A Comparison of the Effects of Instruction Using Traditional Methods to Instruction using Reading Apprenticeship

David Carlton Lowery

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsjunction.msstate.edu/td

Recommended Citation
https://scholarsjunction.msstate.edu/td/71

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Scholars Junction. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholars Junction. For more information, please contact scholcomm@msstate.libanswers.com.
A COMPARISON OF THE EFFECTS OF INSTRUCTION USING TRADITIONAL METHODS TO INSTRUCTION USING READING APPRENTICESHIP

By
David Carlton Lowery

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of
Mississippi State University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education
in Secondary Education
in the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education

Mississippi State, Mississippi
August 2010
A COMPARISON OF THE EFFECTS OF INSTRUCTION USING TRADITIONAL METHODS TO INSTRUCTION USING READING APPRENTICESHIP

By

David Carlton Lowery

Approved:

Susie Burroughs
Interim Department Head
Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education
(Director of Dissertation)

Missy Hopper
Assistant Professor
Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education
(Co-Director of Dissertation)

Joshua Watson
Associate Professor
Meridian Division of Education
(Committee Member)

Devon Brenner
Associate Professor
Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education
(Committee Member)

Kent Coffey
Professor and Graduate Coordinator
Curriculum, Instruction and Special Education

Richard Blackbourn
Dean of the College of Education
Copyright by
David Carlton Lowery
2010
The purpose of this quasi-experimental study was to compare the effects of literature instruction using traditional methods to literature instruction using Reading Apprenticeship (RA) to determine if outcomes of attitude and achievement of students enrolled in World Literature courses are changed. Participants included 104 students from 1 junior college in a southeastern state. Of these 104 students, 68 were taught using a traditional method of instruction, and 36 were taught using the RA method of instruction. Students were administered the Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Survey to determine attitude scores at the beginning of the semester and attitude scores at the end of the semester. In addition, the Accuplacer-Reading Comprehension Test was administered to assess students’ reading achievement at both the beginning of the semester and at the end of the semester.

To analyze the data, a repeated-measures MANOVA was used to determine if statistically significant differences were present in students’ attitudes and achievement
scores based on instruction type. Also, the repeated measures MANOVA was used to
determine if there was an interaction between attitude and achievement scores.

After analyzing the data that was collected, the results indicated a statistically significant
difference between the attitude scores of students taught literature using traditional
instruction and students taught literature using RA instruction. The attitudes of students
who were taught World Literature through traditional instructional methods experienced
little change, and the attitudes of students who were taught World Literature using the
RA method significantly increased. The results of the achievement tests and the
interaction were not statistically significant.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In order for one to be an accomplished professional in the field of education, a teacher must invest time, preparation, and thought on such varied topics as personal teaching philosophies and classroom management techniques. A strong knowledge base is essential to success in the classroom, but this knowledge base alone does not always guarantee a successful classroom experience where students learn. Teaching, as described by Eisner (2002), is truly an art form. A teacher’s actions are not controlled by ordered routine. After examining studies of teacher effectiveness and decision-making processes, Agee (1998) stated that teachers, while they were in the process of instruction, made spontaneous decisions based on their students’ needs, and it appeared that they were using some sort of model of reference that they had previously learned—or had been taught—to guide their instructional practice. The beauty of instruction and the relaying of knowledge emerge as teachers become increasingly aware of the needs of their students and how to best meet those needs.

The Teaching of English

In the English classroom, the role of the teacher encompasses a multitude of tasks. In the preface to their book, Tchudi and Mitchell (1989) stated the following:
Attached to the deceptively simple title “Teacher of English” are responsibilities that could tax the capabilities of a dozen specialists in diverse fields. It is not enough that the English teacher takes on two-thirds of the three R’s. Beyond the teaching of the fundamentals of literacy, he or she must be a reading consultant and diagnostician, literary critic, writing instructor, writer, librarian, reader of books, media specialist, linguist, psychologist, and counselor. (p. xiii)

When a person is assigned to teach an English class, he or she will be responsible for having to teach a variety of subjects within that one course. Myers (2003) stated that the roles of the teacher in the English classroom are not clearly defined. Harden and Crosby (2000) affirmed that “The teacher’s role goes well beyond information giving, with the teacher having a range of key roles to play in the education process” (p. 335). In an English classroom, where multiple areas of content are taught within one class, the roles that the teacher plays change frequently. Based on her extensive research and experience in the field of disciplinary literacy, Moje (2008) revealed that subject matter, or content, affects the way teachers instruct their students.

The broad range of material covered in English classes (especially at the secondary and post-secondary levels) presents a problem for researchers trying to determine the effects of teacher behaviors on student achievement. Lesley and Matthews (2009), two teacher educators with experience teaching content area literacy methods, suggested that instruction is strongly organized around class content, and in the field of English, this instruction covers such areas as writing, grammar, vocabulary, and literature. In all areas of instruction, teachers rely on students to be able to read and understand what they read, but in the area of literature instruction, teachers depend
heavily upon students’ abilities to comprehend what they have read (Anderson & Pearson, 1984; Eckert, 2006). Although teachers depend on students’ abilities to comprehend as they read, many students do not comprehend at the level that they should.

Literature Instruction

The teaching of literature, as stated above, is only one aspect of the English curriculum. In a study that examined English teachers and how they assessed their effectiveness, Agee (1998) found that literature instruction is considered to be the “central organizing structure of the high school English curriculum” (p. 1). Galda and Cullinan (2003) declared the importance of literature in the English classroom by stating that “Experiences with literature during the school years promote interest in reading, language development, reading achievement, and growth in writing ability” (p. 641). Even though exposure to literature carries such benefits, the ability to appreciate literature depends heavily upon one’s ability to read and comprehend the text. Knickerbocker and Rycik (2002) suggested that the study of literature should build both the ability and the desire to read. The ideal literature program would have students growing as fluent readers while tackling complex texts and continuing to want to read more challenging texts as they progress from elementary to middle school to high school and beyond.

The National Research Center on English Language Learning and Achievement (2001) of the United States Department of Education stated that “daily, thought-provoking” (p. 3) interaction with literature helps students’ understanding of what they have read to become more complex, and when that interaction includes discussion,
students’ learning is increased. Discussion serves two purposes: It allows teachers to understand what students think about their reading, and it develops “effective strategies for comprehension” (Wilkinson & Silliman, 2000, p. 353). The way that a person thinks about what is read depends on his or her expectations while he or she is reading, and these expectations shape his or her attitude about the process of reading. The National Research Center (2001) referred to these shifts in understanding as “envisionments” (p. 4), which are important in the area of literary instruction. While there are few teaching strategies that can be identified to help increase students’ literary knowledge, there are a variety of methods that can be used to improve the way in which students approach reading and understanding texts.

Literacy Research

Literacy research has found that students’ attitudes about reading and writing in the early grades can be greatly affected, positively or negatively, by the way they are instructed (McCarthey, 2001). Without positive and early intervention, by the time students reach high school or a post-secondary institution, they may have developed poor attitudes which further affect their ability to be prepared for higher-level reading skills (Zhang, 2003). In fact, Eckert (2008) reported that “In the area of reading comprehension, 41% of college professors indicated students are not well prepared for college-level demands [in reading]” (p. 110). Only 15% of high school teachers found the same to be true (Eckert, 2008). It is apparent that a gap exists between the views of what high school teachers perceive as acceptable literacy standards for their students versus what college professors expect when students reach their classrooms. This lack of
preparation greatly affects the achievement of these students (Applegate & Applegate, 2004). Eckert, who taught on the secondary level and later taught teacher-education courses, pointed out that in post-secondary courses which require a heavy reading load, “without the means of assuming an interpretive stance on their own, students come to class expecting—even requiring—teachers to explicate the nuances of the text for them” (p. 111).

The focus of much of the research conducted on reading comprehension and content area reading has been at the elementary school, middle school, or secondary school level. Based on their research on school improvement efforts in several middle schools and high schools across America, Daggett and Hasselbring (2007) proposed that the process of teaching and learning reading “must continue into the middle grades, high school, and beyond” (p. 1). Maaka and Ward (2000), after conducting a study of 236 students at a community college in Hawaii, maintained that there is a greater need for more theoretical research on the process of teaching and learning reading. Wilhelm (2008) further asserted that older students require new strategies and techniques for learning. However, in 2008, Eckert found that there was very little published research connecting studies of secondary education literacy to post-secondary literacy education. At the post-secondary level, where reading becomes a much more independent activity, many students have already developed reading habits that are detrimental to successful reading experiences.

After having examined past studies on content-area literacy and extensively researching the use of content instruction in the classroom, Readence, Bean, and Baldwin (2004) proposed that reading instruction is more effective when it is taught in conjunction
with the actual content of a course. Similarly, other research suggests that reading instruction is more meaningful when it is embedded within the content of the course. In preparing a report for the Alliance for Excellent Education, Biancarosa and Snow (2004) suggested that all content area teachers should emphasize good reading practices in their individual subject-area classrooms so that students can learn “to read and write like historians, scientists, mathematicians, and other subject-area experts” (p. 15).

Reading Apprenticeship

Following an extensive examination of studies on reading and after careful evaluations of longitudinal studies on schools and their reading practices, Block and Pressley (2003) suggested that traditional methods of instruction have proven to have limited benefits for improving reading comprehension. Strickland (2003) argued that in today’s world, “the definition of what it means to be literate has evolved with the increasing demands of all aspects of our lives” (p. xix). In order to find new ways to reach today’s students and provide them with useful strategies to help improve reading comprehension, the Strategic Literacy Initiative at WestEd, a non-profit research agency, developed a teaching framework which provides methods to help improve students’ reading comprehension skills at both the elementary and secondary levels. Strategic Literacy Initiative researchers are currently examining how this teaching framework can be incorporated at the community college level by providing five-day intensive workshops in the summer with follow-up meetings in the early spring to train teachers to incorporate this framework into the content-area classroom. The framework is called Reading Apprenticeship, commonly referred to as RA. In the RA framework, a central
focus is on students’ use of metacognition to aid them in determining how they can best accomplish the task of reading and comprehending difficult texts. RA “is an approach to reading instruction that helps young people develop the knowledge, strategies, and dispositions they need to become more powerful readers” (Strategic Literacy Initiative at WestEd, 1995-2009, The Reading Apprenticeship Framework section, para. 1).

How Reading Apprenticeship Works

Through the application of the RA framework, teachers “apprentice students to read, write, talk, and think in their discipline. They make the invisible process of reading visible” (Jordan & Schoenbach, 2003, p. 9). Teachers play an important role in the RA framework as expert readers and thinkers in their specific content area. When the teacher aids, or apprentices, a student to think metacognitively about what he or she is reading, the four dimensions of classroom life—social, personal, cognitive, and knowledge building—are embedded into content area instruction. The teacher serves as a model throughout this process and actually demonstrates his or her reading strategies to the student (“Creating a supermodel for teaching comprehension,” 2008; Pardo, 2004; Schoenbach, Greenleaf, Cziko, & Hurwitz, 1999). Students, in turn, are given the opportunity to evaluate their thinking processes in relation to their own reading strategies. This thinking about thinking is part of the metacognitive conversation which is at the core of what RA is all about.

The Need for Reading Apprenticeship

Although metacognition is an important skill in reading comprehension (Braunger & Lewis, 2006), most content-area teachers have not been trained to teach students to
think metacognitively about what they are reading. In fact, many students’ only experiences with reading have been test-driven or skill-based, and, consequently perhaps, students’ attitudes toward reading are negative (Wilhelm, 2008; Zhang, 2003). Williams (2005) observed that the focus of literacy education is becoming more assessment-oriented. A result of assessment-driven instruction is that the concept of reading comprehension has become less of a priority as students move through elementary school and middle school. By the time students reach high school and college, the reading material and the expectations about what is read have changed (Wilhelm, 2008).

Spellings (2006) asserted the following:

There are also disturbing signs that many students who do earn degrees have not actually mastered the reading, writing, and thinking skills we expect of college graduates. Over the past decade, literacy among college graduates has declined. Unacceptable numbers of college graduates enter the workforce without the skills employers say they need in an economy where, as the truism holds correctly, knowledge matters more than ever. (p. vii)

If something is not done to bring about changes in the way students are taught to read and understand what they read, America will face an epidemic of students who do not have the ability to comprehend even the most basic of reading materials.

The Importance of Reading

Over the past decade, numerous empirical studies have provided evidence of the vast array of educational benefits that can be attributed to reading. Kuo, Franke, Regalado, and Halfon (2004) stated “Learning to read is a critical milestone for children.
Reading skills are the foundation for children’s academic success” (p. 1944). In a study of students who were introduced to literacy programs at an early age and followed through to the fifth grade, Zimmerman, Rodriguez, Rewey, and Heideman (2008) found that early literacy initiatives “had a positive impact on student performance and that positive impact was sustained beyond the early elementary years” (p. 475). In fact, after an evaluation of numerous ability tests and the results of students on these ability tests, Naglieri (2001) found that there are strong correlations between students with high intelligence quotient scores and reading ability. MacDonnell (2004) also agreed that “exposure to early reading experiences can actually increase IQ” (p. 30). Goswami (2006) pointed out that “reading literally changes the brain” (p. 28). There are also many other benefits to reading. The following are important reasons why students should be made to read:

1. Readers are better writers.
2. Readers score higher on reading tests.
3. Readers get better jobs.

In addition to these cognitive and academic benefits, reading also has been shown to have an effect on the physical and social development of the individual. According to Gioia (2006), “If you’re a reader, you’re more likely to exercise” (p. 19), attend sporting events, and be involved in your community.
Inspiring Students to Read

Even though reading has been proven to have great benefits, teachers today face great competition when trying to get students to read assigned texts. Students today have many more external stimuli with which to deal than at any other time in history. Mayher (as cited in Ericson, 2001) stated that “the competition for reading as a source of story has become much more intense” (p. x). Computers, television, and video games have opened up a doorway to entertainment that has made today’s children need instruction that appeals to their visual sensibilities and is quick and fast in delivery. The appeal of reading as a pleasurable activity or fun pastime is, quite arguably, lost on a generation of students who are technologically-driven. In order for reading to be considered a pleasant or useful experience, “a delicate balance of skill and interest is crucial, since if one doesn’t read well enough—fast enough, fluently enough, powerfully enough—the frustrations will overwhelm any possible pleasure to be gained from the experience” (Mayher, as cited in Ericson, 2001, p. xi). Many children today lack the attention span or time needed to put into the experience of reading even though, as Turner (1996) suggested, the internal need for narrative is one of human beings’ strongest desires. A review of the literature indicated that while research has been conducted in the area of inspiring younger students to read, little or no research has been conducted in the area of inspiring students to read at the post-secondary level. That is, at the collegiate level, most of the focus on reading is not on inspiring students to become better readers; rather, the focus is on helping remediate those who have problems with reading (Johnson & Carpenter, 2000).
The Necessity of Reading in a Literature Course

In order to understand literature, students must be able to read and comprehend. Traditional methods of instruction have focused on the belief that students read and comprehend the assigned material on their own (Eckert, 2008). RA provides students with a way to approach reading in a manner where the core of instruction deals with helping students understand their individual reading processes and working through these processes to aid in the comprehension of the material that is being read (Strategic Literacy Initiative, 2008). If students are given strategies to help aid them in understanding how they read and they are able to find ways to work around their reading impediments, they can, theoretically, be encouraged to read more.

Good reading requires active engagement on the part of the reader (Lapp, Fisher, & Grant, 2008); it is not just simply decoding written words. According to Schoenbach et al. (1999), “Reading is not a straightforward process of lifting the words off of the page” (p. 18). Comprehension must take place (Braunger & Lewis, 2006; Vacca & Vacca, 2002). Because reading has so many intrinsic and extrinsic benefits and is necessary to a student’s success, research which focuses on reading and ways to improve reading comprehension at all levels is important.

Rationale for the Study

It has been theorized by the developers of RA at the Strategic Literacy Initiative that RA can provide the framework for teachers to utilize their expert knowledge and skills in content-area instruction to aid students in ways to improve their reading ability and understanding of a variety of texts (Strategic Literacy Initiative at WestEd, 1995-
2009). However, at the time of this study, no empirical research could be found to exist on the incorporation of RA strategies into a post-secondary literature classroom. A study that seeks to look at the incorporation of RA on the post-secondary level in the content-area classroom is timely.

The study proposed herein will have two specific purposes. The first purpose is to examine the attitude that students have toward reading in the literature classroom. Separate measures will be made in both a literature class taught in a traditional manner and in a literature class taught using Reading Apprenticeship (RA) teaching strategies. An assessment of attitude commonalities and differences will be made at the beginning of the semester and at the end of the semester to determine if either the traditional approach or the RA approach has an effect on students’ attitudes toward reading.

The second purpose of the study is to compare a traditional method of literature instruction to the RA method of instruction to determine if there is a significant difference in reading comprehension achievement between the two groups. Students’ reading comprehension will be measured with a pre-test at the beginning of the semester in the traditionally-taught classroom and in the RA classroom. At the end of the semester, a post-test will be given to determine if the RA approach to teaching has a significant effect on reading comprehension or if the traditional method is comparable to the RA approach.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions of frequently used terms are given to help clarify their meaning throughout this study:
Achievement is defined as “a number of indicators of school success…” (Webb, Metha, & Jordan, 2007, p. 201) that include learning to read, acquiring basic skills, building problem-solving and critical thinking skills, and improving grades earned in the classroom.

Active engagement in the field of education is “a connection to something” (Schoenbach et al., 1999, p. 55); in reading, this connection is closely tied to motivation (Braunger & Lewis, 2006).

Attitude, in this study, focuses on “a combination of feelings and behaviors related to a specific learning situation which serves as a major factor in the learner’s receptivity to activities related to that learning situation” (Thames & Reeves, 1994, p. 293).

Capturing Your Reading Process is a method in which students determine the strategies that they use in order to make sense of a piece of text (Strategic Literacy Initiative, 2008).

Comprehension is defined as “the interpretation of experience; relating new information to what is already known; asking cognitive questions and being able to find answers to them” (Smith, 1994, p. 309-310).

Content area relates specifically to “subject-matter area; that is, English, science, agriculture, and so on” (Lesley & Matthews, 2009; Massey & Moore, 1966, p. 99).

Embed is when a teacher uses content specific reading strategies within the teaching of a course to aid in instructional learning as part of a teacher’s course content and “not an add-on” (Gilles, 2007, p. 2).

Four Dimensions of Life in the classroom are “four key dimensions of classroom life that nurture…reading inquiry” (Jordan, Jensen, & Greenleaf, 2001, p. 16). They are
the following: the social dimension, the personal dimension, the cognitive dimension, and the knowledge-building dimension.

*Junior college (or community college)* is a public institution that is accredited to award the associate in arts or the associate in science as its highest degrees (Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Vaughan, 2000). The community college is a two-year public institution or higher learning that offers programs which adapt to the needs of the community. Course offerings include both a transfer curriculum, which can apply toward a bachelor’s degree, and occupational programs, which help prepare the student for employment. (Tulsa Community College, 2003).

*Metacognition* is “thinking about thinking” (Schoenbach et al., 1999, p. 23). According to Joseph (2010), students use metacognition to “plan, regulate, and assess their learning” (p. 99).

*Metacognitive reading logs* are writing response logs that require students to focus on their thinking processes as they read. Some reading log prompts ask students to predict what they thought the story was about before they read it and then focus on strategies that were used to aid in the comprehension of the reading of the assigned selection.

*Non-traditional student* is a term that refers to students who have, for any number of reasons, challenges in their lives which make seeking an academic degree more difficult. This term can refer to part-time students, adult learners, or any students who are admitted with special needs or accommodations (Rutgers University College Community, 2008).
Reading is “a thinking process which includes decoding of symbols, interpreting the meanings of the symbols, and applying the ideas derived from the symbols” (Herber, 1978, p. 9) to aid in the active process of comprehension of text (Schoenbach et al., 1999; Smith, 1997).

Reading Apprenticeship (RA) is “an approach to adolescent reading improvement that builds on the expertise of teachers as experienced content area readers. Teachers use this expertise to apprentice students into the strategies and moves skilled readers use” (Jordan et al., 2001, p. 15).

Reading fluency is defined as “freedom from word identification problems that might hinder comprehension” (Harris & Hodges, 1995, p. 85).

Scaffolding is considered to be support that helps learners create a bridge between what they can do and what they need to do to complete a task successfully (Graves & Braaten, 1996).

Talk to the Text is a metacognitive strategy that is used when the student attempts to make sense of his or her own reading strategies by actively engaging the text; a process of annotating the text by using such comments as “I wonder…” and “I didn’t understand when…” or “I got confused by...,” etc. (Strategic Literacy Initiative, 2008).

Think Aloud is a metacognitive practice in which students verbalize “their process of trying to make sense of texts” (Schoenbach et al., 1999, p. 56).

Traditional instruction is a type of instruction that follows a specific pattern: “assign, study, recite” (Maxwell & Meiser, 2001, p. 5).

Traditional literature instruction is lecture-based with little use of technology and progressive teaching strategies such as collaborative learning. The material in a
traditional literature class is presented by the instructor, and the students read the assigned material and produce written work on that material based on the given assignment (C. Windham, personal communication, April 13, 2010).
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This study was designed to compare the effect of traditional literature instruction to literature instruction using Reading Apprenticeship on reading attitude and reading achievement of students enrolled in World Literature. The review of literature focused on (a) the knowledge base for teaching, (b) the importance of reading, (c) literature instruction, (d) reading attitude and reading achievement, and (d) Reading Apprenticeship.

Knowledge Base for Teaching

According to Spencer (2001), teaching is a profession. Strom (1991) maintained that in the profession of teaching, there must be a specific body of knowledge “that is applied with wisdom and ethical concern” (p. 2). Strom further suggested that determining the knowledge base that teachers should attain in order to facilitate classroom instruction is a social process that is created by the community where the teacher instructs his or her students. Many turn to documented research to justify what constitutes an essential knowledge base for teaching. Buehl and Moore (2009) declared that research is a justifiable construct to use when determining instructional practices that work best in the classroom. After extensive studies on content area literacy and best practices in the classroom, Readence et al. (2004) stated that the notion of what an
acceptable knowledge base actually is typically centers on the research and best practices that are offered by teacher education programs. Moore and Hopkins (1992), for example, declared that “Teachers, like other professionals, need a sound body of knowledge to draw from when deciding how to proceed in complex situations” (para. 1). For most teachers, the said body of professional knowledge is prescribed by and through the institutions of higher education where they earned their teaching credentials.

Integral to the professional knowledge that all teachers must have is the ability to help students read and understand from a variety of classroom texts. One skill, moreover, that all teachers require of students is a strong ability to read and comprehend what is read. Moje (2008), a researcher in the field of disciplinary literacy, declared that the teaching of reading was a skill that many educators felt that they were not equipped to accomplish. In order to help teachers improve their views on reading instruction in the content-area classroom, there should be more training in reading instruction for all teachers at all levels (Lapp et al., 2008; “Reading, Key to College Success,” 2006).

