University of South Florida
Scholar Commons

2008

The nature of questioning moves used by exemplary teachers during reading instruction

Melinda M. Lundy
University of South Florida

The Nature of Questioning Moves Used by Exemplary Teachers During

Reading Instruction

by

Melinda M. Lundy

Major Professor: Kathryn Laframboise, Ph.D.
David Allsopp, Ph.D.
Roger Brindley, Ed.D.
Susan Homan, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:
May 21, 2008

Dedication

To Jeff Lundy, my devoted husband, who has unshakeable confidence in my abilities.

Table of Contents

ii

List of Tables

.

The Nature of Questioning Moves Used by Exemplary Teachers During
Reading Instruction

Melinda M. Lundy

ABSTRACT

This study examines and describes the nature of questioning moves used by two exemplary fourth-grade teachers during reading instruction. Questioning moves are defined in this study as the ways in which teachers use scaffolding questions to engage students in talk about text. Another point of interest in this study was to determine how teachers perceive the influence of instructional materials on the language they use to engage students in talk about text.

This study was situated within a constructivist paradigm of inquiry and drew from the case study tradition for its design. Naturalistic methods of data collection were employed including transcripts of teacher and student talk, field notes, videotapes, and interviews with the teachers. Data analysis was conducted in two stages. First data were analyzed separately within each case to locate emerging patterns to build each teacher's profile. Then data were juxtaposed for the purpose of comparison to illuminate similarities and differences in patterns that cut across cases.

In general, results show that while questioning moves used by exemplary fourth-grade teachers are different, they are simple and subtle. The questioning moves used provided scaffolding for the purpose of increasing the students' responsibility for constructing meaning from text and signaled teachers' high expectations in their students'

ability to read and interact with text. Teachers' use of questioning moves was determined by the instructional focus and hinged on the nature, intensity, and support of their professional development opportunities and experiences. Additional findings, indirectly related to teachers' use of questioning moves, and the influences on their use, were themed around the nature of attention that teachers gave to their classroom environment and instructional design. Implications of the results of this study for reading teachers and educators are themed around issues of professional development and time.

Chapter One

Introduction

"To a great extent within classrooms, the language used by teachers and students

determines what is learned and how learning takes place."

(Wilkinson & Silliman, 2000 p. 337)

I was a classroom teacher for eight years. As a reading teacher, I had the goal of

engaging students with text in strategic and deliberate ways to promote thoughtful

reading and content learning. I clung to the notion that providing students with

opportunities to experience and respond to literature as they read deepened their

understanding of text and cultivated a strong reading habit.

In my years spent teaching, I engaged my students in discussions about text on a

daily basis, but reflecting back I realize that I predominately adopted a teaching stance

that encouraged affective responses to text. I adopted this stance in an effort to generate

emotional connections that would complement and embellish the cognitive aspects of

reading. Throughout our discussions I made a series of decisions to afford students

opportunities to express their ideas and to hear the ideas expressed by their classmates. I

often reflected on the nature of our conversations. The engagement manifested in my

students' discourse told me they were interested, but now I realize that I really did not

have a commanding knowledge of the 'what' and the 'how' in regard to scaffolding my

students' ability to construct meaning from text. Often, I wonder if the decisions I made

and the discussions we engaged in achieved the goal of deepening my students'
understanding of text or sacrificed it to ill-structured discussion approaches.

The reflective nature of my practice as a reading teacher fueled an interest in the
complex field of reading. I obtained a Master's degree in reading and engaged in a
plethora of learning opportunities focused on literacy at the national, state, and local
level. My insatiable desire to learn and grow in the field of literacy resulted in my
becoming a literacy coach, and later a district curriculum specialist in the area of
language arts for K-5 teachers. The concept for this study evolved from my experiences
as a curriculum specialist, literacy coach, and classroom teacher.

My experiences in the field of literacy have taken me in and out of many
classrooms to work along side teachers. My observations in multiple classrooms have
allowed me to see a wide array of reading instruction that employs various instructional
materials and calls on various areas of professional development. I find the format
teachers choose for discussion about text also varies and affects discourse features, such
as the amount of time spent on teacher talk and student talk, the frequency of students'
interruptions, the character of the questions asked by the teacher and students, and the
cognitive processes manifested in students' talk. I have noticed that just as there is a
range of discussion approaches and activities that can be attended to during reading
instruction to engage students in talk about text, there is a range of attitudes about making
time for it.

Researchers have long argued for the need to incorporate discussions into
classroom practice (Beck, Hamilton, & Kucan, 1997; Brown, Pressley, Van Meter, &
Schuder, 1996; Goldenberg, 1991; Palincsar & Brown, 1984; Pressley & McDonald,

1997; Rosenshine & Meister, 1994), and there is a strong theoretical base to substantiate the use of talk to shape students' learning (Cazden, 2001; Gilles & Pierce, 2003; Nystrand, 2006). With specific regard to reading instruction, the language teachers use to engage students in talk about text is critical. Their language use sets the tone for discussion, determines the length of discussion time, and is instrumental in facilitating the depth and breadth of students' conversations. Researchers contend that teachers' facilitation of classroom discussions that promote talk about text impacts students' reading comprehension by virtue of the texts chosen, the language used, and the literacy experiences they provide (Tierney & Pearson, 1981; Duke & Pearson, 2002).

Taking into account the teacher's instructional goals, two paradigms of discourse are evident in the literature. One stems from principles of behaviorism, and the other stems from principles of constructivism. The literature frequently suggests that traditional classrooms embrace principles of learning rooted in behaviorism. These traditional classrooms tend to focus on observable and measurable behaviors of skill acquisition and application (Cazden, 2001; Mehan, 1979, Nystand, 2006, Wells, 1993). Teaching in this paradigm is geared to the transmission of knowledge and skills from the teacher to the student. Generally, the dominant discourse pattern is triadic dialogue, which is defined as a three-part sequence of teacher initiation, student response, and teacher evaluation (IRE) (Cazden, 2001; Nystrand, 2006). With this interaction, student learning is demonstrated by giving a correct answer in response to a specific stimulus, which is usually in the form of a question. Upon answering a question, students immediately know the correctness of their response. Typically, scripted programs that offer a structured approach to teaching employ the IRE framework.

In regard to constructivism, the literature is extensive and yields many dimensions of constructivist theory (Bruner, 1990; Kuhn, 1962; Phillips, 1995; Piaget, 1959; von Glasersfeld, 1989; Vygotsky, 1978). It is important to recognize these dimensions are complex and differ in regard to the development of knowledge. Some constructivists focus on the minds of individual learners, others focus on public subject matter domains, few tackle both (see Phillips, 1995).

While constructivism is a "theory about learning not a description of teaching" (Fosnot, 1996, p. 29), attempts have been made in the field of reading to operationally define constructivist teachers so that classroom teachers can more rapidly apply constructivist theory to classroom practice (Lenski, Wham, & Griffey, 1997). For example, Lenski, Wham, & Griffey (1997) define the constructivist teacher as one who uses whole text and integrated instruction, teaches using primarily an inquiry approach, and views students as using prior knowledge to construct meaning to learn. Important here is the central idea that knowledge is socially constructed. As one approach to broader constructivist ideas of subjective ontology, the social constructivist model emphasizes the importance of the relationship between the teacher, the learner, and the environment.

Social constructivism embraces Russian psychologist Lev Vygotsky as the quintessential theorist. From this perspective, common understanding in the literature reflects the notion that teaching, learning, and the environment in social constructivist classrooms is founded on principles of learning focused on building personal interpretations based on experiences and interactions. Simply stated, classrooms supporting the principles of social constructivism structure learning around broad

4

concepts and embed learning in a social context (Cazden, 2001; Chin, Anderson, & Waggoner, 2001; Gilles & Pierce, 2003, Mehan, 1979).

With the use of less scripted, or non-scripted programs, teaching in this paradigm is geared to supporting knowledge construction by modeling and scaffolding within students' zones of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978). Discussion in this paradigm is the everyday implementation of the principle that students must be active participants in their own learning (Chin et al., 2001). Therefore, discourse is highly responsive and extends beyond the traditional IRE framework to allow a discussion format where students are free to respond to another student's comment, ask a question, extend another student's idea, or introduce a new topic (Chin et al., 2001). With specific regard to reading instruction, both paradigms of discourse have a place in classroom discussions (Fisher, 2005; Gilles & Pierce, 2003; Nystrand, 2006), but the latter supports the notion that the language teachers use during reading instruction enhances students' ability to produce meaning from their engagement with text (Chin et al., 2001; Nystrand, 2006; Taylor, Pearson, Peterson, & Rodriguez, 2003; Skidmore, 2000; Wilkinson, Murphy, & Soter, 2005).

Statement of the Problem

Talk in the classroom is both a way for students to learn as well as a window to what learning takes place (Gilles & Pierce, 2003). While the interrogational nature of classroom talk to ensure knowledge of story has been well documented (Cazden, 2001; Fisher, 2005; Gilles & Pierce, 2003; Mehan, 1979; Nystrand, 2006; Wells, 1993) the questioning moves embedded in conversations that engage students in talk about text is under researched (Taylor et al., 2003; Wilkinson, Murphy, & Soter, 2003, 2005).

5

Questioning moves are defined in this study as the ways in which teachers ask questions to scaffold students' understanding of text. The authenticity of teachers' questioning plays a crucial role in engaging students in constructing meaning from text, which is a precursor to promoting reading comprehension. However, in response to political pressures resulting in state mandates, elementary teachers frequently are forced to adopt instructional practices and state adopted programs that focus on raising standardized test scores (Serafini, 2003). Often as a result, teachers' authentic communication with their students takes a back seat to scripted programs. Mindful of the dominance of teacher talk that occurs spontaneously with the recitation format of scripted programs, but weary of the unrelenting pressures for student achievement in reading, exemplary teachers face the professional responsibility of making decisions regarding the nature of their language use to engage students with texts, and their use of materials to foster higher level teacher/student and student/student talk as a means to promote reading comprehension.

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this case study was to examine and describe the nature of questioning moves that exemplary fourth-grade teachers use during reading instruction. This study uses the notion of exemplary as described by Allington's framework of common features observed in exemplary fourth grade classrooms (2000, 2002). Another point of interest was to determine how teachers perceive the influence of instructional materials on the language they use to engage students in talk about text. Drawing upon current research conducted by Taylor et al. (2003) and Wilkinson, Murphy, and Soter (2003, 2005) (discussed in chapter two), the intent of this study was to fortify theory on the teacher's discourse role in regard to student engagement that leads to talk about text.

This study provides a window into exemplary teachers' fourth-grade classrooms during reading instruction for a discussion of the teachers' language use to engage students with text, and addresses gaps in the extant literature identified in Nystrand's (2006) historical review in regard to the teacher's discourse role.

This was a useful focus because empirical research on classroom discourse is especially ample, and has recently documented how the teacher's discourse role affects different types of student learning (Nystrand, 2006; Fisher, 2005; Taylor et al., 2003). Focal attention was placed on understanding that learning takes place in a social context in which students are actively engaged in constructing meaning from their own experience and the ways in which teachers interact with them (Fisher, 2005). Additionally, this study was timely given the privileged status of scripted programs to drive reading instruction in many schools.

Research Questions

Consistent with qualitative inquiry, the research questions addressed in this study are broad in scope. They provided a close analysis of what exemplary teachers said during reading instruction to engage students in talk about text.

1. What is the nature of the questioning moves exemplary teachers use in fourth-grade classrooms during reading instruction?

2. What do exemplary fourth-grade teachers describe as influencing their use of questioning moves within the reading program?

The first question was of primary importance to my study. It focused on what the teachers said during reading instruction to engage students in talk about text. It required descriptive observations and analysis of digital recordings and videotape to determine the

7

relationship of the teachers' questioning moves to student engagement. The answers to the second question were integral to reaching conclusions. Specifically, the second question sought answers to the influence of instructional materials and teachers' professional development opportunities on their use of questioning moves. These answers illuminated how the use of instructional materials was related to the teachers' language use, the teachers' perceptions of their use of materials, and the decisions made about their delivery of instruction. The second question joined interview questions with observations and surveys to explore teachers' perceptions, knowledge base, and delivery of instruction.

Significance of the Study

This study examined the language exemplary fourth-grade teachers used as a medium for promoting reading comprehension through deeper student engagement. While a number of researchers have conducted and reviewed studies on classroom discourse as a precursor to reading comprehension, they mainly focused on middle and high school populations, resulting in a gap in the literature. This study expanded on researchers' (Taylor et al., 2003; Wilkinson, Murphy, & Soter, 2003, 2005) current line of thinking by applying what is known about teachers' language use in regard to student engagement that leads to talk about text to fourth-grade classrooms.

This view suggested opportunities for learning afforded to students while simultaneously examining how teachers used language to shape the nature of teaching and learning. The findings from this study provide an opportunity for reading teachers and educators to better understand the nature of talk teachers use in classrooms during reading instruction, and give voice to the teacher regarding her perceptions, knowledge base, and instructional decision making that is her own phenomenology.

8

Design

The design of this qualitative study is Naturalistic Inquiry. This design allowed me to observe naturally unfolding phenomena that emerged in the non-manipulated context of the participants' classrooms (Patton, 2002). I collected data within a case study tradition (Creswell, 1998). A case study tradition is a qualitative inquiry approach that offers a holistic portrayal of the particularity and complexity of a single case (Creswell, 1998; Patton, 2002; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2003). In addition to the in-depth description and analysis of each case, this study includes cross-case analysis of each case study participant. To determine case study participants, I interviewed principals within a diverse Southwest Florida school district to identify teachers who are considered exemplary. Allington's (2000, 2002) framework of common features observed in exemplary fourth-grade classrooms was used to help guide the identification of exemplary reading teachers. Once teachers were identified for possible selection for this study, I gave them each a Literacy Orientation Survey (Lenski, Wham, & Griffey, 1997). The survey illuminated each teacher's theoretical orientation to reading. From the surveys, I used purposeful sampling to select one teacher from each school who indicated practices and beliefs similar to a constructivist view of teaching and learning. Because of the likelihood that more than one teacher at each school would meet selection criteria, the selection process was aided by a preliminary observation of each teacher who indicated similarities to a constructivist view of teaching and learning. As previously stated, a common notion theoretically advocated by the constructivist view is that learning is a social activity that requires student interaction and engagement in the classroom. Therefore, the preliminary observation focused on the ways in which the teacher

9

interacted with and engaged the students in learning as a means to confirm a constructivist view as defined by the survey. Once study participants were confirmed, the questioning moves these teachers used to engage students in talk about text were plumbed, analyzed, and compared in an effort to provide a better understanding of the nature of the language teachers use during reading instruction.

Throughout the study, I employed various and overlapping data collection methods. I used interviews supported by a digital recorder, observations supported by field notes, and videotapes supported by extended interviews with the teachers. I collected data in depth and detail, and was the instrument for the data collection process (Patton, 2002).

Within the data collection period, I engaged each teacher in two recorded interviews. The first interview employed a protocol that included open-ended focus questions to gain insight into each teacher's literacy beliefs, practices, and philosophies and was conducted during the first week of the study. The second interview was responsive to the first interview as well as identified gaps in data collection. The second interview was conducted after the videotaping and all classroom observations took place.

I observed each teacher's classroom at three different times throughout the study. The observations took place during the 90-minute reading block and included field notes that were recorded on a laptop computer. The 90-minute reading block, as described by the district's K-12 comprehensive reading plan, requires a protected uninterrupted 90 minutes of time per day for reading instruction. The first 30 minutes of the required 90-minute block is intended for whole group instruction supported by the core reading program. The remainder of the block is intended for teachers to provide differentiated

instruction using the core reading program or supplemental reading materials. In the district where this study was conducted, the core reading program was purchased with the allowance of flexibility in its application. At the time of this study, teachers were not required to read the script, nor were they accountable to fidelity checks associated with using the core reading program. Rather, the core reading program was viewed as one of many instructional resources within a balanced literacy framework. The data collected during the 90-minute reading block was identified by teacher name, date, time, and context.

In addition to the observations, a videotape of each teacher's 90-minute reading block was recorded on two separate occasions. I shared segments of the videotapes with each teacher to glean a deeper understanding of their instructional decisions for the questioning moves used. The interviews, observations and videotapes combined to provide rich data ripe for analysis.

Theoretical Framework

The lens through which I studied my research questions is constructivism. While I recognize there are many dimensions of constructivist theory, I conducted this study from the viewpoint of Phillips (2000). In his view, constructivism is concerned with the social processes that facilitate the psychological dynamics that produce understanding in learners. In simple terms, constructivism describes how a learner incorporates knowledge into existing mental frameworks, structures or schemas. Constructivism supports an interactional, mediated style of reading and includes scaffolding that encourages applications of cognitive operations and internalization of written language through social interactions (Wilkinson & Silliman, 2000).

From a constructivist view, the goal of education is to help students construct their own understandings. This view leads to an emphasis on learning rather than teaching, and on facilitative environments rather than instructional goals. The potential result of participating in a social situation involving reading and thinking about texts is that individual students can draw upon the teacher and other students to help them construct not only an understanding of text ideas, but also an understanding of what it means to read and think about text (Kucan & Beck, 1997).

Much of the research on the pedagogical role of classroom discourse draws from Vygotsky's (1978) theory that is grounded on the central idea that knowledge is socially constructed. A major contribution of Vygotsky's theory has been to present cognitive growth as a socially interactive byproduct developed by children as they learn within their zones of proximal development. Language plays a central role in students' development. In regard to reading, the individuals in a group form an interpretive community within which meanings of text are jointly constructed. This social context influences individual attending, talking, thinking, and learning (Chin et al., 2001).

Vygotsky (1978) asserts that the zone of proximal development is important when we realize that the more capable other can mediate learning for the student. Scaffolding activates the zone of proximal development; therefore, scaffolding until the student is capable and successful is critical, as an individual student's cognitive growth is more likely when one is required to explain, elaborate, or defend one's position to others, as well as to oneself (Berk & Winsler, 1995; Nystrand, 2006). In Vygotsky's view, teaching is not a stagnant stance in developing understanding and skill acquisition, rather a dynamic customized process that self perpetuates learning further and higher for

individual learners. Effective teaching within this framework requires teachers to identify students' zones of proximal development that define the immediate context for learning and to appropriately scaffold instructional activities as well as classroom discourse (Nystrand, 2006). Scaffolded instruction underscores both the role of the teacher and the role of the student as co-participants in negotiating meaning (Many, 2002).

Instructional activities that align with a social constructivist perspective generally involve whole class or small group discussion. The focus is on sharing individual interpretations of a particular text within communities of readers to come to a deeper understanding. Throughout the discussion the teacher supports the ongoing dialogue, entering into conversations with students and helping them reach more complex understandings about the text, their world, and their identity (Gee, 1999). The teacher becomes a member of the discussion, supporting the conversation, not simply asking comprehension questions and evaluating responses (Serafini, 2003).

Definition of Terms

To assist in the interpretation of this proposal, the following terms are defined to clarify their meaning:

1. *Exemplary*: Allington (2000, 2002) describes exemplary fourth-grade reading teachers as those who: (a) facilitate classroom talk that is process oriented and fosters teacher/student and student/student interaction; (b) use multiple sources for instruction and ensure appropriate complexity in reading materials; (c)routinely give direct, explicit demonstrations of thinking strategies; (d) engage students in extensive reading and writing activities; (e) evaluate student work and

base grades more on effort and improvement than achievement of an a priori standard; and (f) allocate time for extensive practice in reading.

2. *Mentor Text*: a book that serves as an exemplary model for readers and writers. Mentor texts have the ability to boost language development, promote active listening, model fluency, support learning, and encourage deeper thinking (Hoyt, 2007).

3. *Phenomenology*: the study of lived or existential meanings described and interpreted to a certain degree of depth and richness (Van Manen, 1990, p. 8).

4. *Questioning Moves*: the ways in which teachers use scaffolding questions to engage students in talk about text

5. *Scaffolding:* a metaphorical term used to describe the support that enables a learner to complete a task or achieve a goal that would have been unattainable without assistance (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976).

6. *Scripted program:* a program characterized by an explicit teacher's manual with instructions for teachers to follow verbatim when using the program with their students (Moustafa & Land, 2005). When using a scripted program, all activities are to be followed in the order presented and the teacher's language use is dictated, word-for-word from the manual (Meyer, 2002).

7. *Zone of Proximal Development:* The distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving, and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86). Inherent in this

definition of the zone of proximal development is the feature of social interaction between a learner and an individual with expertise.

<center>*Limitations*</center>

I engaged in a naturalistic inquiry with the intention of considering specifically how exemplary fourth-grade teachers use language during reading instruction. The instrument of choice for data collection in a naturalistic inquiry is the human (Patton, 2002). Given human nature and the fact that this inquiry was conducted from the perspective of a literacy specialist and former classroom teacher, I had to be mindful of my biases so as not to color both data collection and data analysis. This study used surveys, interviews, digital recordings, videotapes, and observational field notes. While I used a number of tools to collect data, the research tools that I employed provided limited bits of reality and the findings are interpretive.

The limitations on this study also include the need to recognize that this study was conducted from the perspective of a researcher in literacy education, not a linguist. Therefore, while contributions were made regarding the nature of the language teachers used during reading instruction, I was not able to contribute to understandings of speech in the classroom, nor could I differentiate between syntactical utterances that may have impacted the teaching of reading.

<center>*Delimitations*</center>

The delimitations of this study center around the fact that this study focused on fourth-grade teachers considered exemplary by their principals. While teachers were considered exemplary, their levels of experience and expertise in the teaching of reading were disparate due to the nature of the professional development they have engaged in

<center>15</center>

and the number of years they have taught fourth-grade. Additionally, since this study was

conducted in fourth-grade classrooms during reading instruction, it was bound by time

frames and the conclusions drawn from this study do not extend to other grade levels or

contexts.

Organization of Remaining Chapters

There are four remaining chapters of this dissertation. Chapter Two provides a

comprehensive review of the literature to position the research questions. The areas

reviewed are the use of core reading programs in reading instruction, the impact of

questioning on reading comprehension, directive and supportive discourse scaffolds, and

the teacher's stance. Chapter Three describes how the study was conducted and justifies

the methods I employed to collect and analyze data. Chapter Four presents the description

and the analysis of data. Chapter Five is a discussion of the study, concluding with

recommendations for future research.

Chapter Two

Review of Literature

"Talk is the central tool of teachers' trade. With it they mediate students' activity and

experience and help them make sense of learning, literacy, life, and themselves."

(Johnston, 2004 p. 4)

The questions that guided this qualitative study concern the nature of teacher talk

that exemplary teachers use during reading instruction. Another point of interest was to

determine how teachers perceive the influence of instructional materials on the language

they use to engage students in talk about text. In order to best situate this study, several

domains of research were explored. These domains include the history of core reading

programs, the impact of questioning on students' reading comprehension, the teacher's

discourse role, and the stance the teacher adopts in reading instruction.

The literature presented in this chapter is organized by these four domains in

sections identified with headings and subheadings. Each section is introduced with a

purpose statement to establish relevance to the proposed research study. The first section

gives a brief history of core reading programs to provide background in reading

instruction in the years prior to the twenty-first century. This overview is necessary in

order to establish the privileged status of core reading programs in classrooms across

America and to establish a link to the No Child Left Behind Act and its Reading First

Initiative. The second section discusses various questioning techniques and their impact

on students' reading comprehension. In this section I examine studies relating to question

type, question generation, and discussion approaches that foster students' thinking and

meaning making. The third section discusses the teacher's discourse role in regard to

student engagement that leads to talk about text. Focal attention is placed on research that

suggests learning takes place in a social context in which students are actively engaged in

constructing meaning from their own experience and the ways in which teachers interact

with them. The final section discusses the influence of the stance a teacher adopts on the

interaction students have with text during reading instruction. This chapter concludes by

situating the proposed study in previous research.

<div align="center">

Core Reading Programs

</div>

The purpose of this section is three fold. First the research will establish the

prominence of core reading programs in classrooms across America by providing a

historical context of reading instruction. Next, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 and

the implications of its Reading First initiative is discussed. This section concludes with a

discussion on developing competencies of twenty-first century readers.

Historical Overview of Core Reading Programs

Core reading programs, typically referred to as basal readers, have a rich and

long-standing history. Basals have served as the base for reading instruction in American

classrooms since the mid 1800's. Among the first basals was a series called the

McGuffey Reader. The McGuffey Reader originated in the Midwest at the request of a

small publishing company interested in a series of books adapted to Western schools. The

series consisted of four grade level texts and relied on the phonics method to teach

beginning readers. The McGuffey readers came into immediate popularity and quickly

extended beyond the Midwest to impact schools throughout the country. The McGuffey

<div align="center">

18

</div>

Readers were used until the early twentieth century and are credited for molding

American literary tastes and morality (Smith, 2002; Westerhoff, 1978).

By the 1920's textbook publishers combined business principles of efficiency

with Thorndike's (1903) laws of learning (effect, exercise, readiness, and identical

elements) to standardize teaching practice according to scientific principles. It was

thought if the most frequently used words in written English were taught with

Thorndike's four laws of learning, students would learn to read (Hiebert, 2005). With the

advent of obtaining scientific information about the effectiveness of reading methods and

materials, and administrative arrangements for teaching reading in the classrooms, basals

became the official technology of reading instruction (Smith, 2002). To ensure efficiency

in and control over the quality of student learning, the basal series offered a set of grade

level anthologies, practice books of skills for students, and a teacher's manual outlining

the correct use of the anthologies, the skills to be taught, and the correct answers to skill

acquisition and application (Shannon, 1983).

In the 1930's the popularity of basals soared with Scott Foresman's series

publication starring two characters named Dick and Jane (Elson & Gray, 1930). For

many years, the characters in this series singularly depicted suburban, white, and middle-

class culture. But when the series peaked in its popularity, it began reflecting the

changing cultures of a progressive country (Smith, 2002). Rather than phonics instruction

for beginning readers, the Dick and Jane series emphasized whole word reading and

repetition, a method which came to be known as 'look and say' (Ravitch, 2001). This

method of teaching came under attack in the mid 1950's, with the publication of Rudolf

Flesch's (1955) *Why Johnny Can't Read*. His book highly criticized the 'look and say'

method, and called for a return to teaching that stressed phonics instruction for beginning readers. The public responded by shifting emphasis to phonics methods for beginning reading instruction. Publishing companies responded by shifting emphasis in basals to more phonics based methods. Shifts in teaching methodologies found in basals as a result of public attention have been metaphorically linked to a swinging pendulum.

Because of their promise to produce readers, basals gained rapid popularity in America's public schools. By the mid 1960s basal readers were in more than 90% of public school classrooms across America (Shannon, 1983). During the same timeframe, B. F. Skinner developed programmed instruction, introducing the prototype of scripted programs. Skinner suggested lessons organized in a series of small, simple steps that provided learners with immediate reinforcement after each successful step would transform education. The practice of programmed instruction received wide attention and attracted many reading educators who concluded such programs have a positive but overall limited impact on increasing student achievement (Halff, 1988; Kausmeier, 1975; Kulik, Cohen, & Ebeling, 1980; Paris, Wixon, & Palinscar, 1986).

In 1965 concern for the ability of low-income children to engage successfully in the education system prompted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This federal law brought standards and accountability that affected education from kindergarten through high school. Shortly thereafter, Direct Instruction for Teaching and Remediation (DISTAR) was published with the primary goal of systematically increasing student learning through explicit teaching (Becker & Gersten, 1982). Direct instruction was conceptualized as a set of behavioral principles for instruction advocating demonstration, guided practice, and individual practice (Rosenshine, 1979). The

instructional emphasis placed on teaching methodologies for beginning readers was spurred by the publication of *Learning to Read: The Great Debate* (Chall, 1967), which presented a review of research comparing phonics methods with the 'look and say' method. Chall's findings suggested learning to read was a developmental process and advocated an early, focused, and systematic emphasis on phonics for beginning readers. Consequently, skill based programs came to define the goals of reading and reading instruction.

During the 1970's and early 1980's, the pendulum rested on a more phonics-based approach to reading instruction. Focus on systematic phonics instruction produced students who were better at decoding words but highlighted deficiencies in comprehension and meaning making activities (Durkin, 1978/1979). This deficit was explored by researchers promoting comprehension strategy instruction as well as pioneering theorist Louise Rosenblatt who researched the role of children's literature in promoting a relationship between the reader and the text (1968, 1978).

