

## Language Arts Journal of Michigan

---

Volume 20  
Issue 2 *Reading Matters*

Article 13

---

1-1-2004

# Study Guides: Teacher Tips: A Review of Literature with Practical Implications

Candice C. Hollingsead  
*Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI*

Raymond J. Ostrander  
*Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI*

Julie Schilling  
*Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/lajm>

---

### Recommended Citation

Hollingsead, Candice C.; Ostrander, Raymond J.; and Schilling, Julie (2004) "Study Guides: Teacher Tips: A Review of Literature with Practical Implications," *Language Arts Journal of Michigan*: Vol. 20: Iss. 2, Article 13.  
Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.9707/2168-149X.1234>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@GVSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Language Arts Journal of Michigan by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@GVSU. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@gvsu.edu](mailto:scholarworks@gvsu.edu).

## **Study Guides: Teacher Tips: A Review of Literature with Practical Implications**

**Candice C. Hollingsead, Raymond J. Ostrander, and Julie Schilling**  
*Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI*

Students today represent a wide range of skills. Some students in every classroom read painfully slowly, stumble, and stall on words, failing to fully grasp passage meaning (Wood, 1988). These students miss out on the opportunity of “learning to read” and, therefore, lose the benefit of “reading to learn”, the classic “Matthew effect” (Ciborowski, 1992; Peters & Wixson, 1984). Struggling readers limit the expansion of their vocabulary and knowledge because of circumscribed abilities, an accumulation of academic frustration and failure. Often students lack learning strategies to organize materials, store information, and retain learning. These facts necessitate using learning strategies as they can supply support for the low achievers in the classroom. Specifically, metacognitive learning strategies designed for comprehension have been proven to increase students’ success in academics, problem-solving skills, independence, making choices, involvement in own learning process, organizational skills, and learning and understanding more efficiently (Day, & Elksnin, 1995; Gunning, 2003; Pressley, 2000; Schoenbach, et. al, 2003; Vaidya, 1999).

Student performance is not the only learning achievement dilemma. Much criticism has been directed toward instructional materials, specifically textbooks, and those teachers who seem to allow textbooks to direct the classroom curriculum. The “how” of reading a textbook, what to do in order to comprehend and remember what is being read, is not part of these teachers’ instructional emphases. Imparting knowledge via

textbooks can be formidable and overwhelmingly difficult (Ciborowski, 1995; Gunning, 2003; Lovitt & Hoi-ton, 1989; Snider & Tarver, 1987). However, just reading a textbook has little bearing on the development of higher order thinking, comprehension skills, concept building, and overall principle development (Ciborowski, 1995, Jitendra, et. al., 2001). Expository texts found in science and social studies classrooms are often filled with technical vocabulary and abstract concepts. Generally, textbooks also have unclear content goals, assume background knowledge, and have inadequate explanation and presentations of content (Bean, & Zigmond, 1994; Readence, Bean, & Baldwin, 2001). Furthermore, textbooks have been shown to restrict learning opportunities, and, by necessity, teachers need to adjust their curriculum for individual differences (Bean, & Zigmond, 1994; Readence, Bean, & Baldwin, 2001). Without appropriate adaptation, textbooks and accompanying materials are intimidating and incomprehensible to students struggling with reading deficiencies (Bean, & Ericson, 1989).

There are, however, instructional practices developed by Fisher, Schumaker, and Deshler (1995) called “Teaching Devices”. Included in this categorization are the instructional tools “graphic organizers” and “study guides”. Study guides, which enable students to draw upon their existing knowledge to assist them in formulating meaning from the text, are constructive, dynamic (affective and cognitive), and interactive tools. Study guides are designed to increase student involvement, highlight key information, and provide students with a preview of expectations (Anderson & Pearson, 1984; Blake & Young, 1995; Ciborowski, 1995; Davey, 1986; Peters & Wixson, 1984). Study guides, as the name implies, help students maneuver their way through text, and, in the meantime, allow students an easier time comprehending content and performing activities that are related to the information being taught. Used correctly, study guides can be coupled with the text to provide a framework of support for conceptual

understanding greatly needed by the students (Vacca & Vacca, 2003).

