scaffolds can offer during prereading, during reading, and postreading activities in a classroom of young students. Their prereading suggestions could apply to guided reading or to shared reading periods.

1. Relating the reading to students’ lives

2. Motivating students
3. Activating background knowledge
4. Building text-specific knowledge
5. Teaching vocabulary and concepts
6. Pre-questioning, predicting, and setting direction
7. Suggesting strategies (Graves, Graves & Braaten, 1996).

Burns (1999) discusses the need for teachers to take opportunities to teach vocabulary in the context of a text or story so that it makes sense, but that it is also common for vocabulary to be introduced so that it makes sense to a student in terms of his schema and background. Readence, Moore and Rickelman (2004) present a more comprehensive set of prereading activities, looking at such areas as student preparation for reading, asking and answering questions, prediction, vocabulary, visual helps, writing and the possibilities of combination running through these ideas. Pinnell (2002) offers three ideas for teachers introducing a text, “presenting the title, author, and main idea; asking students to think about the structure of the text and asking them to say or hear the language; and, pointing out important concepts and words” (p. 170). Several authors posit that before reading is the time for new vocabulary to be introduced (e.g., Phenix, 2000; Rog, 2003). There are many ideas about what is appropriate before reading instruction, but it is clear that prereading activities stand as important scaffolds that prepare students for the act of reading they will be engaged in with their instructor.

*During reading.* Pinnell (2002) states that, during reading, “the teacher interacts and supports” (p. 170). As with prereading instruction, suggestions for activities used during reading instruction are varied, so there are many ways a teacher can interact and

support students' reading while it is happening. Correctly, Dowhower (1999) refers to this as the "active reading" stage of reading instruction, and points out the need for students to have a defined purpose for reading, to monitor their own levels of understanding and to develop awareness about a story's content (p. 673).

Instructional activities that encourage students to be active and successful readers are included in the Scaffold Reading Experience developed by Graves and Graves (as cited in Graves, Graves, & Braaten, 1996). Appropriate activities to scaffold students' instruction during reading are "silent reading, reading to students, guided reading, oral reading by students, and modifying the text" (p. 14). This list includes some of the elements of balanced literacy, suggesting that the inclusion of these instructional methods during reading for their scaffolding benefits on a regular basis will aid students in their development as readers. Au (1992) points out the role that scaffolding can play during reading to help students learn more completely what they need to about a text, "By providing just the right degree of scaffolding, through the use of questions and comments, the teacher can support students as they attempt to construct a theme, and at the same time, *shift responsibility for the task to students*" (p. 107, emphasis added). This does not diminish the importance of what the teacher's role must be during reading instruction, however. In line with the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model of Pearson and Gallagher (1983) previously mentioned, "teacher-fronted talk, which may look more like traditional teaching, and authentic dialogue are not mutually exclusive. Teachers may need to be 'frontal' at times—to tell, demonstrate, explain, and define in order to lead students to deeper understandings" (McIntyre, 2007, p. 619). Instructional

activities done during guided and shared reading periods that make it possible for teachers to support students as needed are necessary and critical.

*After reading.* Appropriate attention should also be given to instruction provided after a text is read in guided reading and shared reading. Pinnell (2002), in her discussion of the guided reading framework, provides suggestions appropriate for instructional activities after reading:

1. Revisiting and discussing the text: Students and teacher revisit the text to talk about the meaning and the language.
2. Teaching for processing strategies: The teacher targets an important reading processing strategy to demonstrate and help students apply the strategy to this text and others.
3. Word work: The teacher targets an important reading processing strategy to demonstrate and help students apply the strategy to this text and others.
4. Extending the meaning of the text: The teacher provides opportunity for students to extend the meaning of the text through writing, diagramming, art, or other media. (p. 170)

It is again important to discuss activities suggested by Graves, Graves and Braaten (1996) relevant to this postreading instruction. Their suggestions are to have students and their teachers, as needed, work on “questions, discussions, writing, drama, artistic endeavors, application and outreach activities, and reteaching” (p. 14). Dowhower’s (1999) discussion includes similar plans for postreading enrichment, including having students work on the activities “either individually or in groups: (a) recall of content, (b) reader response, (c) extensions of text, (d) strategy use and transfer, and (e) informal or self-

assessment” (p. 674). The postreading instruction period can provide ample opportunity for teachers to link reading to other subject matters or disciplines, such as writing. This list of instructional follow-up activities for reading instruction would provide an adequate variety of ideas if used properly with suitable texts.

### *Summary*

This overview of ideas found in literature related to instructional activities done before, during, and after reading instruction as part of instructional routines suggests that there are many suitable choices for instructors to use during literacy instruction. These activities serve as important forms of instructional scaffolding that help teachers implement balanced literacy more fully in classrooms.

### CHAPTER 3: METHOD

The objective of this study was to describe and analyze how and to what extent teachers emphasize instructional activities used before, during, and after reading instruction as part of guided reading and shared reading. The study focuses on answering the following four questions, stated previously in Chapter 1.

1. In the observed classrooms, what percent of total time spent on guided and shared reading routines did teachers devote to instructional activities before, during, and after reading instruction?
  - a. How much total time was spent on instructional activities done before, during, and after reading instruction for guided and shared reading routines?
  - b. To what extent do the average percentages of total instructional routine time spent on instructional activities differ for guided reading and shared reading?
  - c. To what extent do the average percentages of total instructional routine time spent on instructional activities differ between school districts?
2. How do the types of instructional activities conducted before, during, and after reading instruction as part of guided reading compare to those done in shared reading?
3. How do the types of instructional activities conducted as part of guided and shared reading in second-grade classrooms compare with those conducted in third-grade classrooms?

4. In what ways do the instructional activities done before, during, and after reading instruction as part of guided reading and shared reading routines vary across school districts?

The data to answer these questions were collected previously in a series of second and third grade classroom observations in the five BYU-PSP districts. The choice was made to use existing data for this study because it provided an opportunity to look at the observation data from a new angle not originally considered when the observations began.

### *Participants*

The participants for this study were drawn from a larger sample of teachers from five school districts. A stratified random sample of Title I elementary schools in the BYU-PSP was taken in Fall 2005, with percentage of free and reduced price lunch recipients within schools as the stratification variable. Because the BYU-Public School Partnership Governing Board requested the study, districts and schools were obligated to allow the observers to come into the second- and third-grade classrooms, but individual teachers ultimately made the decision to be observed once they were contacted.

Observers contacted all the second and third grade teachers at 27 schools to schedule classroom observations, and visits were scheduled with teachers who agreed to have observations done in their classrooms. In total, from February 2006 to May 2007, observers completed 145 observations in second-grade classrooms and 127 in third-grade classes. Of these totals, 55 second-grade teachers were observed twice during the data collection, and 44 third-grade teachers were observed more than once as well. Only these 99 teachers who had agreed to allow observers to come visit their classes on multiple



occasions were observed twice and included in the present study. The average classroom observation lasted two hours and five minutes for this group of teachers. This study dealt only with the guided reading and shared reading observations, so the group of participants was narrowed further to include only those teachers who had these activities when their classes were observed. For purposes of more specific description, of the 99 teachers observed twice, 40 led their class in shared reading, 67 held guided reading groups, and 22 had both activities on the days they were observed. Permission for the use of human subjects was already obtained, and this study did not involve observing classrooms or gathering new data outside of what was available already.