In 1983 a *Nation at Risk* (The National Commission's Nation at Risk) was published proclaiming that America was in the midst of a literacy crisis that would threaten the nation's technological, military, and economic supremacy. The report pointed to poor pedagogies as the cause for low literacy rates and motivated changes in the ways in which teaching occurred in K-12 classrooms. During the latter part of the 1980s focus was on comprehension instruction. Based on a cognitive view of the reading process, comprehension instruction emphasized teaching a set of strategies that students could use to comprehend text. The goal of comprehension instruction was to develop in students a sense of conscious control, or metacognitive awareness, over a set of strategies

that could adapt to any text (Dole, Duffy, Roehler, & Pearson, 1991). Basal usage

declined and whole language pedagogies emerged. With this swing of the pendulum, the

reading wars raged.

Whole language brought reading for meaning to the foreground and placed a

heavier emphasis on children's literature and trade books for the authentic development

of skills, rather than on basals focused on building skills through direct, explicit

instruction (Goodman, 1989; Pearson, 2004). During the whole language movement,

motivation and engagement perspectives garnered the attention of the field.

To bridge the gap between phonics based methods and whole language methods,

balanced approaches of reading instruction became a mediating force in the reading wars.

A balanced reading approach contains a mix of instructional and practice activities

sufficient to build strong word reading skills as well as the ability to construct meaning

from text. Basals of the early 1990s were restyled to reflect this approach. Publishers

coupled the skills of the previous era with the strategies and philosophies of whole

language, which created more complex core reading programs (Pearson, 2004; Stahl,

1998).

The conventional wisdom of whole language methods was challenged in the late

1990s. This was partly because of the rise in non-English speaking students in American

schools and partly because of the infusion of technology into schools. These external

challenges and cries from business leaders for skilled workers to occupy high wage/high

skill jobs (Guthrie & Springer, 2004) stimulated Congress to call for a national panel to

assess the status of research-based knowledge, including the effectiveness of various

approaches to teaching children to read. Findings were later published in the National

Reading Panel report (NRP) (National Reading Panel, 2000).

This report included a review of past empirical studies concerning reading and

offered suggestions for future educational policy. The NRP found five critical areas that

warranted focus for reading instruction: (a) phonemic awareness instruction, (b)

systematic phonics instruction, (c) fluency instruction (d) explicit and indirect vocabulary

instruction, and (e) comprehension strategy instruction (National Reading Panel Report,

2000). Consequently, the pendulum began to swing back toward more phonics based

methods. Armed with the NRP and a promise to ensure a reasonable standard of quality

teaching, the early years of the 21st century brought the landmark No Child Left Behind

Act (NCLB) of 2001.

NCLB and its Reading First Initiative

NCLB is based on the following guiding principles of instruction: (a) ensure

learning for all students, (b) make school systems accountable for student learning, (c)

provide information and available options regarding students' learning, and (d) improve

the quality of teachers. Along with the NCLB legislation came a reading initiative that

renewed interest in skill acquisition and application and the reestablishment of standards

and accountabilities, which sparked resurgence in basal dominance for reading

instruction.

NCLB and its Reading First initiative reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary

Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. Reading First is the largest and most focused federal

reading initiative this country has ever undertaken. All 50 states, the District of

Columbia, and Puerto Rico have the unprecedented challenge to implement a tightly

prescribed accountability model with the goal of all students achieving at or above grade-level proficiency in reading by 2012 as evidenced by standardized state assessment tests (www.ed.gov).

The Reading First initiative builds on the findings of years of scientific research, such as those published in the NRP report (2000). Federal funding to implement the Reading First initiative is provided to states, districts, and schools. States must apply to the Department of Education (DOE) in the form of formula grants that are submitted to State Education Agencies (SEAs) for approval. The key to this funding is monies must be used for districts to purchase and implement core reading programs that are fully aligned with scientifically based reading research (SBRR).

Reading First defines the core reading program as the primary instructional tool a teacher uses during reading instruction. Reading First assures that core reading programs address the literacy needs of the majority of the students. Strong core programs provide a prioritized sequence and schedule of learning objectives, explicit strategies, and support for students' initial learning and transfer of knowledge and skills to other contexts. Scripted lessons from the core reading program help focus instruction by providing consistent language and maintaining fidelity to the lessons' objectives. Reading First declares that while it is true that scripted lessons may be particularly beneficial to less experienced or less knowledgeable teachers, scripted lessons may also be used effectively by experienced teachers to help them sharpen and focus their instructional language (www.fcrr.org). To implement the core reading program, a protected uninterrupted 90 minute block of time per day for reading instruction is ensured (www.justreadflorida.com). In addition to being a requirement of all Reading First

schools in the nation, it is the philosophy of the Just Read Florida office in the state of

Florida to ensure that all Florida schools use a core reading program based on scientific

evidence found in the NRP and in the NCLB legislation.

Since its inception, the NCLB legislation has been critiqued on a number of fronts

regarding the nature of the law itself and its problematic application. In addition to

criticism made about measures of accountability tied to a single assessment of student

performance, critics argue that federal NCLB funding requirements, state adopted

textbooks and testing mandates, and district curriculum reforms combine to prescribe

what instructional materials teachers use and how teachers teach reading (Stevens, 2003).

The Reading First initiative has also come under scrutiny. Although initial signs

of effectiveness in helping to boost reading instruction were reported, in September 2006

a scathing report by the Office of Inspector General of the United States Department of

Education revealed that several members of the panel who award Reading First grants

may have had conflicts of interest with publishing companies that promoted specific

reading materials with a specific philosophy of how to best teach reading (2006).

Reading instruction and reading research has been shaped by political forces

desiring to privilege particular approaches to instruction for many years (Pearson, 2004).

Since the 1920s, teachers and administrators have increasingly relied on basal reading

series as the primary instructional tool for developing readers. The teacher's manuals

found in basal reading programs are accepted as the correct stimulus to evoke the

appropriate standard response to ensure that students receive businesslike, scientific

instruction (Shannon, 1983). In the earlier years of implementation, researchers criticized

basal programs for their deskilling effect on teachers' practices (Apple, 1995; Shannon,

1983, 1987). Many criticisms were made about teachers' use of basals, such as: reading instruction was reduced to the application of commercial materials, commercial materials were applied regardless of the instructional situation, and the distribution and explanation of the materials filled the majority of time designated for reading instruction (Durkin 1978/1979; Shannon, 1983). In the current climate of educational reform, these same criticisms are echoed.

Developing Competencies of Twenty First Century Readers

With penalties looming under NCLB, researchers now contend that teachers are frequently being forced to use state adopted reading programs that script how to teach, regardless of their beliefs and understandings (Serafini, 2003). This contention has fast become the topic of debate. Those researchers supporting the widespread use of such programs argue on one hand that scripted programs found in basal series provide a mechanism for standardization, they supply a hierarchical set of testable goals, and they certify student attainment of these goals, which increases public confidence in reading instruction. On the other hand, those who are not in support argue that classroom teachers are being robbed of their professional judgment due to an overreliance on standardized curriculum and that students are passive participants in their learning (Apple, 1995; Darling-Hammond, 2002; Jaeger, 2006; Dudley-Marling & Murphy. 2001; Moustafa & Land, 2002; Shannon, 1983).

Researchers further contend that teachers need to understand contemporary theories of reading and literacy development and be able to articulate their theoretical perspectives concerning children's literature, the reading process, and their instructional practices, so they do not fall victim to the political pressures associated with NCLB such

as high stakes standardized tests, state mandates, and commercial reading programs (Coles, 1998; McQuillan, 1998).

In regard to reading instruction, the great debate in the early years of the 21st century is whether or not students will become thoughtful, discriminating readers who are able to negotiate the meaning of texts on their own, talk about text in thoughtful ways, and challenge others' interpretations, as well as accept the challenge of others. These are competencies readers need to develop in a democratic society in order to participate as fully literate, informed citizens (Holcomb, 2005; Luke, 1995). This view represents a significant departure from the traditional and familiar instructional models that focus on the transmission of facts and information (Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Kwang, 2001; Nystrand, 1997; Richardson & Placier, 2001).

Researchers suggest instructional practices that will lead students to develop such competencies include fostering student involvement and extended, collaborative discourse (Chin, et al. 2001; Fall, Webb, & Chudowsky, 2000; Jimenez & Gersten, 1999; Nystrand, 1997). Such practices create new roles for teachers that come with different and strenuous intellectual demands (Hammer & Schifter, 2001, p. 442).

Summary. The literature reviewed in this section highlights that within reading classrooms across America, teachers are required to implement core reading programs that are fully aligned with scientifically based reading research as part of their instructional routine. To ensure a reasonable standard of quality teaching, current reading initiatives are in full support of such instruction. This emphasis on core reading programs that script how to teach reading is debated in the research as it confronts teachers' perceptions, knowledge base, and instructional decision making about developing the

27

competencies of twenty-first century readers. To inform the proposed study it is important to also consider the question-answer sequences that impact students' construction of meaning from text. The next section of the literature review discusses research on the impact of questioning on reading comprehension.

<div align="center">*Impact of Questioning on Reading Comprehension*</div>

The purpose of this section of the literature review is to uncover research findings on the impact of questioning on reading comprehension. There are three areas discussed. First, discussion is on various levels of questioning. Next discussion is on generating questions that foster student engagement with text. Then discussion approaches that embody question-answer sequences found to be effective in promoting reading comprehension are described.

Question Types

With specific regard to reading comprehension, skill approaches found in basal readers have influenced instruction for nearly a century (Paris, Wixon, Palincscar; 1986). Given the influence of basal readers on reading instruction, Durkin (1978/1979) conducted an observational study in a Midwestern school district to see whether individual schools differed in the amount of time they gave to comprehension instruction. Schools selected to participate in the study offered a broad view of teaching and learning. One school was traditional, the second school was considered "open" (pg. 505), and the third school had made special effort to improve its reading program. Durkin focused her observations on teachers in $3^{rd} – 6^{th}$ grade classrooms to learn the extent of comprehension instruction provided to students. Twelve teachers were observed three

successive days, resulting in a total of 2,174 minutes of reading instruction. The class size of the observed classrooms averaged 23 students. To strengthen the study, Durkin also observed 1,119 minutes of comprehension instruction in social studies and science. Taken together, findings revealed that almost no comprehension instruction was being taught. Durkin found that teachers asked students many questions regarding completing workbook assignments related to text content, but spent little time teaching students strategies for answering the many questions asked or comprehending the texts. Throughout the observational study, teachers were observed as being "mentioners", assignment givers and checkers, and interrogators (pg. 523). Consequently, students were observed as being "listeners" and "doers of written assignments" (p. 515).

In a follow-up study, Durkin (1981) examined the manuals of five basal reader programs used in grades K-6 to see if what they recommended for teaching students how to comprehend text matched the observed teachers' behavior. The manuals examined were those with a current copyright date (1978-1979) and those widely promoted by the state. Publishers included Allyn and Bacon, Ginn and Company, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Houghton Mifflin Company, and Scott Foresman and Company. A quantitative method of analysis was used to collect frequency data to determine the degree to which the basals attended to comprehension instruction. Durkin found a close match between the teachers' observed behavior and the manuals examined. Like the teachers in her earlier study (1978-1979), the manuals asked vast amounts of questions. The manuals gave far more attention to workbook practice and the assessment of answers to questions than to direct, explicit instruction in comprehension. Notably absent from the comprehension instruction were explanations about what it means to answer a question

29

and strategies that may be used to answer it. This finding placed importance on the effectiveness of various levels of questions upon comprehension and stimulated the research agenda.

Winne (1979) reviewed eighteen experimental and quasi-experimental studies to determine if the use of higher level questions promoted student achievement. Studies were selected based on two criteria: the study had to contrast students' achievement after exposure to teaching dominated by lower level, and then higher level questions, and purposeful attempts were made to manipulate teachers' questioning behavior. Studies selected were grouped by either *training experiment* or *skills experiment*. The independent variable in the training experiment group was teacher training. The independent variable in the skills experiment group was teachers' skillful use of questioning. The dependent variable for both was student achievement. The training group consisted of studies where the teachers received training and used what they learned in their classroom at their own discretion. The skill group consisted of studies where teachers received no training and were tracked by the researchers for the frequency and manner in which they used skillful questioning. Each study reviewed teachers' instructional use of levels of questions in relation to student achievement. Quantitative methods of analysis were used to determine the impact. Then studies were sorted into three categories: those yielding significant results, those yielding either positive or negative results, and those yielding non-significant results. The categories were then compared. Winne's findings suggest that teachers' use of higher level questions had little effect on student achievement. Noteworthy is the fact that Winne's study represents a wide range of teacher experience, content areas, instructional time, and age of

participants. While Winne provides summaries of each selected study to provide a frame for the conclusions drawn and offers various tables to illustrate the findings, evidence of reliability is unclear. For instance, it is difficult for the reader to ascertain specifics about the types of questions asked, the proportion of questions asked, and the behaviors specific to each group. Interpretive analysis is also questionable. Without reducing the teachers' use of questions to a script or programmed lesson it is unlikely that the teachers studied asked the same questions about the same topics in the same sequence using the same phrasing. Also, the reader is unaware of the teacher-student interaction that surrounded the question/answer sequences that may have or may have not contributed to students' achievement.

In a follow-up study, Redifield & Rousseau (1981) conducted a meta-analysis of experimental research on teacher questioning behavior to further investigate the relationship between teachers' use of higher and lower level questions and student achievement. Twenty studies were selected for review, which included the eighteen previously examined by Winne (1979). While Redifield and Rousseau report using the same set of studies as Winne, there appears to be discrepancy in selection criteria. For instance, Winne selected studies where students' achievement was contrasted after exposure to instruction, Redifield and Rousseau selected studies where the measure of contrast was an achievement test. Both Winne and Redifield and Rousseau used quantitative methods, but the techniques they employed for data analysis differed and therefore yielded different results. The results of the meta-analysis conducted by Redifield and Rousseau do not support earlier findings by Winne. Instead, conclusions drawn from their study suggests, regardless of the type of study reviewed teachers'

predominate use of higher level questions has an overall positive impact on student achievement. The visibility of the analysis techniques used by Redifield and Rousseau supports their conclusions and helps the reader interpret their findings.

Utilizing Bloom's (1956) hierarchy of question types, researchers have worked fervently for nearly three decades to identify the impact of questioning on reading comprehension (Anderson & Biddle, 1975; Andre, 1979; Duke & Pearson, 2002; Hansen, 1981; Medley, 1977; Nystrand, 1997, 2006; Redfield & Rousseau, 1981; Wilkinson, Murphy, & Soter, 2003, 2005; Winne, 1979). Research efforts have uncovered different levels of questions and a myriad of questions types. The level of a question refers to the nature of cognitive processing required to answer it. The type of a question refers to variations in how students interact with the text. The most common types of questions asked of text are factual and detail questions with the answer given directly in the text, questions requiring inference from information given in the text, clarifying questions about vocabulary and phrases in the text, questions eliciting connections to text, and higher level thinking questions asking for interpretations of the text (Andre, 1979; Duke & Pearson, 2002; Rapheal & Wonnacott, 1985).

Unsurprising, the overall finding is that the types of questions teachers ask shape students' understanding of text. For example, asking students lower level questions leads students to focus on remembering facts or details. Students' cognitive engagement with text is low as answers typically consist of a word or short phrase and requires relatively little thought. Conversely asking higher level questions, such as those that encourage students to interpret, evaluate, and connect with text, lends interpretive authority and

requires higher level thinking (Nystrand, 1997; Redfield & Rousseau, 1981; Wilkinson, Murphy, & Soter, 2003, 2005).

Generating Questions

While much is known about question types and teacher-student interaction, much is still to be learned. Since Durkin's (1978-1979) seminal study and the subsequent research attention, the question is seen as a pedagogical device that can be manipulated by a teacher in order to foster student engagement with text. Attention has shifted from engaging students in the process of differentiating the types of questions typically asked of texts (Rapheal & Wonnacott, 1985) to engaging students in meaningful talk about text to enable them to generate their own questions.

Research that elaborates on engaging students in the process of generating questions about texts was conducted by Nystrand (1997) and later extended by Wilkinson, Murphy, & Soter (2003, 2005). Nystrand examined data collected in hundreds of observations of 8th and 9th grade English and social studies classrooms in 25 Midwestern middle and high schools. Nystrand used discourse event history analysis to code question types as well as the teacher-student interaction surrounding the question. Nystrand found that asking authentic questions for which there is no prespecified answer signals to students that their thinking is valued. Further, student engagement with text is fostered when they are asked open-ended questions requiring explanation, elaboration, or defense of text ideas to themselves as well as to others. He concluded that open-ended, authentic questions also signal receptivity from the teacher or from another student and indicates interest in what students have to offer. By building students' previous remarks

into ongoing conversation (uptake), students gain interpretive authority. Nystrand suggests examination of the ways teachers and students interact as evidenced by authentic questions, uptake, and discussion is necessary to explaining the impact of instructional practice. Nystrand presents a strong study. Strengths include a large sample size and diverse samples of classes, schools, and communities. Also, detailed explanations of data collection, analysis, and interpretation methods aid the reader in making interpretive judgments.

Wilkinson, Murphy, and Soter (2003, 2005) tested Nystrand's (1997) use of questions as part of a three year exploratory study funded by the Institute of Education Sciences under the Program of Research on Reading Comprehension. One area studied and analyzed was teacher-student interactions for the incidence of students' generation of authentic questions. Following Nystrand's lead, the researchers coded and analyzed hundreds of question/answer sequences. Findings suggest where authentic questions represent over half of the total questions asked by teacher and students, there appears to exist a classroom context where students are given the floor for extended periods, where there is a strong presence of uptake in both teacher and student questions, and, therefore, where student contributions are seen as vital to the learning that is to occur. According to Wilkinson, Murphy, and Soter, the findings on higher level thinking as elicited by authentic questions suggest that student generated questions can indeed foster analysis, generalizations, and speculation. Findings also suggest a relationship between teacher and/or student generated authentic questions and high level thinking. These findings are consistent with conclusions drawn by Nystand. Among the strengths noted of the researchers of this study is that the researchers thoroughly describe and explain data

analysis and interpretation techniques. The fruits of their labor are shared with the reader in the form of many comprehensive charts, graphs, and diagrams. These lend interpretive understanding to the reader. The sharing of data and explicit explanation and description of the study provides insight on the effectiveness of various questions and discussion parameters that enable students to engage in talk about text.

In a review of studies with a similar focus, Skidmore (2000) found that when elementary students are encouraged to take on a wider range of speaking roles, they challenge and counter each other's thinking and encourage the consideration of multiple view points, which results in attaining a richer understanding of story. Skidmore asserts that when classroom interaction and dialogue between and among students allows social discussion, students develop individual powers of reflection about texts as opposed to the "ability to reproduce a canonical interpretation of the text" (p. 289).

Higher level thinking and talk about text was also investigated by Taylor, Pearson, Peterson, & Rodriguez (2003). These researchers used a framework for effective literacy instruction based on previous research conducted by Knapp, Adelman, Marder, McCollum, Needels, Padilla, Shileds, Turnbull, and Zucker (1995) and Guthrie, Cox, Knowles, Buehl, Mazzoni, and Fasulo (2000) to investigate curricular and teaching variables that account for growth in reading comprehension. The framework used consisted of four dimensions: (1) supporting higher level thinking in both talk and writing about text, (2) encouraging independent use of word recognition and comprehension strategies, (3) stressing active student involvement, and (4) promoting active involvement in literacy. Nine high poverty schools across the United States participated in the study that was conducted over a school year. Data collection consisted of interviews and

classroom observations during the time devoted to literacy instruction. Hierarchical linear

modeling (HLM) was used to determine the effect of teacher variables on students'

growth in reading. Descriptive analysis was also used to elaborate on the findings. Since

their study looked at the overall curricular and teaching variables that account for growth

in reading comprehension, the findings represent many levels relative to the framework

of effective reading instruction. In regard to higher level questioning and talk about text,

the researchers' overarching conclusion was that asking higher level thinking questions

matter. Teachers who emphasized higher level thinking either through the questions

asked or the tasks they assigned promoted greater reading growth. The researchers

explain, "when students are engaged in higher level thinking about text they are making

connections to their prior knowledge, considering thematic elements of the text,

interpreting characters' motives, and so on" (p. 6). To unpack the findings on higher level

thinking, the researchers engaged in comparative analysis of the observations and

interviews. After rereading all the data, they coded all activities related to talk about texts

to add depth to the analysis. This provided insight about the comparison of higher versus

lower level questions. The researchers provided pages of tables to illustrate the HLM

analysis and provided descriptive narratives to offer a clearer picture of what the results

looked like in classroom practice. However, while higher level comprehension instruction

was recognized, the researchers admit that it is an under-emphasized aspect of reading

instruction, particularly in grades 2-5. The researchers found that teachers who did ask a

high proportion of higher level questions also encouraged students to take responsibility

for story discussions, tended to be guided by the theme or main idea of a text, related the

process of the interpretation of text to students' lives, refrained from asking many low

level questions on story events, and they expressed a high level of commitment to reading comprehension.

Discussion Approaches

With specific regard to reading instruction, the questions teachers ask to engage students in talk about text is deemed critical by researchers (Chin et al., 2001; Nystrand, 1997, 2006; McKeown & Beck 2004; Taylor, et. al. 2003; Skidmore, 2000). Further developing our understanding of the role of questions as they affect reading comprehension, Nystrand (2006) identified discussion approaches that exhibit a high degree of reciprocity in instruction. In his comprehensive review, he brings to light a synthesis of 150 years of research on classroom discourse as it affects reading comprehension, with emphasis on empirical research since the 1970's. The research was conducted largely by the Center for the Study of Reading (CSR) and the Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement (CIERA). Nystrand found that providing social space for students to take on more active and vocal roles in discussions helps to deepen their understanding of text.

Those discussion approaches identified by Nystrand (2006) that have overlap with other prominent researchers investigating the role of questioning on reading comprehension are described in this review of the literature: reciprocal teaching (Palincsar & Brown, 1984, 1985) questioning the author (Beck, et al. 1997), transactional strategy instruction (Brown, et al. 1996), collaborative reasoning (Chin et al., 2001), instructional conversations (Goldenberg, 1991; Tharp and Gallimore, 1988), and elaborative interrogations (Pressley, Symons, McDaniel, Snyder, & Turnure, 1988). Although the goals of these approaches are not identical, all purport to help students

develop high level thinking and talk about text. Each discussion approach described has

an instructional frame that influences the interpersonal context of the classroom and the

way that students engage in reading, learning, and thinking (Green, Weade, & Graham,

1986). The questions embodied in these discussion approaches give increasing

responsibility to students for holding their own discussions about text, and they maintain

high student interaction.

Reciprocal teaching. Reciprocal teaching is a discussion approach characterized

as a dialogue that takes place between and among teacher and students that results in the

internalization of flexible strategy use. In the tradition of cognitive strategy instruction,

reciprocal teaching affords students guided practice in generating questions,

summarizing, clarifying word meanings or points of confusion, and in predicting.

In a meta-analysis of 16 studies on reciprocal teaching conducted at a range of

grade levels, Rosenshine and Meister (1994) found that teachers model, prompt, provide

cues, and offer feedback specific to each strategy to foster students' comprehension of

text. The goal of reciprocal teaching is for teachers to gradually transfer control of the

dialogue to students and to become a supportive observer. Rosenshine and Meister

concluded that reciprocal teaching is effective at improving comprehension of text. This

was evident from both experimenter-developed comprehension tests and, to a lesser

extent, from standardized tests of comprehension.

Questioning the Author. Questioning the author, also known as QtA (Beck, et al.

1997) is a discussion approach designed to encourage sustained interactions with texts to

build students' understanding of what they read. McKeown & Beck (2004) explain that

QtA addresses students' interactions with text through a unique constellation of four

features: (a) it addresses text as the product of a fallible author; (b) it deals with the text through general probes for meaning directed toward making sense of ideas in the text; (c) it takes place in the context of reading as it initially occurs; and (d) it encourages collaborative dialogue toward the construction of meaning.

Teachers ask inviting questions to nudge students to consider potential meaning of text. They ask initiating questions to get students involved in discussion. They also ask follow up questions to help students connect emerging meaning with their perceptions of the author's intention and with other ideas in the text. The expectation is that students who engage with text in this manner will develop improved understanding of texts discussed collaboratively, as well as ones they read independently.

While QtA has promising outcomes and offers focused discussion to develop students' thinking and understanding of texts, employing this discussion approach requires time for teachers to analyze text selections for potential points of confusion and support so understanding is reached (Beck, et al. 1997). Professional development that sharpens teachers' skill of effective facilitation increases the likelihood of teachers using QtA to afford students opportunities to grapple with ideas and to co-construct and extend meaning (McKeown & Beck, 2004).

Transactional Strategy Instruction. Transactional strategy instruction (TSI) is a highly interactive discussion approach. It is transactional in the sense that it links text content to prior knowledge, requires co-construction of meaning, and socially determines responses (Brown, et al. 1996). The short-term goal of this discussion approach is to foster students' ability to apply strategies that result in shared interpretations of text. The

long-term goal is students' internalization and adaptive use of strategies. Both goals are promoted by teaching students to emulate the thinking strategies used by the teacher (Brown, et al.). This approach offers teachers a menu of comprehension strategies to support students' understanding of text. The dialogue that takes place between teacher and students is responsive and stems from teachers' explanation and modeling of the strategies used. Typically a few potent strategies are emphasized such as associating, visualizing, and self-questioning (Brown et al.).

Collaborative Reasoning. Collaborative reasoning is a discussion approach that pertains to granting interpretive authority to students by engaging them in critical reading and thinking (Chin et al., 2001). In collaborative reasoning, students take positions on a central question raised in the text, and then they present reasons and evidence for and against these positions (Chin et al.). This discussion approach stimulates critical reading and thinking by requiring that students use textual evidence to support their positions about a text and to challenge or corroborate other readers' interpretations. Students have local control of turn taking and discussion topics. Teachers ask questions to scaffold students' reasoning and model the articulation of clear arguments and counter arguments (Chin et al.).

In a study conducted by Chin, Anderson, and Waggoner (2001) in fourth-grade classrooms, the researchers found that discussions that stressed collaborative reasoning fostered greater student engagement and higher level thinking about text. Discourse features such as the amount of teacher and student talk, the frequency of interruptions, the character of teacher and student questions, and the cognitive processes manifested in the students' talk were analyzed. The researchers suggest that students who have more

40

control over and engagement with text discussions will have deeper understanding. These findings point to instructional practices in which teachers engage students' cognitive functioning rather than simply cover key curricular components.

Wilkinson, Murphy, & Soter (2003, 2005) extended Chin et al.'s (2001) study as another part of their three year project to further investigate discussions that promote high level thinking and talk about text. In regard to Chin et al.'s study, these researchers added discussion parameters that captured important variations among discussion approaches. The discourse parameters added were: choice of text, genre, time of reading, size of group, ability of group, leader of group, and interpretive authority. These researchers concluded that most variations in discussion approaches are in the degree of the teacher's control of topic, interpretive authority, turn taking, and choice of text. It should be noted, however, these conclusions are based on preliminary findings as the data is still in the process of analysis to more fully add to the growing knowledge base of discussion approaches.

Instructional Conversations. Instructional conversations pertain to guiding students to increasingly sophisticated levels of understanding by encouraging expression of students' ideas, and by building upon information students provide regarding experiences they have had (Goldenberg, 1991; Tharp and Gallimore, 1988).

Instructional conversations take place within students' zones of proximal development. The critical form of assisting learners is through dialogue, questioning, and the sharing of ideas and knowledge (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). The teacher's thoughtful use of language is called on to broaden and deepen students' understanding. Instructional conversations are highly interactive. Students play an important role in constructing new

41

knowledge and in acquiring new understandings. The teacher is a strategic discussion leader who encourages expression of students' own ideas, builds upon information students provide, and generally guides students to increasingly sophisticated levels of comprehension (Goldenberg, 1991; Nystrand, 2006; Wilkinson & Silliman, 2000).

In a seven month naturalistic study, Many (2002) examined instructional conversations between teachers and students and between peers to described the scaffolding that occurred as students constructed meaning from texts. Participants were third-fourth grade and fifth-sixth grade multiage classrooms in a large urban city in the southeastern United States. Data consisted of observational field notes, interviews, and student artifacts. Constant comparative analysis was used to determine findings. The findings suggest that instructional conversations function in diverse ways and support students' learning within their zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978). To thrive, the context for instructional conversations must provide ample time and support for rich discussion. Strengths of the study include the thick narrative descriptions of the nature of teaching observed. Although the sample size is small, the methods of analysis are clearly described and the data is shared to allow transferability of the findings to other settings. The researcher notes, more research is needed to explore more specifically how meaning is negotiated.