Three studies reported by Fisher, Schumaker, and Deshler (1995) indicate students with and without learning disability, upon using study guides to supplement teaching materials, improved their curriculum based measurement scores. In the first study, students with learning disabilities improved from 49% correct to 68% (mean scores) while students without disabilities moved from 80% correct to 93% (mean scores). In the second study reported, students with learning disabilities received average scores of 43% correct, but gained averages of 77% with the use of a study guide; students without disabilities scored initially 55% correct and 87% (mean scores) respectively. A third study revealed students with learning disabilities attained 42% correct average scores and increased to 76% during study guide usage, and students without disabilities enhanced their scores from 58% correct to 77% (mean) (Fisher, Schumaker, & Deshler, 1995). Students who use study guides to improve reading comprehension consistently outperform students who do not use study guides (Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2003). Work by Ryder and Graves (2003) under girds these findings. They identify five essential reasons to use study guides. Study guides assist students' learning; they can highlight important concepts; they improve comprehension; they help students organize information; and they assist students' metacognition by enabling them to check for understanding, helping students know when to alter their reading rates, and assisting students thinking about what information is important while reading.

Students fail to comprehend what they read in textbooks for a number of reasons. Key terms are unknown or unfamiliar, concepts are unfamiliar, meanings are confusing, the text organizational patterns found within chapters varies, the number of details surrounding a concept are too numerous to determine importance and significance, prior knowledge is

inadequate or missing, and students read too fast or skip around causing ineffective analyzes of text information (Gunning, 2003). Study guides can help eliminate many of these issues. Study guides are adaptable tools with variable formats that can be used to strengthen student textbook comprehension. Important to remember is that study guides do not supplant curricula. Rather they support it as they allow teachers to “maintain the integrity” of the required course content. One such study guide format is the Three-Level Guide. With this guide, comprehension is developed at literal, interpretive, and applied levels. These three levels position readers to respond to meaning at three levels of abstraction and conceptual difficulty (Vacca, & Vacca, 2003). At the literal level students find and report information explicitly from the text. At the interpretive level students read must read between the lines and begin to make inferences through perceived relationships. At the applied level, responding to reading becomes personal and evaluative, requiring students to express their own opinions and form new ideas. (Vacca, & Vacca, 2003). When considering creating a three-level guide as a learning tool, follow these guidelines:

1. Begin with level II. “What does the author mean?” The student can make inferences based on this question.
2. Then find information in the text for level I responses that will support the inferences needed for level II.
3. Finally, for level III develop statements that help students connect what they already know to what they read (Vacca, & Vacca, 2003).

## **Study Guide Development**

### *Define the Curriculum*

Study guides differ from typical end of chapter questions. In a teacher-developed study guide, the teacher controls the use of the textbook, the questions, and the activities designed to master

content information. Students do not have to delay finding out what they are supposed to know until the conclusion of their reading (Davey, 1986; Wood, Lapp, & Flood, 1992). Instead, study guides can enable students to become metacognitively involved with what they are reading, as teaching for metacognition is creating an instructional environment that facilitates students' awareness of their thinking processes coupled with strategies that enable them to know what is expected before, during, and after reading (Gunning, 2003). Thus, a student's engagement in reading can drive a higher level of thinking rather than a task entered upon for the purpose of answering literal level questions (Davey, 1986; Wood, Lapp, & Flood, 1992).