Many teachers do not consider themselves to be teachers of reading. Readence et al. (2004) proposed that teachers view reading as a skill that is taught in the elementary school, and once a student reaches higher grades, reading simply becomes a way to cover the content of the individual course, and the student is responsible for understanding what is read. Williams (2005) wrote that most secondary and post-secondary teachers likewise believe that reading is a skill that students acquire in the elementary and middle school where reading skills are taught and closely measured by standardized testing. In her research on Reading Apprenticeship training, Sipe (2006) revealed that “Many teachers do not see themselves as avid and refined readers except possibly in their own content
area” (p. 1). In her study, she also discovered that most teachers choose to ignore students’ poor reading abilities or simply diminish the material to the point where no students actually have to read from text for understanding (Sipe, 2006).

In some ways, the knowledge base that is required of a content-area teacher is something that is now out of the hands of the local community; it is controlled by the United States government. Aldridge and Goldman (2007), in researching trends and issues in the field of education, agreed that “Education and politics are inextricably intertwined” (p. 7), and they also suggested that “local control does not seem to be how the agenda works. Several conditions keep the control of schools out of local hands” (p. 5). According to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, states must develop and implement quality standards for academic achievement, and progress toward reaching these standards must be monitored with yearly tests in reading through the eighth grade in the public school system (Salinger, 2003). NCLB created a “much larger federal presence in educational policy and funding and set the foundation for a national testing system” (Lewis, 2002, p. 423). The problem of students with low-reading abilities that plagues the public school system at the elementary, middle school, and secondary level ultimately becomes the problem of post-secondary institutions of higher learning (Clark, 2006; Spellings, 2006). Much of the instruction for students entering college has been based on basic skills and driven by test scores (Williams, 2005). Consequently, comprehension and critical thinking have been avoided (Foote, 2007).

Graber (2001) suggested that content-area instruction in the field of English requires the teacher to not only be well-versed in subject-area knowledge but to also have a knowledge base for reading instruction and content literacy. Myers (2003) defined
content literacy as the material that an instructor must know in order to help his or her students learn from the texts that are used in the content-area classroom. Readence et al. (2004) proposed that the obvious element of the knowledge base needed for the content-area teacher is the discipline-area expertise that a teacher brings to the classroom. Lapp et al. (2008) referred to teachers who are well-versed in content and not pedagogy as “content specific specialists” (p. 378). They suggested that these specialists enter into the teaching profession because they are interested in a subject. Such teachers were found lacking in the pedagogical knowledge to adequately manage a teaching environment where basic skills such as reading and comprehension are not only requirements but a necessity in order to survive school at all levels (Lapp et al., 2008). In another study that examined reading and writing strategies in the content-area classroom, Nichols, Young, and Rickelman (2007) revealed the importance of the teacher’s role in the classroom by describing it as “the major contributing factor in effective instruction” (p. 99). These researchers asserted that teachers must use a variety of content-instructional strategies in order to teach their students effectively and to reinforce good practices in reading. Godt and Godt-Hansen (2007) showed, however, that teachers choose practices that are specific to their particular subject area and to their particular students. Choosing subject-specific teaching practices proves problematic as studies have repeatedly shown that in all classes where reading is required, the focus should be on comprehension, which is the central purpose of reading (Anderson & Pearson, 1984; Biancarosa & Snow, 2004; Braunger & Lewis, 2006; Snow, 2002).
The Importance of Reading

Arguably, perhaps no skill is more necessary to the academic success of an individual than reading. In a study of the effects of reading practice and reading attitude on achievement, Galipault (2008) found: “Reading is the cornerstone of today’s educational framework” (p. 1). As a result, reading and literacy and how the two are taught and measured have become major concerns in the field of education. In their research on current literacy standards and practices, Braunger and Lewis (2006) declared that the standards for literacy are higher than they have ever been, and the demands for high levels of literacy are necessary for a greater portion of the population. Similarly, Smith (1994) stated that “The power that reading provides is enormous” (p. 1). In fact, Braunger and Lewis (2006) believed that “literacy is key to success in school and beyond for effective participation in the workforce, the community, and the body politic” (p. 2). Some researchers go so far as to say that a child’s lack of ability to read or comprehend can possibly lead to social problems, poverty, or even future criminal activity when he or she reaches adulthood (Cart, 2008; Payne, 2005). According to Daggett and Hasselbring (2007), “If students cannot read, they are hamstrung in all other academic areas, including math and science” (p. 1).

At no other point in history has the ability to read and comprehend been more important, especially at the post-secondary level (Kamil et al., 2008). Ericson (2001) described that in today’s world, “increasingly higher literacy skills are required to function successfully in society” (p. 1). Daggett and Hasselbring (2007) affirmed that “The ability to find, analyze, and synthesize written information provides access to lifelong learning in a rapidly changing world” (p. 1). New standards of literacy in the 21st
century call for students to be able to solve problems by reading and comprehending (Spellings, 2006). In the past 50 years, there has been a downhill spiral in students’ reading abilities in the United States. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2007) and Kamil et al. (2008), reading scores of students in the United States have declined significantly. Although this decline can be attributed to factors outside the control of the school, the decrease in reading ability cripples students as they move through school and into college.

Moreover, most students who are graduating from high school do not have the skills to be successful in the college classroom. This is in direct contrast to the standards set up by the National Governors’ Association Center for Best Practices and the Council of Chief State School Officers. According to these standards, there should be a clear framework established to help prepare children for college-level work. Students who meet the literacy standards proposed by the Governors’ Association are those who can “pick carefully through the staggering amount of information available today in print and digitally” (Common Core State Standards Initiative: Preparing America’s Students for College & Career, 2010, English Language Arts Standards, para. 6). Unfortunately, however, one recent report indicated that “more than half (51%) of students showed they were not ready to handle the reading requirements of a typical first-year college course” (“Reading, key to college success,” 2006, para. 1). Once these students have completed college, their reading skills have not improved, and there is a large gap in what was learned in high school, what was learned in college, and what demands were placed on these students once they entered the workforce (Patterson & Duer, 2006; Spellings, 2006). In fact, Godt and Godt-Hansen (2007) affirmed that these college graduates are
not only at a disadvantage on a national level but also on a global level since “learning to read and write are essential skills because they are key ways for the students to obtain knowledge about the world” (p. 70). Without the ability to read and synthesize information, students will lack the knowledge necessary to be productive, informed members of society.

Literature Instruction

In the English classroom, there are several different areas of instruction and different ways to approach the delivery of content. Teachers of English are required to be skillful in such areas as vocabulary, grammar, composition, literary theory, and reading. One aspect of the English classroom is the teaching of literature, a subject that depends heavily on a student’s ability to read and comprehend. All teachers have different techniques that they use to teach literature to students. Agee (1998) argued that there are ideological approaches to the ways that people teach literature and that these ideologies shape a teacher’s instructional strategies. The teacher’s personal identity becomes part of his or her approach to instruction. Agee (2000) stated that “Teachers bring their own funds of knowledge from diverse settings to bear on pedagogy” (p. 7) in all content-area classes such as English.

Because the study of literature has long been a central element in the instruction of English and language arts, much debate surrounds how it should be taught (Applebee, 1993). Lapp, Flood, and Farnan (2004) suggested that literature instruction should focus on the following elements: perception (what the student noticed in the text), association (what the text reminded the student of), and affect (how the text made the student feel).
Others have assumed the stance that teaching students specific strategies works best when attempting to help students read and understand what they have read in any content area (Eckert, 2008; Schoenbach et al. 1999; Vacca & Vacca, 2002). However, Allington (2002) affirmed that the instructor and his or her facilitation of the instructional activities are more important than any strategy that can be taught to the student. While each of these approaches seems to be separate, the English teacher is faced with the task of deciding how to organize classroom instruction in a way that encourages independent reading of literary texts and that helps students connect with text in a way that makes reading meaningful to the students.

At the heart of English instruction is the necessity to teach students not only to read and study literature but also to appreciate what is read in hope that students will develop a positive attitude toward reading. In speaking of appreciation for literature, Pugh (1988) wrote the following:

Appreciation may be explained as the capacity to understand, learn from, and above all enjoy literary works. It involves the ability to read and respond creatively, sharing the author’s role by drawing on one’s own imagination and experience. The text enters the reader as the reader enters the text. Their worlds are joined. (para. 2)

Edmundson (2009) believed that the highest goal of a literary education is the ability to transform and help students grow. The instruction of literature is generally thought of as a way to give students a clear knowledge of culture or good taste or, as comparative literature and literary theory professor Rosenblatt (1995) referred to it, an “aesthetic” experience (p. 23). Barcus (2004), a professor of English at Baylor University, further
indicated that literature helps students understand themselves better and provides a form of “empowerment” (p. 132). Ferrari (2008) explained that the study of literature as an artful or creative experience has been lost in English courses and pushed aside for skills that people think are more practical. Ferrari further claimed that students are not able to develop an appreciation for the subject if they do not see it as an important part of life after school.

Most schools’ literature programs are divided into separate categories from other language arts skills such as composition or grammar. In her research on remedial education, Smittle (2003) pointed out that one extreme of literary instruction in schools focuses on basic reading in classes which are meant to be remedial in nature. Recognized as a leading authority on English language arts, Applebee (1996) stated that the other extreme is having separate literature classes—British Literature, World Literature, Multicultural Literature—that are seen as intellectually divided from any other type of reading instruction that is conducted in schools. Remedial reading does nothing more than repeat basic skills that students are already familiar with. Contrarily, instruction that focuses strictly on interpreting literature does nothing more than teach students to think of a literary piece only in light of specific literary areas—symbol, metaphor, allegory—and nothing else. In these classes, there is no direct contact with making meaning derived from the text or questioning how that meaning comes about (Applebee, 1996). Even though Scholes (1985) argued that interpretation is “a higher skill than reading” (p. 22), Eckert (2008) differentiated between remedial reading and interpretive reading by stating that “The gap between learning reading strategies and practicing literary interpretation forces students to make a prodigious cognitive leap from reading to
interpretation if they are to gain access to college, or college preparatory, English
classes” (p. 111).

Literature teachers are always faced with a variety of options when approaching
literature instruction. Traditionally, some instructors focus strictly on reading content
and factual information while others may focus more on literary theory, a topic that
Appleman (2000), an Educational Studies professor who taught high school English for
nine years, described as “arcane and esoteric” (p. 2) in the eyes of many English teachers.
Although there are a variety of ways to approach literature instruction, Grossman (2001)
pointed out that little research has been conducted to determine any benefits from the
variety of instructional approaches for teaching literature.

In recent years, educators have come to understand that readers bring their own
experiences to the reading of a text. Consequently, the teaching of literature has moved
from a strict analysis of the text to reader interaction with the text (Maxwell & Meiser,
2001). This type of teaching was referred to by Appleman (2000) as the “reader-centered
approach” (p. 26). This method of literary study requires students to be engaged and
active in their reading, affording students the opportunity to learn to not only analyze a
piece of text but to also analyze the world around them. Rosenblatt (1978) believed that
students’ interaction with the text is how meaning is derived. Teachers who use this
reader-centered approach encourage students to actively engage with individual assigned
texts. Brenner (2009) stated that “Readers in English courses must become active
readers” (p. 4), and for that to happen, teachers must find a way to encourage students to
actively engage with the text. When using this reader-centered approach in the
classroom, instruction moves from traditional ways of teaching literature, which are
sometimes objective and skills-based, to a method that is more constructivist in nature, one where the student creates authentic meaning from the text (Eckert, 2008).

As stated above, this engagement between text and reader is commonly referred to as the reader-centered approach. Pugh (1988) asserted the following view on the reader-centered approach: The instruction of reading should not control the experience of the reader but rather facilitate the way the reader structures his or her experience. Appleman (2000) pointed out that the reader-centered approach “has made the enterprise of literature teaching more relevant, immediate, and important” (p. 26). According to Rosenblatt (1978) and Iser (1978), the reader constructs meaning and knowledge as he or she reads and has interaction with the text. Maxwell and Meiser (2005) suggested that it is in those moments of interaction that students truly experience literature and have a better understanding of themselves and how they make meaning of the world around them. There are specific ways that teachers can provide support to students while they are reading a text from a specific content area such as literature; these strategies include the following:

1. Focus the discussion on students’ ideas and questions, first to capture the thoughts that students come away with at the end of a reading, and later, as they further develop their understandings.

2. Teach students to strengthen their reading abilities by showing them ways to discuss and think about a work.

3. Ask questions that move students to different stances in order to develop their understandings.
4. Foster student awareness and control of their envisionments through oral and written activities that make students’ thinking visible to themselves and others. (National Research Center on English Language Learning and Achievement, 2001, p. 5)

Reading Attitude and Reading Achievement

Research has shown that there is no better predictor of success in school than a student’s attitude toward reading (Freeman & Wasserman, 1987) and motivation to read (Vacca & Vacca, 2002). Library media specialists contend that “reading is essential for success in life and is the foundation for all learning” (James, 2003, p. 30). If this assertion is correct, teachers must help students improve their abilities to read, motivate them to read, and foster positive attitudes toward reading. Estes and Vaughn (1978) showed that student attitudes are “critical determinants of learning” (p. 59). In a study of 718 students’ attitudes about reading, Kazelskis et al. (2004) discovered that “Knowledge of students’ attitudes about reading, whether found to be favorable or unfavorable, is useful to educators and researchers in planning and evaluating instructional programs designed for individual students as well as programs designed for groups of students” (p. 29). Most researchers agree that attitude is “a learned response which is influenced by many environmental factors” (Fitzgibbons, 1997, p. 2).

However, most educators claim that attitude, since it is part of the affective domain, is difficult to measure accurately, and it may even be a product of a student’s cultural background (Marzano, 2003; Payne, 2005; Readence et al., 2004). Summers (1977) proposed that while a child’s cognitive ability may be a determining factor in that child’s academic abilities, affective intelligence determines if the child is motivated...
enough to reach certain academic levels. In relation to this theory, Davis (2008) wrote that motivations are part of an “affective context” (p. 47). In research on teacher-directed comprehension strategies, Nist and Holschuh (2000) affirmed that “affective influences can provide the motivation for self-regulated learning” (p. 81). In fact, in an examination of reading motivation and achievement, Baker and Wigfield (1999) declared that the motivation to read is a great contributor to a student’s success academically and to his or her reading achievement. A student’s attitude plays an important role in determining whether or not he or she comprehends what is read (Au, 1998). Furthermore, attitude also determines whether or not the student will become a competent reader (Kazelskis et al., 2004). When examining attitude, cultural factors, student motivation, and teacher attitude have been shown to have direct effects on students’ reading achievement and reading comprehension.

The effects of early exposure to reading and the way this exposure affects a student’s motivation to read are evident in the research. Kubis (1994) claimed that “The fortunate child begins school with a positive attitude toward reading as a result of rich and varied pre-school experiences” (p. 13). For these children, pre-school experiences are nurtured by a home environment where reading is seen as a priority (Teale & Gambrell, 2007). In their research on the use of trade books in the classroom, Galda and Cullinan (2003) found that homes that provide a variety of reading experiences where children are exposed to books and are read to generally produce children who have a positive view toward literacy and who have a motivation to learn. The motivation to read in early school years is pivotal to a student’s success in school and a student’s academic achievement throughout his or her school years and beyond (Biancarosa & Snow, 2004;
Early reading attitudes directly relate to a child’s reading ability as he or she matures, and these attitudes play a pivotal role in a child’s motivation to learn (Heilman, 1972; James, 2003). In their research on teaching children to use a range of active comprehension strategies, Tregenza and Lewis (2008) discovered that if a child has low reading ability, he or she may not have a positive attitude toward reading and quite possibly not be motivated to read. Lause (2004) found that reluctant readers do not have the interest to read nor do they feel that they will ever succeed at reading. In a study of students and their views on reading, Applegate and Applegate (2004) found that motivation is supremely important because it helps students have the desire to read, and the more they read, the better their comprehension level will be. Duggins (as cited in Kubis, 1994) and Schutte and Malouff (2007) confirmed that any study of attitude is truly a study of motivation.

Motivation plays an important role in a student’s scholastic performance. Wharton-McDonald and Swiger (2009) suggested that motivation is significant enough to influence comprehension development. Motivation can be affected by a number of outside influences such as the cultural backgrounds of children or pressure from children’s peer groups (Daggett & Hasselbring, 2007; Johnston, 1983; Vacca & Vacca, 2002). Galipault (2008) revealed that motivation is essential to the process of reading and is “tempered by attitude” (p. 12). Because motivation plays such a key role in developing students’ attitudes about reading, it is imperative that teachers learn how to motivate their students in order to help the achievement of students in reading.

In a case study of 12 young students, McCarthey (2001) found that students’ attitudes about reading and writing directly affected their motivation and achievement.
The researcher also determined that those who were not motivated were underachievers. On the other hand, Wigfield and Guthrie (1997) suggested that students who are motivated will spend more time reading. In the classroom, the goal of the teacher should be to “create conditions that not only allow students to read effectively but also motivate them to want to read purposefully and meaningfully” (Vacca & Vacca, 2002, p. 193).

The most difficult problem is determining where motivation is derived. Motivation can be divided into two categories: intrinsic and extrinsic (Galipault, 2008; Johnston, 1983). Jensen (2005) determined that intrinsic motivation is something that is guided by the individual and brings with it the satisfaction that a task produces a pleasant outcome or some type of enjoyment. Jensen further noted that extrinsic motivation, on the other hand, is where the motivation is something that is outside of the individual, or external. Because there are two types of motivation, the role of the teacher shifts to one where the goal is to find specifically which type of motivation works toward improving the reading skills of individual students.

While two types of motivation exist, it appears that intrinsic motivation—the drive from within—is most important in motivating students to read. Wigfield and Guthrie (1997) found that students who are intrinsically motivated to read will read more than those students who have low intrinsic motivation to read. Guthrie and Wigfield (2000) declared that motivation activates behavior. Those students who lack the intrinsic motivation to read generally have negative attitudes toward reading, and these negative attitudes cause students to avoid reading and thus lower their achievement levels in school (Wang, 2000). Tunnel, Calder, Justen, and Phaup (1991) discovered that achievement is “indeed driven by motivation” (p. 238). In their research on middle-grade
students, Wharton-McDonald and Swiger (2009) revealed that the motivation to read drove individual students to want to read more, and achievement was greater than that of the students who did not read. Thus it is imperative for teachers to not only provide external motivating factors to excite students and get them to want to read more, but there must also be a way to intrinsically motivate students if they are to develop the reading skills necessary to have high achievement in reading.

Achievement levels of students in reading are often in direct correlation to students’ reading comprehension abilities. For this reason, attitude has been shown to have an effect on comprehension. In studies on reading and achievement, researchers have found that the amount of reading a student does correlates directly to the achievement level of that student (Cunningham & Stanovich, 1997; Galda & Cullinan, 2003; Guthrie, Wigfield, Metsala, & Cox, 1999). James (2003) suggested that the attitude which children have toward a reading selection determines how much time they spend reading that selection and how well they comprehend what they read. Studies have shown that a student’s interest in reading material is a powerful predictor as to whether or not a student comprehends what he or she reads (Anderson, Shirley, Wilson, & Fielding, 1987; Bean, 2000). Wood and Endres (2004), in evaluating studies on students’ interactive processes with reading, suggested that an interest in a reading selection helps stimulate a student’s thinking about the selection. Cleworth (as cited in Tunnel et al., 1991) proposed that interests and attitudes are “virtually synonymous” (p. 238). It appears that teachers are not only faced with teaching reading skills to students who are not interested in reading, but they are also faced with preparing ways to interest students in the works that they will be assigned to read.
To reiterate, the motivation that a child has to read impacts his or her ability to comprehend. Matthewson (1979) stated that “In cases which motivation for reading is extrinsic, there is no relationship between attitude toward content and degree of comprehension but, in cases in which motivation [was] intrinsic, such a relationship exists” (p. 9). Nist and Holschuh (2000) related this intrinsic motivation to the individual student’s “self-efficacy” (p. 82). Furthermore, reading specialists Thames and Reeves (1994) and Guthrie and Wigfield (2000) contended that those students with negative attitudes are generally not motivated to learn, and this negative view causes them to have low achievement in reading. A student’s attitude is better when he or she is reading something that he or she is interested in reading, and this helps motivate the student to read more which, in turn, helps improve achievement (Alverman, 2003; Bean, 2000; James, 2003). In a study that evaluated 402 students’ attitudes about reading and their home literary environment, Nickoli, Hendricks, Hendricks, and Smith (n.d.) suggested that “Positive reading attitudes lead to positive reading experiences, which, in turn, lead to higher academic performance” (p. 1). It can be concluded, therefore, that the motivation to read is built on attitudes that are established before students even enter the classroom.

Once students are in school, however, the teacher becomes a key player in helping motivate students to read. According to Cochran-Smith (2004) and Friedman and Wallace (2006), the teacher plays an important role in the development of a students’ reading attitude and achievement in the content-area classroom. Galipault (2008) contended that teachers must inspire and motivate students to want to read. In fact, Scharer, Pinnell, Lyons, and Fountas (2005) showed that one goal of an educator is to
guarantee that students have an emotional response to reading that is positive and encouraging. When the experience is positive, it helps build students’ interest in reading, leads to an increase in comprehension, and helps improve attitude. And as Papanastasiou’s (2008) study on reading achievement found, attitude can indeed be taught.

In two studies that examined pre-service teachers’ attitudes toward reading, Nourie and Lenski (1998) noted that a teacher’s attitude is of great importance in students’ reading achievement. Anderman (1996) and Snow (2002) determined that the educator is in the prime position to influence students in a way that helps increase their motivation to read. In relation to motivation and attitude building reading comprehension, O’Connor (1986), in a study on teachers’ attitudes toward reading, disclosed that it is the role of the “teacher to assume the dual responsibility of presenting subject matter aimed at arousing interest in content material sufficient to encourage a desire to perfect skills necessary for comprehension” (p. 2). According to Friedman and Wallace (2006), content-area teaching includes helping students understand processes or strategies to successfully learn content material. Tunnel et al. (1991) further pointed out that teachers need “to monitor children’s attitudes as well as their achievement” (p. 242). In a report prepared for the United States Department of Education’s Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Snow (2002) wrote that the quality of the instructor is very important in relation to academic achievement. Because teachers play such a pivotal role, it is imperative that classrooms become environments that encourage reading, and teachers must develop ways to motivate and stimulate their students’ interest in regard to the material that is read in their classrooms.
As a result of their study on the attitudes of poor readers, Thames and Reeves (1994) developed a list of instructional elements that can be used to bring about positive changes in the attitudes of students. These elements include:

1. self concept
2. school achievement
3. school and home environments
4. socio-economic status
5. teacher attitudes and behaviors
6. parental attitudes
7. gender
8. individual interests
9. instructional strategies
10. maturation
11. intelligence. (p. 294)

The theoretical ideas related to improving students’ attitude and motivation continue to be examined by researchers who seek to find ways to improve students’ achievement and comprehension. Daggett and Hasselbring (2007) contended that “Low reading ability is a social stigma that can breed feigned or actual indifference to learning. Lack of reading proficiency undermines self-image and self-confidence throughout life” (p. 4). They further asserted that there are a high number of students who “fall through the cracks in reading instruction” (p.4). In a study on reading practice and reading achievement, Galipault (2008) affirmed that a positive attitude will lead a person to continue to engage in a task. The researcher also asserted “that children’s attitudes toward reading are
formed by their experiences, with positive experiences leading to positive attitudes and negative experiences leading to negative attitudes” (p. 31). Consequently, it is imperative that teachers create learning environments where reading is viewed as a high priority and where students are motivated and encouraged to read.