Elaborative Interrogations. Elaborative interrogation is a discussion approach that requires students to relate and elaborate connections between the text read and their own experiences and prior knowledge (Pressley, Symons, McDaniel, Snyder, & Turnure, 1988). The activation of prior knowledge makes this a particularly effective approach. With the activation of prior knowledge, elaborative interrogations facilitate learning by

asking students to construct a reason to a 'why' question that is typically factual. It is unclear, however, what prior knowledge is needed. Some researchers suggest that students need prior knowledge about the subject. Others suggest students need abstract knowledge in the form of rules or principles (Seifert, 1993). Teachers use probing questions to encourage students to explain their thinking. Giving explanations encourages students to clarify and reorganize the material in new ways to make it understandable to others and, in the process, help them develop new perspectives and recognize and fill in the gaps in their own understanding (Webb, Farivar, & Mastergeorge, 2002).

Summary. This section of the literature review focused on studies that established connections between questions asked by teachers and students' ability and achievement. While many studies were found on questioning in general, limited current studies were found specific to the proposed study's focus. The studies that were found extended findings from previous research and used quantitative analysis to illustrate the impact of questioning on students' achievement.

While researchers agree that authentic questions engage students in high level thinking and talk about text (Nystrand, 1997; Wilkinson, Murphy, & Soter, 2003, 2005; Taylor, Peterson, Rodriques, & Pearson 2002), few discussions of this type are observed in classrooms. A reason for this may be that in our current climate of high-stakes accountability, taking time to talk about texts requires a conscious effort on behalf of the teacher. From a practical perspective, teachers have to decide whether their interaction in teaching reading "reflects an authoritative stance well-suited to cultural reproduction and the meeting of pre-set targets, or whether they adopt a dialogic form of interaction that allows for a more fluid and open interpretation of text" (Fisher, 2005, p. 25).

Teaching is a complex activity. Clearly, it is beneficial to engage and sustain students in discussions about texts. But employing a discussion approach with a high degree of reciprocity is more difficult that one would think. Meaning is realized only in the process of active, responsive understanding. What counts as knowledge and understanding in any given classroom is largely shaped by teacher-student interactions, and the structure of pedagogical activities (Beck& McKeown, 2001; Fisher, 2005; Nystrand, 2006). More research is needed to comb out the question-answer sequences that will allow such interaction. Collecting and analyzing examples of such talk in classrooms could sensitize teachers to what it sounds like to engage students in higher level thinking and talk about text.

The next section of the literature review will look at the teachers' discourse role in regard to student engagement that leads to talk about text. Focal attention is placed on research that suggests learning takes place in a social context in which students are actively engaged in constructing meaning from their own experiences and the ways in which teachers interact with them.

Directive and Supportive Discourse Scaffolds

The purpose of this section is to identify and describe the dichotomous ways in which teachers talk to their students. Specifically, this section will discuss two types of discourse scaffolds as they relate to the questions teachers ask students about texts. Questions play a central role in shaping the character of classroom discourse. As such they significantly regulate the extent to which teacher-student interaction is either monologic or dialogic. Monologically organized classrooms are characteristic of the teacher asking students questions with a predetermined answer. Dialogically organized

44

classroom are characteristic of the time devoted to discussion, authentic questions, uptake, and high-level teacher evaluation (Nystrand, 1997, 2006).

Question-answer sequences reveal important features of teacher-student interaction and hence the character of instruction. As a pedagogical device, questions can both accommodate and exclude student voices in the classroom. The character of classroom discourse is identified in the literature by two types of discourse scaffolds, directive and supportive (Cazden, 2001; Fisher, 2005; Wilkinson & Silliman, 2000). Each has its own structure of social interaction as patterned by the discourse of teaching, and each provides varying degrees of support to students (Wilkinson & Silliman, 2000).

Directive Scaffolds

Directive scaffolds are widely recognized as the traditional discourse pattern commonly found in classrooms across America (Cazden, 2001; Chin, Anderson, & Waggoner, 2001; Fisher, 2005; Nystrand, 2006; Skidmore, 2000; Wilkinson & Silliman, 2000). Exemplified by question/answer evaluations, directive scaffolds stem from behaviorism with the principles of learning focused on observable and measurable behaviors of skill acquisition and application. The nature of this discourse is a three-part sequence of teacher initiation, student response, and teacher evaluation (IRE) or teacher feedback (IRF) (Cazden, 2001; Wells, 1993).

Directive scaffolds are primarily used when the teacher's goal is to transmit knowledge to the students and generally involves scripted lessons based on skill acquisition (Wilkinson & Silliman, 2000). Student learning is demonstrated by giving a correct answer in response to a specific question. Students immediately know the correctness of their response. This traditional discourse pattern is routinely identified as

45

the 'recitation script' (Tharp and Gallimore, 1988). This discourse pattern is also defined, as the 'training of the mouth' (Luke, 1992) and as the 'talk of traditional lessons' (Cazden, 2001; Mehan, 1979; Nystrand, 2006; Wells, 1993; Fisher, 2005; Wilkinson & Silliman, 2000).

The most common criticism of the traditional lesson structure is that the teacher dominates classroom talk by asking multitudes of lower level questions with a known answer, consequently minimizing opportunities for students to engage in higher level thinking. (Cazden, 2001; Mehan, 1979). The teacher controls discussion topics through questions that have a single correct answer and does a considerable amount of work constructing ideas. Beck, et al. (1997) asserts that while students are invited to react to the teacher's ideas, their reactions are less cognitively challenging than if they were invited to engage in co-constructing meaning.

From a structural viewpoint, teachers control verbal traffic in IRE/IRF cycles by asking students to raise their hand and then selecting a student to respond (Cazden, 2001). After each student turn, the teacher regains the floor to comment on the student's contribution, often interjecting his or her own ideas, then directs questions back to the whole-class. When teachers ask questions and accept only those answers they believe to be right, they hold interpretive authority (Chin et al., 2001).

Given the dominance of teacher talk, some researchers suggest that instructional focus is on the development of a topic rather than on deepening students' understanding of text (Fisher, 2005; Wilkinson & Silliman, 2000). Others suggest that without the teacher's dominating voice students may be either reluctant to talk on one extreme or monopolize the floor on the other (Chin et al., 2001).

46

Researchers investigating discourse structures claim that in classrooms where the teacher's voice dominates, the students' thinking time is minimal (Cazden, 2001; Mehan, 1979; Skidmore, 2000). Researchers arguably suggest that students are given less wait time for thinking so the teacher can import his or her knowledge onto students. Researchers find that teachers typically wait only one second for a student's response after asking a question, and then only one more second before prompting an answer with a rephrased question or answer clue (Mehan,1979; Nystrand, Gamoran, Kachur, & Prenergast 1997; Rowe, 1974). Rowe (1986, 1996) contends that if teachers wait three seconds or more after posing a question there are pronounced changes in the student's use of language and logic as well as in student and teacher attitudes and expectations. Carlsen (1991) revealed a slow pace of teacher questioning and extended wait times correlate with greater numbers of student responses, as well as more sustained student responses of greater complexity and higher-order thinking. Johnston (2004) proposes extended thinking time is positively related to more student talk, more sustained talk, and more higher order thinking. He contends that when a teacher waits for a student to think it conveys the message the student is expected to be able to accomplish the task. Failure to wait conveys the opposite message.

While directive scaffolds are widely recognized as prototypical and serve the purpose of ensuring story content, such discourse patterns are thought to generate considerable inertia and are criticized for compromising students' autonomous ability to engage in literate thinking (Cazden, 2001; Mehan, 1979; Nystrand, 2003; Skidmore, 2000). Cazden (2001) asserts directive scaffolds deregulate classroom discourse, and like deregulation in other domains of social life, lead to inequality. Similarly, Mehan (1979)

asks whether students who are taught to conform to adult authority through passive

participation can become active participants in a democratic society and the workplace.

Conversely, Wells (1993) argues the use of directive scaffolds can be beneficial to

students if the teacher incorporates feedback to reinforce and extend the student's

response, rather than to merely evaluate the correctness of the student's response

(Cazden, 2001; Fisher, 2005; Wilkinson & Silliman, 2000).

Supportive Scaffolds

Supportive scaffolds stem from constructivism with the principles of learning

focused on building personal interpretations based on experiences and interactions.

Classroom environments employing supportive scaffolds deviate from the triadic pattern

of directive scaffolds by balancing conversational turns to stimulate and support higher

order thinking (Cazden, 2001; Many, 2002). More conversational turns allow teachers

and students to make contributions toward deepening understanding (Beck e t al. 1997;

Nystrand, 2006). Learning is embedded in a social context and constructing knowledge is

an active process. In regard to reading comprehension, the notion behind teachers using

supportive scaffolds is to keep students engaged in the constructive work of building

understanding of text (Beck, et al. 1997).

Supportive scaffolds embody non-traditional discourse patterns that promise to

engage students in the co-construction of meaning and promise to offer teachers a variety

of discussion approaches (Beck, et al.; Cazden, 2001; Goldenberg & Patthey-Chavez,

1995; Palincsar & Brown, 1984). Research shows teachers who use supportive scaffolds

offer students an increased understanding of text as compared to those who default to the

traditional recitation method in pursuit of the 'right answer' (Cazden, 2001; Chin et al., 2001; Mehan, 1979).

The most valuable aspect of co-constructing meaning of text may be that children talk through ideas, emotions, understandings, and reactions beyond their immediate experiences (Eeds & Wells, 1989). This type of interaction acknowledges interpretation of text is not just about right answers, but also about the author's intentions (Fisher, 2005). Researchers (Beck & McKeown, 2001; Eeds & Wells, 1989; Hansen, 2004; Jewel & Pratt, 1999; Sipe, 2000; Skidmore, 2000) consistently find, given functional and supportive literacy environments where voices are valued and respected, students respond to text in a variety of ways and are heavily influenced by the teacher's discourse.

From an instructional viewpoint, the sequencing of supportive scaffolds is responsive to the student in the search for understanding (Wilkinson & Silliman, 2000). Teaching is geared to supporting knowledge construction by modeling and scaffolding comprehension strategies within students' zones of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978). Supportive discourse scaffolds mirror Vygotsky's (1978) notion of constructivist teaching and are directly related to Palincsar & Brown's (1984) initial work on comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring.

Specifically looking at classroom discourse and student learning, Cazden (2001) explains that supportive scaffolds vary in scope from individual scaffolds to group scaffolds. In regard to individual scaffolds, she describes the one-to-one teacher-student interaction put forth in the careful design of reading recovery (Clay, 1993) as highly supportive and honoring the student's zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978). The Reading Recovery program, developed in partnership by developmental psychologist

49

Marie Clay and experienced primary teachers, exemplifies supportive scaffolding by the nature of the reciprocating teacher-child dialogue.

In regard to small group instruction, Cazden (2001) describes how the teacher uses supportive scaffolds with a group of four to five students using a well-designed literacy program known as reciprocal teaching (Palincsar & Brown, 1984). As previously discussed, reciprocal teaching is a discussion-based learning approach designed to teach cognitive strategies such as question generation, clarification, summarization, and prediction. The discussions that take place between and among teacher and students allows the co-construction of meaning from text, and encourages students to monitor their understanding (Cazden, 2001; Fisher, 2005; Rosenshine & Meister, 1994; Wilkinson & Silliman, 2000).

Like Reading Recovery, reciprocal teaching is highly supportive and offers interactional help with the internal cognitive actions expert readers perform (Rosenshine & Meister, 1994). While reciprocal teaching is widely recognized as an effective program to foster and monitor comprehension of text, Kucan and Beck (1997) suggest the success of reciprocal teaching could be due to either focused instruction in specific strategies or to the time devoted to discussion and the requirement of readers to reflect on what they read.

Cazden (2001) suggests group scaffolds constructed for small group instruction become incorporated into whole group instruction with a community of learners. Supportive scaffolds integrate inquiry into cycles of collaborative conversations to support the development of new ideas and understandings. The basic form of supportive

50

scaffolds for whole group instruction is instructional conversations (Goldenberg, 1991; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988).

Wilkinson and Silliman (2000) report four types of supportive scaffolding cycles: explicit modeling, where the teacher verbally demonstrates thinking; direct explanations and re-explanations, where the teacher makes explicit statements to assist students in understanding underlying concepts; invitations to participate in conversation, where the teacher elicits students' reasoning or requests students to expand on meaning; and verifying and clarifying student understanding, where the teacher gives explicit and positive feedback to guide students in evaluating or sharing perspectives.

Wilkinson and Silliman (2000) suggest that effective discourse scaffolds provide support at the edge of a student's competence. The type and quality of scaffolding used conveys to students the teacher's expectations in regard to their overlapping communicative roles as listeners, speakers, readers, and writers, and influences their self-definition as learners. Teachers' use of directive and supportive scaffolds sets the parameters for teacher-student interactions, which play a central role in shaping students' learning.

Sustained interactions allow the teacher and students opportunities to co-construct meaning and stimulate and nourish students' understanding of text. In a review of research perspectives over the past 25 years, Fisher (2005) considers teacher-student interactions in the teaching of reading. He found, for the most part, the interactions between teacher and students have been and continue to be indicative of the use of directive scaffolds. In such focused interactions, students interact with the teacher upon request as the teacher seeks fixed meanings in regard to interpreting texts. Fisher

51

contends the nature of the teacher's expectation for proficient as well as struggling readers dictates interaction. Nystrand (2003) verifies that any given classroom interaction is shaped by interactions of previous lessons.

Fisher (2005) also states, while there is a call for high-quality teacher-student interactions, agreement has yet to be reached as to what high-quality interaction looks like. In the meantime, he argues, classrooms are dominated with focused interactions where little constructive meaning making is observed. In such focused interactions, " the requirement for predetermined outcomes seems to militate against reflection and exploration of ideas" (p.22). It is suggested that interactions of this type stifles students' thought processes which supports Wells' (1986) finding that students are active meaning makers but are traditionally not afforded the opportunity of sustained interaction in the classroom.

Sustained interaction requires the teacher's skillful facilitation as students thoughtfully contribute their ideas toward making meaning (Jewell & Pratt, 1999). The most valuable aspect of co-constructing meaning of text may be that children talk through ideas, emotions, understandings, and reactions beyond their immediate experiences (Eeds & Wells, 1989). This type of interaction acknowledges interpretation of text is not just about right answers, but also about the author's intentions (Fisher, 2005). Fisher (2005) claims there is evidence throughout the literature of a conflict between classroom discourse intended to engage students and lead them to pre-determined outcomes and classroom discourse in which meanings are less fixed and intended to empower.

Summary. This section of the literature review described directive and supportive scaffolds as two very different ways in which teachers talk with students. One

exemplifies behaviorism with the principles of learning focused on observable and

measurable behaviors of skill acquisition and application (Cazden, 2001; Mehan, 1979,

Nystand, 2006, Wells, 1993). The other exemplifies constructivism with the principles of

learning focused on building personal interpretations based on experiences and

interactions. Researchers agree both discourse scaffolds have a place in classroom

discussions (Fisher, 2005; Gilles & Pierce, 2003; Nystrand, 2006), but the latter supports

the notion the language teachers use during reading instruction is critical in engaging

students in higher level thinking and is better suited to enhancing students' ability to

produce meaning from their engagement with text (Chin et al., 2001; Nystrand, 2006;

Pearson, 2003; Skidmore, 2000; Wilkinson, Murphy, & Soter, 2005). The next section

addresses how the stance the teacher adopts influences the ways in which he/she interacts

with students.

<center>*Teacher Stance*</center>

The purpose of this section of the literature review is to describe the various

stances a teacher may adopt when discussing text with students and to understand how

teachers' theoretical perspective influences the stance adopted. Understanding the

different ways text is encountered and the theoretical perspectives that influence the

stance adopted is important to informing the proposed study.

Stance

Teacher stance, defined as the mode of interaction between a teacher and his or

her students, is related to the nature of the questions teachers ask, the reading instruction

they provide, and the responses they encourage from students (Taylor et al., 2003). The

teacher's attitude, use of instructional materials, and discussion approach are also influenced by stance (Beck & McKeown, 2001; Eeds & Wells, 1989; Hansen, 2004; Jewel & Pratt, 1999; Sipe, 2000; Skidmore, 2000). With any given text, teachers may adopt an efferent, aesthetic, or critical stance, or a combination of stances (Chin et al., 2001).

An aesthetic stance refers to attention teachers place on such things as the favorite parts of the story, descriptions of how the story was visualized, associations or emotions the story evoked, hypotheses regarding story events, extensions of story events, and reactions to the story (Cox and Many, 1992). Taking an aesthetic stance, the teacher strives for students to identify with characters, have personal affective responses to story circumstances, and link the story world with their own life. Teachers asks questions that elicit emotive connections and pay attention to the associations, feelings, attitudes, ideas, and actions of a story's character in a way that allows immersion in the story world for a "lived-through" experience (Rosenblatt, 1978, p. 25).

From an efferent stance, the teacher presents text as a source of information and directs students to knowledge and facts. Voice is used to emphasize and clarify meanings of words, concepts, and structural elements. From an efferent stance, teachers ask questions that focus students' attention on acquiring information from the text, such as story facts and details (Rosenblatt, 1978; Chin et al., 2001).

From a critical stance, teachers focus students' attention on a problem facing a character, a consideration to be made for different courses of action, and appeals to the text for evidence to support interpretations (Chin et al., 2001). The questions teachers ask from a critical stance are focused on reasons and evidence, challenges and rebuttals.

54

In the three year project conducted by Wilkinson, Murphy, & Soter (2003, 2005) previously discussed, a relationship was found between the degree of control exerted by the teacher versus the students in terms of topic, interpretive authority, turn taking, choice of text, and the realized stance. Discussions in which students had more control tended to be those encouraging aesthetic (renamed expressive) responses to text. Conversely, discussions in which teachers had more control tended to be those in which teachers adopted an efferent stance. Discussions in which the teacher and students shared control led to a critical stance. In discussion approaches giving prominence to a critical stance, the teacher had considerable control over text and topic but students had considerable interpretive authority. These researchers conclude a reasonable degree of focus on the efferent and aesthetic stance needs to be in place in order for discussions to foster higher level thinking and talk about text. Findings, however, are tentative as more research needs to be conducted on factors such as pre-discussion activity, the culture of the discourse community, and the kinds of questions teachers ask.

Theoretical Perspectives

In an effort to better understand how the stance a teacher adopts, consequently determines the interaction students have with text, it is important to understand the theoretical views associated with reading and literacy education. It is the theoretical perspective a teacher holds that largely determines the stance he or she adopts (Serafini, 2003). Theoretical perspectives associated with reading and literacy education can be broadly categorized as modernist (Eagleton, 1996), transactional (Rosenblatt, 1978), or critical (Luke & Freebody, 1997).

Modernist Perspective. The modernist perspective is based on the belief that meaning resides in the text. Instructional practices are conceptualized as a set of universal skills taught in a direct, sequential manner that students apply to text in order to uncover its meaning (Serafini, 2004). An eclectic approach, which is often referred to as a balanced reading approach, is often associated with a modernist perspective (Pressley, 1999). The primary instructional focus is on establishing an appropriate pedagogical blend of phonics and skills instruction and the use of authentic texts.

Instructional reading materials primarily used in this perspective often include commercial reading programs and workbooks focusing on some selections of children's literature in a basal anthology. The recitation format aligns with a modernist perspective in that teachers use the same text in a whole class setting and adopt a predominately efferent stance. The teacher maintains control of the topic, control of talking turns, and interpretive authority (Chin et al., 2001). The questions teachers ask and the activities they provide students center more on details, facts, and information to be carried away and less on interpretive responses supported by the text (Serafini, 2003). Chin and colleagues (2001) add that while an efferent stance dominates teaching, other stances may also emerge occasionally as teachers ask for students' affective reaction to story events, or for evidence for or against a particular claim. Standardized tests are the primary measure of a student's reading ability and instructional level. Serfani argues while these instructional practices may in fact match the requirements of standardized tests, they have narrowing effects that reduce the use of children's literature to an instructional device for teaching decoding and literal comprehension.

Transactional Perspective. The transactional perspective is based on the belief

that meaning does not reside in the text or in the reader. Instead, meaning is constructed

in the transaction between a particular reader and a particular text (Rosenblatt, 1978).

Readers bring their prior knowledge and experiences to bear on the reading event, and

meaning is constructed in the internal, cognitive space of the individual reader. Theorists

who align with a transactional model view reading as an active, constructive, social

experience and embrace interpretive communities.

With a transactional perspective, the efferent and aesthetic stances are viewed as

endpoints on a continuum. During any reading event the teacher's attention may fluctuate

along that continuum, containing more or less of an aesthetic or efferent emphasis at

given points depending on the learning outcomes. The purposes defined for aesthetic

reading are to focus on the associations, emotions, and ideas the story evokes. The

purposes defined for efferent reading are directed towards learning how to use facts in

order to analyze, evaluate, and synthesize information rather than directed towards

learning the facts for the sake of remembering them (Serafini, 2003).

The instructional practices that align with a transactional perspective focus on

sharing individual interpretations of texts within communities of readers. Open-ended

questions serve as a guide as the local contexts of the reading event are considered (Chin

et al., 2001). The process of allowing students to build, express, and defend their own

interpretations has become a revalued goal of text discussions (Eeds & Wells, 1989;

Raphael & McMahon, 1994).

Critical Perspective. The critical perspective is seen as a social practice of

constructing meaning that cannot be separated from the cultural, historical, and political

context in which it occurs. The reading practices associated with critical perspectives are intended to support students' understanding of the variety of meanings available during the transaction between reader, text, context, and systems of power affecting the constructed meaning (Serafini, 2003).

Instructional practices are constructed from carefully selected children's literature. The literature is used to invite students to make connections to their lives and their communities. Instructional focus is on students' understanding of how different meanings are constructed and how as readers, students themselves are positioned by various interpretations. Teachers who adopt a critical stance in their classroom understand the political, historical, and cultural implications involved with the texts they read and the meanings they construct (Chin et al., 2001; Wilkinson, Murphy, & Soter, 2003, 2005).

There is an overlap in transactional and critical perspectives. Both perspectives reject the notion that meaning resides within the text and both value children's literature as a vehicle to provide a social space for talk about texts. The shift from a transactional to a critical perspective is often associated with a shift from a focus on the local context to a focus on the larger contexts influencing the way texts are constructed, readers are positioned, and meanings are made available during the act of reading (Serafini, 2003). Wilkinson, Murphy, & Soter (2003, 2005) suggest if teachers have control over choice of text, topic, and turn taking but students have considerable interpretive authority, then a critical stance is achieved. They further suggest shared control between teacher and students helps to give rise to the efferent and aesthetic responses necessary for a critical stance to achieve prominence thereby promoting higher level thinking and talk about text.

Summary. This section of the literature review reveals how different stances engage readers with text. In discussions about text, teachers may adopt an aesthetic, an efferent, or a critical stance. To cultivate higher level thinking, a shared focus on the efferent and aesthetic stances needs to be in place. Regardless of whether teachers can explicitly articulate their theoretical perspectives influencing stance, their beliefs play a dominant role in the resources they choose, the instructional practices they employ, the environment they create in their classrooms, and the stance they adopt (Eisenhart, Cuthbert, Shrum, & Harding, 1988; Serafini, 2002)

Conclusions

This chapter presents a review of the literature to position the research questions. Findings pertaining to the history of core reading programs, the impact of questioning on students' reading comprehension, the teacher's discourse role, and the stance the teacher adopts in reading instruction are offered. These topics were addressed in accordance to the ways in which teachers engage students in talk about texts. The intent of this review of the literature was to integrate what is known and unknown about the ways in which teachers use language to deepen students' understanding of texts. To that end, certain discussion approaches have been found that result in measurable gains in reading comprehension. The question/answer sequences residing within these discussion approaches embody nontraditional discourse. To contribute to the knowledge base, we want to know more specifically what these questions sound like. Following is a summation of how the literature reviewed informed this study.

The literature reviewed reveals that since the 1920s core reading programs have served as the primary instructional tool for reading instruction. Historically, their wide-

59

spread use garners both support and criticisms from reading educators and the general

public. With specific regard to engaging students in talk about text, researchers suggest

reading instruction is more than acquiring a skill set and learning takes place in a social

context in which learners are actively constructing meaning from their own experiences

and their classroom interactions. Researchers have worked for thirty years to identify

discussion approaches offering students an increased understanding of text and have long

argued for the need to incorporate discussions into classroom practice that go beyond the

traditional recitation format (Beck, et al.1997; Brown et al.1995; Cazden, 2001; Chin et

al., 2001; Goldenberg, 1991; Palincsar & Brown, 1984; Pressley & McDonald, 1997;

Mehan, 1979; Rosenshine & Meister, 1994). However discussion approaches hinge

largely on the social context for talk along with the supportive and facilitative role of the

teacher. Social space must be created with discussion parameters taking into account the

social nature of reading and its relationship to comprehension, thinking, and learning.

Clearly it is beneficial to engage and sustain students in discussions about texts,

but there are many factors to consider. Meaning is realized only in the process of active,

responsive understanding. In some discussion formats, students respond only to teacher

questions and have little control over what they say. In other discussion formats, students

are free to respond to another's comment, ask a question, extend another student's idea,

or introduce a new topic. As a pedagogical device, questions can both accommodate and

exclude student voices in the classroom. In discussions of text without instructional

frames, often only the most vocal students get to share their thinking. To involve all

students, teachers must employ learning structures that ensure that every student has a

voice.

60

Question-answer sequences reveal important features of teacher-student interaction and hence the character of instruction (Beck& McKeown, 2001; Fisher, 2005; Nystrand, 2006; Wilkinson, Murphy, & Soter, 2003). We know certain discussion approaches actively engage students in talk about text, but we need to comb out and make more specific the questions residing within these discussion approaches. In regard to promoting talk about text, the asking of authentic questions is recognized as key, but we still need to know what they sound like and how and when best to ask them. Researchers' current attention is on developing a fuller understanding of classroom discourse that facilitates authentic questions. Identifying the impact of the questions asked on shaping students' ability to generate their own questions from text, as well as what impact this more generative behavior might have on subsequent comprehension warrants further study. These studies will make contributions to theory by the way the dialogue is interpreted and the lens through which it is viewed (Fisher, 2005; Pearson, 2004; Wilkinson, Murphy, & Soter, 2003, 2005).

With the full weight of the status quo and the unrelenting pressures of accountability looming overhead, teachers need to interrogate the theoretical assumptions supporting their instructional practices in reading. This review of the literature reveals that researchers have argued for over a century about the best method for teaching students how to read. Researchers now suggest we should shift focus from trying to find the right method for teaching students how to read, to determining whether the reading practices and experiences constructed in classrooms are addressing the broad repertoire of practices required in today's society (Cazden, 2001; Chin et al., 2001; Fisher, 2005; Nystrand, 2006).

Chapter Three

Method

"Not everything that can be counted counts and not everything that counts can be

counted." (Albert Einstein)

This chapter describes how the study was conducted. There are five main sections

in this chapter. The first section explains the purpose of the study and the research

questions. The second section details the research design and provisions for

trustworthiness. Study participants and their school sites are described in the third

section. The fourth section discusses researcher bias and ethical considerations. The final

section reports data collection and analysis procedures.

The Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this qualitative research study was to examine and describe the

nature of questioning moves that exemplary fourth-grade teachers use during reading

instruction. Questioning moves are defined in this study as the ways in which teachers

use scaffolding questions to engage students in talk about text. Another point of interest

was to determine how teachers perceive the influence of instructional materials on the

language they use to engage students in talk about text. Specifically, this study sought to

provide a window into exemplary fourth-grade teachers' classrooms during reading

instruction for an analysis of how teachers question students to engage them in talk about

text to construct meaning. According to the literature reviewed, optimal understanding of

how teachers engage students in constructing meaning from text is best gained by

investigating the nature of question-answer sequences (Nystrand, 1993, 1997, 2006; Wilkinson, Murphy, & Soter, 2003, 2005; Taylor et al., 2003). The nature of the questions asked were examined in this study by analyzing the questioning moves exemplary teachers used during reading instruction. Close analysis of the teachers' questioning moves in reading instruction adds to the knowledge base about how teachers use language to shape the nature of teaching and learning afforded to students.

The following questions guided the research study:

1. What is the nature of the questioning moves exemplary teachers use in fourth-grade classrooms during reading instruction?

2. What do exemplary fourth-grade teachers describe as influencing their use of questioning moves within the reading program?

Research Design and Provisions for Trustworthiness

The design of this qualitative study is Naturalistic Inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Naturalistic Inquiry is guided by the following assumptions: (a) the study takes place in a natural classroom setting; (b) the researcher is the primary instrument for data collection; (c) data collection is qualitative; (d) purposeful sampling is used for increased scope; (e) implied and propositional knowledge helps uncover the nuances of multiple realities; (f) findings and results are negotiated with participants to provide an accurate depiction of reality; and (g) trustworthiness underscores the research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This design allowed me to observe naturally unfolding phenomena that emerged in the non-manipulated context of the participants' classrooms (Johnson & Christensen, 2004; Patton, 2002).