### *Instrumentation*

A form similar to the one in Appendix A was originally created by a group of individuals affiliated with the BYU-PSP to observe teachers and ascertain how they were implementing balanced literacy instruction after professional development training. Trainings provided in multiple series of professional development sessions as designed by individual BYU-PSP school districts were based on ideas that are in harmony with the research of Holdaway (1979) and the balanced literacy objectives used by the New Zealand Department of Education (1985). That earlier observation form was adapted for use in the 2006-2007 BYU-PSP literacy observations, and while the format was changed somewhat, the content on both forms remained similar. Thus, the content of the form used in the current study was based on training material, and the training material was based on ideas found in literature (B. J. Lawrence, personal communication, May 29, 2008).

The observation form was divided into nine sections, one for each of eight different literacy instruction routines and a final section devoted to comments about the literacy environment in the classroom. The eight instructional routines found on the form include the following: (a) guided reading, (b) independent/buddy reading, (c) writing workshop and independent writing, (d) interactive writing, (e) literacy minilesson, (f) teacher read-aloud, (g) shared reading, and (h) a section to record instances of other literacy instruction. In each classroom, observers identified the general literacy routines used in the classroom, and recorded more specific instructional activities used during those routines along with the amount of time devoted to each instructional activity. As shown in Appendix A, there is a gray area where observers placed x's or check marks to indicate that an activity took place. Because teachers might include more than one instance of the same activities during an observation, extra columns allowed for observers to record all instances of the eight routines listed above that might have taken place during the observation period. See Appendix A for a copy of the entire form.

### *Procedures*

From February 2006 to May 2007, a group of five graduate student observers and their supervisor completed multiple observations of the literacy block for 99 classrooms in 25 elementary schools. Observers contacted principals, literacy specialists, or individual teachers to set up times to visit the teachers, and then visits were made. During the visits, observers took note of what activities teachers did or had their students do as part of literacy instruction, looking specifically at the eight balanced literacy elements discussed previously. Total time spent was recorded, along with time spent on certain elements of the activities. For specific instructional activities taking place, observers

recorded only the presence of that activity. After completing their visits, the observers transferred what they wrote on the observation forms to a spreadsheet workbook version of the form. These electronic copies, along with the hard copies of the filled out observation forms, were sent or given to the supervisor of the project. At the end of the observation period, data were taken from the individual electronic copies of the observation forms and all combined together in a large spreadsheet. This larger file, after being organized and narrowed down into appropriate sections, provided the data relevant to this study. For this study, only the data from sections for guided reading and shared reading were analyzed, along with classroom information. An analysis of these extant data for instructional activities for guided reading and shared reading before, during, and after reading instruction helps fill the need for more rich description of how teachers are spending classroom time devoted to these important tasks.

#### *Data Analysis*

This study involved analysis of bivariate distributions and descriptive statistics including frequencies for the before, during, and after reading instruction activities for observed guided and shared reading routines and the time devoted to each group of instructional activities. Both SPSS and Excel were used to manage and organize the data.

To answer the first research question, the percent of time spent on before, during, and after reading instruction within instructional routines was calculated by dividing the average amount of time spent on those instructional activities by the average total time spent on guided reading and shared reading instructional routines. This resulted in a group of six percentages to show the average amounts of time spent on before, during, and after reading instruction by the total time spent on reading for guided reading or

shared reading. The first part of question 1 entailed adding up the total time spent on guided reading and shared reading routines; the second part of question 1 was answered by comparing the percentages of time spent on instructional activities before, during, and after reading instruction for guided reading and shared reading. The third part of question 1 was answered by calculating percentages similar to those above for the school districts in the study. A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to test the hypothesis that the average number of total minutes spent on instructional activities during guided reading and shared reading is not the same across the districts in the study population. The Levene test for homogeneity of variance was also used to test the assumption that variances were equal across the school districts.

To answer the second research question, three contingency tables were created with the appropriate observation data to show which before, during, and after reading instructional activities were carried out in the classrooms where teachers did both guided reading and shared reading.

Answering the third research question required calculating the similar proportions as before, but separating the two grade levels observed in the study, as well as making contingency tables to compare the frequency of instructional activities across grade levels for guided reading and shared reading. To determine if any differences between grade levels were statistically significant, chi-square tests of independence aided in the comparison of the frequency of before, during, and after reading instructional activities for second- and third-grade classrooms. These comparisons helped to address the notion that students in these grade levels are at different levels in their reading development.

A group of contingency tables was also used to answer the fourth question for this study. To analyze these crosstabulations and determine if the variation of implementation and the frequency of before, during, after reading instructional activities for guided and shared reading was at all significant across districts, chi-square tests of independence were carried out.

## CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to add to the existing literature related to prereading, during reading, and postreading instructional methods used during different portions of balanced teaching of literacy. This study focused on answering four research questions that would provide insights into the instructional activities second- and third-grade teachers use before, during, and after reading instruction as part of guided reading and shared reading routines. Various statistical comparisons were made to look at time spent on instruction before, during, and after reading, to compare the routines for guided and shared reading, and to compare the routine by grade level and across school districts in the study.

### *Comparison of Percentage of Time Spent on Instructional Activities*

Data for teachers observed doing both guided reading and shared reading instructional routines during a classroom observation ( $n = 22$ ) showed that individual teachers spent an average total time of 61.36 minutes on guided reading and shared reading routines combined. The combined time spent per teacher varied from a minimum of 13 minutes to a maximum of 97 minutes with a standard deviation of 25.67.

Table 1 displays averages and percentages of time spent on the various instructional activities done as part of guided and shared reading routines. For all of the observed guided reading groups in the study ( $N = 379$ ), the average total time spent on guided reading group instruction in a classroom observation was 16.05 minutes ( $SD = 8.95$ ), with an average of 38.19% of total guided reading time being spent on instructional activities done during reading. Teachers spent an average of 21.6% and 16.7% of their guided reading routine time devoted to before and after reading

instructional activities, respectively. Teachers spent the remaining percentage of guided reading instruction time on activities categorized as “Other” on the observation form (see Appendix A).

The average amount of time teachers spent carrying out shared reading routines ( $N = 40$ ) in the classroom observations was 18.75 minutes ( $SD = 15.04$ ). The times spent on these routines ranged in length from 3 minutes to 77 minutes. Instructional activities that took place during reading within shared reading routines accounted for 50% of the average total time spent on the analyzed instructional routines, with instructional activities done before reading accounting for 24.53% and those done after reading accounting for 25.44% of the average total time spent on shared reading.