Reading Apprenticeship

The Strategic Literacy Initiative is a project of WestEd, a research and development agency headquartered in San Francisco, California. The researchers at the Strategic Literacy Initiative have developed an approach to complement content area instruction which they call Reading Apprenticeship (RA), which is a trademarked product of WestEd. The developers of Literacy Matters (2008) explained that the Strategic Literacy Initiative’s “Reading Apprenticeship framework combines affective and cognitive aspects to promote adolescents’ engagement and achievement in reading the variety of texts they face in their content area classes” (Program Purpose section, para. 1). In a study that examined inquiry contexts of utilizing the RA framework in a classroom of intermediate-level language learners, Mehdian (2009), a university faculty member who is involved in teacher training and curriculum development, showed in her research that RA is an approach to reading instruction that is “believed to have the potential to help young readers develop the knowledge, strategies, and dispositions they need to become more powerful readers” (p. 4).

Braunger, Donahue, Evans, and Galguera (2005) wrote that one goal of the RA framework is to help students develop skills to become strong, independent readers of a variety of texts. In addition, Schoenbach (as cited in Mehdian, 2009), determined that the
central aim of RA is to aid students in becoming better readers by (a) engaging them in more reading; (b) making the teacher’s discipline-based reading processes and knowledge visible to them; (c) making their reading processes and the social contexts, strategies, knowledge, and understandings they bring to the task of making sense of subject-matter texts visible to the teacher and to one another; (d) helping them gain insight into their own reading processes; and (e) helping them acquire a repertoire of problem-solving strategies with the varied texts of the academic discipline (p. 5). A classroom that utilizes RA strategies is one that has students and teachers interacting in such a way that students develop both confidence and competence as they approach the different kinds of texts in the content-area classroom. In a study on training teachers to use RA in their classrooms, Sipe (2006) stated that “Ultimately, RA is aimed at putting students in control of their reading processes” (p. 38).

Furthermore, Jordan et al. (2001), in a study that examined the use of RA in a middle-school classroom, claimed that the RA framework “also recognizes and brings to the surface the abundant resources adolescents can access from their own background and the multiple literacies that are part of their world in and out of school” (p. 15). Students in a classroom that incorporates RA strategies are afforded the opportunity to work with content-area experts: the classroom teachers. Jordan and Schoenbach (2003) asserted that when teachers use the RA framework to help their students read in the content area, they are indeed teaching the actual content of the course. Jordan et al. declared that “Learning and practicing strategies are not isolated from, but rather embedded in, authentic content area reading experiences, and are supported by an ongoing metacognitive conversation—lots of talk about when and why these strategies are
effective” (p. 19). RA is not additional work that the teacher must do; it is a way to facilitate and complement content-area instruction. The concept of embedding the reading strategies into the content of the classroom makes RA unique when compared to other types of reading methodologies. Strategies are not taught in isolation, but they are used to help students make sense of their content-area reading.

While preliminary research at the elementary and middle school levels indicates that the RA framework can be used as an effective method of improving students’ reading skills, there is a dearth of research on using RA in the college literature classroom. In fact, Bray, Pascarella, and Pierson (2004) acknowledged that most studies of college readers focus only on developmental readers and not the general college student population. Interestingly, they further contended that “relatively little is known about the literacy development of the general college population” (p. 306).

Theoretical Background

L. S. Vygotsky, the Russian psychologist who is best known for identifying a learner’s Zones of Proximal Development, posited that children learn from activities where they participate with other children who are considered to be more competent and who can provide support for accomplishing tasks that cannot be performed alone (McGuinness, 1993; Schoenbach et al., 1999). This theory supports the notion that when students cannot perform certain tasks alone, teachers must step in and provide assistance. In the classroom, teachers are the experts in their content areas, and as experts, they provide scaffolding for students to build upon by being mentors in class experiences; they also provide modeling of tasks that they want students to accomplish (Collins, Brown, &

Students, in turn, follow the process that has been modeled to build on their individual knowledge base and then collaborate with other students through group discussion to gain awareness of a variety of perspectives. Everyone in the class becomes a learner, including the teacher. In fact, all learners become teachers. In his experiences as a classroom teacher and later as a reading researcher, Wilhelm (2000) stated that “Vygotsky’s writings have convinced me that everything that is learned must be taught” (p. 60). With teachers modeling tasks to be accomplished, and students mentoring others students, everyone in the classroom is actively engaged in the learning process. Mehdian (2009) indicated that students are not allowed to be passive or disengaged from their learning when this approach to instruction is used. They are actively engaged in their learning.

Schoenbach et al. (1999) referred to this active engagement “as a social-cognitive interactive process” (p. 20). In research on reading in the content areas with an emphasis on theory, practice, and policy, Bean (2000) found that in classes that utilize this social-cognitive process, “meaning is socially constructed by teachers and students interacting with texts, media, and each other” (p. 631). These findings support the supposition that learning comes from prior knowledge and experiences, and learning changes with new experiences. As applied to the teaching of reading, the implication is that when students read, they use their individual prior knowledge to help them make meaning of the text. This concept is grounded in Rosenblatt’s (1978) theory of textual transaction which suggests that in order for meaning to be derived from text, a transaction must occur between the reader and the text. Furthermore, student response and discussion of the text
with other students helps build an environment that develops metacognitive skills and enhances students’ individual understanding of the textual content (Braunger & Lewis, 2006; Readence et al., 2004).

According to Pajares (2002), Bandura expanded upon this idea of social interaction among students and called it the social cognitive theory. This approach to learning, where a community of learners provides social interaction, is the basis of the RA approach to teaching and serves as one of the four dimensions of classroom life that the RA Framework identifies as necessary to build and nurture inquiry learning. In a study of both graduate and undergraduate literacy courses where students created questions that helped students read content texts strategically, Fordham (2006) noted that while using a social-cognitive approach to learning, teachers act as coaches—“they explain, guide, demonstrate, cajole, quiz, and more—all with an eye toward helping students grasp academic content” (p. 390). This kind of teaching Schoenbach et al. (1999) suggested can help develop a “cognitive apprenticeship” (p. 21) in which someone more knowledgeable is able to support someone who is at the beginning stages of learning.

Cognitive Apprenticeship

The notion of the apprenticeship system in the classroom is not new. In America, it has its roots in the early education of the New England colonies. Webb et al. (2007) stated that The Massachusetts Law of 1642 ordered that education must be provided to the children of New England by either their parents or “masters (of apprentices)” (p. 117). Of the apprenticeship system, these authors stated the following:
Education was also made available as a result of the apprenticeship system whereby a child was apprenticed to a master to learn a trade. In addition, the master was required by the terms of the indenture to ensure that the apprentice received a basic education. For some children this was the avenue by which they learned what little reading and writing they knew. (p. 118)

The apprentice was one who was actively engaging himself or herself in the task at hand and was “learning by doing with appropriate support and gradually moving toward skillful independence in the desired practice” (Schoenbach et al., 2003, p. 133). Furthermore, as described by Schoenbach et al. (2003), the apprenticeship system required that an expert provided mentorship to the apprentice, and the expert was the teacher.

The concept of apprenticeship is applied in the classroom that utilizes the RA framework. Schoenbach et al. (1999) stated that the type of apprenticeship that is used in an RA classroom is referred to as a cognitive apprenticeship. In a study where a cognitive apprenticeship was implemented in a classroom of preservice teachers, Osana and Seymour (2004) explained that cognitive apprenticeships take into account a student’s need to have a master/apprentice relationship within the classroom environment. In a case study that utilized a cognitive apprenticeship, Darabi (2005) found that a cognitive apprenticeship is a commonly recognized approach to instruction which has four guiding principles:

1. Content—Types of knowledge required for expertise;
2. Method—Ways to promote the development of expertise;
3. Sequence—Order of learning activities; and
Furthermore, Collins et al. (1987) pointed out that the cognitive apprenticeship has as its main focus the idea of examining students’ cognitive processes in order to accomplish a task and solve problems. In a classroom that utilizes a cognitive apprenticeship, “learning is considered a process of active knowledge construction that is dependent on the activity, discourse, and social negotiations that are embedded within a particular community of practice” (Osana & Seymour, 2004, p. 474). The purpose of engaging in a cognitive apprenticeship is not to elaborate on physical skills and processes like it is in the traditional teacher/apprentice relationship. Rather, a cognitive apprenticeship strictly focuses on the cognitive and metacognitive processes that are used in learning. Braunger and Lewis (2006) proposed that in a cognitive apprenticeship, the teacher serves as a model, and the modeling process is used to help students make connections to what they already know. Collins et al. stated that “Cognitive apprenticeship teaching methods are designed, among other things, to bring these tacit processes into the open, where students can observe, enact, and practice them with help from the teacher and from other students” (p. 6).

Because cognitive apprenticeships require a mentor relationship between teacher and student, and students engage in interaction with other students, the cognitive apprenticeship closely resembles Vygotsky’s (1978) idea of the Zone of Proximal Development: Students’ tasks are “slightly more difficult than students can manage independently, requiring the aid of their peers and instructor to succeed” (Virginia Tech, 2009, Definition section, para. 1). In classes that incorporate the cognitive apprenticeship approach, teachers provide scaffolding for students as they engage in the process of
completing a task, and the teacher slowly fades into the background as the student becomes more proficient in the given task (Collins et al., 1987; McGuinness, 1993; Mehdian, 2009; Snow, 2002). Jordan et al. (2001) indicated that “Support … comes through the teacher’s explicit modeling and mentoring as well as abundant opportunities for guided and increasingly independent practice in a collaborate environment, fueled by the intellectual energy that comes from shared inquiry” (p. 16). In any content-area, teachers can use cognitive apprenticeships to aid students in reading and understanding the different types of texts that are presented in their respective classrooms. The teacher and student mentor relationship is enhanced when the apprenticeship method of instruction is utilized in the classroom, and everyone involved, including the teacher, becomes a learner.

Four Dimensions of Classroom Life

In order to nurture reading inquiry through the cognitive apprenticeship approach and to build on students’ strengths, the RA framework enumerates four dimensions of classroom life. In their research on RA and its use in the classroom, Schoenbach et al. (1999) identified the four dimensions of classroom life as the following:

1. The social dimension “gives students access to each other’s reading processes and resources in a safe environment where they can also acknowledge their confusion and difficulties with text” (p. 24).

2. The personal dimension “focuses on developing and extending students’ individual identities and self-awareness as readers” (p. 22).
3. The cognitive dimension “refers to the mental processes skilled readers use, including their repertoire of specific comprehension and problem-solving strategies such as re-reading, questioning, paraphrasing, and summarizing” (p. 22).

4. The knowledge-building dimension identifies and expands “the kinds of knowledge readers bring to a text and further develop through interaction with that text” (p. 22).

Grady (2002) proposed that the four dimensions of classroom life were made “visible to students through metacognitive conversations that students and teachers engaged in about the texts that they are reading” (p. 4). Each of the four dimensions listed above cannot be seen as an isolated concept. These dimensions are the foundation on which the RA framework is built. Incorporating the dimensions into the apprenticeship framework, and thus into the classroom that utilizes this framework, helps students feel that they are in an environment that encourages personal inquiry, group discussion, and learning from one another.

Metacognitive Conversation

Flavell has been credited with first coining the term metacognition in 1976 (de Jager, Jansen, & Reezigt, 2005). Mehdian (2009) signified that metacognition refers to one’s knowledge about his or her individual cognitive processes. Simply put, “metacognition is when you think about what you read” (Strategic Literacy Initiative, 2008, p. 21). The invisible cognitive processes are brought to light through the apprenticeship of teacher and student when teachers provide scaffolding to help students determine how they think and why they think that way (Jordan et al., 2001). According
to de Jager et al. (2005), metacognition has two essential elements: skills, those “self-regulating activities” (p. 180) that are taught before, during, and after work begins on a specific task; and knowledge, where students are aware of their own cognitive processes and are becoming aware of the cognitive processes of others.

Mehdian (2009) found that metacognitive conversation is the “central dynamic” (p. 4) that brings together the four dimensions of classroom life in the RA framework. Jordan et al. (2001) argued that metacognition is “at the heart of the Reading Apprenticeship classroom” (p. 22). Ridley, Schutz, Glanz, and Weinstein (as cited in Halter, n.d.) stated that metacognition involves students “‘taking conscious control of learning, planning, and selecting strategies, monitoring the progress of learning, correcting errors, analyzing the effectiveness of learning strategies, and changing learning behaviors and strategies when necessary’” (What is Metacognition? section, para. 2).

In the classroom that utilizes the RA framework, the role of the teacher is to help the student develop the four dimensions of classroom life. These four areas of learning, consequently, help support reading development. The researchers at the Strategic Literacy Initiative at WestEd (1995-2009) stated the following about metacognitive conversation:

In metacognitive conversation, these four dimensions are integrated as teachers and students work collaboratively to make sense of texts, while simultaneously engaging in a conversation about what constitutes reading and how they are going about it. This metacognitive conversation is carried on both internally, as teacher and students reflect on their own mental processes, and externally, as they share their reading processes, strategies, knowledge resources, motivations, and
interactions with, and affective responses to texts. (Dimensions of Reading Apprenticeship section, para. 3)

Schoenbach et al. (1999) indicated that in metacognitive conversation, a person becomes acutely aware of his or her cognitive processes and then is able to discuss these processes with others. In a classroom where metacognitive conversation is used, teachers and students are able to discuss and determine strategies that they use to make sense of texts and collaborate on their individual strategy processes with each other through the means of a community of learners (Allan & Miller, 2000; Mehdian, 2009). Apprenticed readers become more aware of their reading processes through the use of metacognitive conversation.

As students progress through their early school years in elementary school and then move on to middle school, experiences with reading are mostly drill and practice and test-driven without much emphasis on critical thinking or comprehension (Ivey & Fisher, 2005; Williams, 2005). By the time these students are in high school, there is often little support for helping them develop appropriate reading strategies (Daggett & Hasselbring, 2007). Alnassar (2000) asserted that older students are expected to be more advanced readers, but without reading instruction at the secondary level, many schools “end up with a bottleneck of poor readers” (Clark, 2006, p. 66) in higher grades. Before they ever enter a college classroom, students have formed personal ideas about reading based upon their past experiences, and Zhang (2003) pointed out that students who are lacking in reading skills are most likely going to be the ones who do not obtain college degrees. Jordan and Schoenbach (2003) referred to the level of instruction that students have received in relation to reading as the “‘literacy ceiling,’ the invisible barrier that
blocks many young people from doing the kind of independent reading and thinking they may need to succeed in academic courses, higher education, and the workplace” (p. 8.).

The researchers at the National Center for Education Statistics (2003) stated that a large percentage of students enrolled in college in the year 2000 were enrolled in some kind of remedial education because of their lack of preparedness for college-level work. In the past few years, the percentage of students needing reading remediation at the post-secondary level has increased significantly (Perin, 2006; Pulley, 2008). Indeed, as Maaka and Ward (2000) contended, “Student inability to understand and apply information contained in their readings” (p. 111) is a problem that plagues a high percentage of post-secondary institutions in this country. This affects not only the productivity of the student who has to be remediated since it takes away time from his or her completing a college degree in four years, but it also carries a stigma with it for the student.

In order to build a classroom environment that utilizes metacognitive conversation, the researchers at WestEd recommend that teachers attempt to help students make sense of texts by incorporating various approaches to reading and literacy. These approaches are referred to as Reading Process Analyses or RPAs (Strategic Literacy Initiative, 2008, p. 19). Three suggested RPAs are Capturing Your Reading Process, Think Aloud, and Talking to the Text.

Reading Process Analyses

Capturing Your Reading Process offers as its primary goal the opportunity for readers to “set a purpose for their own reading, or to motivate themselves to read what may be a challenging text” (Strategic Literacy Initiative, 2008, p. 22). Using this process
in the literature classroom provides many benefits to students having trouble understanding the material that they are reading. After students read a short text, they are encouraged to write about how they read the text, noting any specifics about problems that they encountered along the way. Then, in small groups, students share what they have written, noticing any similarities with other students in the group. The main idea is for students to collaborate on similarities to see what approaches work best in aiding comprehension.

A second RPA suggested by the researchers at the Strategic Literacy Initiative is the Think Aloud. Since metacognition is simply thinking about the way that one thinks, the Think Aloud provides students with the opportunity to verbalize “their process of trying to make sense of texts” (Schoenbach et al., 1999, p. 56). Afflerbach and Johnson (as cited in McKeown & Gentilucci, 2007) “set the groundwork for the development of the Think-Aloud Strategy, first as a method of measuring the cognitive reading process, then as an application in the metacognitive realm in which readers use the tool to monitor comprehension” (p. 136). The Think Aloud process is something that must be modeled by the teacher (Vacca & Vacca, 2002). A teacher takes a piece of text (e.g., newspaper article, song lyrics, lines of poetry, etc.) and reads through it aloud, pausing to predict, picture, make connections, and identify problems as he or she reads. This visual process allows students to “externalize their meaning making as they work with a text. The ‘gist’ of the text emerges and is reconsidered and revised as readers work to make sense of the reading” (Strategic Literacy Initiative, 2008, p. 26). It was discovered that the Think Aloud accomplished three specific purposes:
1. It provides a method of inquiry to understand cognitive processing related to reading research.

2. It serves as a method of instruction.

3. It is an aspect of social interaction. (McKeown & Gentilucci, 2007, p. 137)

Talking to the Text, much like Think Aloud, allows students to pick apart the what and why of the text that they are reading. This process occurs while students are actively reading the text. The researchers at the Strategic Literacy Initiative (2008) stated that this is “initially an individual, or private, experience. Readers are invited to write their thoughts on the text as they read” (p. 29). Much like annotation, Talking to the Text allows students the individual opportunity to directly address the text itself (Nist & Simpson, 2000). Any problems with reading are noted, and there is a record of the thought process as students work through textual analysis. Think Aloud, on the other hand, does not have a record of individual thought since the words are spoken, as the name of the process states, aloud. “Talking to the text slows down and focuses the reading process, and gradually students begin to get more specific, noticing where they’re getting off track and what’s distracting them as well as making notes about what they’re understanding” (Jordan et al., 2001, p. 22). Group sharing, using “a small interpretive community to explore other viewpoints and to negotiate understandings” (McKeown & Gentilucci, 2007, p. 137), is another important aspect of Talking to the Text. After completing their individual Talking to the Text activities, students are given the opportunity to collaborate with groups of students to note similarities and differences of others as they work through understanding their cognitive processes. “In pairs or small groups, they can share their different markings, debrief their experience, compare this
experience to other RPAs, and discuss the text itself” (Strategic Literacy Initiative, 2008, p. 29).

Summary

There are numerous reasons why people read. Not only does a person read to enrich his or her life, but he or she also reads to understand and make sense of the world. Reading instruction begins in the elementary school years, but simply learning words on a page and being able to recite those words are not enough. Students must comprehend what is on the page in order for reading to take place. The developers of the National Institute for Literacy (2005) stated that the comprehension is the primary reason for a person to read.

After carefully reviewing the research on reading, it can be determined that teachers play an integral role in helping students learn to read, but as Moje (2008) pointed out, many teachers do not feel that they have the knowledge base in order to help students understand what they read or to help them improve their reading skills. In fact, many content-area teachers do not consider themselves to be reading teachers at all. Most teachers feel that once reading is taught in the elementary school, students in middle school, high school, and college should be able to read and comprehend text without support from an instructor. The United States government has established a mandate through the No Child Left Behind legislation that requires schools to monitor students’ reading achievement yearly while students are in school, but most of these efforts have left students with an assessment-based reading background where basic skills are
monitored by test scores, and, as Foote (2007) concluded, critical thinking and comprehension have been pushed to the side.

There is perhaps no skill more necessary to a student’s academic success than reading. Not only is reading an important consideration in academic success, but it is also an integral part of daily life in general. In fact, Cart (2008) and Payne (2005) discovered that students’ lack of reading skills may lead to many social problems such as poverty or even criminal activity. The crippling effect of poor reading skills is not something that ends when students graduate from high school. Many reports are indicating that most students who graduate from high school are not ready for college-level work, and this puts these students at a disadvantage not only on a national level but also on a global level (Godt & Godt-Hansen, 2007).

All content areas require students to be well-versed in reading skills, but in the English classroom where literature is taught, reading skills are a vital necessity. Because the reading and studying of literature are the central activities of the English and language arts curriculum (Applebee, 1993), the way that teachers approach literature instruction has a great effect on how well students perform in an English classroom. Some teachers focus strictly on finding factual information from reading, and others look more at a “reader-centered” approach (Appleman, 2000, p. 26). The reader-centered approach allows students to engage with the text. Appleman (2000) asserted that this approach makes reading literature more relevant to the student. If students see that the reading is important and meaningful to them, they will learn to appreciate it more and develop a positive attitude toward all reading.
Attitude has long been purported to be a great predictor of success and achievement in school. Attitude, however, is very difficult to measure, and it is affected by numerous factors such as cultural background, home environment, and even classroom experiences. Because Kazelskis et al. (2004) found that attitude determines whether or not students will become competent readers, it is imperative that teachers find ways to motivate students to read more because, as Wharton-McDonald and Swiger (2009) suggested, motivation is significant enough to help improve students’ comprehension development. When students are motivated to read, they will read more and thus improve their reading achievement. Because motivation is important in developing the attitude that students have about reading, teachers are in a prime position to inspire and motivate students to read (Friedman & Wallace, 2006; Galipault, 2008). Varying the instructional strategies that are used in the classroom can bring about more positive attitudes in students (Thames & Reeves, 1994).

In the English classroom, teachers use a variety of instructional strategies in order to ensure that comprehension occurs when students read. Traditional literature instruction methods can be used to introduce students to a variety of literature from around the world. Sometimes, however, these methods do not work to help build students’ comprehension of texts, and new ways to approach reading instruction are needed. According to Schoenbach et al. (1999), classrooms that incorporate the RA framework provide students with strategies to aid and to build comprehension and understanding. RA is an approach to teaching that is used to complement content-area instruction. One of the central goals of RA is to help students become strong, independent readers (Braunger et al., 2005). A classroom that incorporates the RA
framework has teachers and students learning from each other in a mentor relationship. This teacher-learner-mentor interaction is referred to as a cognitive apprenticeship (Osana & Seymour, 2004).