The aim of this study was to illuminate the questioning moves exemplary fourth-grade teachers used during reading instruction. To provide a close analysis of exemplary fourth-grade teachers' questioning moves in reading instruction, I collected data within a case study tradition (Creswell, 1998). Case studies are often employed in qualitative research to provide particular, exacting accounts of specific situations (Merriam, 1988; Yin, 2003). The design of this study offers a holistic portrayal of the particularity and complexity of each case as well as comparisons across cases (Creswell, 1998; Patton, 2002; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2003).

Case Study

Qualitative methodologists offer various definitions and explanations for what it means to conduct a case study. Stake (1995) defines case study as a detailed study of a single case to understand its inherent complexities. Merriam (1998) defines case study as an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single bounded unit. According to Merriam, case study plays an important role in advancing a field's knowledge base and is particularly suited for the field of education. Creswell (1998) defines case study as an exploration of a bounded system over time through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple information rich sources. Berg (2007) defines case study as a method involving systematically gathering enough information about a unit to permit the researcher to effectively understand how the subject operates or functions. The power of the case study, according to Berg (2007), is its sensitivity to nuances, patterns, and other more hidden elements that other research approaches might overlook. Yin (2003) defines case study as a comprehensive research strategy used to investigate an empirical topic within its real-life context. Many units can be considered for case analysis including

individuals, groups, programs, large corporations, events, activities, or processes (Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1988; Yin, 2003).

Taken together, these various definitions suggest that case study is an approach capable of examining simple or complex phenomenon, with varying units of analysis. While many definitions exist for what it means to conduct a case study, this study was conducted in line with Yin's (2003) definitions and explanations. Yin suggests that conducting a case study within its real-life context entails using a variety of sources in data collection that can meaningfully make use of and contribute to the application of theory. Yin further suggests having at least a two-case case study for drawing more powerful findings and analytic conclusions.

This study sought answers to questions about how exemplary fourth-grade teachers use questioning moves to engage students in talk about text. Therefore, the question-answer sequences in exemplary teachers' classrooms during reading instruction were plumbed, analyzed, and compared for incidence of authentic open-ended questions requiring explanation, elaboration, or defense of text ideas. Interviews, digital recordings, videotapes, and classroom observations informed the development of each case in an effort to provide a better understanding of the nature of the language teachers use to engage students in talk about text. In addition to the holistic description and analysis of each case, this study includes cross-case analysis to illuminate similarities and differences in patterns that cut across cases (Johnson & Christensen, 2004; Patton, 2002).

In qualitative research naturalistic inquiry must meet provisions of trustworthiness as defined by credibility, dependability, transferability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Therefore, in designing this study several steps were taken to ensure trustworthiness, as described below.

Credibility pertains to confidence in the research findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Given that the focus in qualitative research is data, one way I address credibility is to make the data visible. Where possible I use examples from that data that are illustrative of authentic open-ended question-answer sequences. Direct quotations are also visible. By having access to the data, readers of this study are able to judge the accuracy of my interpretations and are able to see how they were formed. Triangulation is another strategy I used to address credibility. I triangulated my methods of analysis by comparing the data generated from interviews, transcripts, and field notes. Also, feedback and discussion of my interpretations in the way of member checks (Stake, 1995) were instituted for verification and insight. Further, I discussed my findings with peers in my field who are not involved with the study. These peers included fellow doctoral candidates in childhood education, teachers with whom I work, and professional colleagues. Peer debriefing provided an outside lens with which to view the emerging data. I described what I saw and my peers challenged me to provide clear and solid evidence for my interpretations.

In order to make this study transparent, I strove for dependability by leaving an "inquiry trail" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 317). Lincoln and Guba recommend an inquiry

66

trail so reviewers can examine the consistency of both the process and the product of the research. I kept researcher notes in regard to the methods I used to record and analyze data and used language from the interviews and direct quotations from the field notes. I overlapped my data sources and analysis procedures. I also gave thick descriptions of the context within which the research occurred.

Transferability refers to the degree to which the results of qualitative research can be transferred to other contexts. Careful consideration was given to data collection methods to ensure that the data collected would be representative of the study and that the knowledge gained from this study could be applied to other environments. To enhance transferability, I strove to capture a comprehensive picture of how and why exemplary fourth-grade teachers use questioning moves during reading instruction thus allowing others to make transferability judgments based on their own experiences.

Confirmability refers to the degree to which others can confirm the results of a study. Lincoln and Guba suggest confirmability is the degree to which the researcher can demonstrate the neutrality of the interpretations. This means providing an audit trail consisting of (a) raw data such as videotapes, written notes, and survey records; (b) analysis notes; (c) data reconstruction and synthesis products; (d) process notes; (e) personal notes; and (f) preliminary developmental information (pp. 320 -321). To address confirmability, I documented the procedures I used for checking and rechecking the data throughout the study. I left a detailed audit trail, which Lincoln and Guba (1985) consider crucial. Using this technique, I collected and maintained extensive data. I described in detail how data were collected, how categories in data analysis were derived, and how decisions were made throughout the study.

Participants and Sites

I sought three fourth-grade teachers at three different schools in one southwest

Florida school district to participate in my study. To determine case study participants,

two criteria were considered: (a) principals identify teachers as exemplary, and (b)

teachers beliefs and practices align with a constructivist view of teaching and learning.

After a school district meeting, I met with five principals to outline the intent of my

study. According to Booth and Rosewell (2002), principals develop a school's capacity to

have an impact on student achievement by keeping a clear focus on the quality of the

teaching, the literacy curriculum, and instruction and assessment. The principals with

whom I selected to meet were those known to me to value this focus. They are concerned

with the organizational conditions in which teaching and learning occur and work to

provide instructional and curricular support for reading instruction. They allow teachers

to assume greater professional responsibility for developing proficient readers, and

preserve the school climate from state standardized tests. After I outlined the intent of

this study (see Appendix A), three principals made the commitment to identify exemplary

fourth-grade teachers. Principals used data collected from their regular classroom

"walkthroughs" (Richardson, 2001) in conjunction with Allington's (2000, 2002)

framework of common features observed in exemplary fourth-grade reading classrooms

to guide their identification of teachers.

A walkthrough is an informal way for principals to collect and record data about

effective instruction and the school's success in achieving its instructional goals. In

response to the current reading initiative that impacts every Florida school, and in

adherence to the school district's comprehensive reading plan, principals are required to

68

conduct classroom walkthroughs on a regular basis. Teachscape, a technology enabled

professional development services company, provides principals the technology and

training for collecting data while walking through a teacher's classroom

(www.teachscape.com). Data is collected using an online platform and is used to identify

trends and patterns that assist in targeting professional development. Certified

Teachscape trainers prepare principals for conducting walkthroughs. As standard practice

following the training, principals are required to walk through teachers' classrooms to

look for the following categories that promote student achievement: (a) focus on

curriculum, (b) focus on instruction, (c) focus on the learner, (d) focus on classroom

environment, and (e) focus on the needs of all learners.

Data collected from the classroom walkthroughs are based on standard look-fors

within certain categories that are described in detail and prompted by guiding questions.

The look-fors include but are not limited to the following: identification of the learning

objective, identification of the instructional practices, identification of student grouping

format, identification of instructional materials, determining the level of student work in

regard to Bloom's (1956) taxonomy, determining levels of class engagement, and

determining elements in the classroom environment that support the lesson and are

generally conducive to learning. These look-fors are not weighted and do not place value

judgments on teachers. Rather, they represent categories of general characteristics of

effective teaching.

Allington's (2000, 2002) framework of common features observed in exemplary

fourth-grade reading classrooms was used in conjunction with the walkthroughs to guide

principals' identification of exemplary fourth-grade teachers. According to Allington,

exemplary fourth-grade reading teachers: (a) facilitate classroom talk that is process oriented and fosters teacher/student and student/student interaction; (b) use multiple sources for instruction and ensure appropriate complexity in reading materials; (c) routinely give direct, explicit demonstrations of thinking strategies; (d) engage students in extensive reading and writing activities; (e) evaluate student work and base grades more on effort and improvement than achievement of an a priori standard; and (f) allocate time for extensive practice in reading.

The schools these principals serve vary in type and demographics to offer a broad picture of teaching. One school serves pre-K through fifth grade and is embarking on implementing the International Baccalaureate Primary Years Program (PYP). The PYP combines research and practice from a range of global education systems. The focal point is to promote the use of inquiry to drive the focus of instruction. The school provides rigorous academic research projects as well as foreign language studies to support the international perspective of the curriculum. The school is located in a low socio-economic suburban area and classified as Title I because it serves a high percentage of students who are on free or reduced lunch. Currently 400 students, ranging from pre-kindergarten to fifth grade, are enrolled in the school. There are four fourth-grade classrooms with approximately 15 students each. The school's student population consists of 45% Hispanic, 37% African American, 13% Caucasian, and 4% Multi-cultural. Ninety-two percent of students are on free or reduced lunch. All classrooms ranging from pre-kindergarten to fifth-grade have access to the latest technology tools. The mission of the school is to develop inquiring, knowledgeable and caring young

people who help to create a better and more peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect.

Another school is considered a traditional elementary school and is located in a middle class suburban area. The school currently serves 585 students of which 74% are Caucasian, 14% are Hispanic, 6% are African American, and 6% are multicultural. Thirty-five percent of students are on free or reduced lunch. The school is divided into grade level teams that work together to plan integrated units of study that support district goals and challenge students to become critical thinkers and problem-solvers as they apply their knowledge to real life situations. Teachers are responsible for teaching and assessing Language Arts, Math, Social Studies, and Science. There are four fourth-grade classrooms at this school, each with a class size of approximately 22 students.

The third school is a suburban magnet elementary school of arts and communication. The mission of the school is to foster a love of learning in all students by promoting creativity and excellence in academics through a communications and arts theme. The district's curriculum is taught with an emphasis on the development of strong communication skills and the enhancement of each child's creativity. The staff nurtures the innovative, creative spirit in every child and is committed to the exciting and unique opportunities that communication and creative arts provide as a vehicle for mastery of academic learning. Both oral and written communication are emphasized by integrating activities such as broadcasting, computer applications, journalism, writing, and foreign language. Students receive specialized instruction in drama, visual arts, vocal/instrumental music, and dance. The school is located in a low socio-economic suburban area and currently serves 849 students of which 114 are in the fourth-grade.

71

These fourth-grade students are equally dispersed into five fourth-grade classrooms. The school's diverse student population consists of 44% Caucasian students, 27% Hispanic students, 21% African American students, and 8% Bi-racial students. With 66% of the student body attending by choice, this is one of the most highly requested choice schools in the district.

Cumulatively, principals identified a total of seven exemplary teachers as possible study participants. Once teachers were identified, I contacted them personally to advise them of my research study and of the data collection procedures that would valuably inform it. I explained to teachers that I would be observing and examining their reading instruction because of my interest in how teachers and students interact with each other. I did not mention the study's theoretical framework or the special interest I had in the questions teachers ask to engage students in talk about text.

Theoretically, this study is grounded in social constructivism, which stems from the work of Vygotsky (1978). As discussed in Chapter One (pp. 3-5), from this perspective common understanding in the literature reflects the notion that teaching, learning, and the environment in social constructivist classrooms is founded on principles of learning focused on building personal interpretations based on experiences and interactions. Social constructivism focuses on the social nature of learning on the bases that knowledge is socially constructed. Within the social constructivist frame, Phillips (1995) emphasizes the learner's active participation and heightens recognition given to the social nature of learning. From his perspective, coming to know something is not a spectator sport. Rather, 'coming to know' is a participant sport, requiring each individual to become actively involved in his or her own learning. In this line of thinking, students

must talk about what they are learning, write about it, relate it to past experiences, and apply it to their daily lives.

Teaching in a constructivist classroom is geared to supporting knowledge construction by modeling and scaffolding within students' zones of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978). Dialogue is the mode of discourse in constructivist classrooms. Dialogue is seen as a way for students to share their knowledge and thereby facilitate each other's construction of knowledge (Vygotsky). Such discussion is the everyday implementation of the principle that students must be active participants in their own learning (Chin et al., 2001). Constructivist teachers mediate the community of the classroom so the discussion enables students to develop intellectually, and they put in place scaffolds that enable students to develop within their zone of proximal development (Moll, 1990). Simply stated, classrooms supporting the principles of social constructivism structure learning around broad concepts and embed learning in a social context (Cazden, 2001; Chin, Anderson, & Waggoner, 2001; Gilles & Pierce, 2003, Mehan, 1979).

While constructivism is a "theory about learning not a description of teaching" (Fosnot, 1996, p. 29), attempts have been made in the field of reading to operationally define constructivist teachers so that classroom teachers can more rapidly apply constructivist theory to classroom practice (Lenski, Wham, & Griffey, 1997). For example, Lenski, Wham, & Griffey define the constructivist teacher as one who uses whole text and integrated instruction, teaches using primarily an inquiry approach, and views students as using prior knowledge to construct meaning to learn. Important here is the central idea that knowledge is socially constructed. To explore teachers' beliefs about

literacy learning and classroom practices these researchers developed a *Literacy*

Orientation Survey (L.O.S.) (see Appendix A) based on ten principles consistent with a

constructivist view of teaching and learning: (1) the teacher views literacy as a meaning-

making process; (2) the teacher facilitates child-centered instruction; (3) the teacher

creates an environment conducive to developing literacy skills; (4) the teacher provides

effective instruction in strategic reading practices; (5) the teacher facilitates student

writing; (6) the teacher employs flexible grouping; (7) the teacher provides instruction

through a thematic approach that integrates subject matter across the curriculum; (8) the

teacher employs meaningful assessment; (9) the teacher encourages parental

involvement; and (10) the teacher engages in ongoing reflection (pp. 5-9).

The L.O.S. was designed in two stages to measure the construct of teachers'

literacy beliefs and practices. The first stage of the survey consists of 15 theory based

belief statements. The second stage of the survey consists of 15 statements that translate

belief into classroom practice. The statements are designed to reflect the ten principles of

constructivist approaches to literacy instruction. Statements include: I encourage my

students to monitor their comprehension as they read; Reading instruction should always

be delivered to the whole class at the same time; I hold parent workshops or send home

newsletters with ideas about how parents can help their children with school; When

planning instruction, I take into account the needs of children by including activities that

meet their social, emotional, physical, and affective needs; and Students should be treated

as individual learners rather than as a group. Response to each statement in the survey is

plotted on a five point Likert scale anchored by descriptors such as strongly disagree and

strongly agree or never and always. At the end of the survey, response values are totaled.

The combined score from the survey aligns to principles in learning that distinguish whether the teacher's beliefs and practices are consistent with a traditional or constructivist philosophy, or an eclectic mix of the two.

Although the L.O.S. was field tested by its developers on 235 different teachers and factor analyzed to determine validity, I administered it to 12 different colleagues consisting of classroom teachers, reading coaches, and fellow doctoral students to gain a sense of confidence for the purpose of my study. Before completing the survey, I asked each of my colleagues to read the descriptors for traditional, constructivist, and eclectic teachers provided by the survey and to predict the orientation with which they would most closely align (Lenski, Wham, & Griffey, 1997). In terms of literacy learning put forth by the survey, the traditional teacher is described as one who uses traditional reading methods such as basal reading instruction, teaches primarily by direct instruction, and views students as vessels to be filled. The constructivist teacher is described as one who uses whole text and integrated instruction, teaches using primarily an inquiry approach, and views students as using prior knowledge to construct meaning to learn. The eclectic teacher is described as one who uses some traditional and some constructivist reading methods, frequently "basalizes" literature selections, and combines traditional and constructivist views about student learning.

After my colleagues completed the survey, we scored and interpreted the survey in partnership. The L.O.S. accurately predicted the theoretical orientation presupposed by 10 out of 12 colleagues. There were two discrepancies. One colleague felt she aligned more with behaviorist beliefs and practices but actually aligned with the eclectic description. The other felt she aligned more with constructivist beliefs and practices but

75

actually aligned with the behaviorist description. While I can only speculate reasons for the discrepancies, the first colleague was previously a reading intervention teacher who recently became a literacy coach frequently asked to reflect on literacy learning. The other was a teacher who was engaged in an intense coaching cycle with her literacy coach revolving around inquiry based teaching and learning which may have caused a shift in beliefs that have yet to translate to practice.

As a viable way to determine the theoretical orientation of the seven possible study participants, each candidate was given the survey. Research supports that teachers' beliefs about literacy influence their instruction and assessment practices in the classroom. What is read, how it is read, whether and how it is discussed, and the teacher's beliefs about reading, learning and literature all influence the experiences students have with text (Galda, Ash, & Cullinan, 2000). Investigating exemplary teachers' questioning moves during reading instruction, this research study sought a constructivist view of teaching and learning, opposed to a traditional or eclectic view. Therefore, teachers who indicated their beliefs and practices align with a constructivist view of teaching and learning, as described by the survey, were essential.

While I recognize that a constructivist view does not guarantee a teacher will be inclined to more sophisticated questioning moves, this study is designed on the premise that teachers who align with a constructivist view of teaching and learning are more likely to engage students in talk about text. In simple terms, a constructivist view values the process of learning more than the final product and theoretically advocates that learning is a social activity that requires student interaction and engagement in the classroom. Conversely, a traditional view is deeply rooted in behaviorist philosophy and

advocates teaching primarily by direct instruction and valuing product over process. I

used purposeful selection (Patton, 2002) to select one teacher from each school who

indicated on the survey an alignment with a constructivist view of teaching and learning.

Purposeful selection is a process researchers use to select a sample from which

they can learn the most in regard to a particular area of interest. The benefit of purposeful

selection is that it provides information-rich cases from which detailed information can

be obtained (Berg, 2007; Merriman, 1998; Patton, 2002). The selection process was

aided by a preliminary observation of each teacher who indicated a constructivist view of

teaching and learning. A common notion theoretically advocated by the constructivist

view is that learning is a social activity that requires student interaction and engagement

in the classroom. The preliminary observation focused on the ways in which the teacher

interacted with and engaged the students in learning as a means to confirm a

constructivist view. Once study participants were confirmed, the questioning moves they

used to engage students in talk about text were plumbed, analyzed, and compared in an

effort to provide a better understanding of the nature of the language teachers use during

reading instruction.

Researcher Biases and Ethical Considerations

This naturalistic inquiry was designed to provide close analysis of exemplary

fourth-grade teachers' questioning moves during reading instruction. As such, I was the

primary instrument for collecting and analyzing data. Given human nature, it was

important to identify myself, my perspective, and to recognize my biases in regard to

teaching and learning.

I am a district curriculum specialist for language arts and former reading coach and classroom teacher in the district in which this study was conducted. As such, I hold certain values and beliefs in regard to teaching and learning. I value inquiry-based learning where students' thinking and points of view are appreciated. I value students as partners in learning and view literacy as a meaning making process. I believe the classroom climate is of paramount importance and should be conducive to developing strategic readers. My long-standing employment with the school district affords me familiarity with the three school sites, and I have a positive professional relationship with all three principals. This professional relationship allowed me to have confidence that the principal of each site is the instructional leader and maintains a clear focus on the quality of the teaching, the literacy curriculum, and instruction and assessment. To keep my biases in check, I kept a researcher's reflective journal. I wrote in my reflective journal about the data collection process and data analysis process. I recorded thoughts and ideas generated during data collection and analysis as well as insights and questions. I also engaged in reflexivity, a process of self-reflection about potential biases and predispositions (Johnson & Christensen, 2004). I heeded Patton's (2002) suggestions and constantly asked myself, "What do I know?" and "How do I know what I know?" Data collection and analysis were mediated through my perspectives and biases. However, I made extensive provisions for trustworthiness and committed myself to accurately and objectively portraying the nature of the questioning moves used by each teacher.

To further minimize my biases, I had a fellow doctoral candidate specialized in reading and trained in qualitative research methods examine randomly selected portions of transcripts and videotapes for each teacher. This co-rater was asked to first identify

teachers' questions, then to verify my identification of categorical codes. To determine interrater reliability, we combined our preliminary identification of questioning moves and discussed how each fit into the identified categories. For questioning moves that presented discrepancies, we reanalyzed the questioning move identified and resolved discrepancies by revisiting our interpretations as supported by evidence in the data. Of the questioning moves identified, we retained those with 100% agreement.

I collected data via observational field notes, videotapes, and interviews in order to analyze the questioning moves of exemplary teachers. The observations, videotaped lessons, and follow-up interviews and their transcripts were combined to triangulate the data (Denzin, 1970). Triangulation further decreased the possibility of researcher bias and increased credibility because data were confirmed by multiple data sources. Further, investigator triangulation was employed because I had a second person trained in qualitative methods examine transcripts and videotapes to cross-check categorization of the questioning moves used (Johnson & Christensen, 2004).

Ethics

Ethical considerations were of paramount importance in designing this study. I considered appropriate levels of accountability, informed consent, and professionalism. This study was conducted with exemplary fourth-grade teachers in their classrooms. Following the code of ethics for conducting such a study, I went through Institutional Review Board (IRB) training to ensure that I understood the considerations of human studies. Then I applied for IRB approval. I also received approval from the appropriate gate keepers in the school district within which this study was conducted. I did this by requesting a meeting with the superintendent of schools. At the meeting we discussed the

proposed research investigation along with the potential risks and benefits of asking teachers to participate in the study. To guide the discussion, an outline of the proposed research was presented. The outline consisted of the proposed purpose, participants, data collection methods, significance of the study, and potential risks and benefits (see Appendix B). Questions and concerns were appropriately addressed.

Once necessary approval to conduct the study was obtained and study participants were identified, I set up a meeting with the principals and teachers to describe my research plan and to obtain informed consent. I gave consent forms that outlined the potential risks and benefits of participating in the study to teachers to send home with each student. Once approval was granted from the parents of these children, I met with the class to explain that I would be observing, taking notes, and videotaping their classroom during reading instruction and reporting what I learned in a descriptive narrative account.

Confidentiality was maintained for the duration of the study. Participants and school sites were given pseudonyms. These pseudo names were used when discussing the data with peers and in reporting the findings. All data is stored in a locked office in my home to further ensure confidentiality.

Data Collection Methods and Data Analysis Procedures

To build a comprehensive picture of each case, I employed various and overlapping data collection methods. According to Yin (2003) a major strength of case study data collection is employing multiple sources. For each case in this study, data collection consisted of two interviews supported by a digital recorder, three classroom observations supported by field notes, and two videotapes supported by extended

interviews with the teachers to glean a deeper understanding of their instructional

decisions for the questioning moves used. Throughout the study I collected data in depth

and detail, and was the instrument for the data collection process (Patton, 2002). Given

that the primary purpose of this study was to investigate and describe the nature of

questioning moves that three exemplary fourth-grade teachers used during reading

instruction while demonstrating the research process of a doctoral dissertation, a timeline

for data collection was illustrated (see Appendix C) along with the phases in which this

study would be conducted (see Appendix D). The data collection methods employed

during this time frame allowed explicit attention to the research focus. Table 1 illustrates

data collection methods and data analysis procedures that I used for each guiding

question.

Table 1: Data Collection Methods and Data Analysis Procedures

Question	Data Collection	Data Analysis
What is the nature of the questioning moves exemplary fourth-grade teachers use during reading instruction?	Classroom observational field notes, video tape, digital recorder, interview transcripts	Conversation Analysis (Moerman, 1988); Pattern Analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Patton, 2002); Interview Analysis (Hycner, 1985; Rubin & Rubin, 2005)
What do exemplary fourth-grade teachers describe as influencing their use of questioning moves within the reading program?	Individual interviews, classroom observation field notes	Pattern Analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Patton, 2002); Interview Analysis (Hycner, 1985; Rubin & Rubin, 2005)

Within the data collection period, I engaged each teacher in two focused interviews. Interviews were conducted person-to-person at the participants' school site, were digitally recorded, and lasted approximately one hour. The first interview was guided by focus questions and was conducted in a conversational style to encourage and sustain active participation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Patton, 2002). An interview protocol was used as the data collection tool and was given to study participants in advance of the interview. The protocol used for the first interview (see Appendix E) was designed to include open-ended focus questions to gain insight into each teacher's literacy beliefs, practices, and philosophies and was conducted prior to classroom observations. The second interview (Appendix F) was conducted in an informal conversational style to allow flexibility in pursuing identified gaps in data collection and responsiveness to each teacher (Patton, 2002). The second interview was conducted after all classroom observations took place. In both interviews, probes were used to draw out additional information. With each interview, I requested permission for using a digital recorder. These recordings were used to capture all talk from the interviews and to provide accuracy for analysis. I immediately transcribed the recordings into a word processing document. The transcribed interviews were sent to each study participant for member checking to ensure accuracy of their responses. After the transcribed interviews were checked, I used open coding (Patton, 2002) to identify initial categories and broad themes. I looked for patterns in direct quotes and common themes. The themes and patterns that emerged were compared with my field notes to check for congruency.

Observations of the uninterrupted 90-minute reading block were conducted throughout the data collection period. The 90-minute reading block, as described by the

district's K-12 comprehensive reading plan, requires a protected uninterrupted 90 minutes of time per day for reading instruction. The first 30 minutes of the required 90-minute block is intended for whole group instruction from the core reading program. The remainder of the block is intended for teachers to work with students to provide differentiated instruction using the core reading program or supplemental reading materials. In my field notes I strove for "thick descriptions" (Geertz, 1973) of what I observed to maximize data discovery and to allow for transferability. I recorded field notes on a laptop computer and identified data collection by teacher name, date, time, and context. Field notes were entered into a word processing document and followed the format described by Patton, (2002), with descriptive, concrete, and detailed notes recorded on the right side of the page, and with feelings, reactions, insights, and interpretations recorded on the left. To uphold descriptive validity (Johnson & Christensen, 2004) I used discussion parameters developed by Wilkinson, Murphy, and Soter (2003, 2005) (see Appendix G) to guide the observations. As suggested by Merriam (1998) field notes were recorded in detail immediately following each observation to form the database for analysis.

Data collection also involved videotaping two additional uninterrupted 90-minute reading blocks for each teacher. Videotapes provide rich data for the study of talk and interaction (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Data collection focused on the language teachers used to engage students in talk about text. Thus, close attention was given to teacher and students' verbal interactions surrounding text. Following my review of each taping, I shared pertinent segments of the videotape with each teacher to glean a deeper understanding of their instructional decisions for the questioning moves used. I created

elaborated field notes based on the discussions I had with each teacher regarding the stimulated recall prompted by the videotapes. These field notes served clarification purposes. Additionally, a second observer trained in qualitative methods viewed the videotaped segments for each teacher to verify the categorization of teachers' questioning moves.

The Role of the Researcher

The role a researcher adopts to conduct observations is conceptualized on a continuum with two end poles ranging from complete participant to complete observer (Merriman, 1998; Patton, 2002; Yin, 2003). In this study, I was a non-participant observer conducting direct observations in each classroom (Patton, 2002). As such, I openly took notes while experiencing the activities of the classroom but did not overtly participate in any activities. According to Patton (2002), conducting direct observations provides many benefits to the researcher including: (a) the researcher is better able to understand and capture the context within which people interact; (b) the first hand experience enables researchers to be open, discovery oriented, and inductive; (c) the opportunity for the researcher to see important nuances that may routinely escape awareness among the people in the setting because their routines are taken for granted; (d) a chance to learn information on sensitive topics that study participants would be unwilling to discuss in an interview; (e) the opportunity to move beyond the selective perception of others to give a more comprehensive view of the setting being studied; and (f) the ability to draw on personal knowledge during the formal interpretation stage of analysis (pp. 262-264).

While I made every effort to keep the observations casual and unobtrusive in nature, my presence was known to the class, which may have influenced, at least to a small degree, teacher-student and student-student interactions. Merriam (1998) cautions regardless of the role the researcher adopts, one cannot help but affect and be affected by the setting, and this interaction may lead to a distortion of the researched situation. Therefore, the effect of my presence was taken into consideration in the analysis and interpretation of the data.

Data Analysis

As a qualitative study, the goal of this research was to gain an in-depth understanding of the questioning moves used by exemplary fourth-grade teachers during reading instruction. Therefore, data analysis was inductive and ongoing and I employed a range of interconnected interpretive practices. I used pattern analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Patton, 2002), interview analysis (Hycner, 1985), and conversation analysis (Moerman, 1988) to make sense of data gathered from interviews, observational field notes, digital recordings, and videotapes. Data analysis was conducted in two stages. First data were separately analyzed within each case to build each teacher's profile. Then data were juxtaposed for the purpose of comparison. When I refer to data in Chapter Four, I identify the data source. For example, I refer to interview transcripts as either Interview A (IA) or Interview B (IB). Similarly, I refer to observational field notes as Observation 1 (O1), Observation 2 (O2), or Observation 3 (O3), and videotapes as either Videotape 1 (V1) or Videotape 2 (V2).