Percentages were also calculated to determine how the amount of time devoted to before, during, and after reading instruction varied across school districts in the study sample. Table 2 displays the average number of minutes devoted to shared reading within each district and what percentage of this total time for each district was devoted to before, during, and after reading activities. District 5 had no shared reading routines observed. The district effect was nonsignificant for time devoted to instructional activities in shared reading,  $F(3, 36) = 1.26, p = .303$ , and Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance showed that variances were not significantly different between the districts.

Table 1

*Average Time Spent on Instructional Activities in Classrooms*

Routine	Before			During			After			Total	
	<i>M</i> (min)	<i>SD</i>	Percent of Total Time	<i>M</i> (min)	<i>SD</i>	Percent of Total Time	<i>M</i> (min)	<i>SD</i>	Percent of Total Time	<i>M</i> (min)	<i>SD</i>
Guided Reading	3.47	3.37	21.62%	6.13	5.32	38.19%	2.58	3.71	16.07%	16.05	8.95
Shared Reading	4.60	5.30	24.53%	9.37	8.70	49.97%	4.77	8.38	25.44%	18.75	15.04

Table 2

*Average Time Spent on Shared Reading Instructional Activities by District*

District	Classrooms Observed	Before			During			After			Total	
		<i>M</i> (min)	<i>SD</i>	Percent of Total Time	<i>M</i> (min)	<i>SD</i>	Percent of Total Time	<i>M</i> (min)	<i>SD</i>	Percent of Total Time	<i>M</i> (min)	<i>SD</i>
1	9	2.95	4.44	39.07%	3.90	4.60	51.66%	0.70	1.34	9.27%	7.55	9.08
2	38	1.31	3.38	18.58%	3.54	7.84	50.21%	2.20	6.55	31.21%	7.05	14.17
3	5	0.24	0.56	11.65%	0.94	2.44	45.63%	0.88	3.64	42.72%	2.06	6.18
4	10	1.61	4.70	41.60%	1.91	4.63	49.35%	0.35	1.30	9.04%	3.87	9.50
5	0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

\*District 5 did not have any shared reading instructional routines during observations.

Table 3 displays the same information as the previous table for the instructional activities that accompanied guided reading. The Levene statistic was significant for the ANOVA done for guided reading instructional activities, indicating that the variances for the districts were significantly different. The one-way analysis of variance test showed that the difference of school districts had little effect on the variability of the reported averages for guided reading,  $F(4, 374) = 1.74, p = .142$ .



Table 3

*Average Time Spent on Guided Reading Instructional Activities by District*

District	Classrooms Observed	Before			During			After			Total	
		<i>M</i> (min)	<i>SD</i>	Percent of Total Time	<i>M</i> (min)	<i>SD</i>	Percent of Total Time	<i>M</i> (min)	<i>SD</i>	Percent of Total Time	<i>M</i> (min)	<i>SD</i>
1	13	6.15	9.82	25.52%	13.95	26.44	57.88%	4.00	5.67	16.60%	24.10	35.77
2	61	10.22	8.67	29.82%	16.04	14.43	46.80%	8.01	9.52	23.37%	34.27	23.28
3	17	11.00	5.21	26.64%	24.58	8.94	59.53%	5.71	4.69	13.83%	41.29	9.48
4	20	11.87	8.97	29.58%	19.22	14.77	47.89%	9.04	8.73	22.53%	40.13	26.86
5	4	3.67	2.01	10.29%	24.33	14.41	68.21%	7.67	9.81	21.50%	35.67	18.61

*Comparison of Routines*

Analyses were conducted to compare guided reading and shared reading routines for instruction before, during, and after reading. A dataset created with a smaller sample of teachers ( $n = 22$ ) included teachers who were observed holding both guided reading and shared reading. For this analysis it was necessary to crosstabulate the before, during, and after reading instructional activities for guided reading against those for shared reading used by the group of 22 teachers who held both instructional routines during observations.

Table 4 displays prereading instructional activities for both guided and shared reading routines and shows what percentage of teachers doing guided and shared reading used the various instructional activities listed on the observation form. No more than half of the teachers did prereading instruction before both guided reading and shared reading. Teachers who did any of the instructional activities listed on the observation form before reading instruction in guided reading had a tendency to hold shared reading instruction where they took the opportunity to teach planned strategies.

Table 4

*Instructional Activities Used Before Reading in Guided Reading and Shared Reading*

Guided Reading Instructional Activity	Shared Reading Instructional Activity			Total
	Teach Planned Skills	Model Reading	Model Metacognitive Strategies	
Building interest	43.48%	39.13%	17.39%	23
Relate to prior knowledge	42.86%	38.10%	19.05%	21
Preteach vocabulary	47.06%	35.29%	17.65%	17
Students make predictions	50.00%	41.67%	8.33%	12
Teaching planned strategies	46.15%	38.46%	15.38%	13
Model meta-cognitive strategies	44.44%	33.33%	22.22%	9

All of the teachers in this sample incorporated appropriate instruction during shared reading, so the results for the variable for “Students choral read text with teacher support” were constant. Of note, however, is that more than 90% of teachers who did shared reading also took time to listen to individual students during guided reading, and more than 72% of teachers who held shared reading were supportive to readers during guided reading through offering prompts and other help as needed. Table 5 displays these frequencies and percentages.

Table 5

*Instructional Activities Used During Reading in Guided Reading and Shared Reading*

Guided Reading Instructional Activity	Frequency	Percent of Total (n = 22)
Students read independently	14	63.63%
Students mumble read	11	50.00%
Students choral read	7	31.81%
Teacher listens to individual students read	20	90.90%
Teacher monitors, prompts as needed while students read	16	72.72%

The data in Table 6 show that teachers who were observed leading guided reading instruction were more likely to supplement shared reading instruction with an after reading instructional activity to review text for content and meaning than the other options listed on the observation form.

Table 6

*Instructional Activities Used After Reading in Guided Reading and Shared Reading*

Guided Reading Instructional Activity	Shared Reading Instructional Activity			Total
	Review Text for Content and Meaning	Teach Planned, Specific Skills and Strategies	Explicitly Teach Reading Strategies	
Teach planned strategies	37.50%	25.00%	37.50%	8
Assess comprehension	40.91%	31.82%	27.27%	22
Build vocabulary	41.67%	33.33%	25.00%	12
Model or teach meta-cognitive strategies	41.67%	25.00%	33.33%	12
Have students make predictions	40.00%	40.00%	20.00%	5

### *Comparison by Grade Level*

Comparisons were made between second-grade and third-grade classrooms to pinpoint which activities were used before, during, and after reading instruction as part of guided reading and shared reading. A set of chi-square tests of independence were carried out to examine the relationship between grade level and before, during, or after activities for guided and shared reading.

The totals listed in Table 7 show that observers recorded more instances of prereading instructional activities for guided reading in second-grade classrooms than in third-grade classrooms. Table 8 displays percentages based on the observations of shared reading; a similar number of instances for each before reading instructional activity occurred during shared reading for the two grade levels.