As part of the cognitive apprenticeship, teachers provide scaffolding to help students determine how they think and why they think that way (Jordan et al. 2001). When students think about the way that they are thinking, students are developing metacognitive conversation. Mehdian (2009) wrote that metacognitive conversation is what brings together the four dimensions of classroom life in the RA framework: social, personal, cognitive, and knowledge building. Schoenbach et al. (1999) determined that students who utilize metacognitive conversation are able to understand their own cognitive processes by collaborating and discussing their reading processes with other students and with the teacher. By discussing their individual reading strategies, students are able to make sense of texts (Allan & Miller, 2000) and can become better readers and thinkers. To help fully utilize metacognitive conversation, the researchers who developed RA have suggested using a variety of approaches to reading and literacy. Some of these approaches, commonly referred to as RPAs, include Capturing Your Reading Process, Think Aloud, and Talking to the Text.

It has been suggested that the RA framework provides students with skills that help develop their cognitive awareness and reading ability, thus aiding comprehension and providing the necessary motivation to get students to read more. However, more research is needed to determine the effectiveness of incorporating RA into the college literature classroom. Studies on literature instruction and reading have mostly been limited to elementary, middle school, and high school, and very few direct studies of
literature instruction have been conducted on the post-secondary level (Eckert, 2008; Langer, 1991). At the time of this study, the researchers at the Strategic Literacy Initiative had only been incorporating RA strategies and techniques at the junior college level for approximately three years. Consequently, research is needed to determine whether or not the RA framework can significantly impact students’ reading attitude and reading achievement in the literature classroom. School teachers, administrators, and college instructors could greatly benefit from the results of a study which addresses whether or not either method is best: traditional literature instruction or literature instruction using the RA framework. The results of such research could be used to determine which teaching method to implement as part of the curriculum to attain the best results for building reading comprehension and improving students’ attitudes toward reading.
CHAPTER III
METHODS AND MATERIALS

The purpose of this study was to compare the effects of literature using traditional methods to literature instruction using Reading Apprenticeship (RA) to determine if outcomes of attitude and achievement of students enrolled in World Literature courses are changed. The study took place on the campus of a junior college in the southeastern United States. This chapter outlines the research procedures including the research design, the research questions, the demographics of the participants, instrumentation, materials, procedures, data analysis, and limitations of the study.

Research Design

For this study, an experimental research design was developed. Fraenkel and Wallen (2009) stated that experimental research is “the only type of research that directly attempts to influence a particular variable and … it is the best type for testing hypotheses about cause and effect relationships” (p. 261). However, since this study took place in an educational setting, a true experimental design was not utilized. This is oftentimes the case with educational research since student classes are intact and random assignment is difficult, if not impossible, to achieve. Because existing classes that were scheduled during the semesters that the study took place would not allow the researcher to have the option for random assignment, a quasi-experimental design was utilized in this study.
The independent variable used in this study was the method of instruction. This variable had two categories to it: traditional literature instruction and literature instruction using RA. The dependent variables were the achievement results of students in the study on the pre- and post-Accuplacer-Reading Comprehension test and the results on pre- and post-Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment survey.

The course objectives for the World Literature classes were established by the English department at the college where the study took place. These objectives were the same for both classes as follows:

1. Students will read short stories and demonstrate comprehension of the stories and understanding of selected elements.
2. Students will study the novel and demonstrate understanding of selected elements.
3. Students will read poetry, recognizing types, structure, and selected elements.
4. Students will read plays and demonstrate comprehension of the works and gain an understanding of selected elements.

The class that served as the control group was taught using the traditional lecture method, and the students’ academic performance was evaluated using traditional testing methods such as multiple choice, true and false, short answer, and discussion questions. Students were given reading assignments, and they also were given study guides to complete before coming to class. Students worked in groups on the study guides, and these study guides were used as part of the large group discussion. The teacher instructed
the students to share answers to study questions with the class once everyone completed the group study guides.

In addition to this, the control group kept a reading journal in a composition notebook. The purpose of the journal was to require students to react or respond to what they had read. The journal writings used free writing and open response to such prompts as the following:

1. Write a summary of the story.
2. Rewrite one portion of the story.
3. Explain how you would change the ending of the selection.

The control group also was required to complete a small-group oral report for the course. Each small group was made up of two students. Because one unit that the control group studied related to Beginnings or Origins, the groups were given specific topics related to any Old Testament event or character to choose for this presentation. The groups researched material for the presentation in the library and prepared a PowerPoint presentation, prepared a visual aid (i.e., poster or transparency), and wrote a two to three page essay with two outside sources.

Furthermore, this group wrote a character analysis essay on one of the main characters in Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*. The students were given an assignment sheet that detailed information that was to be included in the introduction and explained how to prepare a thesis statement for a literary essay. The assignment sheet explained what each body paragraph was to include. Since this was an essay that required documentation, each body paragraph included at least two quoted references from the novel. Furthermore, a detailed explanation of the conclusion was included on the assignment
sheet. The conclusion had to include a restated version of the original thesis statement, and it had to summarize the main points of the overall essay. Finally, students were instructed to include a Works Cited page. Students were given class time in the computer lab to work on their writing assignment.

Lastly, the control group was required to complete four unit tests and one final exam as part of the overall grade for this course. Unit tests were given at the conclusion of each unit, and the final exam was given at the end of the course. The tests for these students consisted of 20% matching and 80% discussion questions. The tests were administered by the instructor of the class that served as the control group. A detailed outline of the course readings and testing dates were included in the syllabus for the control group. A copy of this syllabus is included as Appendix A.

The class that was the treatment group also was given reading assignments to complete before they came to each class meeting. However, for these reading assignments, students were required to complete Metacognitive Reading Logs. The logs served as prompts to get students to think closely about what they had read. In each of these logs, students were asked to predict what they thought about the story before it was read and then to complete a short summary of the story. In addition, students were asked to focus on their reading by thinking about what they were feeling as they read the story and what made the reading either easy or difficult for them. Finally, for the reading assignments, students were asked to think about what they did to aid in their comprehension of the story. By requiring the students to complete these logs, the instructor created an environment where metacognitive conversation, an important component of the classroom that utilizes the RA framework, was at the center of the
reading discussions. When students attended class, they had not only been assigned to read a selected work, but they had also been given a way to think about their reading process and how they made sense of the text. A copy of the Metacognitive Reading Log is included as Appendix B.

In addition to the Metacognitive Reading Logs, students were required to complete three reading analysis presentations. These short presentations were part of the ongoing metacognitive conversation that served as the basis of each discussion that has been established in this course. These reading analysis presentations required the students to create a PowerPoint presentation to discuss a reading assignment. For these discussions, students were given a list of questions that specifically related to their reading and processing of the text. The questions included the following:

1. Do you agree with the author’s point of view? Why or why not? Explain.

2. What distractions (wording, wordiness, content, story-lines, subject matter, writing style) did you have while trying to comprehend the story? Explain these distractions and describe if or how you were able to overcome these distractions.

3. What is the purpose of the story? Explain why you think so.

4. Were there parts of the story you had to reread in order to fully comprehend? If so, what lines or paragraphs did you reread, and why were these passages difficult for you?

5. What visual images did you see, and/or what sounds did you hear while reading the story?

6. What reading strategies did you use to help you comprehend the text? Explain and describe how and where you used the reading strategies in the text.
7. Give one question you would like to ask the author of the text that was not directly answered in the reading. Explain why you think the answer to the question is an important element to the reading of the text.

8. What was hard about reading the story and why (complex vocabulary, boring, hard to follow)? Give examples.

9. What thoughts, connections, or memories went through your mind as you were reading the story? Explain

10. Did you make any predictions about the story as you read it? What predictions did you make; which ones actually occurred?

In order to cover the content that was necessary to complete the presentation, students were instructed to choose 6 of the 10 questions to discuss with the class in a three-minute presentation. This allowed each student to discuss two of the questions within a one minute time frame. Furthermore, these presentations also served as prompts for classroom discussion. The questions for the PowerPoint presentations were included as part of the syllabus for the treatment group. A copy of the syllabus for the treatment group is included as Appendix C.

In the treatment group, students were taught how to Talk to the Text (Strategic Literacy Initiative, 2008) for their reading assignments. As part of their Metacognitive Reading Log grade, students were required to choose one sample of their Talk to the Text to turn in to the teacher for one-on-one comments and feedback. Talking to the Text is a form of annotation. When students use the Talk to the Text strategy, they annotate by recording their reactions to the text in marginal notes (Kirschner & Mandell, 2010). This reaction is a recorded form of a Think Aloud (Readence et al., 2004). Think Aloud was
modeled by the teacher first. The teacher took a piece of text (i.e., poem, short story, article, novel chapter) and read through it aloud, pausing to predict, picture, make connections, and identify problems as he read. In Think Aloud, “teachers make their thinking explicit by verbalizing their thoughts while reading orally” (Vacca & Vacca, 2002, p. 363). Students in the treatment group were encouraged to bring their Talk to the Text samples to class to use as part of small group discussion. During the discussion sessions, students participated in activities such as Think-Pair-Share, Evidence and Interpretation, and Final Word. Each of these group activities required students to utilize the text and their reading as the central part of the discussion.

In a Think-Pair Share, students were given the task to think closely about a reading assignment. Afterward, the teacher prompted the students with a specific topic about the reading assignment or allowed the students to create their own statements about the material that had been read. The students then paired with another student or students in a small group setting, and they were encouraged to share their thoughts on the assignment with one another. This interchange of thoughts helped foster open conversation about the reading assignment, and students were afforded the opportunity to see what other students thought about the reading selection (Strategic Literacy Initiative, 2008).

Evidence and Interpretation can be an extended form of a Think-Pair Share, or it can be an individualized activity. In this study, the teacher used both group and individualized activities. Students were prompted by the teacher with a specific topic related to the text. Students were then asked to provide specific evidence from the story supporting this prompt. In addition, students also provided an interpretation for each
piece of evidence that was found in the text. Their explanations in the interpretation were a way for them to use reasoning and logic to decide what they individually thought about the reading assignment (Strategic Literacy Initiative, 2008).

Final Word was a collaborative activity where each person in a small group setting was given the opportunity to allow others students to hear his or her perspective on a selected reading assignment. Participants in this activity identified one specific idea or statement from the text. In a small group setting, a facilitator was identified. The purpose of the facilitator was to keep time and to keep the students in the group focused and on task. The first person to speak identified his or her quote or idea from the text. This speaker had around three minutes to explain why this one statement was important to the overall context of the selected piece of reading. Once the three minutes were finished, the next person in the group had one minute to respond to what was said. The purpose here was to expand on what the original speaker said or to offer a new perspective on the selected quote. Each person in the group had a turn to reflect on the original speaker and the other speakers in the group. When everyone in the group had spoken and responded, the initial person—the one who started the discussion—had the final word. He or she got to reflect on what was said. The initial speaker agreed or disagreed or just simply reacted to the discussion. The person with the final word had one minute to respond. The process continued by moving to the next person in the group who began by sharing his or her quotation and who allowed everyone in the group to respond in turn.

Small group discussions were utilized in the treatment group to generate large group discussion with the entire class and to prepare students for the tests that were given
at the end of each unit. In the control group, tests were made up of matching and discussion questions. In the treatment group, tests were made up of multiple choice, matching, and true/false type questions. In addition to these types of questions, students in the treatment group were also asked to complete discussion questions that required them to utilize the information that they had read in the text. By completing these questions, students also provided textual evidence of their reading. Because there were different ways of achieving course averages in the class, and instructional and testing methods differed, final grades did not factor into the data analysis used in this study.

For this study, the researcher used a cluster random sample. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (2009), a cluster random sample results from the researcher selecting “groups of individuals, called clusters, rather than single individuals. All individuals in a cluster are included in the sample” (p. G-1). Four intact World Literature classes were included in the sample. For this study, the researcher was the only Reading Apprenticeship-trained instructor who taught literature courses, so he served as the instructor for the treatment group. The instructor for the control group was chosen from a list of volunteers. Random assignment was not possible because students involved in this study self-selected which class section in which to enroll.

An example of the research design which was used in this study is presented in Figure 3.1 below. As shown in this figure, the observations for this study consisted of a pre-test using the Accuplacer-Reading Comprehension Test at the beginning of the study to establish baseline data on reading achievement. The pre-test was conducted before any class instruction took place to determine students’ comprehension level before any instruction occurred. The Accuplacer also served as the post-test to determine if any
gains had been made in reading achievement. The post-test was administered in the last week of the semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment group</th>
<th>O₁</th>
<th>X₁</th>
<th>O₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>O₁</td>
<td>X₂</td>
<td>O₂</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O₁ = Accuplacer-Reading Comprehension Test; Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment
X₁ = Reading Apprenticeship Instruction
X₂ = Traditional Literature Instruction
O₂ = Accuplacer-Reading Comprehension Test; Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment

Figure 3.1 Quasi-Experimental Design

In addition to the pre-test and post-test, which measured achievement, the researcher also measured the students’ attitudes about reading at the beginning and end of the semester. The attitudinal survey provided the researcher with background information on each student’s reading history prior to course content delivery and at the end of the semester to determine if RA had an effect on the students’ attitudes. In order to do this, the teacher used the Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment, a self-report questionnaire. According to Readence et al. (2004), the self-report questionnaire is the most common method of assessing attitude. The creators of this survey used the test-retest method to determine reliability of the instrument, and the r value obtained fell at 0.84 (Tullock-Rhody & Alexander, 1980). The Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment was administered at the beginning of the semester as the pre-test, and it was also administered at the end of the semester as the post-test. A copy of the form granting
permission to use the survey is included as Appendix D. A copy of the attitudinal survey is included as Appendix E.

Extraneous variables in this study included the size of class, the ability level of the students, and the age of students. While it is possible that one of more of these variables may have served as a threat to the study’s internal validity, it was determined by the researcher than any potential effects would have a minimal impact on the outcomes of the study. In addition, because the college where the study was conducted had a policy that allowed students to self-enroll in courses, the size of the class, the ability level of the students, and the age of the students were outside the control of the researcher. Consequently, the range of each of these variables varied from group to group. Hence, while the researcher acknowledges that such effects may have been realized during the study, they were deemed to be unavoidable, and moreover, inconsequential.

The teaching style of the instructor was also identified as a possible threat to the internal validity of the study. In order to control for this variable, a comparison of the most recent ratings from the Student Evaluation of Faculty Effectiveness of the traditional literature instructor and the RA instructor was conducted. A review of the evaluations of the two World Literature instructors revealed that the instructor of the control group received an overall effectiveness rating of 4.95, while the instructor of the treatment group received an overall effectiveness rating of 4.77. With a possible range of 1.0 (lowest) to 5.0 (highest), these ratings indicated that the instructors were evaluated similarly by students and were equally effective in the teaching of the World Literature content.
Research Questions

The following research questions are offered for this study:

1. Is there a statistically significant difference in the attitudes of students enrolled in a World Literature course toward reading using a traditional approach to literature instruction versus the Reading Apprenticeship approach to literature instruction?

2. Is there a statistically significant difference in the mean achievement scores of students using a traditional approach of literature study versus the scores of students who use the Reading Apprenticeship approach to literature study?

3. Is there a statistically significant interaction in the mean attitude scores and the achievement scores of students using a traditional approach of literature study versus the Reading Apprenticeship approach to literature study over the course of the semester?

Participants

The participants in this study were 104 students enrolled in World Literature courses taught at a junior college located in the southeastern United States. The junior college is a two-year institution which offers Associate in Arts (AA), Associate in Applied Science (AAS) degrees, and vocational certificates. The enrollment at the college generally ranges from 4,800 students to 5,000 students each semester. The junior college is located in a small, rural town. According to college-wide data collected in the spring of 2010, gender demographics of the students enrolled in courses at the college were reported to be the following: 58.8% were female and 40.8% were male; 0.4% were
labeled as Not Reported. Student race demographics showed that 34.1\% of the students were classified as African-American while 62.6\% were classified as Caucasian; 3.3\% labeled themselves as Other. Although the college boasts a large population of non-traditional students, the average age of students was 23.3 years with 42.0\% being 19 or younger.

World Literature is a sophomore level course, and students who enroll in the World Literature courses must have already completed both English Composition I and English Composition II prior to enrolling in a literature course at this junior college. Both traditional students (i.e., those recently graduated from high school) and non-traditional students (i.e., those who have been out of high school for a number of years) take courses at this junior college, so the age range of students in World Literature classes varied starting as young as 18 with the eldest being aged 28.

There are a limited number of instructors on this junior college campus who have been trained in RA. In the English department, there are three instructors who have been trained, and only one of those instructors teaches literature courses. The researcher was the instructor who taught the literature class in which the RA strategies were incorporated. The instructor selected to use the traditional method was chosen from a volunteer list.

Instrumentation

In order to determine whether or not there was a gain in the students’ reading comprehension, the Accuplacer-Reading Comprehension Test, which is a placement test developed by the College Board (College Board, 2008), was administered to the students.
The test includes 20 multiple choice questions of two primary types. The first type of question is made up of a reading passage followed by a question which specifically targets textual information. The reading selections are a variety of both long and short passages. The second type of question specifically deals with sentence relationships. A passage is given followed by another sentence, and students are asked to determine if one passage relates to the other.

The Accuplacer is an adaptive test that increases in difficulty as each question is correctly answered. The level of difficulty for each question is determined by how well the student responded to the previous question. When a correct answer is given, the computer will move to a question that is slightly more difficult. Results for the test are presented in standardized format as described below:

The results for each test are presented as a standardized score out of 120, as a percentile rank and a standard error of measurement (SEM). The percentile rank compares the student’s score to the score of more than 30,000 test writers who composed the norming sample. A student score of 85 indicates a strong possibility of success in a College level reading course. (Jones County Junior College, 2007, p. 59)

The Accuplacer was given as both a pre-test and a post-test to measure changes in the level of reading comprehension. The Accuplacer served as an adequate measure of reading comprehension ability because in studies that examined the correlation between Accuplacer scores and students’ success rates in college classes, the Accuplacer test demonstrated an acceptable reliability in measuring reading comprehension with a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.87 (Mattern & Packman, 2009).
Thames and Reeves (1994) determined that “there has been increasing interest in the relationship between students’ attitudes toward reading and their achievement in reading; however, questions still remain about the exact nature of the relationship” (p. 293). Furthermore, Kazelskis et al. (2004) proposed that a reader’s attitude will determine whether or not he or she becomes a good reader. To assess students’ attitudes toward reading, a second instrument, the Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment, was administered to students at the beginning of the semester in both the control group and the experimental group to determine their reading attitude prior to any classroom instruction. This assessment also was given at the end of the semester so that the researcher could determine if any changes had occurred in students’ attitudes toward reading over the course of the semester in both the traditional literature instruction classroom and in the Reading Apprenticeship classroom.

According to Johns and Davis-Lenski (2001), the Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment can be used “to acquire a quantitative idea of students’ attitudes toward reading” (p. 27). Tullock-Rhody and Alexander (1980) identified three indicators of the validity and reliability of this instrument as a measure of students’ attitudes toward reading:

1. The scale measures what selected secondary students think are important indicators.

2. Teachers were asked to designate five of their students who had the most positive attitudes toward reading and five of their students who had the most negative attitudes toward reading.

3. The individual items retained on the final scale correlated above an
acceptable level of 0.40 with the total scale. (p. 611-613)

Tullock-Rhody and Alexander (1980) administered and re-administered the attitude survey to students in both rural and urban schools in Tennessee to test its reliability. This produced an acceptable r value of 0.84.

Materials

The basal textbook for the students in both the control and the treatment groups was *The Norton Anthology of World Masterpieces* published by W.W. Norton & Company. The textbook covers a variety of literary content. Part I covers ancient writings and begins with a translation of *Gilgamesh* and goes through the Roman Empire. Part II covers writings from the Roman Empire through Christian Europe; this section includes writings from India, Japan, and the Middle East. Parts III, IV, and V cover world writings from the Renaissance through the Romantic Age in Europe. Part VI focuses on the twentieth century. The students were also required to purchase a novel selected for the class by the teacher.

Throughout the course of study, students in the treatment group were assigned readings from the textbook, and the novel that was assigned was Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*. Each student was responsible for carefully reading through each assignment. Assignments for both the treatment and the control group included selected short stories, dramas, poetry, and an assigned novel. A copy of the syllabus for the control group is included as Appendix A. A copy of the syllabus for the treatment group is included as Appendix C. The syllabus for each group has a detailed list of all assignments for each course. The instructor of the treatment group used the textbook
selections and selected novel passages to model the Think Aloud process and Talking to the Text. Students in the treatment group were responsible for making careful notations in their textbooks to be used for Talking to the Text samples which were turned in as part of class assignments. In addition, assigned readings from the textbook and novel were used for Metacognitive Reading Logs that students in the treatment group kept throughout the course of the semester.

In addition to the textbook and the novel that were used as the primary reading materials for the class, other materials also were used. These included PowerPoint notes and transparencies that provided detailed background information about each reading selection and author. Furthermore, these notes were used to discuss characters, plot, figurative language, and thematic elements of each assigned story. Computers were made available to students for word-processing their essays and for completing the Accuplacer pre-test and post-test. Videos of drama selections such as Hamlet and Oedipus were viewed by the students. Students also watched a video of Victor Hugo’s Les Miserable. The instructor in the control group showed an author background video on William Shakespeare and Geoffrey Chaucer. Examples of the various Reading Process Analyses (RPAs) were modeled by the instructor for students in the treatment group. The RA instructor provided an example of a reading passage to show how the RPA was to be completed. Students in the treatment group were provided individual copies of the reading passages in order to make necessary notes to re-create their own RPAs. The instructor of the treatment group provided students in the treatment group with the teacher-selected reading passages and copies to use to complete any RPAs that required written work or group discussion on the part of the students enrolled in these
courses. Grades for the treatment group were generated from performance on tests, checks of Metacognitive Reading Logs, and reading analysis presentations.

In the control group, students also used the *Norton Anthology of World Masterpieces* and Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*. The instructor for the control group taught the class using thematic units titled: Creation Stories and Origins, Male and Female Relationships, Alienation of Self, and Revenge. The teacher began the semester with the film *Out of Africa* as an introduction to World Literature. Students were assigned a response paper to write about this film for bonus credit.

The first unit began with the epic poem *Gilgamesh* and then moved to Old Testament readings. As part of this unit, students were assigned to small groups of two members, and they were asked to create an eight-slide PowerPoint on the computer to present to the class. Throughout the semester, students in the control group were required to read excerpts from the textbook and to view videos of such works as *The Odyssey* and *Hamlet*. Students were required to read the novel *Frankenstein*, and then students viewed the video *Frankenstein*. After reading the assigned works and watching the films, the teacher in the control group required students to participate in large-group discussion comparing the text readings to the films. For each of these assigned readings, study guides were provided and throughout the semester, students in the control group were required to journal their thoughts and reflections on reading assignments. The instructor also required students to use computers to complete a Character Analysis essay assignment on Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*. Furthermore, computers were used to complete the Accuplacer pre-test and post-test.
Procedures

Before beginning this study, the researcher sought approval from the Vice President of Instructional Affairs at the junior college where the study was conducted. A copy of the letter granting approval for the study is included as Appendix G. Approval was also sought from the Institutional Review Board at Mississippi State University. A copy of the letter granting approval from the Institutional Review Board is included as Appendix H.