Pattern analysis. Pattern analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Patton, 2002) was used to organize data into meaningful components. Identification of the questioning

moves required careful observation and line by line analysis of transcripts. I looked for

patterns by coding direct quotes and by bringing together common ideas. I reviewed raw

data several times to locate emerging patterns. This process is often referred to as open

coding (Patton, 2002; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The purpose of coding is to reach an

understanding of the topic of interest. Throughout data collection, I named and

expounded upon tentative patterns in an effort to group data into categories. According to

Patton (2002), the goal is to create descriptive, multi-dimensional categories that form a

preliminary framework for analysis. Throughout data analysis redundant patterns were

eliminated and ambiguous patterns were refined. Patterns were pieced together to form a

comprehensive picture of each case.

Interview analysis. Interview analysis was used to organize participants'

responses in such a way that overall patterns emerge. I generated open-ended questions to

ask the study participants at the beginning of the study to get to teachers' underlying

philosophy and asked responsive questions at the end of the study. I used Hycner's (1985)

suggestions to guide the analysis of data obtained from the interviews. I organized

responses so that overall patterns emerge. I used inductive analysis to recognize concepts

and themes central to the research topic (Rubin & Rubin, 2005).

Conversation analysis. Conversation analysis is a method that studies the social

nature of everyday talk in interaction. This method was used for its promise to provide a

thick context for describing the questioning moves exemplary fourth-grade teachers use.

The data collected captured as much of the conversation as possible between the teacher

and her students. The analysis process involved carefully reading the transcripts for each

case several times to gain a holistic sense of the data. Data were analyzed line by line

first for the identification of units of meaning. These units of meaning were assigned

construct names that came directly from the data. Constructs that developed from the

emerging data were then deductively analyzed. Discussion parameters such as those

identified by Wilkinson, Murphy, and Soter (2003; 2005), which include control of topic,

interpretive authority, and control of turn-taking, provided the basis for examining the

participants' conversation. This allowed for a careful, detailed look at teacher/student

interaction. Questioning moves were identified within and among these interactions.

Using talk as data allowed me to examine subtle discussion parameters in the classroom,

as well as participation structures that determined the verbal traffic flow.

All forms of data were reviewed immediately upon collection. To develop a

successively deeper understanding of each case during the study, I engaged in interim

analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994), meaning that data collection and analysis worked in

a cyclical fashion throughout the study to both manage the data and to refine my

developing understanding.

Chapter Four

Results

"We've taught you that the earth is round

That red and white make pink,

And something else that matters more –

We've taught you how to think."

Hooray for Diffendoofer Day! (Dr. Seuss)

This chapter presents the description and the analysis of data. After a brief

introduction, it begins with identification of the participating teachers and a description of

their school sites. Next, a holistic portrayal of each case is presented. To understand the

nature of the questioning moves used during reading instruction to engage students in talk

about text and what influences teachers' use of questioning moves, it is necessary to first

describe the instructional context; therefore, I describe both the classroom where reading

instruction occurred and the instructional materials used. Then an explanation of the

patterns that emerged in the instructional context is presented. This section of the analysis

presents the patterns and characteristics unique for each teacher. Within the analysis

presentation of each case, I address the research questions separately and in order. After I

present the results for each case separately, the data from each case is brought together

for comparison of their similarities and differences. The chapter concludes with a

summary of the results.

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative study was to examine and describe the nature of questioning moves used by exemplary fourth-grade teachers during reading instruction. Another point of interest was to determine how teachers perceive the influence of instructional materials on the language they use to engage students in talk about text. Two broad questions guided this study to provide a window into exemplary teachers' fourth-grade classrooms during reading instruction:

1. What is the nature of the questioning moves exemplary teachers use in fourth-grade classrooms during reading instruction?

2. What do exemplary fourth-grade teachers describe as influencing their use of questioning moves within the reading program?

The intent was to closely analyze the teachers' use of questioning moves to engage students in talk about text. Questioning moves are defined in this study as the ways in which teachers use scaffolding questions to engage students in talk about text.

The first question focused on the questioning moves exemplary fourth-grade teachers used during reading instruction to engage students in talk about text. It required descriptive observations and analysis of digital recordings and videotape to determine the relationship of the teachers' questioning moves to student engagement with text. Additionally, teachers were provided 2-3 minute segments of video recordings of their interaction with students to prompt reflection of their instructional decisions for the questioning moves used.

The second question sought answers to how the use of instructional materials was related to the teachers' language use, the teachers' perceptions of their use of materials,

and the decisions made about their delivery of instruction. The second question joined interview questions with observations and surveys to explore teachers' perceptions, knowledge base, and delivery of instruction.

To fully answer the research questions, data analysis techniques included interview analysis, pattern analysis, and conversation analysis. Throughout the analysis process, data sources were triangulated to decrease the possibility of researcher bias. To increase credibility, findings were confirmed by multiple data sources. Further, a second person trained in qualitative methods examined transcripts and videotapes to cross-check the questioning moves used.

<center>Participants and their School Sites</center>

Three teachers were proposed for participation in this study. However, this study is comprised of only two teachers. Due to this study's research design, three fourth-grade teachers considered exemplary by their principals and who align with a constructivist view of teaching and learning as determined by a Literacy Orientation Survey (L.O.S.) (Lenski, Wham, & Griffey, 1997) were sought. Principals identified a total of seven exemplary teachers as possible study participants. Although three teachers out of the seven were initially identified by their L.O.S. score as aligning with a constructivist view of teaching and learning, only two of the three teachers demonstrated instructional practices that mirrored their professed beliefs about teaching and learning.

While the third teacher was considered exemplary by her principal and considered herself to align with constructivist views of teaching and learning, the selection process was aided by a preliminary observation that focused on the ways in which the teachers interacted with and engaged students in learning. Within the instructional time observed

<center>90</center>

for the third teacher, prompted writing seemed to take precedence over reading which

limited opportunities for reading and discussions about text. Therefore, the preliminary

observation for the third teacher was extended. I observed this teacher's 90-minute

reading block for a period of ten-days, which yielded 900 minutes of observational field

notes and transcripts. These data sources were supported by a digital recorder to capture

the essence of teacher-student interactions. The data collected revealed that key beliefs

and practices with which this teacher strongly agreed or disagreed on the L.O.S. were not

evident in her teaching, nor were they evident in the learning experiences she provided

her students. For example, the teacher strongly agreed with the statement "I schedule

time every day for self-selected reading and writing experiences" and strongly disagreed

with the statement "Reading instruction should always be delivered to the whole class at

the same time". But observations of the 90-minute reading block revealed teacher

directed reading and writing experiences with learning opportunities provided primarily

in whole group settings. In terms of reading experiences, one example I observed that

indicated a mismatch for the purpose of this study was that every student (including those

identified as struggling readers and second-language learners) read the same grade-level

reading sheet (a story written on a fourth-grade reading level followed by

'comprehension' questions). Students were directed to read the sheet independently and

to answer the questions that followed. In subsequent observations the teacher passed the

graded reading sheet back to students. She asked students to look at their graded

performance and challenged them to reread the story to find the correct answer "read the

question over until you understand it, then reread the paragraph to find the answer" (O1).

During this time, the teacher pulled a small group of students to bring attention to the low

91

grade they received on the reading sheet and to briefly discuss with them why they might have missed a question. I did not observe students' self-selection of text so I questioned the teacher about time given to self-selected reading material. She suggested, because of time restrictions in class, students read self-selected books at home.

In terms of writing experiences, I observed students contributing to a story constructed by the teacher in response to a prompt. In a whole class setting, the teacher asked the students to consider the prompt and to contribute their thinking to add to the story. Students raised their hand, the teacher called on a student to respond, the student responded and the teacher evaluated the student's thinking; either accepting or rejecting the student's input.

Another example of a mismatch was in regard to read alouds. The teacher strongly agreed with the statement "Teachers should read aloud to students on a daily basis". However, I observed read alouds conducted by various students, each reading portions of the text directed by the teacher. After each student read aloud their portion of the text, the teacher audibly offered recommendations to enhance their reading performance in regard to fluency and strategy use before signaling the next reader.

The intention of the prolonged observational period was not to evaluate this teacher's instructional practices. Rather, to confirm her as a match for study participation. Concerns raised from 900 minutes of observational field notes and related transcripts in regard to this teacher's match to the criteria for study participation were shared with the Major Professor of the doctoral committee. The Major Professor reviewed fieldnotes and transcripts, and listened to digital recordings of teacher-student interactions, and subsequently confirmed that the data collected supported a mismatch for the purpose of

this study. The teacher's reported instructional beliefs on the L.O.S. were incompatible with the instructional practices observed. Thus her alignment with a constructivist view of teaching and learning as identified by the L.O.S. was disconfirmed. Since this study's design aligns with a constructivist view of teaching and learning, the entire doctoral committee was advised of this limitation. After consultation, I focused data collection efforts on the other two teachers who exhibited compatible beliefs and practices.

The two participating teachers in this study are from separate school sites. Both teachers and school sites have been given pseudo names. The first teacher, Carla, teaches fourth-grade at Mangrove Elementary. This school serves pre-K through fifth grade and is embarking on implementing the International Baccalaureate Primary Years Program (PYP). The PYP combines research and practice from a range of global education systems. The focal point is to promote the use of inquiry to drive the focus of instruction. The school provides rigorous academic research projects as well as foreign language studies to support the international perspective of the curriculum. The school is located in a low socio-economic suburban area and is classified as Title I because it serves a high percentage of students who are on free or reduced lunch. Currently 400 students, ranging from pre-kindergarten to fifth grade, are enrolled in the school. The school's student population consists of 45% Hispanic, 37% African American, 13% Caucasian, and 4% Multi-cultural. Ninety-two percent of attending students are on free or reduced lunch. The mission of the school is to develop inquiring, knowledgeable, and caring young people who help to create a better and more peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect.

There are four fourth-grade classrooms at this school serving approximately 15 students each. Of the 15 students in Carla's class, 4 are African American, 4 are Caucasian, 5 are Hispanic, and 2 are multicultural. Although this is Carla's first year teaching in this school district, she has taught fourth-grade for 10 years. She brings teaching experiences from Title 1 schools in both California and North Carolina.

The second teacher, Martha, teaches fourth-grade at Palm Elementary school. This school is considered a traditional elementary school and is located in a middle class suburban area. The school currently serves 585 students of which 74% are Caucasian, 14% are Hispanic, 6% are African American, and 6% are multicultural. Thirty-five percent of attending students are on free or reduced lunch. The school is divided into grade level teams that work together to plan integrated units of study that support district goals and challenge students to become critical thinkers and problem-solvers as they apply their knowledge to real life situations. Teachers are responsible for teaching and assessing Language Arts, Math, Social Studies, and Science.

There are four fourth-grade classrooms at this school, each with a class size of approximately 22 students. Martha's class is made up of 18 Caucasian, 2 Hispanic, and 2 multicultural students. There are no African American students in her class. Martha has served this school as a fourth-grade teacher for 4 years and has been in this school district for 18 years serving at one other school site located across town in a lower socio-economic neighborhood.

Carla

Carla is a tall and slender Caucasian woman with kind eyes and a soft-spoken voice. She has a calming presence and dresses comfortably to attend to the work of

teaching. Carla teaches fourth-grade at Mangrove Elementary School. Her teaching

experiences span 10 years and mostly come from working with children from low-

income families and in schools with high numbers of non-English speaking students. In

addition to being inviting and approachable, I found Carla to have an easy, confident way

about her.

Carla feels her responsibility in regard to teaching reading in fourth-grade is to

enrich students' language by talking with them in ways that promote deeper levels of

engagement with texts. She says, "I have the responsibility to transfer the responsibility

for reading to students and to provide opportunities for them to do that. I can do that by

putting different genres in front of them and by teaching them about behaviors they need

as readers and guiding their attempts" (IA). Carla believes reading is interactive. She

says, "I believe students need to interact with text, stop and think, act metacognitively,

and need to have the opportunity to respond to reading and to reflect on what they're

learning from reading" (IA).

Instructional Context

I observed Carla's reading instruction from 10:30 A.M. to 12:00 P.M. on five

separate occasions, which yielded 450 minutes of observational field notes and

transcripts. Two of the five observations were supported by videotape. For reading

instruction, Carla employs an instructional model similar to that of a reading workshop,

which extends beyond the state's required 90 minutes of daily uninterrupted reading

instruction. The model she employs provides a consistent routine of 30 minutes for a

whole group strategy lesson to identify the purpose for reading, 45 minutes of

independent reading with one-to-one reading conferences, and 30 minutes of read aloud.

Word study takes place for 15 minutes directly after reading workshop but was outside the 90 minute data collection window so was therefore not observed.

Reading instruction predominately takes place in two main areas of the classroom. One area is devoted to whole-group literacy instruction and takes up half of the classroom. One-fourth of this space makes up the gathering area where the whole class meets for strategy lessons and read alouds. All talking and sharing in regard to the strategy lessons and read alouds take place in partnerships at the gathering area. When students are called to the gathering area, they sit with their 'thinking partner' in staggered pairs on the carpet. Thinking partners are established early in the year and are determined according to their reading level, which is derived from the Developmental Reading Assessment (Beaver, 1997) and periodically confirmed by running records (Clay, 1993) to ensure a close match. Carla explains that students learn the responsibility they have to each other through thinking partner conversations that are modeled, practiced, and reinforced (V1).

As a central meeting ground, the gathering area has a rug, an easel with both a white board and chart paper stand, colored markers, a supply bin full of Post-it notes, and a large book basket with purposefully selected texts for strategy lessons and read alouds. One wall bordering the gathering area reflects what students are working on. Carla posts current thinking charts and purpose statements in regard to reading, as well as talking agreements to ensure equity in discussion time. The area also has furniture, plants, lamps, and a short stool for Carla to sit on while reading aloud or writing on the easel. The other fourth of this space is made up of bookshelves. On the shelves are many organized baskets of books. The books are marked by level and reflect a wide range of genres and

interests. The baskets are labeled by the type of book they house (i.e. Spanish books, nonfiction natural disasters, science, Newberry Award Winners, humorous fiction, fictional animals, fantasy, science fiction, favorite authors, and books that will touch your heart). The bookshelves are at a height that is easily accessible by students. Near the bookshelves is a sign up sheet for "book shopping". Each day at a devoted time outside the reading block four or five students sign up to go shopping for a week's worth of books. Stacks of magazines and newspapers are also in this area.

The other instructional area is in the second half of the room, which is flanked by two tables. One is a kidney-shaped table with a teacher chair and four student chairs at the back of the room. The other is a rectangular table at the front of the room that holds the Elmo, LCD projector and teaching materials pertinent to the lesson. The students' desks are grouped in between these tables in teams of six. There is lamp-light and more plants on this side of the room. Also a media cart that houses the television and the student editions of the basal series.

Students spend 45 minutes of instructional reading time at their desk where they engage in independent reading and one-to-one conferencing with Carla. Beside each student's desk is a book basket that is filled with five or six self-selected texts and a reading response journal (RRJ) that houses their thinking sheets. The thinking sheet is a graphic organizer that captures students' thoughts about what they are reading and it is used in conferences with Carla, conversations with other readers, and it serves accountability purposes for their reading work. On top of each student's desk are supply bins, a mini garbage can for trash, and a clipboard to aid organization. Carla roams this area to conference with individual students during their independent reading.

Carla articulates a thorough knowledge of the reading experiences she wants to

provide her students (IA). Next, I describe in detail each component of her reading

instruction; strategy lesson, independent reading with one-to-one conferences, and read

aloud. I discuss Carla's role in promoting and sustaining talk about text, and the

characteristics of students' talk. I also illustrate instruction with transcripts that pull the

purpose for reading from the strategy lesson to the independent reading and one-to-one

conferences, to the read aloud.

Strategy Lesson. To launch reading instruction, Carla invites students to the

gathering area for a 30-minute strategy lesson. Students quickly and quietly assemble on

the carpet next to their thinking partner. Carla sits on a low portable stool at the head of

the group and leans in to connect with students and to orient students to the reading work

at hand. She introduces the purposefully selected text for the strategy lesson and holds it

in her lap so it seems more like a read aloud than a lesson. With this text, Carla

demonstrates a general strategy that can be applied to other texts. Throughout the strategy

lesson Carla utilizes the easel and chart paper to emphasize teaching points and to capture

students' thinking. The texts chosen by Carla for strategy lessons are considered by her to

be exemplary models of children's literature, referred to as mentor texts.

During the data collection period, I observed strategy lessons on character

analysis using the book *Mufaro's Beautiful Daughters* by John Steptoe, how characters

change over time using the book *Mirette on the High Wire* by Emily Arnold McCully,

recognizing the setting and its importance to understanding the story using the books

Night in the Country by Cynthia Rylant and *Mario's Mayan Journey* by Michelle

McCunney, and plot line using the *The Story of Hungbu and Nolbu* retold by Kang

T'ae-hyon. While the instructional focus of each strategy lesson differs, the flow of the lesson follows a consistent structure as confirmed by field notes and videotapes. The structure witnessed for each strategy lesson is setting the purpose for reading, thinking aloud to demonstrate the use of the strategy, providing talk time for students, and restating the purpose for reading in a way that is generalizable to the students' self-selected texts.

To set the purpose for reading, Carla begins by telling the students the purpose for their reading work to orient their focus; for example, "readers infer about characters and support their thinking with evidence from the text" (O1). Carla says, "I believe the purpose for reading should always be grounded in text, and I orient our reading each day by stating and clarifying the purpose for reading. I believe building the foundation for this is necessary to bring students up to a level where they can be active readers, and I work hard to establish such an environment" (IA). The texts Carla uses for strategy lessons are purposely chosen to explicitly model the purpose for reading and to set expectations for the students' independent reading work.

To demonstrate the use of a strategy in the reading moment, Carla makes her thinking public by saying what is coming into her mind as she reads. She pauses to say what she is thinking, highlights the strategy connection, then she debriefs the strategy use and connects it to their purpose for reading.

To provide talk time for students, Carla strategically plans stopping points during her strategy lesson that promise students' active engagement with text. Stopping points to solicit student-student talk are marked in the text with Post-it notes. To signal talk time she says "1-2-3, knee to knee" and indicates which thinking partner shares first to initiate

99

student-student discussions about text (1-2-3, knee to knee, Bs share first). Students turn

to face their thinking partner. Sitting in close proximity of their thinking partner allows

students a quick transition from listening to talking. While students discuss the text, Carla

roams partnerships and listens in on students' conversations. She does not interrupt

student-student talk. Rather, she listens in on what students say to their thinking partner

and jots notes about what she hears in her conferring notebook. To allow equal talk time

Carla says, "3-2-1 B is done, it's A's time to share". After the allotted talk time, Carla

says, "3-2-1 talking is done" and the students readjust to face her. The first thing Carla

does when the students are back in whole group is echo what she heard from the student

partnerships. She also charts students' thinking which signals that she values it (O1; O2;

O3; V1; V2).

To restate the purpose for reading in a way that is generalizable to students' self-

selected texts, Carla restates the purpose of the strategy lesson, tells what she explicitly

modeled and how it can transfer to the text they are independently reading, and then sets

expectations for students' independent reading time.

Independent Reading with One-to-One Conferences. As a way to meet individual

students' needs, a substantial portion (45 minutes) of Carla's reading instruction is

devoted to differentiated teaching in individualized reading conferences. Most often

Carla holds these one-to-one teacher/student reading conferences at the student's desk

where students are reading their self-selected text. She carries her low stool with her from

student to student. She positions the stool along side the student so she is sitting at the

student's eye level. Like the strategy lessons, Carla's reading conferences follow a

predictable structure. She observes the student's reading work for use of strategies; asks

subtle questions in a quiet tone; decides what to emphasize; names what reading work the student did; and highlights successful attempts, reminding the student to do this with other texts read in the future.

Carla consults her conferring notes before engaging students in a reading conference. She begins each conference by asking the broad question, "What have you been working on today as a reader?" The student responds and Carla listens intently and appears fascinated by what she hears. During each conference, she allows the student to direct where the conference will go. She listens intently and thinks about what she knows about each reader and how much support she thinks the reader needs. While conferencing Carla stays within the student's line of thinking. She softly asks a few questions to gently nudge the student toward the purpose for reading. Once the question is posed she offers extended wait time, which puts the responsibility for thinking on the reader. She coaches the student through difficulties with text to build toward independence. She uses phrases like "I'm noticing" and "what you just told me is" to strategically call attention and add detail to the student's reading work so the student knows more about what he/she has done well that will benefit his/her future reading work. Carla jots her conferencing notes on a form attached to her clipboard (the form is later transferred to her conferencing notebook).

Between conferences, Carla roams the room to check in on other readers. She carries her conferencing notebook to jot down assessment information and observations. Conferences last 5-7 minutes and appear to be efficient as Carla gleans information from readers to inform future instruction. Carla says "conferencing is an important component of my reading instruction because it gives me insight to each student as a reader". She

also explains, "what I learn from the one-to-one conferences often drives the formation and instruction of the invitational small group lessons" (IB). Carla uses a warm tone during reading conferences and there is a tender relationship evident with each student. At the end of each conference Carla complements the student and reinforces their self-monitoring behaviors. She also clarifies the direction they will take next (V1; V2). At the end of the independent reading time Carla reconvenes the class at the gathering area. She uses information gleaned from the reading conferences, in regard to students' experiences with text, as a way to illustrate the reading purpose. For example:

> Roman noticed he has to go back in the text to be very specific about his thinking. He thought one of his characters was sad but he realized that he had to go back into the text to support his thinking as a reader. So, o.k., think about that when you read. Ask yourself are you really reading and thinking about focusing on using the text to support your thinking? You always have to go back to the text and prove it, prove it, prove it! Also when I was talking to Dora, we noticed that sometimes characters have names from other countries and when we read an unfamiliar name like that of a character from another country, we sometimes just skip on over that and we kind of don't recognize it. Dora had to go back to the text to clarify who the characters were. Devin was noticing that the character in the story was called by two names. He said, "oh, I noticed that the character has two different names in the story. One is like her nickname that her family uses at home, and one is her real name". Nola noticed something else, the text told her straight out that one of the characters was cross and spiteful, but Nola was a little unsure of what that meant so she read on and then she recognized what that meant by how the characters spoke like, "I hate you!, I hate you!", like they were in a rage, it helped Nola to determine that spiteful and cross meant mean and hateful. So, good job, good thinking readers! (O1).

Ground rules for independent reading and one-to-one conferencing are firmly established as students exhibit sustaining reading behaviors driven by reflection on their reading behaviors and goals. No off-task behaviors were observed (V1; V2). While Carla holds one-to-one conferences, the other students work independently on the task of reading their self-selected text and recording their reading work on their thinking sheet or

102

in their (RRJ). To ensure readability and students' ability to focus on the text, Carla previews students' self-selections. Immediately following the debriefing from independent reading time, Carla conducts a read aloud.

Read Aloud. Carla places importance on planning for the read aloud. The choice of text is her first important decision. She considers the purpose for reading and how the text can support or lead the reading work students do independently. For example, when the purpose for reading was inferring about characters the class engaged in strategy work on using evidence from the text to support their thinking about a character. Carla knows students are thinking along those lines so she marks the text accordingly and weaves that line of thinking into her read aloud. The chapter book Carla used to connect the reading purpose was *Lawn Boy* by Gary Paulsen. Carla sits on the edge of her low stool and leans in to connect with students and keep them in the reading moment. She positions her stool next to the easel so she can record her thinking, the students' thinking, and their lingering questions.

During her read aloud, Carla models proficient reading behaviors, conducts think alouds, clarifies unfamiliar phrases and vocabulary, and provides students opportunities to talk deeply about the characters based on evidence from the text. One reading behavior Carla modeled to connect to the reading purpose is rereading. For example:

> We've been talking about character traits and using clues from the text to determine how we can put a word on a character, how we can infer about characters (flips chart paper to thinking recorded from previous chapter), and some things we've inferred about Duane is that he is confused and scared because he's unsure about how to tell his parents about the money. He's been keeping a big secret from them. It didn't tell us in the text that Duane was confused and scared but you inferred that based on how he was talking about this. So I'm going to go back and reread a little bit about that because remember readers, it's always good to go back and kind of remind yourself what you were reading about. Then

103

we're going to continue to work on identifying ways we can infer about Duane and record what evidence we have from the text to support our thinking. But first let's go back to hear why you inferred that he was confused and scared (V1).

In addition to modeling strategies like rereading, Carla models think alouds and provides opportunities during the read aloud for students to turn and talk to their thinking partner about the text. She strategically marks the book she is reading with Post-it notes to help her remember where to pause and think aloud and where to provide students time to talk. She uses think aloud as a method of instruction to demonstrate building an understanding of text ideas. For example:

> Wow! Readers, did you hear that? Do you know what I'm thinking right now? I'm going to share my thinking with you and I want you to be ready to share your thinking with your thinking partner (as Carla begins to tell what she's thinking she records her thinking on the chart paper). I'm thinking, wow! 12 year old Duane's lawn mowing business has expanded to over $50,000. I'm thinking maybe Arnold isn't such a bad guy, maybe he isn't cheating Duane because he's telling him about how much money he has. He tells him he has $50,000. If Arnold wanted to cheat Duane he wouldn't be telling him that. He wouldn't give him that information at all. I have to support my thinking so I check the text. Listen to this, Duane says "can I see it?" He wants to see the money. Arnold says, "of course, I can pull your account up on the computer." "No, the money, can I see the money?" Arnold shook his head, it's not like that. First you have to sell all of your investments and get a check and then you have to take the check to the bank and cash it and then you can see the money" (O1).

During read aloud, Carla provides students opportunities to voice their views about characters, events, and the author's language. She engages students emotionally by rereading and by voicing the thoughts she has as she reads, and then she offers students talk time with the same verbal prompt used in strategy lessons. Prior to issuing the prompt she says, "I can tell by the look on your faces that you have thoughts running through your brains so I'm going to give you a chance to share those. I want you to turn to your thinking partner and share what you're thinking" (O1). Like during strategy

lessons, Carla roams thinking partnerships and listens in. As evidenced by the videotapes, students appear to enjoy the talk time that not only seem to build student-student relationships, but also pushes them to construct meaning from text (V1; V2).

When talk time is over Carla echoes what she heard back to the whole group. For example, "Ok, this is what I heard when I was listening in..." (O1; O2; O3). As she tells what she heard she records students' thinking on chart paper. She honors students' thinking and credits them for how they supported their thinking with evidence from the text. Then she returns to reading aloud, periodically stopping where indicated by Post-it notes to think aloud and invite students to share their thinking with their thinking partners. Carla wraps up the read aloud session by recording lingering thoughts and questions to consider for next time.

It is noteworthy here to mention that Carla told me in her interview that reading time is "sacred" (IB). I saw evidence of this when a woman entered the room during Carla's read aloud. The woman leaned into the gathering area and looked intently at Carla but Carla did not interrupt her read aloud for the intrusive visitor. She continued to read aloud without giving attention to the visitor. When Carla stopped to think aloud, she still maintained focus on the students. It wasn't until she gave the students talk time that she acknowledged the visitor and then she did so with nonverbal communication. As a result, the visitor took a student and left the room.

Instructional Materials

Carla uses a variety of tools to carry out her reading instruction within the 90-minute reading block. As mentioned, the gathering area has an easel with both a dry erase board and chart paper. Next to the easel, Carla keeps a basket of instructional tools such

105

as dry erase markers, chart markers, Post-it notes, pointers, and mentor texts. This is where the purpose for reading is set for the day and where Carla keeps the bulk of her instructional materials. Carla reports her most important instructional materials are the mentor texts she purposefully selects as exemplary models of children's literature. These texts are used for strategy lessons and read aloud and are heavily marked with Post-it notes. The texts used predominately come from Carla's personal collection and some come from the school library.

Like Carla's reading basket, the baskets of books on the bookshelves accessible to students consist of Carla's own books and books from the school's library selections. Leveled books from the core reading program are also included. Materials from the core reading program are co-mingled with other texts but do not appear to be a primary source of instruction. Rather, the core's learning objectives are considered, incorporated, and referenced (IB).

Both Carla and her students utilize Post-it notes to mark places in the text that stimulate thinking and support their reading work. Additionally, the students use thinking sheets, which are often graphic organizers, and their RRJ to record reading work. Carla refers to the reading work captured in students' RRJ as their "mind work" and considers it one of her most important instructional materials. Carla's conferencing notebook is also a valuable instructional tool as it gives her insight into each student as a reader. She refers to it to hold individualized one-to-one reading conferences (IA).