Teachers will need to set their content priorities. Choosing only the essential curriculum for mastery can eliminate unnecessary content coverage and provide additional time for frequent reviews of needed knowledge and skills, thus improving retention (Bean, Singer, & Cowan, 1985; Dempster, 1993; Palardy, 1997; Smith, Polloway, Patton, & Dowdy, 1995; Wood, 1988). Clearly determined objectives, which are initiated with specific action verbs, need to be established. Likewise, students should be allowed to have a voice in choosing some of the content objectives. This provides them with commitment, investment, and ownership in the learning process. Students will put forth more effort towards success when teachers positively acknowledge effort and engineer empowerment through goal oriented reading (Hoover & Patton, 1997; Irvin, 1998; Palardy, 1997).

Furthermore, in teaching students to process their thinking about their reading, teach for both declarative knowledge (what students will do) and procedural knowledge (how students will do it). To do this, first describe the instructional strategy being used. Then explain why the strategy is important to use during the lesson. Next model the strategy. This should include positive *I* statements, such as, "First I do this; then I do this; finally I do this." Modeling through think-alouds our own reading and thinking process demystifies the comprehension process (Gunning, 2003; Schoenbach, et. al, 2003). As part

of the think-aloud process, explain when and where to use the strategy. Finally, provide sufficient time for guided practice in-order-to offer necessary adjustments to our explanations and/or students' understandings (Gunning, 2003).

#### Procedures for creating a study guide

1. Note the major concepts and principles you want students to learn and assign pages to read that will help students to understand these concepts.
2. Predict problem areas of the text that will cause students to struggle such as: technical vocabulary, new and complex content, figurative language.
3. Determine different strategies for students to use to grasp content.

The study guide should be constructed very deliberately. It should include:comprehension strategies, clear content goals, interesting questions, and game-like activities that are engaging and fun (Gunning, 2003).

#### Designing the Format

To assist readers in creating study guides as described in this article, we have published the following nineteen web linked examples. Adobe Acrobat Reader is needed to open each link.

1. Civil War - <http://www.educ.andrews.edu/pdf/civWar.pdf>
2. Fur Trade - <http://www.educ.andrews.edu/pdf/furTra.pdf>
3. Canada's Atlantic Provinces - <http://www.educ.andrews.edu/pdf/canAtlPro.pdf>
4. Empire in Asia and the Americans - <http://www.educ.andrews.edu/pdf/empAsi&Ame.pdf>
5. Organisms and their Environment - <http://www.educ.andrews.edu/pdf/org&Env.pdf>
6. Regions and States - <http://www.educ.andrews.edu/pdf/reg&Sta.pdf>
7. United States Constitution Study Guide - <http://www.educ.andrews.edu/pdf/usConStuGui.pdf>
8. Map Type and Terms Study Guide - <http://www.educ.andrews.edu/pdf/mapTyp&TerStuGui.pdf>
9. Early American Study Guide - <http://www.educ.andrews.edu/pdf/earAmeStuGui.pdf>

10. Illinois Study Guide - <http://www.educ.andrews.edu/pdf/illStuGui.pdf>
11. North East Region Study Guide - <http://www.educ.andrews.edu/pdf/norEasRegStuGui.pdf>
12. North Central Region of the US Study Guide # 1 - <http://www.educ.andrews.edu/pdf/norCenRegUsStuGui1.pdf>
13. North Central Region of the US Study Guide # 2 - <http://www.educ.andrews.edu/pdf/norCenRegUsStuGui2.pdf>
14. Health: Smoking, Three Level Study Guide - <http://www.educ.andrews.edu/pdf/heaThrLevStuGui.pdf>
15. Science: Plant Characterists, Three Level Guide - <http://www.educ.andrews.edu/pdf/sciThrLevGui.pdf>
16. Physics: Light Lesson, Three Level Guide - <http://www.educ.andrews.edu/pdf/phyThrLevGui.pdf>
17. *The Lottery*, Three Level Guide - <http://www.educ.andrews.edu/pdf/reaThrLevGui.pdf>
18. *The Bet* by Chekhov, Three Level Guide - <http://www.educ..edu/andrewspdf/reaThrLevGui2.pdf>
19. Baseball, Three Level Guide - <http://www.educ.andrews.edu/pdf/reaThrLevGui3.pdf>