A meeting with all of the college’s literature instructors was held. The instructors were informed of the study’s purposes and plans for its implementation, and they were invited to participate in the study. The instructor who was chosen to participate in the study came from a list of volunteers. As previously stated, a review of the most recent Student Evaluation of Faculty Effectiveness ratings revealed that she had a similar overall effectiveness rating as that of the researcher, a major consideration for the design of the study.

Since all students enrolled in these courses were above the age of 18, the researcher met with the students, provided them a detailed description of what their participation in the study would involve, solicited volunteers, and distributed consent forms to those students who volunteered to participate. Consent forms were necessary because, as Fraenkel and Wallen (2009) stated, “researchers should carefully consider whether there is any likelihood of risk involved and, if there is, provide full information followed by formal consent by participants (or their guardians)” (p. 55). Students were given the opportunity to ask questions, and the consent forms were collected. Confidentiality was assured to all participants of the research study. The signed consent
forms were kept on file in a secure location throughout the duration of the study, and these forms will be kept on file for three years following the completion of the study (per Federal guidelines). A copy of the consent form is included as Appendix F.

At the beginning of the semester, students were administered the Accuplacer-Reading Comprehension Test to determine their beginning reading comprehension level. In addition to this test, students also completed the Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment. The scores from the test were kept in a locked filing cabinet to ensure participants’ confidentiality, and these scores will be kept on file for three years following the completion of the study (per Federal guidelines). The surveys were scored using a five-point Likert Scale. Tullock-Rhody and Alexander (1980) stated the following about the scoring of the attitude assessment survey:

To score the Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment, a very positive response receives a score of 5, and a very negative response receives a score of 1. On items 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 15, 17, 20, 22, 23, 24, and 25, a response of “strongly agree” indicates a very positive attitude and should receive a score of 5. On the remaining items, a “strongly disagree” response indicates a very positive attitude and should receive the 5 score. Therefore, on the positive item, “strongly agree” receives a 5, “agree” receives a 4, “undecided” receives a 3, “disagree” receives a 2, and “strongly disagree” receives a 1. The pattern is reversed on the negative items. The possible range of scores is 5 x 25 (125) to 1 x 25 (25). (p. 612)

Like the scores from the tests, the surveys were kept in a secure place to ensure the confidentiality of the participants. All surveys, along with consent forms, were kept in a
locked file cabinet in the researcher’s office. The only person who had access to the keys of the file cabinet was the primary researcher in the study.

At the end of the course, students took the Accuplacer-Reading Comprehension Test a second time to serve as a post-test for the study. Scores were printed and kept in a secure place. In addition, students again completed the Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment.

Data Analysis

Two groups were involved in this study: a control group, students taught using the traditional method of literature instruction, and a treatment group, students taught using the RA method of instruction. The data for this study were analyzed using The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences version 16.0. Descriptive statistics (e.g., means, standard deviations) were computed for each of the included measures. To address the three research questions established for this study, a repeated measures Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted. The repeated measures MANOVA design was chosen to determine whether a significant difference in achievement and attitude difference scores and the interaction between them existed between the two sample groups (traditional instruction and instruction using RA strategies). Alpha was set at .05, and the researcher reported an appropriate indicator of effect size.

Limitations

Due to the nature and design of the study, a small number of inherent limitations were identified to exist. One limitation of this study was that it was centered in only one
geographical area. The study was conducted at a junior college in the southeastern United States, so the findings are generalizable only to instructional settings that serve students with similar characteristics to those of this college’s students. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (2009), one cannot generalize beyond the sample that one is studying.

Another limitation that possibly affected the generalizability of the study was the nonrandom selection of the students who participated in the study. Randomization of subjects is always preferable in experimental designs, but when conducting most educational research, this is typically not possible (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). On the campus of this college, there was only one RA-trained instructor who taught World Literature in the English department, and the sample taken was determined by the students who registered for World Literature under the RA-trained instructor during the time period of this study.

The study was also limited in its application to a single content area. While RA can be used in any content area, for this study, the main area of interest was in the literature classroom, specifically World Literature, where the central focus of the content was based upon a heavy independent reading load. The results of the study, therefore, may not be generalized to instructional settings for disciplines other than literature.

Another limitation of the study involved the instrumentation employed to measure the students’ attitudes toward reading. The attitudes were measured by completing the Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment, which was developed for use primarily with students in grades 7 through 12. Since the attitude assessment was given to students in a junior college, using this assessment may be considered a limitation.
of the study. Because of the limited number of reading attitude assessments geared toward post-secondary students, however, the researcher chose the Rhody instrument because of the acceptable measures of validity and reliability that were established by the creators of the instrument (Tullock-Rhody & Alexander, 1980). Furthermore, the Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment is a self-report instrument. This presented a limitation to the study because on these types of instruments, students volunteer information on themselves, and individual student bias can possibly exist on self-report instruments.

Another limitation to the instrumentation resulted from the use of the Accuplacer-Reading Comprehension Test. This test was chosen because it is an accepted institutionalized test that is used for placement in English courses both nationwide and on the campus of the junior college where the study was conducted. Even though there were other measures that could have been used which had better test-retest reliability, this test was chosen because it was acknowledged by the administration of the junior college as an appropriate measure of reading comprehension for placement. The College Board (2008), in describing the Accuplacer-Reading Comprehension Test, stated that the “reading passages can … be classified according to the kind of information processing required including explicit statements related to the main idea, explicit statements related to a secondary idea, application, and inference” (Reading Comprehension section, para. 1). Because the RA framework has as one of its focuses the improvement of reading comprehension, the Accuplacer test served as a good measure of comprehension ability at the beginning of the course and a good measure of comprehension ability at the end of the course to determine if achievement had improved. In using the same instrument as
both the pre-test and the post-test, it might appear that testing could have been a threat to internal validity; however, the Accuplacer is a test that uses a different pool of like-kind questions each time the student takes a new test. Students were never presented with the same question.

World Literature is a sophomore level college course; thus students of a range of ages were involved in the study, and there is some possibility that this range of ages could result in confounding this study. Because the college offers dual-enrollment, some students can complete their pre-requisite courses prior to graduating from high school and can be enrolled in World Literature during the first full semester of their college career. Likewise, students who have been out of school for some time and are returning—often identified as non-traditional students—can enroll in this course. Consequently, the broad age range was unavoidable.

Finally, researcher bias could have served as a limitation of the study because the consent forms, surveys, pre-tests and post-tests were administered by the researcher to both the treatment group and the control group. This was unavoidable, however, as the researcher was the only instructor at the college who had received training by the Institutional Review Board. It should be noted, however, that if any effects were realized because of the role played by the researcher in the study, the effects would likely have been equivalent for both groups since the protocol for the administration of the consent form and for the two assessment measures was identical for both groups. Moreover, this limitation should be seen as unavoidable and inconsequential to the results of the study since the researcher administered all of the assessments in both the control group and the treatment group.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

The purposes of this study were two-fold. The first purpose was to examine the impact of RA on attitudes that students have toward reading in the literature classroom. Separate measures were made in both a literature class taught in a traditional manner and in a literature class taught using RA teaching strategies. An assessment of attitude commonalities and differences were made at the beginning of the semester and at the end of the semester to determine if a traditional approach to teaching literature or the RA approach to teaching literature had an effect on students’ attitudes toward reading.

The second purpose of the study was to compare the outcomes of a traditional method of literature instruction to the outcomes of the RA method of literature instruction to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in the reading comprehension achievement between the two groups. The students’ reading comprehension was measured with a pre-test at the beginning of the semester in the traditionally-taught classroom and in the RA classroom. At the end of the semester, a post-test was administered to determine if the RA approach to teaching had a statistically significant effect on the students’ reading comprehension or if the effect of the traditional method was comparable to that of the RA approach.
A total of 104 students enrolled in semester-long courses of World Literature at a junior college in the southeastern United States participated in the study. Data were collected over two semesters. The total number of students enrolled in the World Literature courses at the time of the study was 150. According to Krejcie and Morgan (1970), in their *Table for Determining Sample Size from a Given Population*, a sample size of 108 is adequate when the population a sample is extrapolated from numbers 150. Given this criteria, the researcher concluded that an N of 104 constituted an adequate sample size for the study. The instructor of the students in the control group used a traditional method of teaching literature while the instructor of the students in the experimental group used the RA approach. This allowed the formation of two groups: 68 students in the control group and 36 students in the experimental group.

**Demographic Data**

The following demographic data were collected in this study: gender, ethnicity, classification (i.e., freshman or sophomore), and age. The majority of the respondents were females (N = 66), while the two most reported ethnicities were Caucasian (N = 57) and African American (N = 44). Most of the students classified themselves as sophomores (N = 98), and the two most reported age groups were 18-20 years (N = 71) and 21-23 (N = 15). Table 4.1 presents the number of respondents and overall percentages for each of the demographic indicators.
Table 4.1 Gender, Ethnicity, Classification, and Age of Participants (n = 104)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 20</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 – 26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 – 29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 +</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attitudinal Data

For the purpose of analysis, descriptive statistics for each item on the Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment were calculated to determine beginning attitudes for all students in this study. Responses could range from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Items 1, 2, 3, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, and 21 were reverse scored so higher scores would indicate higher levels of agreement. The means for most of the items were above 3.0, and none of the items had means below 2.50. Overall, the standard deviations for each of the items indicated reasonable variability for most of the items, ranging from 0.75 to 1.44. Some of the items with lower means had higher standard deviations, indicating a noticeable amount of variability. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for the pre-survey scores was .96, which indicates that the instrument is within the acceptable range for reliability. Table 4.2 displays the means and standard deviations for each of the pre-survey scores.

Table 4.2  Item Statistics for Pre-Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. You feel you have better things to do than read.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. You seldom buy a book.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. You are willing to tell people that you do not like to read.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. You have a lot of books in your room at home.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. You like to read a book whenever you have free time.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. You get really excited about books you have read.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. You love to read.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. You like to read books by well known authors.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. You never check out a book from the library.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. You like to stay at home and read.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. You seldom read except when you have to do a book report.</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. You think reading is a waste of time.</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. You think reading is boring.</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. You think people are strange when they read a lot.</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. You like to read to escape from problems.</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. You make fun of people who read a lot.</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. You like to share books with your friends.</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. You would rather someone just tell you information so that you won't have to read to get it.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. You hate reading.</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. You generally check out a book when you go to the library.</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. It takes you a long time to read a book.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. You like to broaden your interests through reading.</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. You read a lot.</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. You like to improve your vocabulary so you can use more words.</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. You like to get books for gifts.</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Strongly Disagree…5 = Strongly Agree

Descriptive statistics for each item on the Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment also were calculated to determine the attitudes of the students after the treatment. Responses could range from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

Similar to the pre-survey scores, the means for most of the items were above 3.0, and none of the items had means below 2.50. Overall, the standard deviations for each of the items indicated reasonable variability for most of the items, ranging from 0.87 to 1.44. As with the pre-survey attitude scores, items 1, 2, 3, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, and 21 were reverse scored so higher scores would indicate higher levels of agreement. Some of the items with lower means had higher standard deviations, indicating a noticeable
amount of variability. The internal reliability coefficient for the post-survey scores was .96, which indicates the strength of the instrument’s consistency. The means and standard deviations for the post-survey scores are presented in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3  Item Statistics for Post-Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. You feel you have better things to do than read.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. You seldom buy a book.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. You are willing to tell people that you do not like to read.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. You have a lot of books in your room at home.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. You like to read a book whenever you have free time.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. You get really excited about books you have read.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. You love to read.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. You like to read books by well known authors.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. You never check out a book from the library.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. You like to stay at home and read.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. You seldom read except when you have to do a book report.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. You think reading is a waste of time.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. You think reading is boring.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. You think people are strange when they read a lot.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. You like to read to escape from problems.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. You make fun of people who read a lot.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. You like to share books with your friends.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. You would rather someone just tell you information so that you won't have to read to get it.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. You hate reading.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. You generally check out a book when you go to the library.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. It takes you a long time to read a book.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. You like to broaden your interests through reading.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. You read a lot.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. You like to improve your vocabulary so you can use more words.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. You like to get books for gifts.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Strongly Disagree…5 = Strongly Agree

The researcher then computed an overall mean for each individual who completed the survey by averaging all of their responses to each question. The researcher did this for the pre-survey scores and post-survey scores. Finally, the researcher obtained overall survey means by computing the average of all the pre-survey means and post-survey means for each of the participants. The mean for the pre-survey was 80.47 (SD = 23.32) and the mean for the post survey was 81.53 (SD = 22.87).

Achievement Data

Students were also given the Accuplacer-Reading Comprehension Test (a computer generated test) at the beginning and end of the semester to serve as a measure of reading achievement. This test, developed by the College Board (College Board, 2008), includes 20 multiple choice questions of two primary types. The first type of question contains both short and long narrative reading passages that serve as prompts for the questions that follow. The questions specifically target textual information such as main idea, application, or inference. The second type of question specifically deals with sentence relationships. A prompt is followed by another sentence, and students must determine if one passage is related to the other. The results of the Accuplacer-Reading Comprehension Test are presented as a standardized score with 120 as the highest number of possible points that can be earned. If a student scores an 85 or higher,
Accuplacer recommends the student for college-level reading. A unique identifier was used to match the participants’ pre-achievement scores and post-achievement scores without compromising anonymity. The pre-scores and post-scores of the Accuplacer achievement scores are presented in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4  Accuplacer Achievement Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Score</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>69.47</td>
<td>22.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>70.82</td>
<td>23.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score Range = 0 to 120

Next, the researcher split the participants into two groups—the control group consisted of 68 students who were taught literature using the traditional method, and the experimental group included the other 36 students who were taught literature using the RA techniques. The data were analyzed to determine overall pre-survey and post-survey and test score means by instruction type (i.e., traditional or RA). The means and standard deviations for the overall pre-survey and post-survey scores for both traditional and RA students are presented in Table 4.5. Likewise, the means and standard deviations for the overall pre-test and post-test scores for both traditional and RA students are presented in Table 4.6.
Table 4.5 Traditional and RA Attitudinal Survey Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction Type</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80.44</td>
<td>23.48</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80.29</td>
<td>22.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80.53</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>83.85</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score Range = 25 to 125

Survey scores decreased from the beginning of the semester to the end of the semester for the students who were taught literature using the traditional approach (-.15) while the survey scores slightly increased for the RA students (+ 3.32).

Table 4.6 Traditional and RA Test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction Type</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65.73</td>
<td>23.37</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66.35</td>
<td>23.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76.53</td>
<td>20.37</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>79.25</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score Range = 0 to 120

Test scores for the traditional group were noticeably lower for both the pre-test and post-test administrations when compared to the RA group. However, both groups did show an improvement in test scores from the beginning to the end of the semesters, although the RA group showed a larger improvement (2.72 versus 0.62).
Statistical Analyses

To determine if there were statistically significant differences in the attitude, reading achievement, and the interaction between attitude and reading achievement among students taught literature using the traditional method of instruction versus the RA method of instruction, the researcher used a repeated-measures multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). During the analysis, Box’s M test did indicate an issue regarding the homogeneity of variances for the groups (Box’s M = 10.49, \( p = .017 \)). Because the basic assumption of homogeneity of variance was violated, Pillai’s Trace was interpreted in the MANOVA output instead of the more traditional Wilk’s Lambda. Wilk’s Lambda results may be unstable or inaccurate when this assumption is not met, and as a result, the more stringent Pillai’s Trace test is used.

Analysis of the Data

Research Question 1:

Is there a statistically significant difference in the attitudes of students enrolled in a World Literature course toward reading using a traditional approach to literature instruction versus the Reading Apprenticeship approach to literature instruction?

The multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) did not indicate an overall statistically significant difference between the attitudes and achievement scores of traditional and RA groups, Pillai’s Trace = .046, \( F = 2.44, \ p = .095 \). However, the univariate comparison did indicate a statistically significant difference between the attitude scores of traditional students and RA students, \( F(1,102) = 4.15, \ p = .044, \ \eta^2 = .038 \). The attitudes of students who were taught World Literature through traditional
instructional methods experienced little change, and the attitudes of students who were
taught World Literature using the RA method significantly increased. While these results
of the univariate attitude scores are statistically significant, the effect size indicates a
relatively low phenomenon present in the study. The mean differences in attitude scores
for traditional students and the RA students are presented in Table 4.5.

Research Question 2:

Is there a statistically significant difference in the mean achievement scores of
students using a traditional approach of literature study versus the scores of
students who use the Reading Apprenticeship approach to literature study?

The multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) did not indicate an overall
statistically significant difference between the attitudes and achievement scores of the
traditional students and the RA students, Pillai’s Trace = .046, $F = 2.44$, $p = .092$. While
the univariate comparison did indicate a statistically significant difference between the
attitude scores of traditional students and RA students, $F(1,102) = 0.41$, $p = .525$, it did
not indicate a statistically significant difference in the achievement scores between the
two groups. The means and standard deviations for the overall pre-test and post-test
scores for both traditional and RA students are presented in Table 4.6.

Research Question 3:

Is there a statistically significant interaction in the mean attitude scores and the
achievement scores of students using a traditional approach of literature study
versus the Reading Apprenticeship approach to literature study over the course of
the semester?
The repeated-measures MANOVA did not indicate a statistically significant interaction between the traditional students and the RA students with regards to their pre and post attitude and achievement scores, *Pillai’s Trace* = .046, *F* = 2.41, *p* = .095.

Discussion

In the English classroom, a broad range of material is covered at the post-secondary level, and because of this, researchers have problems when trying to identify specific ways that teaching methods affect student behaviors and achievement. In fact, at the post-secondary level, very little research exists on literacy instruction in specific content areas (Eckert, 2008). In order to fill a gap that exists in the literature on post-secondary students’ reading attitudes and reading achievement, a quasi-experimental study that compared two different ways of teaching a post-secondary World Literature class was developed. The first method of teaching was identified as the traditional method of instruction. The second method of teaching incorporated RA strategies into the instruction. The three purposes of the study were (a) to examine attitudes that students had about reading in both classes at the beginning of the semester and at the end of the semester, (b) to assess achievement scores of students in both classes at the beginning of the semester and at the end of the semester, and (c) to investigate the possibility of an interaction between the attitude and the achievement of students in both groups.

Research on reading and how students feel about reading clearly supports the idea that students’ attitudes have an effect on their reading abilities. Freeman and Wasserman (1987) stated that the attitude that students have toward reading determines their success
in school. Many students move through elementary school, middle school, and high school with low reading abilities, and by the time that they reach college, they have developed reading habits that hinder their abilities to comprehend what they have read (Braunger & Lewis, 2006; Zhang, 2003). In the literature classroom, teachers depend heavily upon students’ abilities to independently understand what they have read (Anderson & Pearson, 1984; Eckert, 2006); however, most students simply expect teachers to explain the material to them because they feel that reading is a cumbersome activity that is not enjoyable (Eckert, 2008).

Because attitude is affected by a variety of factors, Kazelskis et al. (2004) proposed that it is important for teachers to understand students’ attitudes toward reading in an effort to help motivate students to read more. To help motivate students and to encourage their reading attitudes, teachers must use a variety of strategies and not simply use traditional methods where students read the assigned material and produce written work on that material based on a given assignment. Offering a variety of learning strategies in the classroom has been shown to bring about positive attitudes in students (Thames & Reeves, 1994). One method of instruction that incorporates a variety of teaching and learning strategies that are meant to help students become strong, independent readers is Reading Apprenticeship (RA). According to Mehdian (2009), RA is purported to have the potential to affect student dispositions to help them become better readers.

The results from the study presented herein revealed that a statistically significant difference was found in the reading attitudes of students who were taught using RA when compared to students who were taught using traditional instruction methods. Because
one of RA’s goals is to put students in control of their reading processes, it is hypothesized that the class taught using RA had a better attitude because they were introduced to a variety of ways to approach the reading of a text. When students enter a classroom with negative attitudes toward reading (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000), and they are taught using the same methods that they have always been exposed to in their classes, their negative attitudes do not improve. Hence, one can assume that offering a different approach could lead to a positive reading experience and thus affect students’ attitudes about the material that was assigned to be read in class. In the RA classroom, students were actively engaged in the process of reading, and engagement has been shown to motivate students (Braunger & Lewis, 2006; Lapp et al., 2008).

RA instruction incorporates a cognitive apprenticeship approach to learning. Teachers provide scaffolding to help students understand their individual thinking processes (Jordan et al., 2001). This idea of thinking about thinking is part of the metacognitive conversation that is a central component of RA. In the class taught using RA, the teacher emphasized the use of metacognitive conversation throughout the course of the semester by requiring students to complete reading logs and PowerPoint presentations which emphasized individual reading processes. In addition, students were periodically grouped with other students throughout the semester to complete a variety of Reading Process Analyses such as Think Aloud, Think-Pair Share, and Talk to the Text. The ultimate goal of these activities was to get students to think about their reading processes and share those processes with others in an effort to offer a variety of ways to approach the reading of a text (Schoenbach et al., 1999), something that research has shown to bring about positive attitudes in students (Thames & Reeves, 1994). By sharing
their individual reading strategies with others, students were able to see that there were a
variety of ways to understand and make sense of reading material. This finding supports
the theory, as proposed by Allan and Miller (2000), that hearing how others approach the
reading of a text and seeing how others make sense of the reading helps students become
better readers and thinkers. If students become better readers, then their attitudes toward
reading will change. At the time of this study, however, no identifiable research on
students’ attitudes in a post-secondary literature classroom that utilizes RA is available to
make comparisons or draw conclusions.

In the area of reading, attitude generally affects achievement. Estes and Vaughn
(1978) declared that attitudes are “critical determinants of learning” (p. 59). Wang
(2000) affirmed that students who have negative attitudes toward reading typically avoid
reading, and they have lower achievement levels in school. Wharton-McDonald and
Swiger (2009) also concluded that the achievement levels of students who do not read are
lower than the achievement levels of students who do read. The body of research on
literacy clearly indicates that attitude directly affects comprehension (Au, 1998) and
reading competence (Kazelskis et al., 2004). The finding of this study that revealed no
statistically significant difference in achievement levels of students taught using
traditional methods compared to students taught using RA is not consistent with the
research that affirms that attitude affects achievement. Students who were taught World
Literature using RA instructional methods experienced, on average, higher achievement
gains than did those students who were taught World Literature using traditional
instructional methods. While both groups of students did show achievement gains over
the course of the semester, the gains achieved by each were not statistically significantly
different. This might be attributed to the fact that students taught using RA instructional methods had pre-achievement scores that were much higher than students who were taught World Literature using the traditional method (76.53 versus 65.73). Therefore, since students in the RA group had higher achievement scores at the beginning of the semester, the students who were taught using RA methods of instruction would have had a better chance of improving because they started with higher achievement scores. Their higher achievement scores might also possibly explain why their attitude scores were statistically significantly higher than students taking World Literature using traditional instruction given that the literature supports the idea that attitudes toward reading directly impacts reading achievement.

The final purpose of this study was to determine if there was a statistically significant interaction in the mean attitude scores and the achievement scores of students taught using a traditional approach of literature study compared to students taught using the RA approach over the course of the semester. The study did not reveal a statistically significant interaction between attitude and achievement for either the traditionally-taught students or those students taught using RA. It is possible that the disparity in sample sizes between the groups could have been a confounding variable that prevented a statistically significant interaction from being detected within the analysis.