The whole group time at the gathering area generates pages of chart paper to capture students' thinking around text during strategy lessons and read alouds. These pages reflect current thinking and cover the wall so students can easily refer to them, or

they are saved on the chart stand for future reference. Also posted on the walls are pages of chart paper that serve to remind students of the agreements made in regard to sharing and talking about texts.

When I asked Carla about the use of the basal from the core reading program as an instructional tool, she told me that she culls the basal's teacher edition for essential learnings to ensure those strategies are taught, and then uses it as a reference guide. However, if it is a good fit for a strategy lesson, Carla will use selections from the students' basal reader. The student editions of the basal reader are housed on a media cart. The teacher's edition is shelved (IB).

Explanation of the Patterns that Emerged

Based on the results of the analysis procedures, this section presents the patterns and characteristics found in regard to each research question. The research questions are addressed separately and in order. Observational field notes, interviews, and video segments reveal that questioning moves are predominately used during one-to-one reading conferences. Therefore, this instructional context was the focus of analysis. First I address question one which focuses on the questioning moves exemplary teachers use in fourth-grade classrooms during reading instruction to engage students in talk about text. Then I address question two which sought answers to how the use of instructional materials was related to the teacher's language use, the teacher's perceptions of her use of materials, and the decisions made about her delivery of instruction.

What is the Nature of the Questioning Moves Exemplary Teachers Use in Fourth-Grade Classrooms During Reading Instruction? Questioning moves are defined in this study as the ways in which teachers use scaffolding questions to engage students in talk

about text. Questioning moves were analyzed by investigating the nature of the question-answer sequences for incidence of authentic open-ended questions that require explanation, elaboration, or defense of text ideas to shine light on how teachers use language to shape the nature of teaching and learning afforded to students.

A fellow doctoral candidate specialized in reading and trained in qualitative research methods examined randomly selected portions of the transcripts and videotapes. This co-rater first identified Carla's questions, then verified my identification of categorical codes. We retained the categorical codes for questioning moves for which we had 100% agreement. Transcripts illustrate that the same subtle questioning moves are used over and over during one-to-one reading conferences with students' self-selected texts. As evidenced by the following transcript that typifies Carla's use of questioning moves, Carla used four types of questioning moves: (a) questioning moves to signal accountability, (b) questioning moves to probe for additional information, (c) questioning moves to request evidence from the text, and (d) questioning moves to check for understanding. The highest proportions of questioning moves were used to probe for additional information and to request evidence from the text to support thinking.

To signal accountability, Carla initiates each conference with the broad, open-ended questioning move, "What are you working on today as a reader?". Carla waits for the student to respond. She listens intently and appears fascinated by what she hears. Carla does not impose her own thoughts. Instead her language use and wait time highlights her expectations and beliefs in the student's ability to construct meaning from text.

Carla used the probing questioning move, "What else?" to accept the student's initial thinking and to force the student to think deeper about text and to elaborate on his/her thinking. The use of this type of questioning move puts the responsibility for talking about text on the student, as evidenced by the extended wait time. Also, this move seems to be used at the edge of the student's competence as it caused the student to wrestle with his/her thinking as evidenced by the way the student squirmed in his/her seat.

The questioning moves used to request the student to provide evidence from the text are "Can you show me?", and "What evidence do you have?" Carla uses these questioning moves to gain insight into the ways in which the student accessed the text to construct meaning.

To check students' understanding of text, Carla asks "What were you thinking?" and "What are you now thinking". These moves are used to determine if the student's thinking is growing or changing in response to new information encountered in the text. These moves also seem to shape Carla's understanding of the reader. It tells her if the student is able to build upon or revise his or her thinking and is able to support his or her thinking with evidence from the text.

To illustrate Carla's use of questioning moves, the following transcript from a one-to-one reading conference with a student reading the book *Boundless Grace* by Mary Hoffman and Caroline Binch (V1) is broken into question-answer sequences and labeled by the questioning move used (T = teacher, S = student, QM = questioning move):

T. What have you been working on today as a reader?
S. Evidence that a character changes over time.
[QM= signals accountability]

109

T. What book have you been reading?
S. Boundless Grace, Grace is the main character who has changed over time.
[QM = signals accountability]

T. What were you thinking as you were reading this book?
T. As a reader, what were you noticing about how Grace changed over time?
S. She was worried that her papa wouldn't love her because he had other children.
[QM = checking understanding]

T. O.K., can you show me that in the book? I see that you have it down here [points to a Post-it note] but you don't have it on your thinking sheet [graphic organizer with three columns: character, character trait, and evidence from the text to support the character has changed over time] so can you show me evidence in the text to support your thinking?
S. Here she says [refers to text] "Papa, will you still want me?"
[QM = proving/asking for evidence]

T. What else?
S. She was worried because she was wondering if he would love her because he had other children now.
[QM = probing]

T. O.K., you're saying she was worried and you're supporting your thinking by saying that she wonders if her papa is going to love her.
S. Yes.
[restating]

T. So now, great you've got that part and you say that's how she was in the beginning so what evidence do you have now that she has changed?
S. Because now she knows that she'll have stepbrothers and stepsisters.
[QM = proving/asking for evidence]

T. What else?
S. She told him stories.
[QM = probing]

T. What else?
S. She doesn't want to leave.
[QM = probing]

T. Can you show me more in the text when it's talking about she doesn't want to leave?
S. [finds place in text] Grace was sorry to say good-bye to her new stepsister and brother and even to her stepmother.
[QM = proving/asking for evidence]

T. O.K., you said she was worried before, so what are you now thinking about Grace?
S. She loves them now.
[QM= checking for understanding]

T. What else?
S. She is sad because she doesn't want to leave.
[QM = probing]
T. I'm noticing here [points to thinking sheet] you said she was worried before because she was wondering if he would love her. Right, because he had other children? I agree with you that she was feeling sad, but how has she changed from worried to loved?
S. Because now she knows that her Pa loves her because he took her to the coffee house.
[QM = proving/asking for evidence]

T. O.K., do you have a word we can put on that? What character trait are you now inferring about Grace?
S. That she's uh…
S. She's feeling loved. [writes on thinking sheet]

T. What evidence do you have to support that?
S. She didn't want to leave.
[QM= proving/asking for evidence]

T. How does this help you as a reader to understand the characters? [points to thinking sheet]

S. Because I see that characters can change in books over time

[QM= checking for understanding]

T. What else? Why do you think it's important to recognize that characters change over time?
S. So you can understand the book better.
[QM = probing]

T. O.K., it's going to help you understand the book better so…tomorrow when we talk we're going to use this thinking sheet to discover what made Grace change from feeling worried to feeling loved and secure.
S. O.K.
T. O.K., Great job!
[focusing]

Carla demonstrates confidence in her students' abilities in regard to constructing

meaning from texts. As evidenced in the transcripts (O1; O2; O3; V1; V2), Carla's use of

questioning moves are thoughtfully used to generate student thinking. Notable is the

extended wait time (ranging from 10 seconds to 1 minute and 23 seconds) Carla provides

after a questioning move is used. Students are aware of Carla's expectation for them to

answer the question. The extended wait time Carla offers signals to students her

confidence in their ability, which likely increases their confidence and the likelihood that

they will take risks with their thinking. When Carla and I viewed the video segment, I

asked specifically about the wait time that seemed to be given when students were at the

edge of their competence because as an observer, I felt uncomfortable watching students

squirm while wrestling with his/her thinking. Carla explained:

> The goal for me is for talking to be student led. I don't really know how well I do
> that. I try to give them wait time for their thinking and I repeat back to them what
> they say to scaffold their thinking. I try to restate their thinking in ways that make
> their thought a little bigger. It should be them doing most of the talking and me
> doing very little. If I'm doing all the talking then I'm doing all the thinking. I
> think it is important to give students time to think so they can talk and it's
> important to value what they say. I was trained to extend wait time to allow
> students an opportunity to voice their thinking. I've learned that if I wait for
> students to respond it not only shows them that I value their thinking, it shows
> that I have confidence in their abilities. The answers they give are so much more
> amazing than anything I can impose on them. By waiting on them to share their
> thinking, I really get a sense of how well they are understanding the text (V1; IB).

What do Exemplary Fourth-Grade Teachers Describe as Influencing Their Use of

Questioning Moves Within the Reading Program? Carla describes in-depth training,

observations with critical feedback, and ongoing support as heavily influencing her use of

questioning moves.

> I spent four years in North Carolina at a Title 1 school where my research driven
> principal and our curriculum coordinator were determined that low SES students
> could be just as successful as higher SES kids if they were given quality
> instruction, the opportunities to learn, and most important, have the belief instilled
> in them that they could be successful readers. Because of their strong commitment
> to student learning they would bring in people like Ellen Keene, Linda Hoyt, and
> Carl Anderson. For interactive reading we would watch modeling sessions in our
> classrooms and in small groups, and we'd have large group workshops to

deconstruct the modeling sessions. As part of the support offered to the school, two times a year (once in the fall and once in the spring) we would have one-to-one observations of our reading instruction and would get feedback as a school for future professional development. The professional development at this school was focused on how to be a better reading, math, or writing teacher. We were given professional articles and professional books that supported the learning and would have to be accountable to our reading. The conferencing I learned from Carl Anderson was huge. He taught me to focus on the individual child as both a reader and a writer. I learned to offer learning opportunities to my students that are both guided and invitational; and I learned to keep records of what they're doing to drive the focus for instruction. To support me in my efforts to confer with my students, my principal would come in and sit behind me when I conferred with students and take notes. From her notes she would provide me critical feedback on where I was in my learning and what direction I should be going in. The constant feedback from the administration had a strong impact. We had four formal observations a year from our principal and many informal classroom visits. My principal had a vision in mind for how the school would be philosophically. I learned a lot there because I had to and I was expected to. I am very thankful for that learning experience. Now that I'm in a different setting, I question that way because it's in my blood. It's become a part of me (IA; IB).

The ongoing professional development Carla received is credited for tightening her focus on the individual student as both a reader and a writer. During the one-to-one reading conferences with her students, Carla keeps records of what students are doing to drive the focus for instruction and to offer learning opportunities that are both guided and invitational. Carla places high importance on the quality of the children's literature she uses to provide learning opportunities for her students. She spends a great deal of time reading and evaluating children's books to ensure support for the reading purpose and its alignment with strategy work. "I have to know the teaching points and I have to know which books will be the best fit" (IA). Although Carla predominately uses exemplary models of children's literature to support her reading instruction by way of mentor texts, she is mindful of the instruction supported by the core reading program and references its learning outcomes when planning instruction. She also includes leveled books from the

core reading program in her classroom library. As a result of the nature of her

professional development, she has learned to scrutinize her instructional materials to

identify essential learning goals. When I asked Carla "How has your belief system

changed your teaching"? She restated, "It's become a part of me, it's in my blood, and

added "It's made me so much more aware of the text I choose for teaching points. It

reminds me to always get back to the students' thinking, to promote deeper thinking and

to transfer responsibility for thinking to students" (IA).

Martha

Martha is a charming, courteous Caucasian woman with smiling eyes and a kind

voice. Martha has been teaching for 18 years. She began her teaching career in the state

of Michigan. However, after just one year, she moved to this school district where her

teaching experiences have ranged from second-grade to fourth-grade. Martha has taught

at two school sites in this district, both considered traditional with middle-class students.

Martha feels her responsibility in regard to teaching reading is to:

> provide as many different reading experiences that I can to the kids and to open
> their minds to the world of reading and to the many different genres. I feel
> responsible to provide lots of practice with the skill work behind reading so my
> students' worlds will open up and these experiences will get them ready for
> middle school, college and real life reading" (IA).

Further, Martha proclaims what she teaches is what she believes to be best for her

students. She says, "What I believe is what I teach, and the things I have to put in I

squeeze around what I believe to be true. Above all, I try to instill in kids a love for

reading so that they love to read" (IA).

114

Upon entering Martha's classroom you feel more like your entering a living room than a classroom. Half of the classroom is devoted to literacy instruction. The gathering area is set up like a living room with an area rug, end tables, upholstered recliners, upholstered chairs with cherry wood legs, lamps, plants, picture frames, and bookshelves. The books are arranged on the shelves in baskets that are labeled favorite author, mysteries, animal as the main character, great dog stories, wonder books, poetry, award winning books, animal fact books, cultural books, and adventure books.

Martha explains, "creating the classroom environment is critical because if students are comfortable in it and it feels like home then it builds up stamina and promotes reading at home" (IA). The gathering area has an easel with both a dry erase board and chart paper. Next to the easel, Martha keeps a basket of instructional tools such as dry erase markers, chart markers, Post-it notes, and pointers. Martha's desk is facing the gathering area. Directly behind her desk is a tall bookshelf filled with literature books (referred to as mentor texts) that are heavily marked with Post-it notes for stopping points during strategy lessons.

The students' desks are to the right of the gathering area, grouped in teams of four. While students are grouped, they have independent workspace. This workspace is defined by a panel of corkboard that extends approximately six inches above their desk and holds personal pictures and positive phrases such as "I'm Fabulous", "If I can dream it, I can do it", and "I'm so lucky to be me". Although I did not see it in use, Martha pointed out a corkboard side panel between students' desks that can be raised for additional privacy when needed. On the carpet beside each student's desk is a basket that

115

holds their reading response journal (RRJ), a week's worth of book selections from the classroom library, Post-it notes, pens, pencils, scissors, and markers. There is a rectangular table at the front of the room that holds instructional equipment like an ELMO and LCD projector, and instructional materials for word study that Martha describes as being more in line with how she believes reading should be taught. To the far right, there is a kidney shaped table used for small group projects and meetings.

I observed Martha's reading instruction from 10:00 A.M. to 11:30 A.M. on five separate occasions, which yielded 450 minutes of observational field notes and transcripts. Two of the five observations were supported by videotape. The instructional routine that makes up Martha's 90-minute reading block consists of 15 minutes of word study, 30 minutes of a strategy lesson, and 45 minutes of differentiated reading, which was done in either small groups, partnerships, or independently. Directly after the 90-minute reading block, students went to lunch. Read aloud was conducted in the afternoon, outside the 90-minute reading block, and was therefore not observed. Following, I describe each component of Martha's instructional routine within the 90-minute reading block. I discuss Martha's role in promoting and sustaining talk about text, and the characteristics of students' talk.

Word Study. To launch reading instruction, Martha engages students in word study. Typically, this instructional time is focused on teaching observations and connections for words. Martha provides explicit instruction of word concepts. Students use a thin spiral notebook to investigate and savor new words, puzzle over confusing pronounciations, and test new spelling strategies. Also, students use their word study notebook to illustrate words, phrases, and sentences. The expectation is that the word

116

concepts studied will help students become more responsible for their learning, as these concepts transfer to their writing work in the form of revising, editing, and inferring the meaning of new words.

Strategy Lesson. After word study, Martha invites the students to the gathering area for a 30-minute strategy lesson. She says "meet me on the carpet" and tells students what to bring (their thinking sheet or RRJ and pen or pencil). Students quickly and quietly assemble at the gathering area and sit next to their thinking partner (V1). Thinking partnerships are formed considering standardized reading scores, social skills, and their independent reading level as determined by the DRA. In terms of the range of reading levels within each grade level, students who are considered by the DRA to have a reading level in the middle range are split and paired with both high and low leveled readers. Partnerships are in tact for 6-8 weeks. (O1).

Martha sits at the head of the group next to the easel on one of the upholstered chairs. She sits on the edge of her chair so she can lean in to connect with the students and to orient students to the reading work at hand. She introduces the purposefully selected text for the strategy lesson and holds it in her lap so it seems more like a read aloud than a lesson. During the data collection period, I observed strategy lessons on reading with a question in mind using the book *Stranger* by Chris Van Allsburg, reading nonfiction for new information using *Time Magazine for Kids*, and understanding nonfiction informational narratives using a selection from the student's basal reader titled *Look to the North: A Wolf Pup Diary* by Jean Craighead George.

While the instructional focus for each strategy lesson differs, the flow of the lesson follows a consistent structure as confirmed by field notes and videotapes. The

structure witnessed for each strategy lesson is setting the purpose for reading, thinking aloud to demonstrate the use of the strategy, providing talk time for students, and restating the purpose for reading.

To set the purpose for reading, Martha begins by telling the students the purpose for their reading work to orient their focus. For example, today our purpose is to "read with a question in our mind". She draws attention to the reading purpose by asking a broad open-ended question such as, "Why do we ask questions and how does that help us become better readers?" Students turn and talk then offer responses such as, "it helps us to understand our book better"; "we ask questions because it helps us wonder what is happening in the story, also if what is happening could really happen to us in real life"; "it makes us think about what's going to happen next"; and "it will help us because we'll have a lot of knowledge because we'll get smarter because our brain is growing because we're thinking and asking ourselves a lot questions" (O1).

The texts for strategy lessons are purposefully chosen by Martha as appropriate to explicitly model the identified purpose for reading and to set expectations for the students' independent reading work. To demonstrate the use of a strategy in the reading moment, Martha utilizes the easel and chart paper to emphasize teaching points and to capture thinking. She makes her thinking public by saying what is coming into her mind as she reads, and records her thinking on a smaller piece of chart paper attached to the side of the easel. She pauses to say what she is thinking, charts her thinking, highlights the strategy connection, then she debriefs the strategy use and connects it to their purpose for reading.

To provide talk time for students, Martha reads from the text and then stops and asks students a broad question to give them the opportunity to share with their thinking partner and to apply the strategy. Throughout the strategy lesson she repeats this cycle of reading, asking the broad question, and allowing talk time. To signal talk time Martha simply says, "turn and talk to your thinking partner" (O1; O2; O3). Since students sit in close proximity of their thinking partner they are able to quickly turn to face each other. While students discuss their thinking, Martha roams partnerships and listens in on students' conversations. She does not interrupt student-student talk. Rather, she listens in on what students say to their thinking partners and jots notes about what she hears in her conferring notebook. What she hears prompts in the moment reflections in regard to the strategy lesson. She told me "I listen to everything my students say aloud during the strategy lesson. I listen for if the lesson is coming through and if I can hear purpose in students' talk (IA). To signal the end of talk time she counts backwards from five to one.

The first thing Martha does when the students are reoriented to whole group is check students' application of the strategy. For example, to check if students are asking questions in their mind as they listen to her read the text aloud she asks, "What were you thinking" and directs it to individual students and charts their thoughts and questions to signal that she values their contributions (O1; O2; O3). Also, she spotlights the active listening she noticed in partnerships and provides examples and complements to thinking partners for a job well done (O1). Martha ends her strategy lesson by restating the purpose for reading and tells what she explicitly modeled and then sets expectations for students' differentiated reading time (O1; O2; O3).

119

Differentiated Reading. After the strategy lesson, Martha provides students 45 minutes of differentiated reading, which could look like independent reading with one-to-one conferences, reading partnerships, or invitational small group conferences. During this time, depending on how they are grouped, students use a thinking sheet or their RRJ to record their reading work either alone, with a buddy, or with a small group. The thinking sheet is a graphic organizer that captures students' thoughts about what they are reading. The RRJ is a spiral bound notebook that also captures students' thinking in the way of responses to reading. Both are used in conferences with Martha, conversations with other readers, and serve accountability purposes for their reading work.

If independent reading time is directed, then students disperse to their favorite reading spot. Some students sprawl out on the carpet, other students scatter around the room, and others recline in the recliner or lay sideways in the upholstered chairs. Still other students sit on the carpet and lean up against the bookshelves (O2). Based on information gathered about students' reading behaviors, Martha typically targets three students for one-to-one reading conferences. The conferences are held wherever the students have chosen to read. Martha weaves in and out of spaces and positions herself next to the student at eye level.

If reading partnerships are directed after the strategy lesson, students partner-up to reread the text used in whole group and attempt to apply the strategy modeled by Martha. If copies of the text are not available in book form, then Martha types the text and gives students printed copies. Given the strategy discussed and modeled in whole group, student partnerships will reread the text and attempt to apply the modeled strategy. As students work in partnerships to apply the strategy, Martha roams the room to check their

application attempts. She sits on the carpet next to partners, or squats down to see the thinking work they have recorded. Periodically Martha checks students' reading work and asks questions such as, "Are you asking any questions?"; "Do you think we all have the same questions?"; "Do all readers have the same questions when they read?" Students respond with a yes or no answer. Martha elaborates for students by talking about how background knowledge determines questions we have, as well as familiarity with the storyline and the predictions that we make as readers (V1).

By invitation, Martha holds small group conferences, when she notices in her one-to-one conferences or student partnerships that there is a group of 4-6 students who need work with the same previously taught strategy. Students who come together for a small group conference are not reading the same level of text, rather they are reading a text at their independent reading level that lends itself to the strategy and purpose for reading. Martha pulls the group together and tells them the reason for the conference based on what she has noticed in their reading work and hones in on one teaching point. The re-teaching is followed by reviewing expectations and providing independent practice (V2).

Ground rules for the differentiated reading time are firmly established as students exhibit sustaining reading behaviors and no off-task behaviors were observed regardless if students were directed to work independently, in partnerships, or in small groups (V1; V2). At the end of the differentiated reading time Martha reconvenes the class at the gathering area to sit in one large circle. She uses this time to signal responsibility for students' reading work by asking students to share their answers to the broad question, "What have you learned about yourself today as a reader?" (O1; O2; V1; V2). Responses from this discussion are informal and are not charted. Martha invites reflective responses

with open hands. Then students use dinner table talk, where they wait for one classmate to finish speaking before they start speaking, to share their answers to her question. One student begins the sharing time. Martha stays with that one student and the others listen and wait for an opening to share what they learned. Throughout the sharing time, Martha listens intently to students' discovery about themselves as a reader so she can restate it and ask follow up questions. The following transcript (V1) illustrates such an exchange (T = teacher, S = student):

> T. What have you learned today about yourself as a reader?
>
> T. Who would like to share?
>
> S. I would like to share. I learned that reading makes me ask a lot of questions.
>
> T. You discovered about yourself that you ask a lot of questions.
>
> S. Yes, like I discovered when I was reading this one part that I had like 5 questions about it. I have a lot of questions.
>
> T. Do you think when you are reading in your mind without your reading response journal that you have those same types of questions, you just haven't recorded them?
>
> S. Yes.
>
> T. So you are asking a lot of questions.
>
> S. [next student] I learned that I really like it when they [the authors] don't tell us the answers to the questions right away because I like to have to think about it.
>
> T. And so you like when you're left hanging and I'm a person who likes closure. I like closure when the book is done.
>
> S. [next student] I found out that I'm a fast reader.

T. You found out today when you're reading that you're a fast reader. You read things pretty quickly. Do you still ask questions at the same time?

S. Yes, I read fast and I still have questions, my comfortable reading speed is kind of fast.

T. When you're reading fast you feel that your comfortable reading speed is a little bit speedy. Can you still understand what you're reading?

S. Yes, I can still understand what I'm reading.

T. That's important, [addresses the group] so we can read at different speeds and still understand. We all have to find our comfortable reading speed.

S. [next student] I noticed that as a reader that when I read something and ask a question about it I keep it in my mind and I keep reading and then I read more and something pops in my mind that I connect to and then sometimes I answer my own questions.

T. Good, making connections, that's a good thing to do.

S. [next student] I learned that I read really slow because when I read slow I can understand but if I speed up then I don't understand what I read, nothing comes into my mind and I have to read it over.

T. So, you read slower. Do you think it's worse to read at a slower pace than a faster pace?

S. I don't think it's better or worse. It has to be a speed that I'm comfortable with. If someone is a faster reader it doesn't mean that he is a better reader because just reading fast doesn't mean you'll be able to understand what you're reading.

T. Exactly, it's really good to know your reading speed and you're the one who has to find that. It's like everyone's just right book is different and so is their reading speed.

S. [next student] I'm a better reader when I read slower. If I read slower I can stop and think and if I read too fast I'll get off track and that's what I learned about myself today as a reader.

T. Do you stop and think when you're reading?

S. Yes, when I read slower because when I read fast I get off track.

T. Thank you all for sharing today.

Instructional Materials. Martha seeks instructional materials that offer many different reading experiences for her students. The instructional materials are housed at the gathering area, behind her desk, and at the front on the room on a rectangular table. As mentioned, the gathering area has an easel with both a dry erase board and chart paper. Martha uses chart paper to record thinking and questioning. The whole group time at the gathering area generates pages of chart paper to capture students' thinking about text during strategy lessons. These pages reflect current thinking in regard to strategy work and are saved on the chart stand for future reference.

Next to the easel, Martha keeps a basket of instructional tools such as dry erase markers, chart markers, Post-it notes, and pointers. Martha also uses instructional tools such as typed texts from selected stories that students can reread in partnerships to apply strategy work, thinking sheets which are often graphic organizers that scaffold students' thinking, and students' RRJ. The students do a lot of writing in response to reading in their RRJ to track their thinking and to answer questions. Martha says out of all of her

instructional materials, "the reading response journal is huge for me because I can see so much growth in there" (IB). Martha's conferencing notebook is also a valuable instructional tool as she refers to it to hold differentiated conferences.

Martha has an extensive collection of mentor texts. These are purposefully selected texts that are considered exemplary models of children's literature. These texts are used for strategy lessons and are heavily marked with Post-it notes to signify stopping points to stimulate discussion. After a strategy lesson, they are shelved directly behind Martha's desk in a tall bookshelf. The collection of books Martha uses for strategy lessons are mostly from her personal collection, although some come from the school library. Also shelved with her literature books is a copy of the student's edition of the basal reader. Martha looks through the student's edition of the basal for literature selections that support strategy lessons and marks selected pages with Post-it notes.

Like Martha's bookshelves, the baskets of books on the bookshelves accessible by students consist of Martha's own books and texts from the school's library. Additionally, leveled texts from the core reading program are co-mingled with Martha's other leveled books. The student editions of the basal reader are housed in the students' desk for shared reading. Martha will use a selection from the student's edition of the basal reader if it is a good fit for a strategy lesson (IB). Instructional materials from the core reading program are referenced and incorporated as a source of reading instruction but do not appear to be the primary source of instruction. Rather, the core reading program's learning objectives are considered and referenced in regard to how the core program supports strategy work and students' differentiated instructional needs. The rectangular table at the front of the room holds instructional equipment like an ELMO and LCD projector. Along with the

125

equipment, Martha keeps other instructional materials and manipulatives such as Max

Brand's and Diane Deford's (2004) Word Savvy program, utilized for word study.

Explanation of the Patterns that Emerged

Based on the results of the analysis procedures, this section presents the patterns

and characteristics found in regard to each research question. The research questions are

addressed separately and in order. Observational field notes, interviews, and video

segments reveal that questioning moves are predominately used during whole group

strategy lessons. Therefore, this instructional context was the focus of analysis. First I

address question one which focuses on the questioning moves exemplary teachers use in

fourth-grade classrooms during reading instruction to engage students in talk about text.

Then I address question two which sought answers to how the use of instructional

materials was related to the teacher's language use, the teacher's perceptions of her use of

materials, and the decisions made about her delivery of instruction.

What is the Nature of the Questioning Moves Exemplary Teachers Use in Fourth-Grade Classrooms During Reading Instruction? Questioning moves are defined in this

study as the ways in which teachers use scaffolding questions to engage students in talk

about text. Questioning moves were analyzed by investigating the nature of the question-

answer sequences for incidence of authentic open-ended questions requiring explanation,

elaboration, or defense of text ideas to shine light on how teachers use language to shape

the nature of teaching and learning afforded to students. The same second rater and

procedures used for the first case study presented were used in the analysis of this case.

Transcripts gathered were from whole group strategy lessons using both fiction and non-

fiction texts. To identify questioning moves within the transcripts, first question-answer

sequences were highlighted. Then questions were cut up and sorted as being either open-ended, or close-ended. The open-ended questions were further analyzed as questioning moves. Martha's use of questioning moves were sparse. Her use of questioning moves depended on the focus of her strategy lesson. Martha used questioning moves during whole group to generate students' questions and to signal their responsibility as readers using narrative fiction. Martha did not use questioning moves with nonfiction texts. In a strategy lesson using fiction texts, Martha predominately asks, "What are you thinking?" She uses this questioning move to generate questions the students may have about the text she is reading. She also sparingly asks, "What else?" to probe for more questions. The other questions asked were either closed-ended, such as "Do you have any questions?", or they were asked to clarify the meaning of vocabulary words encountered in the text, for example, "Does anyone know?" and "What does it mean to…?" (O1; O3). The questions Martha asks using non-fiction texts are geared toward having students notice and wonder about the layout of the story.