### Study Guide Implementation

The task of study guide design can become problematic if not approached with a win-win attitude. Teachers should pool their talents in order to problem-solve together the pitfalls (i.e., curriculum/assessment decisions, time investment) of material creation and curriculum enhancement. Benefits of mutual cooperation can be increased through the generation of ideas, ownership in process and product, and a clear focus on reading purpose (Ciborowski, 1995; Dettmer, Dyck, & Thurston, 1996). Teachers should never attempt, in one year's time, to construct study guides as a support curriculum for an entire textbook. Accomplish what is manageable. Thus educators should devise only a few study guides during a school year. Sharing study guides between and among professionals can increase the momentum of substantive task accomplishment (Davey, 1986; Kampwirth, 2002; Mastropieri & Scruggs, 2003).

Following initial development decisions, Horton and Lovitt (1989) suggest teachers can expect to spend about 30 minutes preparing a 15-

item study guide and approximately 20 minutes forming a corresponding curriculum based assessment. Conclusions drawn from Fisher, Schumaker, and Deshler (1995) indicate concerns regarding the acceptability of time teachers need to spend in study guide preparation. They suggest a timeline of 50 - 60 minutes per guide. *Some specific suggestions for implementation of study guides are to:*

Install the textbook reading passage (possibly adapted for some students) and aligned study guide on a computer disk and/or CD-ROM, using video and/or audio clips (Friend & Bursuck, 1999; Higgins & Boone, 1992; Horton & Lovitt, 1989; Horton, Lovitt, Givens, & Nelson, 1989);

Create study Class Wide Peer Tutoring 3x5 cards for extended practice of facts clips (Friend & Bursuck, 1999; Horton & Lovitt, 1989);

Use study guides as homework assignments building in accountability (Blake & Young, 1995; Friend & Bursuck, 1999; Hoover & Patton, 1997; Horton & Lovitt, 1989);

Engage students' active participation through goal setting, self-assessment/monitoring and student ownership in objectives (Davey, 1986; Palardy, 1997);

Provide students options from which to select (Hoover & Patton, 1997);

Identify structured activities to break down student isolation (a) individual student, (b) peer groupings, (c) cooperative groupings, (d) whole class, (e) heterogeneous and homogeneous divisions, and (f) learning centers (Bean & Ericson, 1989; Davey, 1986; Palardy, 1997; Wood, 1988);

Incorporate a variety of response formats both written (i.e., diagrams, questions/answers, maps) and verbal (i.e., discussions, presentations, news reporting) (Davey, 1986);

Employ a strategic instructional delivery format to implicitly teach through direct instruction the "how to" of using a study guide including: describe, model, faded individualized guided practice, and independent practice (Bean, Singer,

& Cowan, 1985; Davey, 1986; Gajria & Salvia, 1992; Goetz, 1993; Horton & Lovitt, 1989; MacLean, 1991; O'Shea, O'Shea, & Algozzine, 1998; Wood, 1988);

Provide a student directed learning atmosphere rather than a teacher lead learning classroom (Horton & Lovitt, 1989);

Respond to student errors with feedback targeted on the expansion of student learning (formative constructive comments) (O'Shea, O'Shea, & Algozzine, 1998; Talbot, 1997);

Encourage students to dream, develop, and implement their own study guides for future curriculum needs (Horton & Lovitt, 1989).

## **Conclusion**

Critical thinking is the learning process students navigate in coming to what they know (Talbot, 1997). Study guides are the instructional aids that act as critical thinking stimulators engaging students in learning processes; they accompany reading, before, during, and after (Bean & Ericson, 1989; Bean, Singer, & Cowan, 1985; Ciborowski, 1992; Ciborowski, 1995; Horton & Lovitt, 1989; Palardy, 1997; Wood, 1988; Wood, Lapp, & Flood, 1992).