To determine if grade level had an effect on the frequency of prereading instructional activities used, two numbers were assigned to each teacher in both grade levels based on the number of prereading instructional activities listed on the observation form that they used for every guided reading or shared reading group held during the observation; these numbers ranged from 0 to 6 for guided reading and 0 to 3 for shared reading. A chi-square test of independence was carried out to aid in each of these comparisons. The chi-square tests of independence showed that the relationship between grade level and the number of prereading instructional activities used by observed teachers was nonsignificant for guided reading routines,  $X^2 (6, n = 379) = 12.55, p = .051$ , as well as for shared reading routines,  $X^2 (2, n = 40) = 0.489, p = .921$ .

Table 7

*Instructional Activities Used Before Reading in Guided Reading by Grade*

Guided Reading Instructional Activities							
Grade	Building Interest	Relate to Prior Knowledge	Preteach Vocabulary	Students Make Predictions	Teach Planned Strategies	Model Meta-cognitive Strategies	Total
2	30.71%	19.66%	13.30%	11.42%	16.67%	8.24%	534
3	25.67%	21.67%	17.00%	12.00%	18.00%	5.67%	300

Table 8

*Instructional Activities Used Before Reading in Shared Reading by Grade*

Shared Reading Instructional Activities				
Grade	Teach Planned Skills	Model Reading	Model Meta-cognitive Strategies	Total
2	40.74%	40.74%	18.52%	27
3	35.71%	35.71%	28.57%	28

Instructional activities done during reading in guided reading are shown according to grade level in Table 9; second-grade teachers were observed doing more of the instructional activities listed on the observation form than were third-grade teachers. To determine if grade level had an effect on the frequency of during reading instructional activities used for guided reading, a number ranging from 0 to 5 was assigned to each teacher in both grade levels based on the number of during reading instructional activities listed on the observation form that they used for every guided reading held during the observation. These frequencies were compared by grade level using a chi-square test of independence. For guided reading, the chi-square tests of independence showed that there

Table 9

*Instructional Activities Used During Reading in Guided Reading by Grade*

Guided Reading Instructional Activities						
Grade	Students Read Independently	Students Mumble Read	Students Choral Read	Teacher Listens to Individual Students Read	Teacher Monitors, Prompts as Needed While Students Read	Total
2	21.69%	14.11%	7.75%	29.78%	26.68%	581
3	18.68%	15.38%	9.89%	29.12%	26.92%	364

was no significant difference between grade levels in the frequencies of instructional activities during reading,  $X^2(5, 379) = 8.62, p = .125$ .

The total number of postreading activities observed in the two grade levels, displayed in the far right columns of Table 10 and Table 11, was higher in the classrooms of second-grade teachers for guided reading and slightly higher for shared reading routines seen in second-grade classrooms.

Two numbers were assigned to each teacher in both grade levels based on the number of postreading instructional activities listed on the observation form that they used for every guided reading or shared reading group held during the observation; these numbers ranged from 0 to 5 for guided reading and 0 to 3 for shared reading. These frequencies were used to conduct a chi-square test of independence, which showed that grade level significantly affected the total number of guided reading postreading instructional activities used by individual teachers,  $X^2(5, N = 379) = 31.96, p < .001$ . Grade level did not have a significant effect on the frequency of instructional activities teachers used after shared reading,  $X^2(3, N = 40) = 1.14, p = .768$ .

Table 10

*Instructional Activities Used After Reading in Guided Reading by Grade*

Guided Reading Instructional Activities						
Grade	Teach Planned Strategies	Assess Comprehension	Build Vocabulary	Model or Teach Meta-cognitive Strategies	Have Students Make Predictions	Total
2	21.63%	41.85%	12.08%	12.92%	11.52%	356
3	16.43%	34.74%	18.31%	14.08%	16.43%	213

Table 11

*Instructional Activities Used After Reading in Shared Reading by Grade*

Shared Reading Instructional Activities				
Grade	Review Text for Content and Meaning	Teach Planned, Specific Skills and Strategies	Explicitly Teach Reading Strategies	Total
2	40.00%	36.00%	24.00%	25
3	36.36%	36.36%	27.27%	22

*Comparison by School District*

Observation data were also used to compare before, during, and after reading instruction implementations for the districts in the sample to understand any possible differences more fully.

*Shared reading.* One of the districts, District 5, did not have any teachers who were observed doing shared reading, so the comparisons of percentage of the total observed shared reading groups that employed the instructional activities on the observation form for before, during, and after reading in shared reading shown in Table 12, Table 13, and Table 14 are only between four districts. These three tables show that

Table 12

*Instructional Activities Used Before Reading in Shared Reading by District*

District	Shared Reading Instructional Activities			Total
	Teach Planned Skills or Strategies	Model Reading	Model Meta-cognitive Strategies	
1	33.33%	50.00%	16.67%	12
2	43.33%	30.00%	26.67%	30
3	33.33%	66.67%	0.00%	3
4	30.00%	40.00%	30.00%	10
5	*	*	*	0

\*District 5 did not have any shared reading instructional routines during observations.

Table 13

*Frequency of Instructional Activities Used During Reading in Shared Reading by District*

District	Shared Reading Instructional Activity	
	Students Choral Read Text With Teacher Support	
1	11	
2	22	
3	3	
4	6	
5	*	

\*District 5 did not have any shared reading instructional routines during observations.

Table 14

*Instructional Activities Used After Reading in Shared Reading by District*

District	Shared Reading Instructional Activities			Total
	Review Text for Content and Meaning	Teach Planned, Specific Skills and Strategies	Explicitly Teach Reading Strategies	
1	42.86%	42.86%	14.29%	7
2	37.93%	37.93%	24.14%	29
3	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	3
4	37.50%	25.00%	37.50%	8
5	*	*	*	0

\*District 5 did not have any shared reading instructional routines during observations.



District 2 had the highest percentage of prereading, postreading, and during reading instructional activities that occurred during the observations.

To determine if the frequency of shared reading instructional activities done in individual classrooms differed significantly due to district, teachers who held shared reading were assigned a number based on the instructional activities they used that were included on the observation form; these numbers ranged from 0 to 3 for prereading instructional activities and 0 to 3 for postreading instructional activities. For shared reading, results for the chi-square test of independence comparing these frequencies by district were nonsignificant, showing that the district effect on prereading instructional activity frequency was minimal,  $X^2(9, N = 40) = 13.95, p = .124$ , as well as for after reading instructional activities,  $X^2(9, N = 40) = 9.49, p = .393$ .

*Guided reading.* Table 15, Table 16, and Table 17 show the percentages of total guided reading groups in each of the school districts in the study that were observed carrying out the different types of instructional activities listed on the observation form before, during and after reading instruction. As with the shared reading instructional activities, District 2 had the largest number of guided reading instructional activities carried out on the days classrooms were observed. District 5 had the fewest recorded instances of these instructional activities for before, during, and after reading for guided reading instruction.