To illustrate Martha's use of the questioning move "What are you thinking?" to generate students' questions in regard to understanding the text, the following transcript taken from a strategy lesson on reading with a question in mind using the text *Stranger* by Chris Van Allsburg is broken into question-answer sequences (O1) (T = teacher, S = student):

T. Richard, What are you thinking?
S. What did he hit?
T. He thinks he hit a deer, but you want to know what did he hit.

T. Does anyone else have a question? Andrew, what are you thinking?
S. Where are they?

127

T. We don't really know where they are yet, it's fall, could it be down here? [referencing Florida]
S. I don't know.
T. Maybe not, it kind of doesn't look like Florida to me.

T. What are you thinking, Amelia?
S. As you read the title and I looked at the picture, I thought this doesn't really look like a stranger.
T. The story doesn't start out sounding like it's going to be about a stranger because they tell us the character's name is Mr. Bailey. So you're not really asking a question, you're thinking this doesn't sound like it's going to be a stranger story.

T. What are you thinking?
S. How did he hit it [with his car], How did he hit the stranger?

T. (to the group), Do you still have questions?
S. Yes (choral response)
T. That's what happens when you're reading a story.

T. What are you thinking, Bradley?
S. Who is this man he hit and does he know this man?
T. Did he seem like he did?
S. I don't know. He (the stranger) was unconscious.

T. What are you thinking Tommy?
S. Maybe he (the stranger) was born and raised in the wild.

T. What else?, Dallas?
S. How did he get up and walk if he's hurt?
T. How did he walk if he was hurt?

T. What else?
S. Was the stranger running from another man?
T. Was he running from someone?

T. What else?
S. Did the car bump him or go over him?
S. [a different student] It kind of looks like it did.
S. [a different student] Maybe he tripped in front of the car and then it ran over him.
T. *reminder about table talk manners*

T. What are you thinking Amelia?
S. Maybe the pets think he's a friend.
T. Maybe… they don't act like he's a stranger.

T. Daniel, what are you thinking?
S. He looks happy.
T. Do you have any questions? I wonder if he's had a family before.

T. What are you thinking, Haley?
T. Do you have any questions? Is he magical?
S. Why is everything turning green when it's fall?
T. Great question.

Martha executes questioning moves within the comfort of the whole group setting to check students' application of the focus strategy. As evidenced by the data collected on the other transcripts and videos, when students are in partnerships or are reading independently Martha roams readers to verify their attempts at applying strategy work on texts they reread, but the use of questioning moves were not evident in more intimate settings.

What do Exemplary Fourth-Grade Teachers Describe as Influencing Their Use of Questioning Moves Within the Reading Program? In the interviews conducted with Martha she describes professional books, seminars, and workshops as influencing her use of questioning moves (IA; IB). Martha takes advantage of professional development opportunities provided by the school district, and seeks learning opportunities on her own geared around interactive reading, reading strategies, and questioning. Martha embraces the social nature of learning and strives to provide opportunities for her students to engage with texts. As a result of her professional development, Martha uses carefully selected texts during reading instruction and incorporates social skills in her instructional routines. Martha's use of questioning moves within the strategy lesson are influenced by her belief system, which "changes over time with every thing I add in; trainings,

seminars, workshops, conferencing, and learning from the kids. Every year the experiences with the kids challenge and sometimes alter my beliefs" (IA).

Martha's beliefs in regard to teaching reading seem to be in a constant state of development based on her learning experiences. Martha attempts to transfer new learning to practice, but the nature of her training opportunities and the limited scope of implementation support does little to facilitate the incorporation of new learning to build toward independence. Consequently, her use of questioning moves are limited.

Cross-case Analysis

This section will describe the results as they occurred across both classrooms studied. Data sources were employed in pursuit of a holistic portrayal of each case to reveal the entirety of the 90-minute reading block. The data collected serves as invaluable aids toward understanding the nature of questioning moves used during reading instruction. Therefore, data from both classrooms were combined for comparison of their similarities and differences. Like the presentation of results above, this section addresses each research question separately and in order. Additionally, I address common themes that cut across cases.

What is the Nature of the Questioning Moves Exemplary Teachers Use in Fourth-Grade Classrooms During Reading Instruction?

The notion behind teachers using questioning moves is to keep students engaged in the constructive work of building understanding from text. In the case studies presented, questioning moves were analyzed as part of the instructional routine to discover their nature. Although these two teachers used different types of questioning moves, they used the critical few to promote understanding of text, rather than the trivial

130

many that researchers suggest focus on the development of a topic rather than on

deepening students' understanding of text (Fisher, 2005; Wilkinson & Silliman, 2000).

As Table 2 illustrates, the questioning moves used were simple and subtle.

Table 2: Questioning Moves (adapted from Taylor, et al., 2003)

Questioning Move	Use	Example	Illustration of Student Response
Signaling Accountability	To signal the student's accountability as a reader.	What have you been working on today as a reader?	Evidence that a character changes over time.
Proving	To request additional evidence from the text to support thinking.	Can you show me?	Here [refers to text] she says, "Papa, will you still want me?"
		What evidence do you have to support that?	She didn't want to leave.
Probing	To force the student to think deeper about text and to elaborate on his/her thinking.	What else?	She is sad because she doesn't want to leave.
Checking for Understanding	To evaluate the student's understanding of text.	What were you thinking? What are you now thinking?	She was worried that her papa wouldn't love her because he had other children.
Generating Questions	To generate students' questions about the developing story.	What are you thinking?	Where are they? What did he hit? Was the stranger running from another man? Why is everything turning green when it's fall?
Signaling Responsibility	To signal the student's responsibility as a reader.	What have you learned today about yourself as a reader?	I learned that I really like it when they [the authors] don't tell us the answers to the questions right away because I like to have to think about it.

Teachers' use of questioning moves signal that they have high expectations in their students' abilities to read and interact with text for the purpose of constructing meaning. The questioning moves used provide scaffolding for the purpose of increasing the students' responsibility for constructing meaning from text. With Carla, questioning moves were predominately used during one-to-one reading conferences with students who read self-selected texts. The highest proportions of questioning moves were used to probe for additional information and to request students to provide evidence from the text to support their thinking. With Martha, questioning moves were predominately used in whole group strategy lessons with a mentor text to develop strategy work.

The questioning moves Carla used during one-to-one reading conferences influenced the way her students constructed meaning and engaged with text. Her ease of use of questioning moves indicates the questions are in her head and come naturally as a way to refine student learning. After modeling a strategy that supports the reading purpose and can be generalized to other texts, Carla provided students the opportunity to independently read self-selected texts. During this time, she held one-to-one reading conferences that were student lead. Carla used scaffolding questions to support students in their efforts to internalize strategies previously taught. Carla coached her students using lean questioning moves in a way that extended their talk about texts. The frequency of Carla's subtle extrinsic prompting and the depth of the students' response makes me wonder if the questions Carla asks may also be internalized by her students when they are reading on their own in a natural setting. Transcripts from Carla's one-to-one reading conferences illustrate the subtleness of the questioning moves used and the process of how Carla's expectations and language use is used to scaffold students' construction of

133

meaning. Carla has the goal for talking to be student led. As evidenced by the balance of conversational turns, Carla's students did more talking/grappling with ideas, which suggests they were working toward a deeper understanding of the text.

Conversely, Martha used questioning moves in a more directive manner with her students to check for application of the strategy modeled in whole group. In this context, her sparse use of questioning moves shows that she did not stay with her students' thinking long enough to collect evidence of whether or not they were engaged in deeper thinking. Rather, her students' talk was more on a surface level to illustrate the application of a strategy. The focus on the development of a strategy was important for the whole group lesson. While Martha asked open ended questions during the lesson, she retained control and did most of the talking so the verbal traffic flow of conversational turns looked more like the initiation-response-evaluation(IRE) format commonly referred to in traditional lessons (Cazden, 2001) than an authentic conversation about text.

While both teachers used questioning moves to further the instructional focus, Carla's questions were mostly asked during one-to-one reading conferences. In the intimacy of a one-to-one reading conference Carla used questioning moves to encourage students to think deeper about text. She flexibly posed questions, listened intently, and complemented and honored student responses. On the other hand, Martha's use of questioning moves in the whole group setting was informed by the strategy focus in the mini lesson and did not extend to small group or one-to-one settings.

What do Exemplary Fourth-Grade Teachers Describe as Influencing Their Use of

Questioning Moves Within the Reading Program?

Both Carla and Martha pursue professional development opportunities to hone their craft as a reading teacher. Both describe professional development as the primary factor influencing their use of questioning moves. The professional development they seek is based on experiences close to the classroom and the kinds of situations they want to create with their students. While Carla's and Martha's professional development stems from the same research base, Carla's professional development was broader in scope, had greater intensity, was in-depth in nature, and she received layers of support in her implementation efforts, which allowed her to employ a wider repertoire of questioning moves. Martha's professional development differed in that it was delivered by a single consultant on an occasional basis. She describes her professional development opportunities as occasional, and the support she received at her school site as limited in scope. Even so, Martha learned some essential elements of engaging students with text. She has an awareness of explicit strategy instruction and the importance of engaging students in talk about texts, but not the capacity to use questioning moves autonomously, indicating the professional development she has engaged in has been essential but insufficient in moving her learning forward in this area. A deeper exploration of these essential elements and direct access to the research base they stem from seems necessary to build her repertoire of questioning moves.

As evidenced by Table 2, there are different types of questioning moves. Carla's use of questioning moves were wider and more refined. As mentioned, she had the unique learning experience of delving deep into the research base behind the moves, was

135

offered intensive and extensive support during her implementation efforts, and was offered explicit feedback on her efforts to apply new learning. Consequently, Carla used questioning moves to a greater degree than Martha and in a more intimate instructional setting, which indicates for these two teachers that the amount and type of questioning moves used depends upon the depth, intensity, and nature of implementation support received in terms of professional development.

Also, as a result of the amount and type of her professional development, the themes in Carla's articulation of her theoretical framework for teaching and learning are clearly stated (IA). On the other hand Martha appeared to be responding to the occasional professional development offerings she has had access to and was unable to clearly articulate the theoretical underpinnings that drive her instructional decisions (IA).

Aesthetically, there are many similarities in the instructional contexts and instructional materials in Carla's and Martha's classroom. The difference appears to be that Carla understands the research base that informs her instructional decisions on a deeper level. Carla's reading instruction is linked from lesson to lesson, threaded with the purpose for reading (O1; O2). She uses questioning moves during one-to-one reading conferences with students who are reading self-selected texts. Her use of questioning moves is not hierarchical, rather they are responsive to what the student is working on as a reader. This could be because of the depth, breadth, and nature of Carla's training. Martha's reading instruction was thoughtfully delivered but lessons appeared to be somewhat disconnected. She used questioning moves to check for application of a modeled strategy using a text she selected for whole group instruction, but did not execute questioning moves with precision in varying instructional contexts.

136

Both Carla and Martha strategically use their instructional materials to make daily decisions about teaching strategies and embrace their professional responsibility for teaching and learning. Both Carla and Martha cull the core reading program for essential learning outcomes and consider and incorporate expectations into mini lessons and strategy work. Then they use the core as a reference and do not report feeling overburdened in regard to mandates about how to teach reading. Consequently, they employ their knowledge about reading to implement the standards and devise their own responses to students' individual learning needs. Resources from the core reading program are co-mingled with other reading materials, indicating that harmony of purpose and compliance in regard to teaching reading take precedence over mandates and expectations put forth in the district's K-12 reading plan.

Common Themes

Additional findings, indirectly related to teachers' use of questioning moves and the influences on their use, came from observational evidence derived from direct observations in the classroom. In regard to common themes, the most salient features of data collected from both teachers were the nature of attention that teachers gave to their classroom environment and instructional design.

Both Carla's and Martha's classroom environment is print rich. They both utilize wall space for interactive learning, both post the purpose for reading, both utilize chart paper that captures students' thinking for further instruction, and both have a well stocked lending library that reflects a wide range of genres and levels. Both Carla and Martha have a designated gathering area for reading work and both identify thinking partners to maximize students' discussions about text. It is evident in both classrooms that social

137

skills are not canned or stilted, rather are naturally incorporated into discussion. Both Carla and Martha devote half of their room to reading. They talk in soft tones and promote individual responsibility. Both have plants and use lamplight to simulate a homey feel, and both assign students classroom jobs to promote student responsibility. Both Carla and Martha offer students an easy-going, relaxed classroom environment that sends the message that the environment for learning is safe.

The instructional design of both classrooms reveals consistent use of language among teachers in regard to strategy work. Both Carla and Martha use exemplary models of children's literature to teach reading. Both have clearly established structures and routines that ensure seamless transitions from one instructional context to another so that classroom management is a non-issue. The backbone of their reading instruction is the opportunities provided for differentiated learning where each reader is seen and treated as an individual. Both confirm students' identities as readers and set high expectations for student learning. Students are aware of the high expectations of accountability and are able to attend to their reading work. Both teachers explicitly model fluent reading, think aloud, make text connections to clarify texts ideas, solicit students' thinking, and provide students talk time. Student engagement with texts is ensured with carefully identified thinking partners who are afforded many opportunities to talk about texts. Students have choice and easy access to a wide range of interesting, appropriately leveled books. Additionally, students are offered differentiated instruction based on data teachers gather from assessments and conferencing notes.

During my observations I specifically noted the interaction between both teachers and their students during the reading of a story as the students were in the process of

138

constructing meaning. Although Martha's read alouds were not observed because they were conducted outside the 90-minute reading block, her strategy lessons felt like interactive read alouds and she evoked emotional responses from students (O1; V1). Also, Carla strove to place the students inside the texts, to enable them to live through experiences by paying attention to the associations, feelings, attitudes, and ideas described in the text (Rosenblatt, 1978).

Summary

This chapter presented the emergent categories involved in the collection and analysis of questioning moves used by exemplary fourth-grade teachers during reading instruction. Questioning moves were not taken out of context, rather were presented as part of the instructional routine, which revealed the entirety of the 90-minute reading block, to give a holistic portrayal of each case. Focal attention was specifically placed on what the question-answer sequences sounded like and how and when questioning moves were asked to reveal important features of teacher-student interaction and hence the character of instruction. Results of these analyses were presented addressing each teacher's case separately, then were juxtaposed to show the similarities and differences of teachers' use of questioning moves.

Both teachers engaged in professional development and provided the social space necessary to employ questioning moves. But the extent of the use of questioning moves seems to hinge largely on the breadth, depth, and nature of teachers' professional development, as well as the instructional focus. Additionally, several themes were found between and among the two teachers. The themes involved issues related to classroom environment, instructional design, and students' engagement with text.

Chapter Five

Discussion

"Who dares to teach, must never cease to learn."

(Dana, 1997)

This chapter begins with an overview of the research, including the study's purpose, literature review, research questions, and research methods. Then, a discussion of the study's results and their intersection with the literature follow. Next, implications of the results for reading teachers and educators are discussed. This chapter concludes with recommendations for future research.

Overview of the Research Study

This study provides a window into exemplary teachers' fourth-grade classrooms during reading instruction for a discussion of the teachers' language use on student engagement with texts. The purpose of this study was to examine and describe the nature of questioning moves that exemplary fourth-grade teachers use during reading instruction. This study uses the notion of exemplary as described by Allington's framework of common features observed in exemplary fourth-grade classrooms (2000, 2002). Another point of interest was to determine how teachers perceive the influence of instructional materials on the language they use to engage students in talk about texts.

To integrate what is known and unknown about the ways in which teachers use language to deepen students' understanding of texts, the review of the literature presented in Chapter Two focused on topics such as the history of core reading programs, the

impact of questioning on students' reading comprehension, the teacher's discourse role, and the stance the teacher adopts during reading instruction. Drawing upon current research conducted by Taylor, Pearson, Peterson, and Rodriguez (2003) and Wilkinson, Murphy, and Soter (2003, 2005), the intent of this study was to fortify theory on the teacher's discourse role in regard to student engagement that leads to talk about texts. According to the literature reviewed, optimal understanding of how teachers engage students in constructing meaning from text is best gained by investigating the nature of question-answer sequences (Nystrand, 1993; 1997; 2006; Wilkinson, Murphy, & Soter, 2003; 2005; Taylor et al., 2003). To contribute to the knowledge base, focal attention was specifically placed on what these question-answer sequences sound like and how and when they happened. This focus promised to reveal important features of teacher-student interaction and hence the character of instruction.

The first research question that guided this inquiry asked about the nature of the questioning moves exemplary teachers use in fourth-grade classrooms during reading instruction. It focused on the relationship of the teachers' questioning moves to students' engagement with texts. The second question addressed what exemplary fourth-grade teachers describe as influencing their use of questioning moves within the reading program. The second question sought answers to how the use of instructional materials was related to the teachers' language use, the teachers' perceptions of their use of materials, and the decisions made about their delivery of instruction.

To address these two questions, this study was situated within a constructivist paradigm of inquiry. In keeping with the constructivist paradigm, naturalistic methods of data collection were employed including transcripts of teacher and student talk, field

141

notes, videotapes, and interviews with the teachers. This naturalistic inquiry drew from the case study tradition for its design (Creswell, 1998). A case study tradition is a qualitative inquiry approach that offers a holistic portrayal of the particularity and complexity of a single case (Creswell, 1998; Patton, 2002; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2003). In an effort to provide a better understanding of the nature of the language teachers use to engage students in talk about texts, data collection for each case consisted of two interviews supported by a digital recorder, three classroom observations of the 90-minute reading block supported by field notes, and two videotapes of the 90-minute reading block supported by extended interviews with the teachers to glean a deeper understanding of their instructional decisions for the questioning moves used.

Data analysis was conducted in two stages. First data were analyzed separately within each case to locate emerging patterns to build each teacher's profile. This analysis involved reviewing transcripts line by line several times to locate emerging patterns. I looked for patterns by coding direct quotes and by bringing together common ideas. After an analysis of each case, data were juxtaposed for the purpose of comparison to illuminate similarities and differences in patterns that cut across cases (Hycner, 1985; Johnson & Christensen, 2004; Patton, 2002).

Discussion of the Study's Results and Their Intersection with the Literature

In many ways results of this study validate or expand upon previous research related to engaging students in discussion about text. As discussed, the purpose of this study was to examine and describe the nature of questioning moves used by exemplary fourth-grade teachers during reading instruction. In general, results show that while questioning moves used by exemplary fourth-grade teachers are of different types, they

are simple and subtle. The questioning moves used provided scaffolding for the purpose

of increasing the students' responsibility for constructing meaning from text and signaled

teachers' high expectations in their students' ability to read and interact with text. The

nature of the question-answer sequences these moves yield expand upon previous

findings on discussions about texts (Beck& McKeown, 2001; Chin et al, 2001; Fisher,

2005; Nystrand, 2006; Taylor et al., 2003, & Wilkinson, Murphy, & Soter, 2003) by

highlighting the use of questioning to promote a deeper level of student engagement in

one-to-one reading conferences. In this intimate setting, questioning moves are used at

the edge of the student's competence (Vygotsky, 1978; Wilkinson and Silliman, 2000) to

gently nudge him or her to think deeper about texts.

Because a wider repertoire of questioning moves were used in one-to-one reading

conferences, results of this study also brought attention to the teacher's role as a coach.

This role was demonstrated by the teacher's use of questioning moves to coach students

to think deeper about text to build toward independence. Given the reciprocity between

language and interaction, previous research on discussions about texts describes the

teacher's role as a facilitator who introduces a particular way of thinking and talking

about story (Hansen, 2004; Kucan & Beck, 1997); as a collaborator in constructing

meaning during literary discussions (Jewell & Pratt, 1999); as definitive in regard to

creating the social context (Sipe, 2000); as fluidly moving between participant, guide,

facilitator, and learner (Gilles & Pierce, 2003); and as a discussion director in a dialogic

exchange of meaning (Nystrand, 2006). The amount of time and attention devoted to

discussions about texts provided evidence that the teachers in this study take the social

143

nature of learning to heart, thereby tipping a hat to studies that take into account the social nature of reading and its relationship to thinking and learning.

Results of this study also address what teachers describe as influencing their use of questioning moves within the reading program. A consistent finding is that the teachers' stance in regard to their interaction with students and their subsequent use of questioning moves, as well as their use of instructional materials, is influenced by the nature and intensity of their professional development. Teachers in this study call upon their professional development to strategically use their instructional materials to make daily decisions about teaching reading. In this study, teachers culled the core reading program for essential learning objectives, then exercised their professional rights and went outside the core reading program to flexibly meet learning outcomes. To that end, exemplary models of children's literature were used to promote the reading purpose and to further strategy work. In the classroom where word study was observed, the teacher dipped into instructional materials outside the core reading program for vocabulary and word study instruction. These supplemental reading materials were more in line with how she believes reading should be taught. Findings in this study also revealed the nature of attention that teachers gave to their classroom environment, instructional design, and their students' engagement with texts. Taken together, the findings in this study exemplify the notion that regardless of whether or not teachers can explicitly articulate their theoretical perspective, their beliefs play a dominant role in the resources they choose, the instructional practices they employ, the environment they create in their classrooms, and the stance they adopt (Eisenhart, Cuthbert, Shrum, & Harding, 1988; Serafini, 2002).

Implications for Reading Teachers and Educators

During the course of this study, the implications that emerged for reading teachers and educators are themed around issues of professional development and time. The focus of this study was on the nature of the language teachers use to engage students in talk about text by investigating questioning moves; which also provided insight to what is not said to engage students in talk about text and why.

As discussed in Chapter Four, the professional development opportunities and experiences of the teachers in this study were unequal in terms of nature, intensity, and support, which contributed to the differences in their instructional focus and their students' engagement with text. Consideration to the kinds of professional development opportunities and experiences that will extend and refine teachers' knowledge base in engaging students in talk about text seem essential. Importance is placed on the instructional leader and the impact of the school sharing a common vision to this end. Also, importance is placed on teachers' professional responsibility to aggressively pursue learning opportunities that efficiently push their learning forward to enhance their practice. Learning is gradual and continual. It is not enough to read about or watch demonstrations of how to engage students in talk about text. Learning opportunities need to also allow for guided practice, critical feedback, and coaching toward independence. Investigating venues that meet the diverse needs of teachers, support learning close to current research, allow rigorous conversations and collaboration with peers, and offer ongoing support structures that scaffold and facilitate attempts to apply new learning, could be a valuable pursuit (DuFour, 2004; Dufour, Defour, Eaker, & Many, 2006; Fang, Fu, & Lamme, 2004; Gelberg, 2008). The collaborative nature of such learning could be

one way for teachers to take their learning to the level of knowledge that will have long-term effects on enhancing their practice. It could also help bridge the gap between teachers' desire to acquire new learning and their access to intense and supported professional development. To build precision, continuous observations and thoughtful reflections about how the nature of their learning impacts the learning experiences provided for students is key (Allington, 2002).

In regard to time, teachers in this study view the time dedicated to reading instruction as sacred, providing students more than the 90-miniutes required by the state. Both teachers structured their time to provide students a variety of learning experiences, which expanded their role in engaging students with talk about texts. Each learning experience provided created teacher-student or student-student interactions and resulted in differences in the nature of talk about texts.

A highlight of this study was the focus on one reader at a time to empower and strengthen his/her ability to understand texts with the goal of making the reader more responsible for his/her own thinking. To provide students with dedicated reading time with an orientation toward responsibility, it is first necessary to invest time in modeling and reflecting upon expectations around students' engagement with texts. Such modeling will serve to empower students with how to make book selections and how to build reading stamina.

This study also points to investing time in understanding the value of one-to-one reading conferences to deepen teachers' understanding of each student as an individual reader. There are many aspects of conferencing to investigate, along with implications for management structures and systems of accountability to ensure purposeful use of time.

146

Recommendations for Future Research

The purpose of this study was to examine and describe the nature of questioning moves that exemplary fourth-grade teachers use during reading instruction. One of the delimitations of this study is the disparity in the teachers' level of experience and expertise in the teaching of reading due to the nature of their professional development. While Carla's and Martha's professional development stems from the same research base, the professional development Carla received in another state in regard to engaging students in talk about text was broader in scope, had greater intensity, was in-depth in nature, and she received layers of support in her implementation efforts, which allowed her to employ a wider repertoire of questioning moves. Martha's professional development differed in that it was delivered at an awareness-building level by a single consultant on an occasional basis with less implementation support. The professional development opportunities provided for Martha in regard to engaging students in talk about text have been limited and while essential, have been insufficient in regard to depth and implementation support to facilitate the transfer of new knowledge. To probe deeper into this line of inquiry, a future study could target the nature and depth of professional development as selection criteria and include a larger number of teachers.

Another limitation of this study is that it was conducted in two fourth-grade classrooms for the entirety of the 90-minute reading block over a relatively short period of time. Both teachers conducted additional components of the reading curriculum outside the 90-minute reading block, and these components were not observed. Another study might be a longitudinal study that focuses just on the language teachers use in one-to-one reading conferences and includes the data such conferences yield to learn more

about how teachers use language to coach individual students to go as far as they can go as readers. It might also be informative to see if students' participation in scaffolded conversations in one-to-one reading conferences strengthens their ability to actively participate in small group and/or whole group discussions about texts. This inquiry could investigate if there is a reciprocal relationship between the venues of one-to-one reading conferences, small group discussion, and whole group discussion in regard to students' ability to construct meaning from texts.

Still another area that lends itself to further research is the impact of teachers' reiterative questioning on students' metacognition. For instance, it would be interesting to see, in regard to questioning moves, if teachers' questioning extends students' cognition. This inquiry could investigate if students think deeper about text when they are doing reading work on their own in a natural setting because they have internalized the subtle questioning moves used by the teacher.

Since professional development was a key contributor to teachers' use of questioning moves, it would be informative to identify what components of professional development facilitate the transfer of new learning to actual practice in a way that impacts student achievement. Also informative would be the identification of professional development models that sustain school-wide efforts to maximize students' engagement with texts. A different study might also investigate whether instructional outcomes can be predicted using alternative instructional methods and materials. I think it is important to fully explore the rigor behind professional development and how districts, given the reality of budgetary issues, offer professional development and implementation support to teachers. Such an exploration might lead researchers to ask about the

148

characteristics of professional development that initiates and sustains changes in teaching practice in regard to reading instruction.

Since the development of our early American schools, reading instruction remains at the forefront both politically (Baumann, 1992; Shannon, 1983, 1987; Smith, 2002) and in terms of pedagogy (Apple, 1995; Dole, Duffy, Roehler, & Pearson, 1991; National Reading Panel, 2000; Paris, Wixon, & Palincscar, 1986; Pearson, 2004; Serafini, 2003). Researchers consistently emphasize that it is the teacher's knowledge base and instructional deliverance that matters most in regard to preparing students to be proficient readers for the 21st century (Allington, 2002; National Commission, 1996; Shannon, 1983, 2007). As revealed in the literature, in order to participate as fully literate, informed citizens in a democratic society students need the ability to be thoughtful, discriminating readers who are able to negotiate the meaning of texts on their own, talk about texts in thoughtful ways, and challenge others' interpretations, as well as accept the challenge of others (Holcomb, 2005; Luke, 1995). To that end, this study found many factors that influence how and when discussions take place and illuminated the teacher's role in sustaining talk about text. Engaging students in discussions about texts is not for the faint hearted. To provide students with such learning experiences requires deliberate knowledge building on behalf of the teacher, systematic and ongoing implementation support, and the opportunity for frequent reflection on the enactment of new knowledge to student learning. Thus amplifying the sentiment put forth by John Cotton Dana (1997), "Who dares to teach must never cease to learn".

References

Allington, R. L. (2000). Exemplary Fourth-Grade Teachers. *Language Arts, 79, 462-466.*

Allington, R. L. (2002). What I've learned about effective reading instruction: From a decade of studying exemplary elementary classroom teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan, 83, 740-747.*

Allington, R. L. (2004). Supporting struggling readers: Is evidence important in policy making? *The Florida Reading Quarterly, 41*(2), 8-11.

Anderson, R. C. & Biddle, W. B. (1975). On asking people questions about what they are reading. In G. H. Bower (Ed.), *The psychology of learning and motivation* (Vol. 9, pp. 9-129). New York: Academic Press.

Andre, T. (1979). Does answering higher-level questions while reading facilitative productive learning? *Review of Educational Research, 49*, 280-318.

Apple, M. (1995). *Education and power*. New York: Routledge.

Baumann, J. F. (1992). Basal reading programs and the deskilling of teachers: A critical examination of the argument. *Reading Research Quarterly, 2*, 390-398.

Beaver, J. (1997). *Developmental Reading Assessment*. Celebration Press.

Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., Hamilton, R. L. & Kucan, L. (1997). *Questioning the author: An approach for enhancing student engagement with text.* International Reading Association.

Becker, W. C., & Gersten, R. (1982). A follow-up of follow through: The later effects of the direct instruction model on children in fifth and sixth grades. *American Educational Research Journal, 19*, 75-92.

Berg, B. L. (2007). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bloom, B. S. (1956). *Bloom's Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals: Handbook I*, McKay Cognitive domain, New York.