A review of the literature clearly reveals the many benefits that reading provides students; however, very little research has been conducted on literacy instruction in the college classroom and how it affects students’ attitudes and achievement scores. While it has been suggested that RA can provide students with skills that help develop their cognitive awareness and reading abilities, no research has been conducted on its effects.
This study was conducted to determine what, if any, effects RA had on the attitudes students held toward reading and their achievement levels in the study of World Literature. The results of this one-semester study indicate that using RA in the post-secondary literature classroom does improve students’ attitudes about reading, but the findings do not indicate that RA statistically significantly increases students’ achievement scores. This can perhaps be attributed to the short time frame of this study.

Summary

Data were collected from 104 students taking World Literature at a junior college in the southeastern United States. Of these 104 students, 68 were taught using a traditional method of instruction and 36 were taught using the RA method of instruction. Students were administered the Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Survey to determine attitude scores at the beginning of the semester and attitude scores at the end of the semester. The mean for the pre-survey was 80.47 (SD = 23.32), and the mean for the post-survey was 81.53 (SD = 22.87). The Accuplacer-Reading Comprehension Test was administered to assess students’ reading achievement at both the beginning of the semester and at the end of the semester. The mean for the pre-achievement test was 69.47 (SD = 22.87), and the mean for the post-achievement test was 70.82 (SD = 23.35).

A repeated-measures MANOVA was used to determine if statistically significant differences were present in students’ attitudes and achievement scores based on instruction type. Also, the repeated-measures MANOVA was used to determine if there was an interaction between attitude and achievement scores. The results indicated a statistically significant difference between the attitude scores of students taught literature
using traditional instruction and students taught literature using RA instruction. All other results were not statistically significant.

Teachers are in the position to positively affect the attitudes of students in the post-secondary literature classroom. In order to accomplish this goal, however, a variety of teaching and learning strategies must be used. The RA framework offers teachers a variety of ways to embed instruction within the content of the course. Students who are used to lecture and drill-and-practice procedures in the classroom benefit from being given the opportunity to learn in different ways. The greatest benefit that comes from offering a variety of strategies is the improvement of students’ attitudes about reading. Most often, attitude directly affects achievement. However, in this study, achievement scores of students who were taught using RA were not statistically significantly different from those who were taught traditional methods. More research needs to be conducted on achievement in the classroom that is taught using RA strategies.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The overall purpose of this study was to determine if Reading Apprenticeship (RA) had an effect on students’ reading attitudes and students’ reading achievement scores in a post-secondary literature classroom. The importance of reading and how instructional practices affect attitude scores and achievement scores are presented. Recommendations are offered for teaching literature using RA and for future research relative to the use of RA in the content-area classroom. A summary, conclusions, and recommendations resulting from this study follow.

Summary

A review of the literature presented five areas of research relevant to this study: (a) knowledge base for teaching, (b) the importance of reading, (c) literature instruction, (d) reading attitude and reading achievement, and (e) Reading Apprenticeship. The first area of research identified teaching as a profession that requires not only a knowledge base of content-area material but also a knowledge base of how to teach students to read in that content-area. Readence et al. (2004) pointed out, however, that many teachers do not consider themselves to be reading teachers. Most teachers believe that reading is a subject that is taught in the elementary school, and once students reach secondary or post-secondary levels of learning, they should be prepared to read independently without the
aid of instruction from a teacher. In some subjects, teachers can find ways to avoid requiring students to read a textbook, but in a subject such as English, which requires a heavy independent reading load, teachers cannot escape requiring students to read and understand textbooks independently (Sipe, 2006). Nichols et al., (2007) maintained that it is the responsibility of all content-area teachers to reinforce good practices in reading.

The second area that was researched focused on reading’s importance. Modern standards of literacy are higher than they have ever been. Some researchers go so far as to say that a child’s inability to read can lead to poverty or even crime once the child reaches adulthood (Cart, 2008; Payne, 2005). Poor literacy skills at the elementary school, middle school, and high school levels carry forward into college. This lack of literacy puts students at a disadvantage not only on a national level but also on a global level. If students do not have the ability to read, they will lack the knowledge that is necessary to be productive members of society.

The third area of research focused specifically on the literature classroom. In the field of English, teachers are required to teach a variety of subjects such as grammar, composition, vocabulary, and literature. Different techniques, such as literary theory analysis or the reader-centered approach, are used to teach literature to students. Lapp et al. (2004) asserted that literature instruction should focus on perception, association, and affect. Edmundson (2009) suggested that the highest goal of a literary education is to help students transform and grow. As part of this growth, students should develop an appreciation for what they have read. Rosenblatt (1995) referred to this as an “aesthetic” experience (p. 23). At the heart of understanding literary works, however, is the students’ ability to independently read and comprehend.
The fourth area of research was reading attitude and reading achievement. Attitude has long been seen as a predictor of success in school (Freeman & Wasserman, 1987). One goal of all teachers should be to help improve students’ attitudes toward reading. Some researchers propose that having information about students’ attitudes helps the teacher design and plan lessons that will, in turn, improve students’ attitudes (Kazelskis et al., 2004). Since attitude is part of the affective domain, it is very difficult to measure, and some researchers believe that it might even be connected to a student’s cultural experiences (Marzano, 2003; Payne, 2005). Because attitude contributes to motivation (Galipault, 2008; Schutte & Maluffe, 2007; Tregenza & Lewis, 2008), and students who are motivated to read generally comprehend better (Au, 1998), it is important to determine how to improve students’ attitudes toward reading. Teachers can help improve attitudes by providing extrinsic motivation to get students excited about reading, but teachers must also find a way to help students become intrinsically motivated if students are to develop the skills necessary to have high achievement in reading.


The final area of research examined in the review of the literature was RA. RA provides an affective and cognitive framework to help students engage in reading a variety of texts in their classrooms. RA’s main goal is to provide students with “the knowledge, strategies, and dispositions they need to become more powerful readers” (Mehdian, 2009, p. 4). The theoretical background of RA is based on Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development and on the social cognitive theory. When students get to a point where they cannot perform a task alone, they will need someone to step in and help
them perform those tasks. This help that is provided establishes the idea of the cognitive apprenticeship in the RA classroom (Osana & Seymour, 2004; Schoenbach et al., 2009). A cognitive apprenticeship provides students with a mentor who is able to step in and help move the student through a difficult task. In a cognitive apprenticeship, the focus is on cognitive and metacognitive processes that are used in learning. In the cognitive apprenticeship, students are actually encouraged to think about the way that they think. The teacher serves as a model for the students by sharing his or her learning and reading strategies. Students, likewise, share learning and share reading strategies with the teacher and with other students. Cognitive apprenticeships can be used in any content-area where reading is required.

In the RA framework, there are four dimensions of classroom life: (a) social, (b) personal, (c) cognitive, and (d) knowledge-building. These four facets of the classroom are essential in creating an environment where metacognitive conversation is at the center of class discussion. Each of the four dimensions is not an isolated concept. They work together to help strengthen the RA framework. Students are provided a social outlet where they share their thoughts about assigned readings. The personal dimension affords students the opportunity to become acutely aware of their own individual identities as readers. The cognitive dimension specifically refers to students evaluating the strategies that they use to make sense of texts (Braunger & Lewis, 2006; Jordan et al., 2001). Finally, the knowledge-building dimension culminates each of these other dimensions by expanding the various kinds of knowledge that students bring to the reading of a text (Schoenbach et al., 1999). In order to create a classroom environment that utilizes these four dimensions, teachers are encouraged to use Reading Process Analyses or RPAs
(Strategic Literacy Initiative, 2008). Three RPAs that can be used are Capturing Your Reading Process, Think Aloud, and Talking to the Text.

The literature review provided a framework for understanding what research has revealed in the general area of the importance of reading, traditional methods of literature instruction, and the use of RA at the pre-collegiate levels. A gap in the research was found to exist, however, in the use of RA at the college level. Hence, this study was designed to ascertain if RA could significantly help students’ reading attitude and reading achievement improve in the post-secondary literature classroom.

In an effort to determine if RA could be used in the post-secondary literature classroom to improve students’ attitudes and students’ achievement scores, a quasi-experimental study was conducted. The study utilized a sample of 104 students out of a total population of 150 students taking a World Literature course at a junior college in southeastern United States. Of these 104 students, 68 were taught World Literature using traditional instruction and 36 were taught World Literature using RA. The majority of the students in this study were college sophomores between the ages of 18 and 20.

Data that measured students’ attitudes toward reading and reading achievement were collected at the beginning of the semester as pre-measures and again at the end of the semester as post-measures. In order to measure reading attitude, the Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment was administered to students. To measure reading achievement, students were administered the Accuplacer-Reading Comprehension Test. Data were collected to determine if statistically significant differences in students’ attitudes and achievement scores would result as an effect of the type of instruction utilized by the instructor. The data were analyzed to determine if a
A repeated-measures Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used to determine if statistically significant differences were present in students’ attitudes and achievement scores based on instruction type. Also, the repeated-measures MANOVA was used to determine if there was an interaction between attitude and achievement scores. The results indicated a statistically significant difference between the attitude scores of students taught literature using traditional instruction and students taught literature using RA. All other results were not statistically significant.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, there is a statistically significant difference between the attitudes of students taught using different instructional methods (i.e., traditional approach versus the RA approach). The students who were taught using RA had higher attitude scores from the beginning of the semester to the end of the semester. Having found that there is a statistically significant difference in the attitude scores of students who are taught using RA leads the researcher to believe that RA should be incorporated into the post-secondary classroom. If students’ attitudes toward reading continue to improve through the incorporation of RA in the classroom, and this motivates them to read more, then it can be assumed that the achievement scores will improve over time.

Secondly, the gains in achievement scores of students taught using traditional instruction compared to students taught using RA were not statistically significantly
different in this study. However, the gains in achievement experienced by students taught using RA strategies were higher than the gains experienced by traditional students. While this study does not clearly conclude that RA instruction is the best method to teach World Literature, it does show that students experienced higher achievement gains than those of students taught using traditional methods. Perhaps more than one semester’s worth of data collection could prove to have significant impacts on student achievement. More research is needed to definitively conclude if RA instruction is more effective than traditional instruction in World Literature.

Students in college classes should be taught using a variety of instructional strategies, including those suggested by the Strategic Literacy Initiative, the developers of the RA framework. Most college classrooms maintain the tradition of using the lecture and test method, and for many students, this does not enhance reading comprehension. Wilhelm (2008) stated that older students require new strategies and techniques for learning. Incorporating a variety of learning strategies has been shown to increase students’ attitudes, and it is theorized that attitude does help improve achievement. If all college instructors focused on using a variety of teaching strategies, perhaps students’ reading skills would improve (Nichols et al., 2007). Based on the findings in this study, the use of a variety of instructional strategies did statistically significantly increase student attitude, but attitude did not statistically significantly increase achievement, a finding which is contradictory to research conducted in the field of reading. This could possibly be attributed to the one-semester time frame of this study. Students have a lifetime to learn to dislike reading, but it is very difficult in a few short weeks to adequately impact students’ attitudes enough to improve their achievement scores.
In order to increase college instructors’ abilities to be good reading teachers, more training needs to take place. Based on the findings in this study, all college instructors, who generally lack pedagogical training in the area of teaching reading, would benefit from workshops such as those offered by the Strategic Literacy Initiative. These intensive workshops provide instructors with strategy-based learning techniques within a variety of content areas. Instructors work through the different Reading Process Analyses as part of the workshop with a variety of teachers from different instructional areas. Teachers are afforded the opportunity to see how practitioners in other fields of study approach reading material in their classes, and this gives teachers the opportunity to view how students approach a variety of texts when they are enrolled in multiple classes.

The interaction between attitude and achievement was not statistically significantly different. The students who were taught using RA instruction had higher pre-achievement scores than those students who were taught using traditional methods. This inequality of achievement scores between the two groups at the beginning of this study could have made finding a statistically significant interaction harder to detect. When drawing conclusions about the two types of instruction from the results of the interaction test, the effect of the discrepancy of achievement scores at the beginning of the study between the two groups should be weighed.

Recommendations

The results of this study indicate the need for further study in a number of specific areas. Therefore, the following recommendations are offered:
This study was conducted at one junior college in the southeastern United States and cannot be generalized beyond that scope. Future studies should include students enrolled in colleges from different regions across the United States so results can be more broadly generalized.

This study employed the use of an instrument originally designed to measure reading attitudes of secondary students. Future researchers should design an instrument that measures post-secondary students’ attitudes toward reading to better measure this construct at the college level.

This study evaluated the reading achievement of post-secondary students in the literature classroom. Future studies should employ the use of an assessment that measures students’ metacognitive abilities to better understand how post-secondary students think while they are reading texts.

This study compared two different teaching methods in a World Literature class where a heavy emphasis was placed on students’ reading abilities. Future research needs to be conducted on teachers who have gone through training in employing reading strategies to determine if training has an impact on reading achievement and attitudes.

This study investigated students’ reading attitude and achievement scores in a World Literature class using two different types of instruction: traditional and RA. Future studies should examine students’ reading attitudes and achievement scores in other content-area classes which incorporate different instructional methods to broaden the understanding of post-secondary reading achievement across many disciplines. This will allow researchers to better understand which
methods of instruct best impact reading attitude and achievement in a variety of academic disciplines.

- This study utilized a quasi-experimental research design. Future studies should employ a mixed-methods analysis that employs both quantitative and qualitative research methods. A mixed-method research design will allow for both quantitative, generalizable data, and it will allow for rich, detailed data from participants that is often missed in studies that are strictly quantitative in nature.
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APPENDIX A

SYLLABI FOR THE CONTROL GROUP: SPRING AND SUMMER
ENG 2413—World Literature
Windham, Instructor
Syllabus—Monday Night Class—Spring
Phone—601.477.4063 (Office Hours 7:30 a.m to 2:30 p.m. M – F)

Texts and Materials:

Norton Anthology of World Masterpieces: Expanded Edition in One Volume
Novel: Mary Shelley’s Frankenstein
Journal
Manila Folder (regular size—not the long size)

Requirements:

- Purchase of the textbook, journal, and the novel
- Punctuality and regular attendance (3rd absence results in W from class)
- Missed or late written assignments and/or tests must be made up promptly
- Cell phones must be placed on silent or OFF

DISABILITY NOTICE:
Jones County Junior College students who wish to obtain educational accommodations due to qualifying disabilities should contact Ms. Katie Murphy, ADA/504 Coordinator, Office 117, Hutcheson-Hubbard Administration Building, (601) 477-4028. Documentation of disability may be required. Grievance procedures related to this area are available in this office.

Course Schedule

Week 1 -- 01/12          Introduce Mr. David Lowery—introduction of research study; consent form, Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment pre-survey
Lab Assignment with Mr. Lowery—Accuplacer Reading Comp. pre-test;
CERA
Film Presentation—Out of Africa
Bonus Assignment
Assign Gilgamesh for next week

Week 2 -- 01/19          Turn in Bonus assignment -- Out of Africa
Go over syllabus
Study guide/ Discussion questions
Group work
Assign Old Testament readings

Week 3 -- 01/26          Wrap up Gilgamesh—Complete study guide
Give Old Testament study guide
Assign OT oral reports for next week (give topics)
Film presentation—Cain and Abel

Week 4 -- 02/02          Old Testament oral reports

123
Discuss creation stories from different cultures
Group work—OT study guide
Review for Test #1

Week 5 -- 02/09  Test #1 Gilgamesh and Old Testament selections
Film presentation on Joseph

Week 6 -- 02/16  Give back Test #1 for folders
Film presentation—the Odyssey
Odyssey handouts: 24-book study guide and crossword

Week 7 -- 02/23  Go over 24-book handout
Group work—crossword puzzle
Complete Odyssey unit
Start Oedipus the King—assign parts
Start Oedipus the king

Week 8 -- 03/02  Finish Oedipus
Notes for test
Review for Test #2

Week 9 -- 03/09  Give study time prior to test
Test #2 Odyssey and Oedipus the King

Week 10 -- 03/23  Give back Test #2 and average grades
Assign parts—read Medea
Review for Test #3 on Medea (after spring break)

Week of 03/16  Spring Break

Week 11 -- 03/30  Test #3 Medea
Introductory info on Mary Shelley
Film presentation—Frankenstein
Character analysis essay handouts

Week 12 -- 04/06  Finish film—Frankenstein
Discuss text v. film
Discuss relevant parts of text
Discuss character analysis essay assignment
(To be written in class next week)

Week 13 -- 04/13  Q & A on character analysis essay
Complete essay in class (to be typed in lab next week)

Week 14 -- 04/20  Lab date—ESSAYS DUE
Week 15 -- 4/27
Essays back and discuss
Film presentation—Hamlet
Review for Test #4 next week—Hamlet

Week 16 -- 05/04
**Test #4—Hamlet**
Average grades
Review for Final Exam
Mr. Lowery: Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment post-survey, and Accuplacer Reading Comprehension post-test (computer lab); CERA

Week 17 -- 05/11
Final Exam—**Test #5**

**Course Summary**

Student grades will be based on a combination of the following:

- 4 unit tests @ 100 pts. each
- 1 character analysis essay @ 100 pts.
- Final exam @ 100 pts.
- Correct journal entries
- Bonus points for *Out of Africa*

600 Total Points
English 2413—World Literature
Windham, Instructor
Summer Syllabus—Monday Night Class
Phone—(601) 477-4063 7:30 a.m to 2:30 p.m. M – F
Email: cheryl.windham@jcjc.edu

Texts and Materials:

Norton Anthology of World Masterpieces: Expanded Edition in One Volume
Mary Shelley’s Frankenstein
Journal
Manila Folder (regular size—not the long size)

Requirements:

- All assigned reading must be done prior to class
- Purchase of the textbook, journal, and the novel
- Regular attendance
- Punctuality
- Missed/Late written assignments or tests must be made up promptly—you must be responsible.
- Cell phones and beepers are to be hidden from sight and on silent of OFF
  (PLEASE let me know if there are extenuating circumstances that I need to be aware of…such as sicknesses or other “emergencies.”)

DISABILITY NOTICE:
Jones County Junior College students who wish to obtain educational accommodations due to qualifying disabilities should contact Ms. Katie Murphy, ADA/504 Coordinator, Office 117, Hutcheson-Hubbard Administration Building, (601) 477-4028. Documentation of disability may be required. Grievance procedures related to this area are available in this office.

Course Schedule

Week 1—6/8
Course Introduction
Mr. Lowery: Consent Form, Survey, Accuplacer, CERA
Out of Africa Film Presentation (Response Paper for Bonus Credit)
Read Gilgamesh for next week/Study Sheet

Week 2—6/15
Journal
Gilgamesh Discussion
Group Work
Complete Study Sheet
Assign Old Testament Selections for Next Week
Assign OT Topics for Oral Presentations

Week 3—6/22
Journal
Begin Oral Reports/Group Presentations
Group Discussions/OT Study Sheet
Questions and Answers on OT Study Sheet  
Biblical Version of Creation and Various Other Creation Stories

Week 4—6/26  
(1st Fri. night)  
Journal (and any OT Oral Reports Not Completed Last Class Meeting)  
Wrap up *Gilgamesh* and OT Discussion  
Finish Study Sheets  
Review for Test #1  
(Test #1 – Gilgamesh and OT – next week)

*Odyssey* Introduction/ Notes and Handouts  
Film Presentation of the *Odyssey*

Week 5—6/29  
Journal  
**Test #1** on *Gilgamesh* and OT (Timed—45 to 50 min.)

Finish the *Odyssey* Film Presentation (if necessary)  
Discussion/Group Work on *Odyssey*  
24-Book Handout/Crossword Puzzle

Intro. *Oedipus the King*  
*Oedipus*—Choose parts and Read IN CLASS

Week 6—7/06  
Journal  
Finish *Oedipus the King*  
Notes/Discussion  
Review for Test #2  
(Test #2 on the *Odyssey* and *Oedipus the King* Next Week)

Intro. *Medea*—Choose parts and Read IN CLASS (at least ½ of the play)

Week 7—7/13  
**Test #2** on the *Odyssey* and *Oedipus* (Timed—50 min.)

Finish Reading *Medea*  
Review for Test #3  
(Test #3 on *Medea* Next Week)

Give Character Analysis Handout/”Bulls of Heaven” Sample Essay  
BEGIN Film Presentation of Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*

Week 8—7/  
**Test #3** *Medea* (Timed—40 minutes)  
Finish Film Presentation of *Frankenstein*  
With Remaining Time—Begin Writing Character Analysis IN CLASS  
(Type Character Analysis Essays in Class Friday Night)

Week 9—7/24  
(2nd Fri. night)  
LAB DATE: Type Character Analysis Essays IN CLASS  
CHARACTER ANALYSIS ESSAYS DUE AT END OF CLASS

Week 10—7/27  
Film presentation—*Hamlet*  
Discuss *Hamlet*—Test Is TONIGHT Immediately AFTER Film  
**Test #4** *Hamlet*
Review—Final Exam Next Week
Mr. Lowery: Survey, Accuplacer, post-CERA

Week 11—8/03  FINAL EXAM (Test #5)

Grades will be based on the following:

- 5 tests @ 100 pts each (including final exam, which is also worth 100 pts.)
- 1 character analysis essay @ 100 pts.
- Old Testament Oral Presentations
- Correct Journal Entries
- Response Paper for *Out of Africa*

Please do not hesitate to call or email me if you need help.
APPENDIX B

METACOGNITIVE READING LOG
Reading Log

(Place the title of the story on the line)

1. Before you actually read this story, what did you think it was going to be about, and why did you think this?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

2. After reading this story, write a very brief summary of what you read – a few sentences to one paragraph.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

3. What do you think and/or feel about what you read? Explain why you felt the way you do.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

4. What made this reading easy or difficult for you?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

5. What strategies did you use to try to improve your comprehension of the story? (Describe your strategies.)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

6. Write 1 sentence you thought had an interesting style in communicating the author’s meaning and tell why.

________________________________________________________________________

Page # where sentence is located_____ Paragraph # where sentence is located___________
APPENDIX C

SYLLABI FOR THE TREATMENT GROUP: SPRING AND SUMMER
Unit Objectives:

A. Students will read short stories and demonstrate comprehension of the stories and understanding of selected elements.
B. Students will study the novel and demonstrate understanding of selected elements.
C. Students will read poetry, recognizing types, structure, and selected elements.
D. Students will read plays and demonstrate comprehension of the works and gain an understanding of selected elements.

Texts:


Novel to be assigned by instructor: *Frankenstein* by Mary Shelley

Course Policies:

**Attendance:** In keeping with the JCJC absentee policy for Monday, Wednesday, and Friday classes, students missing 9 times will be withdrawn (W) from the course. For Monday/Wednesday and Tuesday/Thursday classes, students will receive a W after 6 absences. Three tardies constitute an absence. Students who are 15 minutes tardy will be counted absent.

**Late work:** Tests must be made up as soon as you return to school. No work will be made up after a week. You must have an official excused absence from Student Services to take a make-up test. Reading logs must be turned in on the assigned due date; these logs will not be accepted for late credit.