Table 15

*Instructional Activities Used Before Reading in Guided Reading by District*

Guided Reading Instructional Activities							
District	Building Interest	Relate to Prior Knowledge	Preteach Vocab	Students Make Predictions	Teach Planned Strategies	Model Meta-cognitive Strategies	Total
1	41.18%	14.71%	2.94%	26.47%	2.94%	11.76%	34
2	28.02%	21.18%	13.90%	11.85%	17.08%	7.97%	439
3	30.82%	21.92%	15.75%	9.59%	19.86%	2.05%	146
4	27.54%	18.84%	16.91%	9.66%	18.36%	8.70%	207
5	25.00%	12.50%	25.00%	25.00%	0.00%	12.50%	8

Table 16

*Instructional Activities Used During Reading in Guided Reading by District*

Guided Reading Instructional Activities						
District	Students Read Independently	Students Mumble Read	Students Choral Read	Teacher Listens to Individual Students Read	Teacher Monitors, Prompts as Needed While Students Read	Total
1	28.87%	5.15%	1.03%	32.99%	31.96%	97
2	21.46%	15.75%	9.82%	29.00%	23.97%	438
3	22.98%	12.42%	11.18%	27.95%	25.47%	161
4	13.96%	18.02%	7.66%	29.73%	30.63%	222
5	14.81%	14.81%	7.41%	33.33%	29.63%	27

Table 17

*Instructional Activities Used After Reading in Guided Reading by District*

Guided Reading Instructional Activities						
District	Teach Planned Strategies	Assess Comprehension	Build Vocabulary	Model or Teach Meta-cognitive Strategies	Have Students Make Predictions	Total
1	13.58%	34.57%	13.58%	22.22%	16.05%	81
2	20.00%	40.77%	14.62%	13.46%	11.15%	260
3	23.19%	46.38%	13.04%	2.90%	14.49%	69
4	21.62%	34.46%	14.19%	14.19%	15.54%	148
5	9.09%	54.55%	27.27%	0.00%	9.09%	11

To determine if the frequency of guided reading instructional activities done in individual guided reading groups differed significantly across districts, teachers who held guided reading were assigned a number based on the number of instructional activities they used during any guided reading group session that were included on the observation form; these numbers ranged from 0 to 6 for prereading instructional activities, and 0 to 5 for both during reading and postreading instruction.

Chi-square tests for independence indicated that frequencies for guided reading instructional activities done before, during, and after reading differed significantly by school districts. For prereading instructional activities done as part of guided reading,  $X^2(20, N = 379) = 90.41, p < .001$ . The number of instructional activities done during the reading portion of guided reading differed significantly across districts,  $X^2(16, N = 379) = 38.56, p = .008$ . The different frequencies among the districts for instructional activities done after reading as part of guided reading were also significant,  $X^2(16, N = 379) = 42.60, p = .002$ .

## CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to add to the larger body of literature related to instructional scaffolding provided before, during and after reading during different portions of balanced teaching of literacy. The results presented in the previous chapter shed some light on the instructional activities second- and third-grade teachers use before, during, and after reading as part of guided reading and shared reading routines. The questions and statistical analyses that guided this study helped to break down the observation data so that various aspects of before, during, and after reading instruction implementation could be compared according to grade level, school, district, and type of literacy instruction.

### *School and District Differences*

Balanced literacy was developed in the districts that make up the Brigham Young University-Public School Partnership (BYU-PSP) with general guidelines in place. Professional development courses taught to the school teachers provided training in instructional methods and teaching techniques useful in balanced literacy teaching, and a portion of the implementation included teachers being trained to train other teachers. Preservice teachers who complete their coursework at BYU enroll in courses to teach methods for balanced teaching.

Some matters of the initiative's implementation were left to the districts to decide, and, as a result, it is understandable and expected that there are differences in how guided reading and shared reading are carried out in the various districts of the BYU-PSP. The districts choose to focus on balanced literacy to varying degrees, with some offering professional development courses, in-service workshops, and support from literacy

specialists on the school and district level, and others leaving implementation in the hands of the teachers to a large degree.

*Percentages of time.* How teachers spend instructional time is important in fostering literacy skills. One aspect of instruction examined in this study was the average percentage of time teachers devoted to instructional activities before, during, and after reading as part of instructional routines. One comparison was between the different percentages devoted to different time periods of instructional activities for guided and shared reading instructional routines. For both guided reading and shared reading, teachers devoted the greatest portion of instructional time to the instructional activities done during reading instruction. For guided reading, a greater percentage of total time was spent on instructional activities before reading than for after reading. The opposite was true for shared reading, and a slightly larger percentage of time was spent on instructional activities done after reading than before reading. The variation in the percentages of time spent on instructional activities done as part of guided reading and shared reading simply points out that teachers use instructional time in different ways for the two instructional routines analyzed in this study.

Another comparison was between the districts in the sample and the percentages of time each devoted to before, during, and after reading instructional activities for guided and shared reading routines. The comparison of the districts doing shared reading showed that they tended to devote larger amounts of time to during activities and then either before or after activities, with a smaller proportion of time devoted to the other. The same pattern was displayed by most of the percentages for the district comparison for guided reading, and in those cases more time was spent on the before reading and during

reading activities than on the after reading instructional activities, except for District 5 which had teachers spending more time on instructional activities after reading in guided reading and less time on before reading instruction. On average, District 2, the district with the greatest number of guided reading groups observed, devoted the lowest percentage of total guided reading time to instructional activities done during reading instruction. While the districts have agreed upon general principles for implementing balanced literacy—and have even identified and defined instructional practices held in common across the partnership—no guidelines have been put into place regarding the amount of time to spend on instructional activities done as part of guided and shared reading. The results of this comparison speak to the unique design of the BYU-PSP balanced literacy initiative where districts are given the necessary latitude to adjust the general balanced literacy principles as needed.

*Instructional routine differences.* Guided reading and shared reading are implemented differently because they serve different purposes as instructional routines. The frequency of instructional activities differed between the two routines in the district comparisons. The results of the comparison of the frequencies for guided reading instructional activities in the different districts showed that some teachers use a greater variety of instructional activities than others. Using a variety of instructional activities may suggest that teachers were working to meet the needs of individual students in the guided reading groups. Teachers observed doing shared reading used less variety among instructional activities in this same frequency comparison. That may be due to the fact that shared reading by its very nature is not carried out to meet the needs of individual students so much as it is to aid in different types of strategy instruction for readers.

Teachers may not need to use as great a variety of instructional activities for shared reading because strategies may be taught effectively with a few simple focused activities, which are not limited to those included on the observation form used for this study.

### *Grouping Effects*

Within the group of 22 teachers who had both guided and shared reading on the days they were observed, it was found that except for in a few select cases, instructional activities done before, during and after reading as part of guided reading were independent of those done as part of shared reading. This was interesting given that there were a few similarities between the instructional activities listed on the observation form for guided reading and those listed for shared reading. Before and after reading during guided reading and shared reading, teachers might take time to teach planned strategies or model metacognitive strategies such as checking for understanding, posing questions or finding meaning of words. During the reading portion of guided reading a teacher might have students choral read together. This was also listed on the observation form as an instructional activity for during shared reading. Despite the obvious similarities between some of these activities that observers looked for during classroom observations, it was apparent that teachers who held before reading, during reading, and after reading activities for guided reading were not necessarily likely to also hold before reading, during reading, and after reading instruction for shared reading periods.