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (1982). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Booth, D., & Rowsell, J. (2002). *The literacy principal: Leading, supporting and assessing reading and writing initiatives*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Brand, M. & Deford, D. E. (2004). *Word savvy: Integrated vocabulary, spelling, and word study, grades 3-6*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Brown, R., Pressley, M., Van Meter, P., & Schuder, T. (1996). A quasi-experimental validation of transactional strategies instruction with low-achieving second-grade readers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *88*, 18-37.

Bruner, J. (1990). Acts of Meaning. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Carlsen, W. S. (1991). Questioning in classroom: A sociolinguistic perspective. *Review of Educational Research 61*, 157-178.

Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Chin, C. A., Anderson, R. C., Waggoner, M. A. (2001). Patterns of discourse in two kinds of literature discussion. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *36*, 378-411.

Clay, M. (1993). *The observation survey*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Coles, G. (1998). *Reading lessons: The debate over literacy*. New York: Hill & Wang.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Darling-Hammond, L. Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. Education Policy Analysis Archives. 8:1: January 1. 2000 http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n1

Denzin, N. K. (1970). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods.* Chicago: Aldine.

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). The sage handbook of qualitative research. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dole, J. A., Duffy, G. G., Roehler, L. R., & Pearson, P. D. (1991). Moving from the old to the new: Research on reading comprehension instruction. *Review of Educational Research, 61*, 239-264.

DuFour, R. (2004). Schools as learning communities. *Educational Leadership, 61*, 6-11.

DuFour, R., Defour, R., Eaker, R., & Many, T. (2006). *Learning by doing: A handbook for professional learning communities at work*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

Duke, N. K., & Pearson, P. D. (2002).Effective practices for developing reading comprehension. In What Research Has to Say About Reading Instruction (3rd ed.). International Reading Association.

Durkin, D. (1981). Reading comprehension instruction in five basal reader series. *Reading Research Quarterly, 16*, 515-544.

Eagleton, T. (1996). *Literary theory: An introduction*. London: Blackwell.

Elson, W. H., & Gray, W. S. (1930). *Elson basic readers*. Chicago: Scott Foresman & Company.

Fall, J. R., Webb, N. M., & Chudowsky, N. (2000). Group discussion and large-scale

 language arts assessment: Effects on students' comprehension. *American*

 Educational Research Journal, 37, 911-942.

Fang, Z., Fu, D., & Lamme. L. L. (2004). From scripted instruction to teacher

 empowerment: Supporting literacy teachers to make pedagogical transitions.

 Literacy, 4, 58-64.

Fisher, R. (2005). Teacher-child interaction in the teaching of reading: A review of

 research perspectives over twenty-five years. *Journal of Research in Reading 28*,

 15-27.

Flesch, R. (1955). *Why Johnny can't read and what you can do about it*. New York:

 Harper & Brothers.

Galda, L., Ash, G. E., Cullinan, B. E. (2000). Children's Literature. In R. Barr, M. Kamil,

 P. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research: Vol. II*

 (pp. 361-379). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Kwang, S.K. (2001). What

 makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of

 teachers. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*, 915-945.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis theory and method*. NY:

 Routledge.

Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In C.

 Geertz, *The interpretation of cultures* (pp. 3-30). New York: Basic Books.

Gelberg, D. (2008). Scripted curriculum: Scourge or salvation? *Educational Leadership*

 3, 80-82.

George, J. C. (1998). *Look to the North: A wolf pup diary.* Harper Trophy.

Gilles, C., & Pierce, K. M. (2003). Making room for talk: Examining the historical implications of talk in learning. *English Education, 36*, 56–79.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine

Goldenberg, C. (1991). Instructional conversations and their classroom application. Educational Practice Report 2. National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning. Retrieved from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/ncrdsll/epr2/index.htm.

Goldenberg, C., & Patthey-Chavez, C. (1995). Discourse processes in instructional conversations: Interactions between teacher and transition readers. *Discourse Processes, 19*, 57-73.

Goodman, K. S. (1989). Access to literacy: Basals and other barriers. *Theory into Practice, 28*, 300-306.

Green, J. L., Weade, R., & Graham, K. (1988). Lesson construction and student participation: A sociolinguistic analysis. In J. L. Green, & J. O. Harker (Eds.). *Multiple perspective analysis of classroom discourse* (pp. 11-47). Norwood: NJ: Ablex.

Guthrie, J. T., Cox, K. E., Knowles, K. T., Buehl, M., Mazzoni, S. A., & Fasulo, L. (2000). Building toward coherent instruction. In L. Baker, M. J. Dreher, & J. T. Guthrie (Eds.), *Engaging young readers: Promoting achievement and motivation* (pp. 1-16). New York: Guilford.

Guthrie, J. W. & Springer, M. G. (2004). A nation at risk revisited: Did "wrong" reasoning result in "right" results? At what cost? *Peabody Journal of Education, 79*(1), 7-35.

Half, H. M. (1988). Curriculum and instruction in automated tutors. In M. C. Polson and J. J. Richardson (Eds.). *Foundations of intelligent tutoring systems*, (pp. 79–108). Hillside, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hammer, D. M., & Schifter, D. (2001). Practices of inquiry in teaching and research. *Cognition and Insturction, 19*, 441-478.

Hansen, C. (2004). Teacher talk: Promoting literacy development through response to story. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 19*, 115–129.

Hansen, J. (1981). The effects of inference training and practice on young children's reading comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly, 16*, 391-417.

Hiebert, E. H. (2005). State reform policies and the task textbooks pose for first-grade readers. *The Elementary School Journal, 105*, 245-266.

Hoffman, M. & Binch, C. (1995). *Boundless Grace*. Penguin Group USA.

Holcomb, S. (2005). *Reading by the script: What's all the fuss about?* National Education Association. Retrieved May 10, 2007, from
 http://findarticles.com/p/articles/miqa3617/is200502/ain9478163/print

Hoyt, L. (2007). *Interactive read alouds, grades 4-5: Linking standards, fluency, and comprehension.* Heinemann, Portsmouth, NH.

Hycner, R. H. (1985). Some guidelines for the phenomenological analysis of interview data. *Human Studies 8*, 279-203).

Jaeger, E. (2006). Silencing teachers in an era of scripted reading. *Rethinking Schools Online, 20* (3). Retrieved May 10, 2007, from http:// www. rethinkingschools.org/ archive/20_03/sile203.shtml

Jimenez, R. T., & Gersten, R. (1999). Lessons and dilemmas derived from the literacy instruction of two Latina teachers. *American Education Research Journal, 36*, 265-301.

Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. B. (2004). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Johnston, P. H. (2004). *Choice words: How our language affects children's learning*. Portland, Maine: Stenhouse Publishers.

Klausmeier, H. J. (1975). IGE: An alternative form of schooling. In H. Talmage (Ed.), *Systems of Individualized Education*, (pp. 48-83). Berkely, CA: McCutchan Publishing.

Knapp, M. S., Adelman, N. E., Marder, C., McCollum, H., Needels, M. C., Padilla, C., Shields, P. M., Turnbull, B. J., & Zucker, A. A. (1995). *Teaching for meaning in high-poverty classrooms*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Kucan, L., & Beck, I. L. (1997). Thinking aloud and reading comprehension research: inquiry, instruction, and social interaction. *Review of Educational Research, 67,* 271-299.

Kulik, J. A., Cohen, P. A., & Ebeling, B. J. (1980). Effectiveness of programmed instruction in higher education: A meta-analysis of findings. *Education and Policy Analysis, 2*(6), 51-64.

Lenski, S., Wham, M. A., & Griffey, D. (1997). Literacy orientation survey: A survey to

     clarify teachers' beliefs and practices. Paper presented at the annual meeting of

     the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. Retrieved from

     ERIC database. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED408286).

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Thousand

     Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Luke, A. (1995). When basic skills and information processing just aren't enough:

     Rethinking reading in new times. *Teachers College Record, 97*(1), 95-115.

Luke, A., & Freebody, P. (1997). Shaping the social practices of reading. In S. Muspratt,

     A. Luke, & P. Freebody (Eds.), *Constructing critical literacies: Teaching and*

     learning textual practice (pp. 185-225). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.

MacGillivrary, L., Ardell, A. L., Curwen, M. S., & Palma, J. (2004). Colonized teachers:

     Examining the implementation of a scripted reading program. *Teaching*

     Education, 15 (2), 131-144.

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.

Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D. J., & Pollock, J. E. (2001). *Classroom instruction that*

     works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement. Alexandria,

     VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Department.

McCully, E. A. (1997). *Mirette on the High Wire*. Penguin Group USA.

McCunney, M. (1997). *Mario's Mayan Journey*. Mondo Publishing.

McKeown, M. G., & Beck, I. L., (2004). Transforming knowledge into professional

    development resources: Six teachers implement a model of teaching for

    understanding text. *The Elementary School Journal, 104*, 391-408.

McQuillian, J. (1998). *The literacy crisis: False claims, real solutions*. Portsmouth, NH:

    Heinemann.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). Qualitative research and case study applications in education. San

    Francisco, CA: Jossey- Bass.

Meyer, R. (2002). *Phonics exposed: Understanding and resisting systematic direct

    intense phonics instruction.* Mahwah, NJ: Earlbarm.

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, M. A. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis, Second

    Edition*.

Moerman, M. (1988). *Talking culture: Ethnography and conversation analysis.*

    Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Moll, L. C. (1990). Introduction. In L.C. Moll (Ed.), *Vygotsky and education:

    Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology*.

    Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Moustafa, M. & Land, R. (2002). The reading achievement of economically-

    disadvantaged children in urban schools using Open Court vs. comparably

    disadvantaged children in urban schools using non-scripted reading programs.

    American Educational Research Association (AERA) Urban Learning, Teaching

    and Research 2002 Yearbook, 44-53. Retrived online from

    http://curriculum.calstatela.edu/margaret.moustafa.

Moustafa, M. & Land, R. (2005). Scripted reading instruction: Help or Hindrance? In B.

    Attwerger (Ed.), *Reading for profit: How the bottom line leaves kids behind* (pp.

    63-77). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

National Commission (1996). *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future.*

    Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). *A nation at risk: The*

    imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of

    Education.

National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence based*

    assessment of the scientific research literature and its implications for reading

    instruction. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human

    Development.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110 (2002).

Nystrand, M., Gamoran, A., Kachur, R., & Prenergast, C. (1997). *Opening dialogue:*

    Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom.

    New York: Teachers College Press.

Nystrand, M., Wu, L., Gamoran, A., Zeiser, S., & Long, D. (2003). Questions in time:

    Investigating the structure and dynamics of unfolding classroom discourse.

    Discourse Processes, *35*, 135-196.

Nystrand, M. (2006). Research on the role of classroom discourse as it affects reading

    comprehension. *Research in the Teaching of English, 40*, 392-412.

Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering

    and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction, 1.* 117-175.

Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1989). Classroom dialogues to promote self-regulated comprehension. In S. Brophy (Ed.), *Teaching for understanding and self-regulated learning*, Vol. 1. JAI Press.

Paris, S. C., Wixson, K. K., & Palincsar, A. S. (1986). Instructional approaches to reading comprehension. *Review of Research in Education, 13,* 91-128.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (3rd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Paulsen, G. (2007). *Lawn Boy*. Random House Publications.

Pearson, P. D. & Fielding, L. (1991). Comprehension instruction. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research: Vol. II* (pp. 815-860). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Pearson, P. D., & Johnson, D. D. (1978). *Teaching reading comprehension*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Pearson, P. D. (2004). The Reading Wars. *Educational Policy, 18*, 216-254.

Phillips, D. C. (2000). *Constructivism in education: Opinions and second opinions on controversial issues*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pressley, M. (1999). *Effective reading instruction: The case for balanced teaching*. New York: Guilford.

Pressley, M., Symons, S., McDaniel, M. A., Snyder, B. L., & Turnure, J. E. (1988). Elaborative interrogation facilitates acquisition of confusing facts. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80,* 268-278.

Pressley, M., Wharton-McDonald, R. (1997). Skilled comprehension and its development through instruction. *The School Psychology Review, 26*, 448 – 466.

Ravitch, D. (2001). It's time to stop the war. In T. Loveless (Ed.), *The great curriculum debate: How should we teach reading and math?* (pp. 210-226). Washington D.C.: Brookings Institute.

Richardson, J. (2001). *Seeing through new eyes: Tools for schools*. Stenhouse Publishing

Rosenblatt, L. (1968). A way of happening. *Educational Record, 49,* 339-346.

Rosenblatt, L. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of literacy work*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Press.

Rosenshine, B. (1979). Content, time and direct instruction. In P. Peterson & H. Walberg (Eds.). *Research on teaching: Concepts, findings, and implications*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Rosenshine, B., & Meister, C. (1994). Reciprocal teaching: A review of the research. Review of Educational Research, 64, 479-530.

Rowe, M. B. (1986). Wait time: Slowing down may be a way of speeding up. *Journal of Teacher Education 37,* 43-50.

Rowe, M. B. (1996). Science, Silence, and Sanctions. *Science and Children 34*, 35-37.

Rylant, C. (1991). *Night in the Country.* Aladdin Publications.

Rubin, H. J. & Rubin, I. S. (2005). Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Seifert, T. L. (1993). Effects of elaborative interrogation with prose passages. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 85*, 642-651.Shannon, P. (1983). The use of commercial reading materials in American elementary schools. *Reading Research Quarterly, 19*, 68-85.

Serafini, F. (2003, February). Informing our practice: Modernist, transactional, and

critical perspectives on children's literature and reading instruction. *Reading*

Online, 6(6). Retrieved November 11, 2004, from

http://www.readingonline. org/articles/art_index.asp?HREF=serafini/index.html

Shannon, P. (1987). Commercial reading materials, a technological ideology, and the

deskilling of teachers. *The Elementary School Journal, 87*, 307-329.

Shannon, P. (2007). *Reading against democracy: The broken promises of reading*

instruction. Heinemann: Portsmouth, NH.

Shapiro, J., & Kilbey, D. (1990). Closing the gap between theory and practice: Teacher

beliefs, instructional decisions and critical thinking. *Reading Horizons, 31 (1), 59-*

73.

Skidmore, D. (2000). From pedagogical dialogue to dialogical pedagogy. *Language and*

Education, 14, 283-296.

Soter, A. O. & Rudge, L. (2005). *What the discourse tells us: Talk and indicators of high-*

level comprehension. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American

Educational Research Association, Montreal Canada, 11-15-3005.

Stahl, S. A. (1998). Understanding shifts in reading and its instruction. *Peabody Journal*

of Education, 73(3), 31-67.

Stake, R. E. (1995). Qualitative Case Studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.),

The sage handbook of qualitative research (3rd ed., pp. 443 – 466). Thousand

Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Publications.

162

Steptoe, J. (1987). *Mufaro's Beautiful Daughters.* Harper Collins Publishers.

Stevens, L. P. (2003). Reading First: A critical policy analysis. *The Reading Teacher 56*, 662-668.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

T'ae-hyon, K. (1996). *The story of Hungbu and Nolbu: A Korean folktale.* Mondo Publishing.

Taylor, B. M., Pearson, P. D., Peterson, D. S., Rodriguez, M. C. (2003). Reading growth in high-poverty classrooms: The influence of teacher practices that encourage cognitive engagement in literacy learning. *The Elementary School Journal, 14*(1), 3-28.

Thorndike, E. L. (1903). *Educational psychology.* New York: Lemcke & Buechner. 2006. *The Reading First Program's Grant Application Process: Final Inspection Report* (ED-OIG/I13-F0017)

Tierney, R. J., & Pearson, P. D. (1981). Learning to learn from text: A framework for improving classroom practice. In R. D. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.) *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp. 496 – 513). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Valencia, S. W., & Wixon, K. K. (2000). Policy-oriented research on literacy standards and assessment. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research: Vol. II* (pp. 909-935). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Van Allsburg, C. (1986). *Stranger.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Van Manen, M. (1990). *Research lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. Ontario, Canada: State University of New York Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Webb, N., Farivar, S. H., & Mastergeorge, A. M. (2002). Productive helping in cooperative groups. *Theory into Practice, 41*(1), 13-20.

Wells, G. (1993). Reevaluating the IRF sequence: A proposal for the articulation of theories of activity and discourse for the analysis of teaching and learning in the classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, *5,* 1-38

Westerhoff, John H. McGuffey and His Readers: Piety, Morality, and Education in Nineteenth-Century America. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1978.

Wilkinson, L. C., & Silliman, E. R. (2000). Classroom language and literacy learning. In M. Kamil, P. B. Mosentahl, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*: *Vol. III*. (pp. 337 – 360). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Wilkinson, L. A., Murphy, P. K., & Soter, A. (2003). *Group discussions as a mechanism for promoting high-level comprehension of text. Technical Report 1* ((PR/Award No. R305G020075). Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.

Wilkinson, L. A., Murphy, P. K., & Soter, A. (2005).

Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Child Psychology & Child Psychiatry, 17*, 89-100.

Yin, Robert, K. (2003). Case study research: Design and methods. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

http://www.ed.gov/programs/readingfirst/index.html

http://www.fcrr.org/curriculumInstructionFaq1.htm

http://www.justreadflorida.com

http://www.teachscape.com

Appendices

Appendix A: Literacy Orientation Survey (LOS)

Name_____   Date_____

Directions: Read the following statements and circle the response that indicates your feelings or behaviors regarding literacy and literacy instruction.

1. The purpose of reading instruction is to teach children to recognize words and to pronounce them correctly.

    strongly   strongly
    disagree   agree
    1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

2. When students read text, I ask them questions such as "What does it mean?"

    never   always
    1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

3. Reading and writing are unrelated processes.

    strongly   strongly
    disagree   agree
    1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

4. When planning instruction, I take into account the needs of children by including activities that meet their social, emotional, physical, and affective needs.

    never   always
    1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

5. Students should be treated as individual learners rather than as a group.

    strongly   strongly
    disagree   agree
    1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

6. I schedule time every day for self-selected reading and writing experiences.

    never   always
    1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

7. Students should use "fix-up strategies" such as rereading when text meaning is unclear.

strongly   strongly
disagree   agree
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

8. Teachers should read aloud to students on a daily basis.

strongly   strongly
disagree   agree
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

9. I encourage my students to monitor their comprehension as they read.

never   always
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

10. I use a variety of prereading strategies with my students.

never   always
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

11. It is not necessary for students to write text on a daily basis.

strongly   strongly
disagree   agree
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

12. Students should be encouraged to sound out all unknown words.

strongly   strongly
disagree   agree
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

13. The purpose of reading is to understand print.

strongly   strongly
disagree   agree
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

14. I hold parent workshops or send home newsletters with ideas about how parents can help their children with school.

never   always
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

15. I organize my classroom so that my students have an opportunity to write in at least one subject every day.

never   always
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

16. I ask the parents of my students to share their time, knowledge, and expertise in my classroom.

 never   always
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

17. Writers in my classroom generally move through the processes of prewriting, drafting, and revising.

never   always
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

18. In my class, I organize reading, writing, speaking, and listening around key concepts.

never   always
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

19. Reading instruction should always be delivered to the whole class at the same time.

strongly   strongly
disagree   agree
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

20. I teach using themes or integrated units.

never   always
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

21. Grouping for reading instruction should always be based on ability.

strongly   strongly
disagree   agree
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

22. Subjects should be integrated across the curriculum.

strongly   strongly
disagree   agree
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

23. I use a variety of grouping patterns to teach reading such as skill groups, interest groups, whole group, and individual instruction.

never   always
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

24. Students need to write for a variety of purposes.

strongly   strongly
disagree   agree
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

25. I take advantage of opportunities to learn about teaching by attending professional conferences and/or graduate classes and by reading professional journals.

never   always
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

26. Parents' attitudes toward literacy affect my students' progress.

strongly   strongly
disagree   agree
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

27. The major purpose of reading assessment is to determine a student's placement in the basal reader.

strongly   strongly
disagree   agree
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

28. I assess my students' reading progress primarily by teacher-made and/or book tests.

never   always
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

29. Parental reading habits in the home affect their children's attitudes toward reading.

strongly   strongly
disagree   agree
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

30. At the end of each day, I reflect on the effectiveness of my instructional decisions.

never   always
1…………………2…………………3…………………4…………………5

LOS Scoring Sheet

Name_____   Date_____

Directions: Place the number of your answer in the space provided. Recode answers for items with an asterisk (*).

Beliefs   Practices
 *1. _____   2. _____
 *3. _____   4. _____
  5. _____   6. _____
  7. _____   9. _____
  8. _____   10. _____
*11. _____   14. _____
*12. _____   15. _____
 13. _____   16. _____
*19. _____   17. _____
*21. _____   18. _____
 22. _____   20. _____
 24. _____   23. _____
 26. _____   25. _____
*27. _____   *28. _____
 29. _____   30. _____

Beliefs score: _____ Practices score: _____

Total score: _____

*Recoding Scale
1 = 5
2 = 4
3 = 3
4 = 2
5 = 1

Interpreting Your (LOS) Score

Teacher's Name _____   Date _____

   1. Plot your Total Score on the line.

90…..95…..100…..105…..110…..115…..120…..125…..130…..135…..140…..145
     traditional teacher   eclectic teacher   constructivist teacher

   2. If your score is in the 90-110 range, you are most likely a traditional teacher.

       If your score is in the 111-125 range, you are most likely an eclectic teacher.

       If your score is in the 126-145 range, you are most likely a constructivist teacher.

   3. Plot your Beliefs Score on the line.

45.46.47.48.49.50.51.52.53.54.55.56.57.58.59.60.61.62.63.64.65.66.67.68.69.70.71.72

   4. If your score is closest to 51, you have beliefs similar to a traditional teacher.

       If your score is closest to 61, you have beliefs similar to an eclectic teacher.

       If your score is closest to 69, you have beliefs similar to a constructivist teacher.

   5. Plot your Practice Score on the line.

45.46.47.48.49.50.51.52.53.54.55.56.57.58.59.60.61.62.63.64.65.66.67.68.69.70.71.72

   6. If your score is closest to 51, you have practices similar to a traditional teacher.

       If your score is closest to 56, you have practices similar to an eclectic teacher.

       If your score is closest to 63, you have practices similar to a constructivist teacher.

   7. List your Beliefs Score _____ List your Practices Score _____

   8. If your Beliefs Score is higher than your Practice Score, you have not yet found a

       way to incorporate your constructivist beliefs in your classroom.

       If your Practice Score is higher than your Beliefs Score, you need to think about

       why you make the instructional decisions that you do.

Definitions of teaching practices

Traditional teacher:
* uses traditional reading methods such as basal reading instruction
* teaches using primarily direct instruction
* views students as "vessels to be filled"

Eclectic teacher
* uses some traditional and some constructivist reading methods
* frequently "basalizes" literature selections
* combines traditional and constructivist views about student learning

Constructivist teacher
* uses whole text and integrated instruction
* teaches using primarily an inquiry approach
* views students as using prior knowledge to construct meaning to learn

Appendix B: Outline of Proposed Study

Title of Study: The Nature of Questioning Moves Used by Exemplary Teachers During Reading Instruction

Researcher: Melinda Lundy

Purpose of Research: Doctoral Dissertation, University of South Florida

Proposed Location for Collection of Data: Three Manatee County School Sites

Proposed Participants: One exemplary fourth-grade teacher from each school site

Description of Research: This study will use qualitative methods to answer the following questions. These questions are broad in scope to provide a close analysis of what exemplary teachers say during reading instruction to engage students in higher level thinking and talk about text.

- What is the nature of the questioning moves exemplary teachers use in fourth-grade classrooms during reading instruction?

- What do exemplary fourth-grade teachers describe as influencing their use of questioning moves within the reading program?

Data Collection - Fall 2007: Proposed data collection will begin after obtaining informed consent from the teacher and permission from the parents of the fourth-grade students in each exemplary teacher's classroom. (This is an approved form from the University of South Florida's International Review Board (IRB).)

- Permission request forms for students will be provided by the researcher and sent home from school.

- Data collection will consist of three classroom observations, two videotapes, and two interviews.

- Researcher will visit classrooms three times to observe the 90-minute reading block; Tool used to collect data will be observational field notes.

- Two additional 90-minute reading blocks will be captured on videotape. Following review of the tapes, the researcher will share segments with the teacher to glean a deeper understanding of their instructional decisions for the language used to engage students in higher order thinking and talk about text.

- Two focused interviews will be conducted and supported by audiotape. Interviews will be conducted person-to-person at the participant's school site and last approximately one hour.

Significance of the Proposed Research: This study will examine the language three exemplary fourth-grade teachers use as a medium for promoting reading comprehension through deeper student engagement. While a number of researchers have conducted and reviewed studies on classroom discourse as it affects reading comprehension, they mainly focused on middle and high school populations, which results in a gap in the literature. This study will expand on researchers' current line of thinking by applying what is known about classroom discourse and reading comprehension to fourth-grade classrooms.

This view may suggest opportunities for learning afforded to students while simultaneously examining how teachers use language to shape the nature of teaching and learning. The findings from this study will provide an opportunity for reading teachers and educators to better understand the nature of talk teachers use in classrooms during reading instruction, and will give voice to the teacher regarding her perceptions,

176

knowledge base, and instructional decision making that is her own phenomenology.

<u>Potential Benefits and Risks:</u> The benefits of this study include advancing teachers'

understanding regarding the nature of teacher talk they use in classrooms during reading

instruction and contributing toward increased understanding in the field. There are no

anticipated risks.

Appendix C: Timeline for Data Collection.

Data Collection Timeline

Week	Data Collection Method	Total Time
Week 1	Interview each teacher 60 minutes	180 minutes
Week 2	Observe each teacher's 90-minute reading block	270 minutes
Week 3	Videotape each teacher's 90-minute reading block	270 minutes
Week 4	Observe each teacher's 90-minute reading block	270 minutes
Week 5	Videotape each teacher's 90-minute reading block	270 minutes
Week 6	Observe each teacher's 90-minute reading block	270 minutes
Week 7	Interview each teacher 60 minutes	180 minutes

Appendix D: Phases of Study

	Phase 1		Phase II						Phase III	
Week	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Interview Principals	X									
LOS/Preliminary Observation		X								
Interview & Audiotape			X		X		X		X	
Observation & Fieldnotes		X		X		X		X		
Videotape					X		X			
Data Analysis			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Appendix E: Interview Protocol A

1. What do you believe about how students learn to read?

2. What has influenced your belief system about teaching reading?

3. How has your belief system changed your teaching?

4. What is your responsibility in regard to teaching reading?

5. What do you feel is the relationship between your teaching beliefs and actual classroom practice?

6. Do you reflect on your reading instruction? How?

7. What instructional practices make up the most important part of your reading instruction?

8. What instructional materials make up the most important part of your reading instruction?

Appendix F: Interview Protocol B

1. What learning experience has made the greatest contribution to your professional

   development as a reading teacher?

2. Who gives you the most support in your reading instruction? In what way(s)?

3. How much planning time goes into your reading instruction?

4. How do you measure students' growth in reading?

5. How has the K-12 plan (pages 10-11) impacted your reading instruction?

6. What are your professional goals for this school year in regard to reading

   instruction and how will you work to achieve them?

Appendix G: Discussion Parameters

Discussion Parameters (developed by Wilkinson, Murphy, & Soter, 2003, 2005)

- Control of Topic (Teacher or Student)

- Interpretive Authority (Teacher or Student)

- Control of Turns (Teacher or Students)

- Chooses Text (Teacher or Students)

- Teacher or Student Led (Teacher or Students)

- Grouping by Ability (Heterogeneous or Homogeneous)

- Reading Before/During (Before or During)

- Genre (Narrative Fiction or Expository)

- Whole Class/Small Group (Whole Class or Small Group)

- Expressive Stance (High, Medium, or Low)

- Efferent Stance (High, Medium, or Low)

- Critical-Analytic Stance (High, Medium, or Low)

- Authorial Intention (High, Medium, or Low)

About the Author

Melinda Moran Lundy received a Bachelor of Arts Degree from the University of South Florida (USF) in 1994. She began serving the School District of Manatee County as a classroom teacher; achieving National Board Certification in 1999. Melinda graduated with her Master of Arts Degree from USF in 2001, and subsequently served the school district as a Literacy Coach to K-5 teachers.

While in the Ph.D. program at USF, Melinda served as a Graduate Assistant and taught undergraduate courses in literacy. She also taught literacy courses as an adjunct professor on the Sarasota-Manatee campus. Melinda has made presentations at state and local conferences. Her research interests include the role of teacher talk as it pertains to facilitating children's developing literary understanding, effective reading instruction, teacher education, and the perspectives adopted by teachers in their day-to-day practice. Melinda presently serves the School District of Manatee County as a Curriculum Specialist.