The words "read" and "study" can be meaningless to students who are not aware of how to learn and retain information. Spontaneous integration of old (familiar) and new (unfamiliar) knowledge may not be within the struggling student's repertoire (Bean, Singer, & Cowan, 1985; Blake & Young, 1995). Study guides are not only the means of making students aware of metacognitive strategies for successful comprehension; they also develop and reinforce necessary student skills and strategies; guides are "tutors in print", tools students can use to refer back to essential curriculum, and a repetition of instruction (Dempster, 1993; Friend & Bursuck, 1999; Goetz, 1993; MacLean, 1991; Smith, Followay, Patton, & Dowdy, 1995; Wood, 1988; Wood, Lapp, & Flood, 1992).

Understanding of content material, increased text material retention, movement through textual material at a faster pace, improved task completion and on-task behaviors, and higher curriculum based

measurement scores are all outcomes teachers can expect when they use study guides to teach expository information (Blake & Young, 1995; Friend & Bursuck, 1996; Graham & Johnson, 1989; Lovitt & Hoi-ton, 1989; Lovitt & Horton, 1989; Wood, Lapp, & Flood, 1992). Study guides facilitate success by emphasizing important information and skills through consistent structure, direction, and purpose (Graham & Johnson, 1989; Lovitt & Horton, 1989; Smith, 1987).

Finally, study guides facilitate metacognitive comprehension. As metacognition requires goal setting for constructing meaning, assessing whether the goals are being met, and modifying the goals if they are not being met (Gunning, 2003), teachers who follow the framework for creating study guides as detailed in this article are positioning their students to become metacognitively involved in making meaning from their reading.

## Works Cited

- Anderson, R. C., and P. D. Pearson. "A Schema Theoretic View of the Reading Processes in Reading Comprehension." *Handbook of Reading Research*. Ed. P. D. Pearson, NY: Longman, 1984.
- Bean, R. M., and N. Zigmond. "Adapted Use of Social Studies Textbooks in Elementary Classrooms." *Remedial & Special Education* 15(4) (1994): 216-25.
- Bean, T. W., and B. O. Ericson. "Text Previews and Three Level Study Guides for Content Area Critical Reading." *Journal of Reading*. 32(4) (1989): 337-41.
- Bean, T. W., H. Singer, and S. Cowan. "Analogical Study Guides: Improving Comprehension in Science." *Journal of Reading*. 29 (1985): 246-50.
- Blake, D. A., and R. W. Young. "Using Study Guides to Help Students Focus Their Reading in the Basic Course." 65<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Southern States Communication Association. New Orleans. Apr. 1995.
- Brophy, J. "Probing the Subtleties of Subject Matter Teaching." *Educational Leadership*. 49 (1992): 4-8.
- Brown, A. "Metacognitive Development and Reading." *Theoretical Issues of Reading Comprehension*. Ed. R. Spiro, B. Bruce, & W. Brewer. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 1980. 453-81.
- Bryan, T., D. Deshler, J. Lloyd, and H. L. Swanson. "The Past, the Present, and the Future of Research in the Field: Panel Presentations of Leading Researchers of the 1980's Institutes of Research in Learning Disabilities." 20<sup>th</sup> Annual International Conference of the Council for Learning Disabilities. Albuquerque. Oct. 1998.
- Ciborowski, J. *Textbooks and the Students Who Can't Read Them: A Guide to Teaching Content*. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books, 1992.
- Ciborowski, J. "Using Textbooks with Students Who Cannot Read Them." *Remedial and Special Education*. 16(2). (1995): 90-101.
- Davey, B. "Using Textbook Activity Guides to Help Students Learn from Textbooks." *Journal of Reading*. 29 (1986): 189-94.
- Day, V. P. and L. K. Elksnin "Promoting Strategic Learning." *Intervention in School & Clinic*. 29 (1995): 262-69.
- Dempster, P. N. "Exposing Our Students to Less Should Help Them Learn More." *Phi Delta Kappa*. 74 (1993): 432-37.
- Deshler, D. D. and J. B. Schumaker. "Strategy Mastery by At-risk Students: Not a Simple Matter." *Elementary School Journal*. 94 (1993): 153-67.
- Dettmer, P., N. Dyck, and L. Thurston. *Consultation, Collaboration and Teamwork*. 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon. 2002.
- Fisher, J. B., J. B. Schumaker, and D. D. Deshler. "Searching for validated inclusive practices: A review of literature." *Focus on Exceptional Children*. 28 (1995): 1-20.
- Friend, M., and W. D. Bursuck. *Including Students with Special Needs: A Practical Guide for Classroom Teachers* 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon. 1999.
- Gajria, M., and J. Salvia. "The Effects of Summarization Instruction on Text Comprehension of Students with Learning Disabilities." *Exceptional Children*. 58 (1992): 508-16.
- Goetz, W. W. "Retrieving and Reinforcing U. S. Government Using Graphic Organizers." *Social Education*. Feb. 1993. 87-88.
- Graham, S., and L. A. Johnson. "Research-supported Teacher Activities that Influence the Text Reading of Students with Learning Disabilities." *LD Forum*. 15 (1989): 27-30.
- Gunning, T. G. *Building Literacy in the Content Areas*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. 2003.
- Hallahan, D. P., J. M. Kauffman, and J. W. Lloyd. *Introduction to Learning Disabilities*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon. 1999.
- Higgins, K., and R. Boone. "Hypermedia Computer Study Guides for Social Studies: Adapting a Canadian History Test." *Social Education*. (Mar. 1992): 154-59.
- Hoover, J. J., and J. R. Patton. *Curriculum adaptations for students with learning problems*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Austin: PRO-ED. 1997.