One possible explanation for this outcome is the difference in grouping for shared reading as compared with guided reading. In shared reading, teachers typically have the entire class read together in some fashion. In guided reading students are usually grouped together according to their level of reading ability so that instruction can be given that is

appropriately helpful and challenging for each group member (Wagstaff, 1994). For shared reading the group of participants is heterogeneous because there are students of varying abilities reading together when the whole class is involved. Teachers can be flexible in tailoring shared reading instruction because, as Rog (2003) writes, “[shared reading] accommodates a variety of levels of development, as each child gains something different from the experience” (p. 11). Guided reading groups are homogeneous and provide teachers with an opportunity to address similar needs among a small group of students. The grouping structure differences for guided reading and shared reading may account for the lack of a relationship between how teachers led before reading, during reading, and after reading instruction within guided and shared reading routines. These findings are not undesirable, however, because early readers can benefit from being in a variety of groups during instruction (Rog, 2003).

#### *Developmental Differences*

The analysis done to compare what before reading, during reading, and after reading instructional activities were used in second- and third-grade classrooms as part of guided reading and shared reading routines showed that there were more occurrences for most types of instructional activities in the second grade, for both guided and shared reading. This raises an interesting point about instructional scaffolding. One possibility for the higher frequencies appearing where they did is because second-graders are typically less-experienced readers than are third-graders. Some methods of scaffolding, and perhaps those on the observation form, are targeted primarily toward beginning readers because they are the students who most need additional instructional supports. As students learn to have and use skills of their own with decreasing amounts of teacher



assistance over time, it seems logical that the scaffolds listed on the instrument may have become less useful for more sophisticated third-grade readers.

This same comparison by grade level also shows that for the before reading and after reading instructional activities for guided reading that are the same on the observation form, more teachers in both grades chose to do these activities (teaching vocabulary, teaching planned strategies, have students make predictions, and model or teach metacognitive strategies) before reading as opposed to after. Ultimately it is the teachers who decide what scaffolding to use in their classrooms (McIntyre, 2007), and they have the additional role of determining what instructional activities are most appropriate for their particular students' developmental needs.

#### *Study Limitations*

Using a pre-existing data collection form and using existing data in addition to that presented severe limitations for this study. One way the form itself was limiting was in terms of its content. For example, in the shared reading section of the form there is only one activity listed for observers to note as part of during reading instruction: choral reading. In reality there are many other instructional activities teachers might use to scaffold students' understanding of a text during reading instruction in shared reading routines. Some of the instructional activities that teachers may also have used during reading instruction include activities designed for helping build students' vocabulary, word recognition, focusing on fluency in reading, and others. The findings of this study, then, do not fully represent the variety of activities possibly used to successfully scaffold students' learning during reading instruction in shared reading.

The observation form was also limiting in its format. Observers did not record lengths of time spent on individual instructional activities, but rather only kept track of the total time spent on groups of instructional activities and total time spent on instructional routines. Had times been recorded for all individual instructional activities a teacher did during a classroom observation, different conclusions could have been drawn from this study's data. Additionally, in some instances, such as during the reading instruction portion of guided reading where both teacher and student activities were listed, the form allowed for multiple activities to be occurring at the same time. This study did not address this limitation effectively and essentially ignored the lack of discrete time measurements for activities done by students instead of teachers.

One difficulty in drawing conclusions from findings made with observation data from multiple observers is the issue of inter-rater reliability. The graduate students who observed classrooms were given the same training at the beginning of their employment, and the supervisor provided opportunities for new observers to attend observations with veteran observers for training purposes. The supervisor and her assistants checked and rechecked digital copies of the completed observation forms for accuracy after each was entered into Excel from hard-copy forms, but the main concern with having a group of multiple raters is that it would be difficult to have absolute consistency between what observers recorded in all sections of the form.

Another limitation of this study was that the extant data used came from a study conducted on a sample population in a closely-knit group of school districts. The use of observation data and results of analysis of the data should be constrained to the sample population, particularly because of a self-selection limitation due to teachers choosing

whether or not to respond once observers contacted them to schedule a visit. To increase the generalizability of the findings presented in the current study, it would be necessary to observe additional grade levels, classrooms and schools.

#### *Further Research Ideas*

A study to compare criterion-referenced test scores and the implementation of balanced literacy across the districts in the BYU-PSP would be most informative, and would allow for inferences to be made about the effectiveness of the BYU-PSP initiative for balanced literacy. In conducting such a study one would need to control for extraneous factors unique to individual students such as socio-economic status of students' families. A study based on interviewing individual teachers for the purpose of evaluating their understanding and use of instructional scaffolds as part of what they do during balanced literacy instruction would prove helpful in shedding light on what differences in the districts might be attributable to implementation by teachers and perhaps not just the district, as shown in the present study. It would also be instructive to do more background research to find out what role, if any, theories about specific instructional scaffolding methods played in the development of the premier balanced teaching ideas in the New Zealand school system. It would also be important to continue to work within the BYU-PSP, and a study could be done to make comparisons between the BYU-PSP districts and other districts that have implemented balanced literacy but without the assistance of Partnership resources and personnel to see if that involvement makes any difference in the overall implementation process.

*Summary*

This study provides some ideas about the use of instructional scaffolds before reading, during reading, and after reading for guided reading and shared reading routines. There may not be a readily observable pattern for using scaffolds to aid in prereading, during reading and postreading instruction, but it is important to know that teachers are using them and devoting precious time and resources to equip students with the skills and knowledge they need to succeed readers. As P. David Pearson (1996) writes,

Scaffolding [before, during, and after reading instruction] allows us, as teachers, to intervene in an environment and provide the cueing, questioning, coaching, corroboration, and plain old information needed to allow students to complete a task before they are able to complete it independently. (p. 273)

As changes are made that affect literacy education of primary-grade students care should be taken for teachers and the administrators who run the schools and districts they work within to learn the vital role that scaffolding can play in helping children develop one of the most valuable skills they could ever possess.

## REFERENCES

- Au, K. H. (1992). Constructing the theme of a story. *Language Arts, 69*, 106-111.
- Beed, P. L, Hawkins, E. M., & Roller, C. M. (1991). Moving learners toward independence: The power of scaffolded instruction. *The Reading Teacher, 44*, 648-655.
- Burns, B. (1999). *How to Teach Balanced Reading and Writing*. Arlington Heights, IL: Skylight Publishing, Inc.
- Cazden, C. B. (1992). *Whole language plus: Essays on literacy in the United States and New Zealand*. New York: Teachers College Press
- Center for the Improvement of Teacher Education and Schooling. (2007). *Balanced literacy research description for CITES website*. Unpublished manuscript, Brigham Young University: Provo, UT.
- Clay, M. M. (1991). *Becoming literate: The construction of inner control*. Auckland, New Zealand: Heinemann Education.
- Davidson, A. (1990). *Literacy 2000: Teachers' Resource*. Crystal Lake, IL: Rigby.
- Department of Education, New Zealand. (1985). *Reading in junior classes*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education
- Dowhower, S. L. (1999). Supporting a strategic stance in the classroom: A comprehension framework for helping teachers help students to be strategic. *The Reading Teacher, 52*, 672-688.
- Eldredge, J. L, Reutzel, D. R., & Hollingsworth, P. M. (1996). Comparing the effectiveness of two oral reading practices: Round-robin reading and the shared book experience. *Journal of Literacy Research, 28*(2), 201-225.