**Reading Logs and Talking to the Text samples:** All students will complete reading logs throughout the semester. There will be a total of 20 reading logs and 5 Talking to the Text samples turned in by the end of the semester. The entire reading log must be complete in order to receive credit; do not skip questions. Each reading log should be given a title; the title should be the name of the selection that you have read. Each student will choose a Talking to the Text sample to turn in with the reading logs; students are responsible for copying these samples from the textbook.

**Presentations:** Each student will be responsible for completing three reading analysis presentations at some point during the semester.

**STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES:** Jones County Junior College students who wish to obtain educational accommodations due to qualifying disabilities should contact Ms. Katie Murphy, ADA/504 Coordinator, Office 117, Hutcheson-Hubbard Administration Building, 601-477-4028. Documentation of disability may be required. Grievance procedures related to this area are available in this office.

The use of recording devices is prohibited in this classroom. All cell phones must be turned to silent and placed inside of a bookbag or a purse.
Withdrawal: Any student sensing any undue burden because of this class may withdraw before the tenth week and receive a W on the transcript.

Plagiarism: Any student who plagiarizes will receive a zero on the assignment. The student’s name will also be reported to the academic dean.

Grading: Tests will be objective and based upon your reading of the material assigned.

The grading scale is as follows: A: 90-100; B: 80-89; C: 70-79; D: 60-69; F: 59 and below

60%--Tests
20%--Reading Logs and Annotations
20%--3 Reading Analysis Presentations

LITERARY TERMS (on reserve in An Introduction to Literature (9th edition) in the library):

1. antagonist 16. motivation
2. aside 17. narrator
3. character 18. novel
4. comedy 19. omniscient narrator
5. dialogue 20. plot
6. elegy 21. point of view
7. fiction 22. protagonist
8. flashback 23. realism
9. foreshadowing 24. satire
10. genre 25. scene
11. irony 26. setting
12. melodrama 27. simile
13. metaphor 28. stream of consciousness
14. monologue 29. theme
15. mood 30. soliloquy

JCJC Portal Login: (make sure all letters are capitalized while logging into the Portal)
W0102569 (W and your JCJC complete id number)
JOSM2569 (first two letters of your first name, first two letters of your last name, last four digits of your JCJC id number)

JCJC Blackboard Login:
At the top of the JCJC homepage, click on eLEARNING. On the left side of the page, click on Jones Blackboard.
jsmith2569 (first initial of your first name, your complete last name, last four digits of your JCJC id number)
3265 (last four digits of your social security number)

JCJC Email Login:
jsmith2569 (first initial of your first name, your complete last name, last four digits of your JCJC id number)
102569 (your JCJC id number without the first zero)
Thinking About Your Reading

**Some Reading Strategies:**
- Highlight sentences you feel are important
- Write notes in the margin of the text
- Re-read sentences for clarity
- Question the text
- Question the author
- Make predictions as you read the text
- Visualize the text (picture in your mind)
- Summarize what you have read
- Think aloud while you read the text
- Read the text aloud
- Reflect the text in a Reading Log
- Use prior knowledge to help understand the text

**Talking to the Text**

1. Highlight any sentences you feel are important or you want to remember as you read the story.

2. Place a star beside sentences or paragraphs that you had difficulty understanding or had to reread for clarity.

3. Write a 2 – 3 sentence summary of the story in your textbook.

4. The following are examples of ways to annotate the story in the margins of the pages:
   - I wonder… I thought… I suppose… I could not believe it when…
   - I predict… I was reminded of… I don’t see… Why did…
   - I like the way the author… I got stuck when… I was surprised when…
   - I figured out that… I was distracted by… It bothered me when…
   - I felt confused when…

**PowerPoint Presentation**

Choose six questions from the following list to fulfill the three minute presentation time.

1. Do you agree with the author’s point of view? Why or why not? Explain.

2. What distractions (wording, wordiness, content, story-line, subject matter, writing style) did you have while trying to comprehend the story? Explain these distractions and describe if or how you were able to overcome these distractions.

3. What is the purpose of the story and explain why you think so?

4. Were there parts of the story you had to reread in order to fully comprehend? If so, what lines or paragraphs did you reread, and why were these passages difficult for you?

5. What visual images did you see, and/or what sounds did you hear while reading the story?

6. What reading strategies did you use to help you comprehend the text? Explain and describe how and where you used the reading strategies in the text.
7. Give one question you would like to ask the author of the text that was not directly answered in the reading. Explain why you think the answer to the question is an important element to the reading of the text.

8. What was hard about reading the story and why (complex vocabulary, boring, hard to follow)? Give examples.

9. What thoughts, connections, or memories went through your mind as you were reading the story? Explain.

10. Did you make any predictions about the story as you read it? What predictions did you make; which ones actually occurred?

**Presentation Grading Rubric:**

_____  25 points  **PowerPoint Slides:** (1 Title Slide and 6 Content Slides)  Grammar & spelling must be correct on each slide.

_____  30 points  **Delivery of Content:**

1. _____Student understood content he or she presented (10 points)
2. _____Student explained content using in a clear manner using specific references to the text (10 points)
3. _____Student addressed a minimum of six questions from the list given (10 points)

_____  25 points  **Time:** ______________  
under :59  -25  
1:00 – 1:29  -20  
1:30 – 1:59  -15  
2:00 – 2:29  -10  
2:30 – 2:59  -05  
3:00  -0

_____  20 points  **Slideshow Handout for Teacher:**

_____  -20 points  Presentation given on the due date (-20 points per class meeting it is presented late)

_____  **Total Points**

World Literature:  D. Lowery

**Unit 1**

**Beginnings (pages 3-9)**
- The Bible: The Old Testament—Genesis 1-3; Genesis 4; Genesis 6-9; Genesis 11; Genesis 37, 39-46 (pages 48-52; 52-71)
- Psalms 8, 19, 23; Isaiah 52-53 (re-read pages 51 and 52; read pages 82-85)

**Ancient Greece (pages 87-95)**
- Aristotle: From Poetics (pages 520-524)
- Sophocles: Oedipus the King (pages 388-433)
- Euripides: Medea (pages 433-465)

**India’s Heroic Age (pages 567-575)**
- The Bhagavad-Gita (pages 612-624)

**Unit 1 Test**
Unit 2

The Roman Empire (pages 626-631)
- Ovid: Metamorphoses (pages 683-699)

From Roman Empire to Christian Europe (pages 703-707)
- The Bible: The New Testament—Luke 2; Matthew 5-7; Luke 15; Matthew 26; Matthew 27; Matthew 28 (pages 708-722)
- Augustine: Confessions—Books I, II, III, VI, VIII (pages 722-736)

The Rise of Islam and Islamic Literature (pages 861-867)
- The Koran: 1., From 4., 12 (pages 868-880)

The Formation of Western Literature (pages 951-955)
- Geoffrey Chaucer (pages 1165-1171): The Pardoner’s Prologue and Tale (pages 1204-1217)

Unit 2 Test

Unit 3

The Renaissance in Europe (pages 1475-1483)
- Francis Petrarch: Italian Sonnets (pages 1484-1488)
- Niccolo Machiavelli: From The Prince (pages 1488-1502)
- William Shakespeare: Hamlet (pages 1629-1726)—media presentation

The Enlightenment in Europe (pages 1889-1897)
- Jonathan Swift: “A Modest Proposal” (pages 2027-2034)

Unit 3 Test

Unit 4

Revolution and Romanticism in Europe and America (pages 2137-2147)
- William Blake: From Songs of Innocence and of Experience (pages 2264-2272)
- William Wordsworth: Selected Poems (pages 2273-2284)
- Walt Whitman: From Song of Myself (pages 2305-2313)
- Emily Dickinson: Selected Poems (pages 2313-2322)

Realism, Symbolism, and European Realities (pages 2325-2337)
- Mary Shelley: Frankenstein (novel)
- Victor Hugo: Les Miserables (media presentation)

Unit 4 Test

Unit 5

The Twentieth Century (pages 2587-2613)
- Virginia Woolf: “An Unwritten Novel” (pages 2735-2746)
- Nadine Gordimer: “Oral History” (pages 2919-2931)

Comprehensive Final Exam: Unit 5 Test with Literary Terms
World Lit—Spring

**Three reading analysis presentations**

**Reading Logs and Talking to the Text samples**—20 Reading Logs and 5 Talking to the Text samples due by the end of the semester—4 points per page—logs must be handwritten; Talking to the Text samples must be copied from the textbook

**Week 1: January 12-16**
Day 1—Orientation; introduction to research study; consent forms; Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment pre-survey
Day 2—Computer lab for Accuplacer Reading Comprehension pre-test; CERA

**Week 2: January 19-23**
Day 1—O. T.: Genesis 1-3; Genesis 4; Genesis 6-9; Genesis 11; Genesis 37
Day 2—O.T. Genesis 39-46 (notes on story form); Psalms 8, 19, 23; Isaiah 52-53

**Week 3: January 26-30**
Day 1—Ancient Greece; Aristotle’s Poetics; Greek theater background
Day 2—Oedipus; discuss archetypes; 1st set of Reading Logs and Talking to the Text sample—4 Reading Logs and 1 TTTT

**Week 4: February 2-6**
Day 1—Medea
Day 2—India’s Heroic Age; The Bhagavad-Gita—

**Week 5: February 9-13**
Day 1—Unit 1 Test
Day 2—The Roman Empire; Ovid’s Metamorphoses

**Week 6: February 16-20**
Day 1—Ancient Rome and Christianity; excerpts from the New Testament
Day 2—Augustine’s Confessions; 2nd set of Reading Logs and Talking to the Text sample—4 Reading Logs and 1 TTTT

**Week 7: February 23-27**
Day 1—Rise of Islam: Koran—1, from 4 and 12
Day 2—Formation of Western Literature; Chaucer—The Pardoner’s Prologue and Tale

**Week 8: March 2-6**
Day 1—Unit 2 Test
Day 2—Renaissance; Petrarch’s Sonnets; Machiavelli’s The Prince

**Week 9: March 9-13**
Day 1—Shakespeare background video
Day 2—**Hamlet**: 3rd set of Reading Logs and Talking to the Text sample—4 Reading Logs and 1 TTTT

**Week 10: March 16-20**: Spring Break

**Week 11: March 23-27**
Day 1—**Hamlet**
Day 2—**Hamlet**

**Week 12: March 30-April 3**
Day 1—complete **Hamlet** discussion; The Enlightenment in Europe—Swift’s “A Modest Proposal”
Day 2—**Unit 3 Test**

**Week 13: April 6-10**
Day 1—Revolution and Romanticism in Europe and America; Blake and Wordsworth selected poems
Day 2—Whitman and Dickinson selected poems—4th set of Reading Logs and Talking to the Text sample—4 Reading Logs and 1 TTTT

**Week 14: April 13-17**
Day 1—Realism, Symbolism, and European Realities; **Frankenstein**
Day 2—**Les Miserables** film

**Week 15: April 20-24**
Day 1—**Les Miserables** film
Day 2—complete **Les Miserables** film; discussion

**Week 16: April 27-May 1**
Day 1—**Unit 4 Test**—5th set of Reading Logs and Talking to the Text sample—4 Reading Logs and 1 TTTT
Day 2—The Twentieth Century; Woolf’s “An Unwritten Novel”; Eliot’s “Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock”

**Week 17: May 4-8**
Day 1—Gordimer’s “Oral History”; CERA; class wrap-up and review
Day 2—Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment post-survey; computer lab for Accuplacer Reading Comprehension post-test

**Week 18: May 13-16**—Final exam week—need #2 pencil and Scantron sheet (Unit 5 test with Literary Terms from syllabus)
Unit Objectives:

A. Students will read short stories and demonstrate comprehension of the stories and understanding of selected elements.
B. Students will study the novel and demonstrate understanding of selected elements.
C. Students will read poetry, recognizing types, structure, and selected elements.
D. Students will read plays and demonstrate comprehension of the works and gain an understanding of selected elements.

Texts:


Novel to be assigned by instructor: *Frankenstein* by Mary Shelley

Course Policies:

**Attendance:** In keeping with the JCJC absentee policy, students absent 4 times will be withdrawn from the course (W). Three tardies equal an absence. If a student chooses to leave early, he or she will receive an absence OR tardy, depending on the amount of time spent in class.

**Late work:** Tests must be made up as soon as you return to school. No work will be made up after a week. You must have an official excused absence from Student Services to take a make-up test. Reading logs must be turned in on the assigned due date; these logs will not be accepted for late credit.

**Reading Logs and Talking to the Text samples:** All students will complete reading logs throughout the semester. There will be a total of 20 reading logs and 5 Talking to the Text samples turned in by the end of the semester. The entire reading log must be complete in order to receive credit; do not skip questions. Each reading log should be given a title; the title should be the name of the selection that you have read. Each student will choose a Talking to the Text sample to turn in with the reading logs; students are responsible for copying these samples from the textbook.

**Presentations:** Each student will be responsible for completing three reading analysis presentations at some point during the semester.

**STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES:** Jones County Junior College students who wish to obtain educational accommodations due to qualifying disabilities should contact Ms. Katie Murphy, ADA/504 Coordinator, Office 117, Hutcheson-Hubbard Administration Building, 601-477-4028. Documentation of disability may be required. Grievance procedures related to this area are available in this office.

The use of recording devices is prohibited in this classroom. All cell phones must be turned to silent and placed inside of a bookbag or a purse.

**Withdrawal:** Any student sensing any undue burden because of this class may withdraw before the specified date and receive a W on the transcript.
Plagiarism: Any student who plagiarizes will receive a zero on the assignment. The student’s name will also be reported to the academic dean.

Grading: Tests will be objective and based upon your reading of the material assigned.

The grading scale is as follows: A: 90-100; B: 80-89; C: 70-79; D: 60-69; F: 59 and below

60%--Tests
20%--Reading Logs and Annotations
20%--3 Reading Analysis Presentations

LITERARY TERMS (on reserve in An Introduction to Literature (9th edition) in the library):

1. antagonist 16. motivation
2. aside 17. narrator
3. character 18. novel
4. comedy 19. omniscient narrator
5. dialogue 20. plot
6. elegy 21. point of view
7. fiction 22. protagonist
8. flashback 23. realism
9. foreshadowing 24. satire
10. genre 25. scene
11. irony 26. setting
12. melodrama 27. simile
13. metaphor 28. stream of consciousness
14. monologue 29. theme
15. mood 30. soliloquy

JCJC Portal Login: (make sure all letters are capitalized while logging into the Portal)
W0102569 (W and your JCJC complete id number)
JOSM2569 (first two letters of your first name, first two letters of your last name, last four digits of your JCJC id number)

JCJC Blackboard Login:
At the top of the JCJC homepage, click on eLEARNING. On the left side of the page, click on Jones Blackboard.
jsmith2569 (first initial of your first name, your complete last name, last four digits of your JCJC id number)
3265 (last four digits of your social security number)

JCJC Email Login:
jsmith2569 (first initial of your first name, your complete last name, last four digits of your JCJC id number)
102569 (your JCJC id number without the first zero)
Thinking About Your Reading

**Some Reading Strategies:**
- Highlight sentences you feel are important
- Write notes in the margin of the text
- Re-read sentences for clarity
- Question the text
- Question the author
- Make predictions as you read the text
- Visualize the text (picture in your mind)
- Summarize what you have read
- Think aloud while you read the text
- Read the text aloud
- Reflect the text in a Reading Log
- Use prior knowledge to help understand the text

**Talking to the Text**

1. Highlight any sentences you feel are important or you want to remember as you read the story.

2. Place a star beside sentences or paragraphs that you had difficulty understanding or had to reread for clarity.

3. Write a 2 – 3 sentence summary of the story in your textbook.

4. The following are examples of ways to annotate the story in the margins of the pages:
   - I wonder…
   - I thought…
   - I suppose…
   - I could not believe it when…
   - I predict…
   - I was reminded of…
   - I don’t see…
   - Why did…
   - I like the way the author…
   - I got stuck when…
   - I was surprised when…
   - I figured out that…
   - I was distracted by…
   - It bothered me when…
   - I felt confused when…

**PowerPoint Presentation**

*Choose six questions from the following list to fulfill the three minute presentation time.*

1. Do you agree with the author’s point of view? Why or why not? Explain.

2. What distractions (wording, wordiness, content, story-line, subject matter, writing style) did you have while trying to comprehend the story? Explain these distractions and describe if or how you were able to overcome these distractions.

3. What is the purpose of the story and explain why you think so?

4. Were there parts of the story you had to reread in order to fully comprehend?
   - If so, what lines or paragraphs did you reread, and why were these passages difficult for you?

5. What visual images did you see, and/or what sounds did you hear while reading the story?
6. What reading strategies did you use to help you comprehend the text? Explain and describe how and where you used the reading strategies in the text.

7. Give one question you would like to ask the author of the text that was not directly answered in the reading. Explain why you think the answer to the question is an important element to the reading of the text.

8. What was hard about reading the story and why (complex vocabulary, boring, hard to follow)? Give examples.

9. What thoughts, connections, or memories went through your mind as you were reading the story? Explain.

10. Did you make any predictions about the story as you read it? What predictions did you make; which ones actually occurred?

Presentation Grading Rubric:

_____ 25 points  PowerPoint Slides: (1 Title Slide and 6 Content Slides)  Grammar & spelling must be correct on each slide.

_____ 30 points  Delivery of Content:
  1. _____ Student understood content he or she presented (10 points)
  2. _____ Student explained content using in a clear manner using specific references to the text (10 points)
  3. _____ Student addressed a minimum of six questions from the list given (10 points)

_____ 25 points  Time:  ______________  under :59  -25
  1:00 – 1:29  -20
  1:30 – 1:59  -15
  2:00 – 2:29  -10
  2:30 – 2:59  -05
  3:00  -0

_____ 20 points  Slideshow Handout for Teacher:

_____ -20 points  Presentation given on the due date (-20 points per class meeting it is presented late)

_____ Total Points

World Literature: D. Lowery

Unit 1
Beginnings (pages 3-9)
- The Bible: The Old Testament—Genesis 1-3; Genesis 4; Genesis 6-9; Genesis 11; Genesis 37, 39-46 (pages 48-52; 52-71)
- Psalms 8, 19, 23; Isaiah 52-53 (re-read pages 51 and 52; read pages 82-85)

Ancient Greece (pages 87-95)
- Aristotle: From Poetics (pages 520-524)
- Sophocles: Oedipus the King (pages 388-433)
- Euripides: Medea (pages 433-465)
India’s Heroic Age (pages 567-575)
- The Bhagavad-Gita (pages 612-624)

Unit 2
The Roman Empire (pages 626-631)
- Ovid: Metamorphoses (pages 683-699)
From Roman Empire to Christian Europe (pages 703-707)
- The Bible: The New Testament—Luke 2; Matthew 5-7; Luke 15; Matthew 26; Matthew 27; Matthew 28 (pages 708-722)
- Augustine: Confessions—Books I, II, III, VI, VIII (pages 722-736)
The Rise of Islam and Islamic Literature (pages 861-867)
- The Koran: 1., From 4., 12 (pages 868-880)
The Formation of Western Literature (pages 951-955)
- Geoffrey Chaucer (pages 1165-1171): The Pardoner’s Prologue and Tale (pages 1204-1217)

Unit 2 Test

Unit 3
The Renaissance in Europe (pages 1475-1483)
- Francis Petrarch: Italian Sonnets (pages 1484-1488)
- Niccolo Machiavelli: From The Prince (pages 1488-1502)
- William Shakespeare: Hamlet (pages 1629-1726)—media presentation
The Enlightenment in Europe (pages 1889-1897)
- Jonathan Swift: “A Modest Proposal” (pages 2027-2034)

Unit 3 Test

Unit 4
Revolution and Romanticism in Europe and America (pages 2137-2147)
- William Blake: From Songs of Innocence and of Experience (pages 2264-2272)
- William Wordsworth: Selected Poems (pages 2273-2284)
- Walt Whitman: From Song of Myself (pages 2305-2313)
- Emily Dickinson: Selected Poems (pages 2313-2322)
Realism, Symbolism, and European Realities (pages 2325-2337)
- Mary Shelley: Frankenstein (novel)
- Victor Hugo: Les Miserables (media presentation)

Unit 4 Test

Unit 5
The Twentieth Century (pages 2587-2613)
- Virginia Woolf: “An Unwritten Novel” (pages 2735-2746)
- Nadine Gordimer: “Oral History” (pages 2919-2931)

Comprehensive Final Exam: Unit 5 Test with Literary Terms
# World Literature: Summer (First Semester)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June 8</th>
<th>June 9</th>
<th>June 10</th>
<th>June 11</th>
<th>June 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to research study; survey; introduce Talking to the Text; Accuplacer; Vocabulary terms</td>
<td><strong>Beginnings:</strong> Old Testament: Genesis 1-3, 4, 6-9, 11, 37, 39-46; Psalms 8, 9, 23; Isaiah 52-53</td>
<td>TERMS due; Ancient Greece/From Aristotle’s Poetics; Greek theater background; discuss Oedipus</td>
<td><strong>1st set of Reading Logs and TTTT due;</strong> discuss Oedipus</td>
<td>Discuss Medea; India’s Heroic Age: The Bhagavad-Gita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit 1 Test/ The Roman Empire:</strong> Ovid’s Metamorphoses</td>
<td>From Roman Empire to Christian Europe: Luke 2; Matthew 5-7; Luke 15</td>
<td>From Roman Empire to Christian Europe: Matthew 26, 27, and 28</td>
<td><strong>2nd set of Reading Logs and TTTT due;</strong> Augustine’s Confessions; The Rise of Islam and Islamic Literature: The Koran</td>
<td>The Formation of Western Literature: Chaucer and The Pardoner’s Prologue and Tale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 15</td>
<td>June 16</td>
<td>June 17</td>
<td>June 18</td>
<td>June 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit 2 Test/ The Renaissance in Europe:</strong> Petrarch’s Sonnets</td>
<td>Complete discussion of Sonnets; Machiavelli’s The Prince; Shakespeare background information</td>
<td>Watch Hamlet</td>
<td><strong>3rd set of Reading Logs and TTTT due;</strong> Finish Hamlet; discuss play; The Enlightenment in Europe: Swift’s “A Modest Proposal”; Unit 3 Test</td>
<td>Revolution and Romantcism in Europe and America: Blake, Wordsworth, Whitman, and Dickinson poetry; begin Frankenstein notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 22</td>
<td>June 23</td>
<td>June 24</td>
<td>June 25</td>
<td>June 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4th set of Reading Logs and TTTT due;</strong> Frankenstein; Les Miserables film</td>
<td>Discuss Les Miserables film/Unit 4 Test</td>
<td><strong>5th set of Reading Logs and TTTT due;</strong> The Twentieth Century: “An Unwritten Novel,” “The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock,” and Gordimer’s “Oral History; Accuplacer</td>
<td>Survey; Final Exam: Unit 5 and Literary Terms</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

FORM GRANTING PERMISSION TO USE SURVEY
October 19, 2008

David C. Lowery
Mississippi State University
200 South Court Street
Elliott, MS 32447

PHONE: 662-325-8409
EMAIL: david.lowery@msu.edu


Yes, IRA grants you permission without fee for the use reproduced in your dissertation.*

IRA grants you permission without fee for the use of the above in your dissertation, thesis, research project.*

You are the author or the chief researcher, and IRA has no objection to your specified use of this material.*

The material you plan to use will appear as an adaptation and there is no fee.*

“IRA requires a credit line that includes authors, editors, title, publication, copyright date, and organization by the International Reading Association.”