- Horton, S. V., and T. C. Lovitt. "Using Study Guides with Three Classifications of Secondary Students." *The Journal of Special Education*. 22 (1989): 447-462.
- Horton, S. V., T. C. Lovitt, and D. Bergerud. "The Effectiveness of Graphic Organizers for Three Classifications of Secondary Students in Content Area Classes." *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. 23 (1990): 12-22.
- Horton, S. V., T. C. Lovitt, A. Givens, and R. Nelson. "Teaching Social Studies to High School Students with Academic Handicaps in a Mainstreamed Setting: Effects of a Computerized Study Guide." *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. 22 (1989): 102-07.
- Irvin, J. *Reading and the Middle School Student: Strategies to Enhance Literacy*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon. 1998.
- Jitendra, A.K., V. Nolet, P.X. Yan, O. Gomez, K. Renmouf, and L.I. Iskold "An Analysis of Middle School Geography Textbooks: Implications for Students with Learning Problems." *Reading and Writing Quarterly*. 17 (2001): 151-73.
- Kampwirth, T. J. *Collaborative Consultation in the Schools: Effective Practices for Students with Learning and Behavior Problems*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice. 2002.
- Lovitt, T. C., and S. V. Hoi-ton "How to Develop Study Guides." *Journal of Reading, Writing, and Learning Disabilities. International*. 3 (1987): 333-43.
- Mastropieri, M. A., and T. E. Scruggs. *Effective Instruction for Special Education*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Austin, TX: PRO-ED. 1994.
- Mastropieri, M. A., and T. E. Scruggs. *The Inclusive Classroom: Strategies for Effective Instruction*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice. 2003.
- MacLean, I. "Twelve Tips for Producing Handouts." *Medical Teacher*. 13 (1991): 7-12.
- O'Shea, L. J., D. J. O'Shea, and B. Algozzine. *Learning Disabilities from Theory Toward Practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice. 1998.
- Palardy, J. M. "15 Strategies for Motivating Students." *Principal*. 76 (1997): 20-2.
- Peters, C. W., and K. K. Wixson. "Reading Redefined: A Michigan Reading Association Position Paper." *The Michigan Reading Journal*. 17 (1984): 4-7.
- Pressley, M. "What Should Comprehension Instruction Be the Instruction of?" (1996). Ed. Reutzel, D. R., and Cooter, R. B. *Teaching Children to Read*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill/Prentice. 2000.
- Readence, J.E., T.W. Bean, and R.S. Baldwin. *Content Area Literacy: An Integrated Approach*. 7<sup>th</sup> Ed. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt. 2001.
- Ryder, R. J., and M. F. Graves. *Reading and Learning in the Content Areas*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 2003.
- Schoenback, R., J. Braunger, C. Greenleaf, and C. Litman. "Apprenticing Adolescents to Reading in Subject-area Classrooms." *Phi Delta Kappa*. 85 (2003): 133-38.
- Smith, R. J. "A Study Guide for Extending Students' Reading of Social Studies Material." *The Social Studies*. (1987, March/April): 85-87
- Smith, T. E. C., E. A. Polloway, J. R. Patton, and C. A. Dowdy. *Teaching Students with Special Needs in Inclusive Settings*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon. 1995.
- Snider, V. E., and S. G. Tarver. "The Effect of Early Reading Failure on Acquisition of Prior Knowledge among Students with Learning Disabilities." *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. 20 (1987): 351-356.
- Talbot, G. L. "Helping Teachers and Students Talk about Learning Strategies for Teacher Made Tests and Assignments." ERIC Document Reproduction Service. ED 411 203. 1997.
- Vacca, J.L., and R. T. Vacca. *Content Area Reading: Literacy and Learning across the Curriculum*. NY: Longman. 2003.
- Vaidya, S.R. "Metacognitive Learning Strategies for Students with Learning Disabilities." *Education*. 120 (1999): 186-190.
- Wood, K. D. "Guiding Students through Informational Text." *The Reading Teacher*. 41 (May 1988). 912-21.
- Wood, K. D., D. Lapp, and J. Flood. *Guiding Readers through Text: A Review of Study Guides*. International Reading Association: Newark, Delaware. 1992.