- Fall, R. Webb, N. M. and Chudowsky, N. (2000). Group discussion and large scale language arts assessment: Effects on students' comprehension. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37, 911-941.
- Fountas, I. C., & Pinnell, G. S. (1996). *Guided reading: Good first teaching for all children*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Fountas, I. C., & Pinnell, G. S. (2001). *Guiding readers and writers: Grades 3-6*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Graves, M. F., Graves, B., & Braaten, S. (1996). Scaffolded reading experiences for inclusive classes. *Educational Leadership*, 53(5), 14-16.
- Hogan, K., & Pressley, M. (Eds.). (1997). *Scaffolding student learning: Instructional approaches and issues*. Cambridge, MA: Brookline.
- Holdaway, D. (1979). *The foundations of literacy*. Sydney, Australia: Ashton Scholastic.
- Holdaway, D. (1982). Shared book experience: Teaching reading using favorite books. *Theory into Practice*, 21, 293-300.
- Jesse, J. (n.d.) *Goals 2000 evaluation*. Unpublished manuscript, Brigham Young University-Public School Partnership: Provo, UT.
- Lenski, S. D. & Nierstheimer, S. L. (2002). Strategy instruction from a sociocognitive Perspective. *Reading Psychology*, 23, 127-143.
- Many, J. E. (2002). An exhibition and analysis of verbal tapestries: Understanding how scaffolding is woven into the fabric of instructional conversations. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 37, 376-407.
- McIntyre, E. (2007). Story discussion in the primary grades: Balancing authenticity and explicit teaching. *The Reading Teacher*, 60, 610-620.

- Mooney, M. E. (1990) *Reading to, with, and by children*. Katonah, NY: Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.
- Pearson, P. D. (1996). Reclaiming the center. In M. Graves and P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *The first R: Every child's right to read* (pp. 259-274). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Pearson, P. D., & Fielding, L. (1991). Comprehension instruction. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research*, (Vol. 2, pp. 815-860). New York: Longman.
- Pearson, P. D., and Gallagher, M. (1983). The instruction of reading comprehension. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 8, 317-344.
- Phenix, J. (2000). *The reading teacher's handbook*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Pinnell, G. S. (2002). Good first teaching: Making the critical difference for all students. In H. J. Walberg (Series Ed.) & M. L. Kamil, J. B. Manning & H. J. Walberg (Vol. Eds.), *Research in educational productivity: Successful reading instruction* (pp. 155-182). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Pressley, M. (2002). *Reading instruction that works: The case for balanced teaching*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. NY: Guilford Press.
- Pressley, M., Wharton-McDonald, R., Allington, R. L., Block, C. C., Morrow, L., Tracey, D., Baker, K., Brooks, G., Cronin, J., Nelson, E., & Woo, D. (2001). A study of effective first-grade literacy instruction. *Scientific Studies in Reading*, 5, 35-58.

- Readence, J. E., Moore, E. W., & Rickelman, R. J. (2004). *Prereading activities for content area reading and learning* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Rigby. (1989). *Teachers' resource: Guided and independent reading*. Crystal Lake, IL: Rigby.
- Rog, L. J. (2003). *Guided reading basics: Organizing, managing, and implementing a balanced literacy program in K-3*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Rosenshine, B. & Meister, C. (1992). The use of scaffolds for teaching higher-level cognitive strategies. *Educational Leadership*, 49(7), 26-33.
- Slavin, R. E. (2000). *Educational psychology: Theory and practice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Strech, Lorie L. (1995). *Ability grouping for elementary reading instruction and its relationship to the balanced literacy approach*. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, Long Beach. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED380783). Retrieved May 26, 2008, from the ERIC database.
- Sweet, S. P. (1993). *State of the art: Transforming ideas for teaching and learning to read*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wagstaff, J. M. (1994). *Phonics that work!: New strategies for the reading/writing classroom*. New York: Teaching Resources/Scholastic.
- Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Psychology and Psychiatry*. 17, 89-100.



## APPENDIX A

## LITERACY OBSERVATION FORM—School Year 2006-07

Date of Observation: \_\_\_\_\_ Name of Observer: \_\_\_\_\_ Teacher Name/ID: \_\_\_\_\_

School \_\_\_\_\_ District \_\_\_\_\_ Grade Level \_\_ No. St. in Class \_\_ Present \_\_ Start/End of Visit \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

**Instructions:** For the parts marked "SETTING," indicate the presence or absence of them, make any relevant comments, and obtain a copy of the lesson plan, if possible. For the parts marked "INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES," enter the start time in the first box and the end time in the next box IN THE NON-SHADED AREAS each time the specified instructional activity is observed, then check the shaded boxes below to record the specific sub-activities. In the "Notes" section at the very end, indicate in general what was happening during time periods of greater than 1 minute when the teacher was **not** engaged in one of the listed INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES.

<b>Guided Reading</b>	<b>TIMES</b>			
The teacher works with a small group (5-8) of students. The teacher chooses and introduces <b>instructional level texts</b> . Students have individual copies of the text and independently read (orally or silently) the entire text or text section. The teacher observes, coaches, prompts, and evaluates student performance.	Record beginning and ending times for each activity in white areas, and place a check mark in the shaded box for the more specific activities the teacher used during that time period.			
<b>INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES</b>	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
• <b>BEFORE:</b> Teacher introduces text to students by:				
• building background/interest.				
• relating to prior knowledge.				
• preteaching vocabulary.				
• having students make predictions.				
• teaching planned strategies.				
• modeling/teaching metacognitive strategies (e.g., check for understanding, pose questions, find meaning of words).				
• <b>DURING:</b> Students read the entire text or text section:				
• students read independently				
• students mumble read				
• students choral read				
• teacher listens to individual students read				
• teacher monitors and prompts as needed while students read				
• <b>AFTER:</b> The teacher leads a brief discussion to:				
• teach planned strategies.				
• assess comprehension.				
• build vocabulary.				
• model/teach metacognitive strategies (e.g., check for understanding, pose questions, find meaning of words).				
• have students make predictions.				
• <b>OTHER ACTIVITIES:</b> Done during GR:				
• round-robin reading				
• word work (e.g., word families, word recognition), spelling				
• test preparation				
• monitoring behavior of students outside the group				
• other (specify)				
<b>SETTING</b>				
• Number of students in group:				
• Text appears to be at students' <b>instructional level</b> .				
• Teacher documents individual student progress.				
• Other students are engaged in independent activities while the teacher works with small groups.	List:			