Yes, IRA does not hold the right to this material. Please contact:

Thank you for your interest in IRA publications.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Janet S. Parrack
Rights, Contracts, & Permissions Manager
International Reading Association
parrack@reading.org
Fax: 302-368-2410
APPENDIX E

RHODY SECONDARY READING ATTITUDE ASSESSMENT
Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment

Directions: This is a survey to tell how you feel about reading. The score will not affect your grade in any way. Read the statements silently and shade in the box under the letter or letters that represent how you feel about the statement.

SD=Strongly Disagree
D=Disagree
U=Undecided
A=Agree
SA=Strongly Agree

1. You feel you have better things to do than read.  
3. You are willing to tell people that you do not like to read.  
4. You have a lot of books in your room at home.  
5. You like to read a book whenever you have free-time.  
6. You get really excited about books you have read.  
7. You love to read.  
8. You like to read books by well-known authors.  
10. You like to stay at home and read.  
11. You seldom read except when you have to do a book report.  
12. You think reading is a waste of time.  
13. You think reading is boring.  
14. You think people are strange when they read a lot.  
15. You like to read to escape from problems.  
16. You make fun of people who read a lot.  
17. You like to share books with your friends.  
18. You would rather someone just tell you information so that you won’t have to read to get it.  
20. You generally check out a book when you go to the library.  
21. It takes you a long time to read a book.  
22. You like to broaden your interests through reading.  
23. You read a lot.  
24. You like to improve your vocabulary so you can use more words.  
25. You like to get books for gifts.

Demographic Information: Please provide me with some information about yourself.

1. Place a check beside your gender:
   ______ Male
   ______ Female

2. Place a check beside your ethnicity:
   ______ Asian-American/Pacific Islander
   ______ Native American/American Indian
   ______ African American
   ______ Hispanic/Latino
   ______ Caucasian
   ______ Other

3. Place a check beside your current school classification:
   ______ Freshman (0-32 credit hours)
   ______ Sophomore (33-64 credit hours)

4. Place a check beside the age group that best describes you:
   ______ Under 18
   ______ 18-20
   ______ 21-23
   ______ 24-26
   ______ 27-29
   ______ 30-32
   ______ 33 and above
Consent Form

Title of Study: A Comparison of Traditional Instruction Methods versus Instruction Using Reading Apprenticeship on the Attitude and Achievement of Students Enrolled in World Literature

Study Site: Jones County Junior College

Name of Researcher(s) & University affiliation: David C. Lowery—Mississippi State University; Dr. Charlotte Burroughs—Mississippi State University

What is the purpose of this research project? To determine if Reading Apprenticeship has an effect on students' reading attitude or reading achievement

How will the research be conducted? Each subject in the project will be responsible for completing classroom assigned tasks in his or her world literature course. In both classes, subjects will complete a pre-test and a pre-survey; in addition, subjects will complete a post-test and a post-survey. One class will be taught using the traditional approach and one will be taught using Reading Apprenticeship strategies.

Will this information be kept confidential? All information will be kept confidential. Names will be removed from the tests and survey responses prior to analysis and the writing of any publications.

Who do I contact with research questions? If you should have any questions about this research project, please contact David C. Lowery at 601-477-4073 or Dr. Susie Burroughs at 662-325-7124. For additional information regarding your rights as a research subject, please feel free to contact the MSU Regulatory Compliance Office at 662-325-5220.

What if I do not want to participate? Please understand that your participation is voluntary. Your refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled, and you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits.

Please circle one of the following options below:

I agree / do not agree to participate in this research study.

Participant Signature __________________________ Date __________

Researcher's Signature __________________________ Date __________

You will be given a copy of this form to keep for your records.
APPENDIX G

LETTER GRANTING PERMISSION TO PROCEED WITH STUDY
November 4, 2008

Mr. David Lowery
Jones County Junior College
900 South Court Street
Ellisville, MS 39437

Mr. Lowery,

I am giving you permission to proceed with your Doctor of Education degree at Mississippi State University. Your goal to do an experimental study of reading attitude and reading achievement in world literature classes comparing the traditional method of instruction and those taught using the Reading Apprenticeship strategies will coincide nicely with your work on our QEP.

Best wishes as you continue your higher education at Mississippi State University.

Jim Kelly
VP of Instruction
Jones County Junior College
APPENDIX H

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
BEFORE SUBMITTING YOUR PROTOCOL FOR IRB REVIEW, MAKE SURE YOU HAVE INCLUDED THE FOLLOWING (IF APPLICABLE):

- ___Survey, Questionnaire or Interview Questions
- ___Consent and Assent forms
- ___Recruiting materials
- ___Permission letters from participating institutions
- ___Signed Investigator Assurance form
- ___Clear, concise description of procedures to be used (Feel free to also attach any proposals that may further explain your project.)

Additionally, these assurances must be made:

- ___All personnel listed must have completed IRB/Human Subjects Training. If not, your application cannot be approved until the training has been completed. See our website for training information. [http://www.msstate.edu/dept/compliance/irb/irbtraining.htm](http://www.msstate.edu/dept/compliance/irb/irbtraining.htm)

- ___IF APPLICABLE, THE ADVISOR HAS THOROUGHLY REVIEWED THIS APPLICATION TO ENSURE READABILITY AND ACCURACY.

PLEASE NOTE:

- THE DETERMINATION OF THE IRB WILL BE COMMUNICATED TO YOU IN WRITING. SUBMISSION OF AN APPLICATION TO THE IRB DOES NOT EQUAL IRB APPROVAL. YOU MAY NOT BEGIN THIS RESEARCH UNTIL YOU HAVE IRB APPROVAL.

- IF YOUR RESEARCH HAS NOT YET RECEIVED FUNDING NEEDED TO CREATE INSTRUMENTS AND OTHER ASSOCIATED MATERIALS, PROVIDE A TIMELINE OF WHEN THOSE ITEMS WILL BE DEVELOPED. YOUR APPLICATION WILL BE REVIEWED FOR “118 DESIGNATION” (SEE [http://www.msstate.edu/dept/compliance/irb/irbawardchanges.htm](http://www.msstate.edu/dept/compliance/irb/irbawardchanges.htm) FOR MORE DETAILS).

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact our office at 325-5220 or by email at irb@research.msstate.edu

Send to:
IRB
Campus Mailstop 9563
PO Box 6223, Mississippi State, MS 39762
8A Morgan Street

INVESTIGATOR'S ASSURANCE
Mississippi State University
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Institutional Review Board

Project Title: A Comparison of Traditional Instruction Methods versus Instruction Using Reading Apprenticeship on the Attitude and Achievement of Students Enrolled in World Literature

As Primary Investigator, I have ultimate responsibility for the performance of this study, the protection of the rights and welfare of the human subjects, and strict adherence by all co-investigators and research personnel to all Institutional Review Board (IRB) requirements, federal regulations, and state statutes for human subjects research. I hereby assure the following:

The information provided in this application is accurate to the best of my knowledge.

All named individuals on this project have been given a copy of the protocol and have acknowledged an understanding of the procedures outlined in the application.

All experiments and procedures involving human subjects will be performed under my supervision or that of another qualified professional listed on this protocol.

I understand that, should I use the project described in this application as a basis for a proposal for funding (either intramural or extramural), it is my responsibility to ensure that the description of human subjects use in the funding proposal(s) is identical in principle to that contained in this application. I will submit modifications and/or changes to the IRB as necessary to ensure these are identical.

I and all the co-investigators and research personnel in this study agree to comply with all applicable requirements for the protection of human subjects in research including, but not limited to, the following:

- Obtaining the legally effective informed consent of all human subjects or their legally authorized representatives, and using only the currently approved, consent form (if applicable); and
- Making no changes to the approved protocol or consent form without first having submitted those changes for review and approval by the Institutional Review Board; and
- Reporting serious and unexpected adverse effects to IRB Administration verbally within 48 hours and in writing within 10 days of occurrence, and all other unexpected adverse events in writing within 10 days of occurrence; and
- Promptly providing the IRB with any information requested relative to the project; and
- Promptly and completely complying with an IRB decision to suspend or withdraw its approval for the project; and
- Obtaining continuing review prior to the date approval for this study expires. I understand if I fail to apply for continuing review, approval for the study will automatically expire, and study activity must cease until IRB current approval is obtained.
- Your study and any associated records may be audited by the IRB to ensure compliance with the approved protocol.

Name of Primary Investigator / Researcher: David C. Lowery

Signature:

I assume responsibility for ensuring the competence, integrity and ethical conduct of the investigator(s) for this research project. The investigator(s) is/are fully competent to accomplish the goals and techniques stated in the attached proposal. Further, I certify that I have thoroughly reviewed this application for readability and accuracy and the study is clearly described herein.

Name of Advisor: Charlotte Burroughs

Signature:

THE MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH
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Protocol Submission Form

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR / RESEARCHER INFORMATION
Name: Dr./Mr./Ms. David C. Lowery
MSU Net ID: dcl17
Daytime Phone Number: 601-477-4073 (office)
Mailing Address: 900 South Court Street
City/State/Zip: Ellisville, MS 39437
E-Mail Address: david.lowery@jcjc.edu
Department: Curriculum and Instruction
IRB and Human Subjects Protections Education completed on June 6, 2008

FACULTY ADVISOR (Faculty member supervising the student for this project)
If you are a student, you must have an advisor for this project.
Advisor: Charlotte Burroughs
MSU Net ID: cdb27
Daytime Phone Number: 662.325.7124
Advisor’s E-Mail Address: susie.burroughs@msstate.edu
Department: Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education
Campus Mail Stop: 9705
IRB and Human Subjects Protections Education completed on April 30, 2008

ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATORS / RESEARCHERS
Will additional researchers be involved with this project? If so, list them along with their Net ID, phone number, address, and email address. Indicate the date in which they completed IRB and Human Subjects Education.

TITLE of project: A Comparison of Traditional Instruction Methods versus Instruction Using Reading Apprenticeship on the Attitude and Achievement of Students Enrolled in World Literature

Is this an original submission or a revision? Original submission

If this is a revised application, please list the docket number assigned to the first submission of the study.

PROJECT PERIOD: from January 2009 to January 2010
Includes both data collection and data analysis
*NOTE: Beginning date cannot predate IRB approval date. If you intend to begin immediately upon IRB approval, list beginning date as “upon IRB approval”.
STUDY FUNDING

Provide information about how the study costs will be supported

___Department funds  ___X_Personal Funds  ___No cost study
___Other, specify:
___External Funding
Agency:
SPA Proposal or Fund/Account Number:
PI of Award (if different than Principal Investigator/Researcher listed above):

ADDRESS EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS IN YOUR WRITTEN PROTOCOL.

Personnel & Qualifications

NOTE:

- In this section, the principal investigator is to describe the qualifications of all researchers involved in the study to perform the responsibilities assigned.
- As principal investigator, it is your responsibility to ensure that all individuals conducting procedures described in this application are adequately trained prior to involving human participants.
- All personnel listed on this application are required to successfully complete the MSU IRB & Human Subjects training course or an MSU IRB approved alternative. APPROVAL WILL NOT BE GRANTED UNTIL ALL INDIVIDUALS HAVE COMPLETED THIS TRAINING.
- As personnel change, you must submit a modification request to the IRB for approval before they can work with human subjects or identifiable or confidential information.

A. Including yourself, provide the name of each individual who will be responsible for the design or conduct of the study, have access to human participants, or have access to identifying or confidential information.

David C. Lowery will primarily be responsible for the design and conduct of the study. Charlotte Burroughs will serve as David’s advisor throughout the course of the study.

B. For each person identified above, identify his/her role in the project and clearly state the procedures or techniques he/she will be performing.

David C. Lowery is the principal investigator for the study. His role will be to design the study and oversee the procedures of the study. The principal investigator will collect the data and do the necessary analyses to complete the study.

Charlotte Burroughs will be David’s advisor throughout the study.

C. For each person identified above, describe his/her level of experience with the procedures or techniques he/she will be performing.
David Lowery has taught world literature for 8 years now. In addition, he received Reading Apprenticeship training during the summer of 2008. This involved going to a week-long conference in San Francisco, led by the LIRA team from WestEd, and receiving 5 days worth of intensive training in the administration and use of Reading Apprenticeship. In addition, David has incorporated Reading Apprenticeship strategies in one class that he taught this summer and in two classes that he taught this fall.

Dr. Burroughs has been a doctoral advisor for students conducting research studies for a number of years.

D. Indicate where each of the personnel listed received training to perform the identified procedures and who supervised or provided the training.

David C. Lowery received his Reading Apprenticeship training during the summer of 2008 in San Francisco, CA, at a workshop sponsored by the LIRA team from WestEd. In addition, he holds a B.A. degree from U.S.M., an M.Ed. degree from U.S.M., and an Ed.S. from M.S.U. He is currently pursuing his doctorate degree from M.S.U. He has completed all of his coursework including 11 hours worth of statistics courses to aid in data analyses, and he has completed a research design course to aid in the set-up and administration of this research study.

E. Explain how these skills/abilities will be periodically reviewed.

My committee, made up of Dr. Charlotte Burroughs, Dr. Peggy F. Hopper, Dr. Kay Brocato, Dr. Joshua Watson, and Dr. James Kelley, will continually review my skills and abilities.

Dr. Burroughs will serve as David’s primary advisor throughout this process. She will periodically meet with him face-to-face to discuss progress throughout the course of the study; in addition, e-mail and telephone correspondence will be used when situations arise that require discussion.

E-mail correspondence, phone calls, and face-to-face meetings will be held with other members of the committee throughout the progress of the study as deemed necessary by committee members.

As faculty members of Mississippi State University, each of these faculty members undergoes annual faculty review.
II. Research Protocol

1. **SITE OF WORK:**
   Jones County Junior College, 900 South Court Street, Ellisville, MS  39437

2. **Brief description of the GENERAL PURPOSE of the project.**
   The primary purpose of this project is to determine if Reading Apprenticeship (RA) teaching strategies have an effect on the attitude and achievement of students enrolled in world literature courses. This will be completed by comparing the RA method of teaching to the traditional method of literature instruction.

3. **In your view, what BENEFITS may result from the study that would justify asking the subjects to participate?**
   The primary benefit in this study will be to determine if using Reading Apprenticeship is beneficial in the literature classroom on students’ reading attitude and achievement. If so, more teachers should incorporate these strategies into their teaching.

4. **Give details of the PROCEDURES that relate to the subjects’ participation.**
   There will be two different groups used in this study: a traditionally taught group and a group that is taught using Reading Apprenticeship strategies. Each group will be administered a consent form before any instruction takes place. Confidentiality will be assured of all participants. Consent forms will be kept on file throughout the duration of the study and for three years following the completion of the study (per Federal guidelines). Students will be administered a pre-survey assessing their attitude on reading in both groups, and both groups will also be administered a pre-test. Each group will be taught using the specified method of instruction as they would be taught even if there was not a research project going on as well. At the end of the semester, students will complete a post-survey and a post-test.

5. **List ALL vulnerable subject populations to be included and additional precautions being taken to ensure their protection.**
   The subjects in this study will be made up of students enrolled in World Literature at Jones County Junior College in Ellisville, MS during the specified semester(s). Some of the subjects will be students of the principal investigator; he will ensure that these students understand that participation is voluntary and that nothing negative will result if they choose not to participate. Data will be held until the end of the semester before any analysis has been conducted to ensure that all students know that the results will in no way affect their grades.

6. **How will the subjects be selected and recruited?**
   On the campus of Jones County Junior College, there is one faculty member who teaches world literature who has been trained to use Reading Apprenticeship (the primary researcher of this project). The control group will consist of students of another instructor who teaches world literature using a traditional method. The principal investigator will ask students in both classes if they are willing to participate in this research study.

7. **What inducement will be offered?**
   None

8. **How many subjects will be used? List any salient characteristics of subjects (e.g., age range, sex, institutional affiliation, other pertinent characterizations.)**

   160
The principal investigator in this study will use a total of 4 classes in all. Classes at Jones County Junior College have a maximum capacity of 40 students in all. It is estimated that approximately 120-160 students will be part of this overall study. Students enrolled in this course should have completed English Composition 1113 and English Composition 1123. The classification of most students who enroll in this course is sophomore. The age range of these students can be anywhere from 18 and above. Because this is a junior college, there are many non-traditional students enrolled, so age range will be difficult to determine until the semester begins. In addition, the gender of students involved cannot be determined until the semester begins.

9. **Number of times researchers will interact with each subject?** The principal investigator is the instructor for the non-traditional (Reading Apprenticeship) courses, and, therefore, will interact as part of his teaching responsibilities a minimum of 3 hours per week for the duration of the semester. For the purpose of this research, the principal investigator anticipates interacting with subjects (in all sections) approximately 4 times to recruit them, to provide informed consent and to obtain signed consent forms, and to administer the pre-test and survey and post-test and survey.

10. **What will the subjects do, or what will be done to them, in the study?**
Each of the subjects will have signed up for a world literature course to complete their 3 semester hours of literature credits. One group will be taught using the traditional method of instruction. Another group will be taught using Reading Apprenticeship instructional strategies. Each group will take a pre-test and complete a pre-survey. In addition, at the end of the semester, after all content has been taught, each participant will complete a post-survey and a post-test.

Both the pre-test and the post-test will be administered on the computer in the school’s computer lab. The pre-survey and post-survey will be administered using paper copies and pencils.

11. **How do you intend to obtain the subjects’ INFORMED CONSENT?**
N/A is not an acceptable answer to this question.

A consent form will be read aloud to all participants in the study. Each person will be given an opportunity to complete the consent form agreeing to participate in the study. Confidentiality will be assured to all participants in the study by the researcher carefully explaining the process of the study and assuring that all information (surveys and testing) will be kept confidential and no names will be used in the study. A copy of the consent form will be provided to each subject for his or her records.

Is it clear to the subject that their participation is fully voluntary? Yes.

Is it clear to the subjects that they may withdraw at any time? Yes.

Is it clear to the subjects that they may refuse to answer any specific question that may be asked of them? Yes.

Is it clear to the subjects who to contact in case of research-related questions? Yes.
If the subjects are minors, you must obtain minor assent in addition to parental consent. Please attach assent form/procedure. No subjects in this study will be considered minors.

12. **Assessment of RISK**
   Do you see any chance that subjects might be harmed in any way? No.

   Do you deceive them in any way? No.

   Are there any physical risks? Psychological? (Might a subject feel demeaned or embarrassed or worried or upset?) Social? (Possible loss of status, privacy, reputation?)

   **There are no apparent risks associated with this study.**

   How will you control for the risks you’ve identified? **There are no apparent risks associated with this study.**

13. **How do you ensure CONFIDENTIALITY of information collected?**
   **At a minimum, provide the following information:**
   - **Who will have access to the data?** The researcher involved in this study will have access to the data. In addition, the advisor may access the data if a need arises.

   - **Where will data be stored?** The data will be stored in David Lowery’s office at Jones County Junior College in Ellisville, MS. All data will be locked in a filing cabinet.

   - **Where will signed consent forms be stored (be specific regarding location)?** Signed consent forms will be locked in a filing cabinet in David Lowery’s office at Jones County Junior College in Ellisville, MS. This will be a separate cabinet than the one containing the data.

   - **What identifiers (direct or indirect) will be collected?** Each student will be assigned a random number prior to the beginning of the research study. Each pre-test and post-test will be completed on the computer and will require student names and school identification numbers in order to process the test. The researcher will remove all names and identification numbers from the pre-tests and post-tests after the results of the tests are printed out. The randomly assigned number will then be placed on the pre-test (and post-test at the end of the semester). This will allow the researcher to know which students have completed the appropriate tests. Likewise, the instructor will use the randomly assigned numbers to determine who completes the pre-survey and post-survey and to link the items together for analysis purposes. The results of the pre-tests and post-tests and pre-surveys and post-surveys will be kept in a locked filing cabinet in the researcher’s office; these results will be kept separate from the list of student names and randomly assigned numbers to ensure student confidentiality.
What purpose do the identifiers serve? The code numbers on the surveys will allow the researcher to link pre-test and post-test items and pre-survey and post-survey items to each other for comparison and analysis.

When will identifiers be removed or “de-linked” from the data? The coding list of random numbers for each student will be kept on file in the instructor’s office in a locked filing cabinet throughout the duration of the study. Names of all students will be removed from pre-tests and post-tests as soon as the tests are completed. Numbers will be assigned to each pre-test and post-test in place of the names. Likewise, the same procedure will be used to complete the pre-survey and post-survey. Once the data collection is complete and all of the items from each individual are linked together, the list of names and corresponding assigned code numbers will be destroyed, thus rendering the data as de-linked and not identifiable.

Will the data be retained or destroyed? The data will be destroyed.

If the data will be destroyed, how and at what point in time (be as specific as possible)? The data will be destroyed after the process of writing the dissertation has been completed. Signed informed consent forms will be stored in a secured fashion as outlined in this application for a period of three years after the completion of the project.

14. Are approvals needed from another MSU regulatory committee (i.e. IACUC for animals or IBC for infectious agents or recombinant DNA)? If so, please attach approval letter(s) from appropriate committee(s). If approval has not yet been obtained, where are you at in the approval process? No other approvals need to be obtained.
November 21, 2008

David Lowery
65 Kings Lane
Laurel MS 39449

RE: IRB Study #08-315. A Comparison of Traditional Instruction Methods versus Instruction Using Reading Apprenticeship on the Attitude and Achievement of Students Enrolled in World Literature.

Dear Mr. Lowery,

The above referenced project was reviewed and approved via administrative review on 11/21/2008 in accordance with 45 CFR 46.101(b)(1). Continuing review is not necessary for this project. However, any modification to the project must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to implementation. Any failure to adhere to the approved protocol could result in suspension or termination of your project. The IRB reserves the right, at anytime during the project period, to observe you and the additional researchers on this project.

Please note that the MSU IRB is in the process of seeking accreditation for our human subjects protection program. As a result of these efforts, you will likely notice many changes in the IRB’s policies and procedures in the coming months. These changes will be posted online at http://www.orc.msstate.edu/human/ahhp.php. The first of these changes is the implementation of an approval stamp for consent forms. The approval stamp will assist in ensuring the IRB approved version of the consent form is used in the actual conduct of research. You must use copies of the stamped consent form for obtaining consent from participants.

Please refer to your IRB number (#08-315) when contacting our office regarding this application.

Thank you for your cooperation and good luck to you in conducting this research project. If you have questions or concerns, please contact me at cwilliams@research.msstate.edu or call 662-325-5220.

Sincerely,

Christine Williams
IRB Compliance Administrator

c: Susie Burroughs (Advisor)