## Background Information References

- Hudson, F., C. K. Ormsbee, and B. S. Myles. "Study Guides: An Instructional Tool for Equalizing Student Achievement." *Intervention in School and Clinic*. 30 (1994): 99-102.
- Irvin, J. *Teaching Reading Comprehension Processes*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall. 1986.
- Joint Committee on Teachers Planning for Students with Disabilities. *Planning for Academic Diversity in America's Classrooms: Windows on Reality, Research, Change, and Practice*. Lawrence: The University of Kansas Center for Research on Learning. 1995.
- Johnson, A. P. "What Exactly Are Comprehension Skills and How Do I Teach Them?" *Reading*. 32 (1998): 22-26.
- Piercey, D. "Reading Activities in Content Areas." Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon. 1976.
- Tiemey, R. J., and J. W. Cunningham. "Research on Teaching Reading Comprehension." *Handbook of Reading Research*. Ed. P. David Pearson. NY: Longman. 1984.

### About the Authors:

Ray Johnson Ostrander, Ph.D., associate professor, is currently Director of the Master of Arts, Teaching and Certification Officer at Andrews University. His areas of expertise are in writing methods, content area reading methods, language arts methods, and computer assisted instruction methods

Candice Haas Hollingsead, Ph.D., professor, is currently chair of the Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum Department at Andrews University. Her area of expertise is in special education, having previously served as a teacher in K-12 systems, administrator, and university special education professor.

Julie Schilling currently has dual enrollment in the Master of Arts, Teaching and Special Education programs at Andrews University. Her academic emphasis is in Learning Disabilities. She is currently seeking an elementary teaching position in South-west Michigan.