<b>Literacy Mini Lesson</b>	<b>TIMES</b>						
During a whole class mini lesson, the teacher delivers instruction or information to all students and communicates expectations regarding what the students should be able to do as a result. May be followed up with an in-class assignment (e.g., worksheet, collaborative activity).	Record beginning and ending times for the session in white areas, and place a check mark in the shaded boxes for the more specific activities the teacher used during that time period.						
<b>INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES</b>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whole class mini lesson:</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• word work--phonics, prefixes, suffixes, word wall, etc.</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• spelling</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• comprehension</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• text structure (expository vs. narrative text, etc)</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• grammar or word usage</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• other (specify)</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assigns and gives time to complete independent work (not as a center during Guided Reading)</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discusses and wraps up independent work (not as a center during GR)</li> </ul>							
<b>SETTING</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher organizes for whole class and involves all students</li> </ul>	Describe involvement of students (e.g., all, some):						

<b>Teacher Read-Aloud</b>	<b>TIMES</b>						
Teacher reads aloud or plays a tape recording of someone reading and students sit and listen or follow along with the text. This differs from Shared Reading in that students <b>do not</b> read along. (NOTE: Sometimes a read aloud will be part of another activity such as Interactive Writing—if so, record it as part of that activity.)	Record beginning and ending times for the session in white areas, and place a check mark in the shaded boxes for the more specific activities the teacher used during that time period.						
<b>INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES</b>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher reads/plays tape for students (not as part of other literacy activity) to:</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• develop a sense of story or text structure.</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improve comprehension.</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• develop active listening skills.</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• teach planned strategies/concepts (e.g., using colorful adjectives).</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• model fluent reading.</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• promote prediction.</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• other (specify).</li> </ul>							
<b>SETTING</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All students are attentive and involved in the discussion.</li> </ul>	Describe involvement of students (e.g., all, some):						

<b>Independent/Buddy Reading</b>	<b>TIMES</b>						
(May be referred to as reading workshop. NOTE: Choose this instead of “SSR” if the teacher is listening to individuals read, coaching them, conferencing with them, assessing reading, etc., as all students read.)	Record beginning and ending times for the session in white areas, and place a check mark in the shaded boxes for the more specific activities the teacher used during that time period.						
<b>INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES</b>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The session is structured as follows:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>teacher coaches, conferences, and/or assessments students as they read.</li> <li>students read books at appropriate level(s) chosen for them by the teacher</li> <li>students read together (buddy reading)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>							
<b>SETTING</b>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Materials are accessible that are appropriate for independent or buddy reading.</li> </ul>							

<b>Shared Reading</b>	<b>TIMES</b>						
During shared reading all students have access to the print. Teacher often reads first to model fluency and expression. At some point, <b>students and teacher read together</b> . There is an active exchange of thoughts and ideas between the teacher and students. Teachers plan Shared Reading lessons for a specific purpose.	Record beginning and ending times for each activity in white areas, and place a check mark in the shaded box for the more specific activities the teacher used during that time period.						
<b>INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES</b>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher leads a discussion <b>before</b> reading to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>teach planned, specific skills and strategies.</li> <li>model reading with expression and fluency.</li> <li>model metacognitive reading strategies (e.g., check for understanding, pose questions, predict, find meaning of new words).</li> </ul> </li> <li>Students choral read text with teacher support</li> <li>Teacher and students discuss <b>after</b> reading to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>review text for content and meaning.</li> <li>teach planned, specific skills and strategies.</li> <li>explicitly teach reading strategies (e.g., check for understanding, pose questions, predict, find meaning of new words).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>							
<b>SETTING</b>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Text is large enough (or otherwise available) for all students to see</li> <li>Teacher appears to have planned to teach specific skills and strategies.</li> <li>All students involved at some point in the lesson</li> </ul>							
	No. Students in group: No. Actually Involved:						

<b>Writing Workshop/Independent Writing</b>	<b>TIMES</b>						
During writing workshop the teacher provides instruction in writing skills which may involve reading text or exploring other resources as models. Often students will then be asked to write independently following the model the teacher used.	Record beginning and ending times for the session in white areas, and place a check mark in the shaded boxes for the more specific activities the teacher used during that time period.						
<b>INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES</b>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher directs whole class writing instruction using activities such as:</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>sharing an experience (e.g., read-aloud, fieldtrip, discussion) to initiate the writing lesson</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>sharing examples of good writing, modeling good strategies</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>teaching planned strategies and concepts</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>having student(s) share composition with whole class for peer review</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students write independently to complete a writing assignment:</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>students work independently on their own compositions</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>teacher conferences with students</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>classmates conference with each other for peer review</li> </ul>							
<b>SETTING</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Materials are accessible that are appropriate for independent writing.</li> </ul>							

<b>Interactive Writing</b>	<b>TIMES</b>						
During interactive writing the teacher and students <b>jointly negotiate, compose, and construct written text</b> . The teacher uses the process to teach lessons based on specific objectives. Upon completion, the piece is made available for reading.	Record beginning and ending times for the session in white areas, and place a check mark in the shaded box for the more specific activities the teacher used during that time period.						
<b>INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES</b>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher directs the session using activities such as the following:</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shares an experience (e.g., read aloud, fieldtrip, discussion) to initiate the interactive writing lesson</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>actively involves students in negotiating and composing the text</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>makes appropriate teaching points</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>has student(s) scribe each text section</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>reads the text with students after each addition</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>uses environmental print (word wall, interactive writing, alphabet charts, name charts) as a resource for writing.</li> </ul>							
<b>SETTING</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The generated text is created in a form that all students can see and read.</li> </ul>							

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Other Literacy Instruction</b></p> <p>These are whole class activities that are not part of any other literacy activity.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>TIMES</b></p> <p>Record beginning and ending times for the session in white areas, and place a check mark in the shaded boxes for the more specific activities the teacher used during that time period.</p>						
<b>INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES</b>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whole class seat work:</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• writing (e.g., writing in journals—not part of “writing workshop”)</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• completing worksheets (not as a centers during Guided Reading)</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• finishing previous assignments (not as a center during Guided Reading)</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whole class reading (not “Independent Reading”—see above)</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• silent (e.g., SSR)</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• choral</li> </ul>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• round robin</li> </ul>							
<p><b>SETTING</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The materials needed to complete the activities are readily available.</li> </ul>							

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Environment</b></p> <p>The teacher creates a literate environment by displaying accessible print including student writing. Literacy materials, including shared reading, independent reading, and read aloud texts are available for student use. The teacher can create a literate environment to promote student involvement.</p>	<p>Indicate the presence of these features in the classroom and write any explanatory information as appropriate.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interactive writing pieces are displayed in the classroom.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describe grade-appropriate texts available for student use (e.g., numbers, quality).</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Word study materials are evident (i.e., word walls, chunk walls, making word boards, magnetic letters, erasable student boards).</li> </ul>	List observed materials:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describe books available for independent reading, including the variety of genre and levels.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describe how students use the room environment to help them read and write.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describe how well the teacher manages the classroom.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describe movement of students into/out of the classroom during literacy instruction (e.g., for resource, special instruction).</li> </ul>	

NOTES: