


**READING COMPREHENSION AND READING STRATEGIES**

by

**Rebecca J. Baier**

**A Research Paper  
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the  
Master of Education Degree  
In  
Education**

**Approved: 2 Semester Credits**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Dr. Amy Carole Schlieve**

**The Graduate School**

**University of Wisconsin-Stout**

**December, 2005**

**The Graduate School  
University of Wisconsin-Stout  
Menomonie, WI**

**Author: Rebecca J. Baier**

**Title: Reading Comprehension and Reading Strategies**

**Graduate Degree/Major: MS Education**

**Research Advisor: Dr. Amy Carole Schlieve**

**Month/Year: December, 2005**

**Number of Pages: 53**

**Style Manual Used: American Psychological Association, 5<sup>th</sup> edition**

ABSTRACT

It was hypothesized that students who use reading comprehension strategies while reading retain more information and comprehend the text better. It was also hypothesized that students who have good reading comprehension skills perform better on reading comprehension tests. Fourteen sixth grade students in a small town private school were identified for this study. The students were given the *Qualitative Reading Inventory - 4* reading comprehension pretests after determining their individual reading levels. The students then began a six-week long study of the *Self-Questioning Reading Strategy*. At the conclusion of the study the students were again given the *Qualitative Reading Inventory - 4* reading comprehension posttests. A comparison of the percent correct on the reading comprehension pretests and posttests was taken. Twelve of the fourteen sixth grade students demonstrated improvement in the reading comprehension scores. Two of the fourteen students resulted in no change in the reading comprehension scores. There

were no students that exhibited a decline in scores. It was concluded that the sixth grade literature students performed better on the posttests where they used the *Self-Questioning Reading Strategy*. Further study recommendations included completing this study on different age groups or using different reading comprehension strategies.

**The Graduate School**

University of Wisconsin-Stout

Menomonie, WI

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Amy Carole Schlieve for her assistance and patience in the process of writing this paper. I would also like to thank my family; Mom, Dad, Joe, Little Joe, Luke, Hannah, Roger and Orpha for their unending help and support.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| ABSTRACT.....                                  | ii  |
| List of Tables.....                            | vii |
| Chapter I: Introduction.....                   | 1   |
| <i>Statement of the Problem</i> .....          | 6   |
| <i>Research Hypothesis</i> .....               | 6   |
| <i>Limitations</i> .....                       | 7   |
| Chapter II: Literature Review.....             | 8   |
| Chapter III: Methodology.....                  | 20  |
| <i>Subject Selection and Description</i> ..... | 20  |
| <i>Instrumentation</i> .....                   | 20  |
| <i>Data Collection Procedures</i> .....        | 20  |
| <i>Data Analysis</i> .....                     | 21  |
| <i>Limitations</i> .....                       | 21  |
| Chapter IV: Results.....                       | 22  |
| <i>Item Analysis</i> .....                     | 23  |
| <i>Conclusion</i> .....                        | 36  |
| Chapter V: Discussion.....                     | 37  |
| <i>Discussion</i> .....                        | 37  |
| <i>Limitations</i> .....                       | 38  |
| <i>Conclusions</i> .....                       | 38  |
| <i>Recommendations</i> .....                   | 38  |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| References.....   | 39 |
| Appendix A: IRB Form.....                                       | 42 |
| Appendix B: Parent Letter.....                                  | 43 |
| Appendix C: Consent to Participate.....                         | 44 |
| Appendix D: Self-Questioning Strategy for Fiction Text.....     | 47 |
| Appendix E: Self-Questioning Strategy for Non-fiction Text..... | 50 |
| Appendix F: Student Profile Sheet.....                          | 53 |

## List of Tables

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table 1: Student 1 Profile Sheet.....   | 23 |
| Table 2: Student 2 Profile Sheet.....   | 24 |
| Table 3: Students 3 Profile Sheet.....  | 25 |
| Table 4: Student 4 Profile Sheet.....   | 26 |
| Table 5: Student 5 Profile Sheet.....   | 27 |
| Table 6: Student 6 Profile Sheet.....   | 28 |
| Table 7: Student 7 Profile Sheet.....   | 29 |
| Table 8: Student 8 Profile Sheet.....   | 30 |
| Table 9: Student 9 Profile Sheet.....   | 31 |
| Table 10: Student 10 Profile Sheet..... | 32 |
| Table 11: Student 11 Profile Sheet..... | 33 |
| Table 12: Student 12 Profile Sheet..... | 34 |
| Table 13: Student 13 Profile Sheet..... | 35 |
| Table 14: Student 14 Profile Sheet..... | 36 |

## Chapter I: Introduction

Do students fully understand what they are reading? Are they able to express verbally or in written communication what they have read? Professional teachers need to guide students to become independent and effective in our fast-paced, fast-growing society. To do this we need to start with a basic skill that is used throughout life; and that skill is reading comprehension. The issues discussed in this chapter are reading comprehension skills and vocabulary knowledge; preparation for college; literacy rates; and *No Child Left Behind*.

Reading comprehension is a skill that is critical in the educational success of all individuals. Without adequate reading comprehension skills, students can struggle in many subject areas. Reading comprehension is an important skill needed for all areas of school. Subjects, other than reading or literature, where comprehension skills are significantly important include science, social studies and math. In the area of science, research indicates that many students lack prior knowledge and reading strategies to generate inferences; thus, the students comprehend science texts poorly. It is also found that students lack the specific reading strategies to generate inferences that aid in the understanding of science texts (Best, Rowe, Ozura, and McNamara, 2005).

A study called *Improving Reading Comprehension Through Vocabulary* (Berg, Cressman, Pfanz, 1998) focuses on using vocabulary to improve reading comprehension. This study was conducted to examine if the use of games and other study methods would improve vocabulary knowledge; therefore, improve reading comprehension and reading levels. At the beginning of the sixteen week study, second through fourth grade students



were given a *Qualitative Reading Inventory II Test*. Thereafter, the students had weekly reading lessons that involved vocabulary words. During this time, the students were exposed to these vocabulary words at least five times throughout each week including pretests and posttests. At the conclusion of the study, the students were given the *Qualitative Reading Inventory II Test* again. A review of the vocabulary pretests and posttests exhibits improved knowledge of vocabulary words. This study also reveals significant improvements in reading comprehension scores and reading levels in the group.

In addition to reading comprehension and vocabulary knowledge, more topics of relevance to reading comprehension are identified. First, students need to be prepared for college entrance exams and college itself. College entrance exams contain sections where students read material and demonstrate their knowledge of what they read. When students reach college, the reading required for most classes is more difficult and vast in amount than at the high school level. Students benefit greatly by having a good handle on reading comprehension skills before entering college. An article regarding the idea of close reading states, "A typical college student is unable to deeply comprehend what he or she reads. Most students have few if any intellectual tools that would enable them to read deeply, and then apply what they have read" (Elder and Paul, 2004, p.1).

A study of four first year college students enrolled in a college developmental reading class were identified as struggling in reading by the TABE Test (a pretest given at the beginning of the semester). All four of these students were from a different ethnic/racial background. Throughout the semester the students had three main assignments that helped in reading and reading comprehension. The assignments were

inquiry based research, independent and shared reading events, and direct instruction of reading comprehension strategies. Throughout the semester changes in several areas of development occurred in the four students' reading comprehension strategies. As they read they became more critical, focused and productive. At the end of the semester the TABE Test was taken again by the students. After using the newly learned reading comprehension strategies, the students all improved their test scores by at least three grade levels (Falk-Ross, 2002).

Second, the *National Adult Literacy Survey* most recently indicates the illiteracy rate in our nation at approximately 13%. According to an article by Anthony V. Manzo "The term *functional literacy* refers to the level of learning at which one is able to read well enough to negotiate life's everyday activities and demands" (2003, p. 654). He reveals that the results of the most recently taken *National Adult Literacy Survey* initially indicates about 47% of the adult population functioning at the 2 lowest levels of literacy (on a 5 level scale); with 21% of those adults functioning at level 1 (able to locate YTD gross pay on a paycheck, but unable to identify the type of sandpaper to buy from a table listing the types of grains on the horizontal axis and the types of applications on the vertical axis). With an adjustment to the data that Manzo deems more fair and realistic, the results improve stating that only 13% of Americans are functioning at the lowest two levels on the scale. Even though this is an improvement; there is still educational progress that needs to be made (Manzo, 2003).

Educators need to provide instruction to students in elementary and middle school to improve their reading and comprehension abilities before reaching high school. One

can only assert that improving reading comprehension skills in younger people will improve literacy rates as time progresses.

Third, in 2002, President George W. Bush signed into law the *No Child Left Behind Act*, which is a renewal and revision of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965*. This act is in place in America's schools where there is a significant achievement gap between disadvantaged students and their more affluent peers. *No Child Left Behind* offers increases in federal aid to states and local school districts for necessities (teachers, Title I, materials) to improve students' learning. According to the mandates of *No Child Left Behind* schools must test their students yearly in reading, science and math and report the results to their state. Schools report results for all students regardless of race/ethnic group, income status, disability and/or English proficiency (The House Education & the Workforce Committee Majority Staff, 2002).

There are four education reform principles identified in *No Child Left Behind*: Accountability, Flexibility and Local Control, Resources for Reform, and Expanded Parental Options. First, Accountability for results makes all parents, voters and taxpayers aware of the testing results in their local district. By testing each year the communities and schools become aware of any students that may be lagging behind. This area also emphasizes that quality and qualified teachers will be in the appropriate classrooms. Second, Flexibility and Local Control allows each state to design and implement their own testing. Also, within each state, individual school districts are given the flexibility to use a percentage of the federal funds effectively to meet students' unique needs. Through this principle, states and local districts also coordinate efforts through state-local flexibility partnerships to jointly address students' needs. *No Child Left Behind* provides

rural schools, in particular, with increased flexibility and funding to enhance academic achievement, because they are often unable to compete with the larger, urban schools for federal grants. Third, President Bush and congress are providing for an increase in funds for Title I, teacher quality aid, reading programs, charter schools and special education. Resource for Reform provides a significant expansion for state and local control over how federal education funds are spent. Federal government provides more resource with fewer strings attached. Fourth, Expanded Parental Options gives parents the right to obtain supplemental education resources or move their child to another district if the district they are in has failed to meet the standards for two consecutive years. If school districts continue to fail through the 2008-09 school year, they will have a school reconstitution. Parents are also a partnership in this act. It is the desire of President Bush and congress that parents do their part in the education process by instilling values and discipline at home so students can learn at school (The House Education & the Workforce Committee Majority Staff, 2002).

According to Wisconsin State Superintendent, Elizabeth Burmaster (2005), the goal of *No Child Left Behind* is to implement a statewide accountability system that ensures students will be proficient or better in reading and math by the 2013-14 school year. The final goal is to have 100% of all students at this level by 2014. When the question “Why 100%?” is asked, the response is “Anything less means children will be left behind” (The House Education & the Workforce Committee Majority Staff, 2002, p.9).

As the research indicates, reading comprehension is a key element to increasing reading scores. Solving problems, preparing for college, illiteracy and *No Child Left Behind* are very credible reasons for the improvement of reading comprehension skills.

Primarily, this study is being conducted to determine if there is a difference between reading comprehension scores prior to instruction of the self-questioning reading comprehension strategy and reading comprehension scores after instruction of the self-questioning reading comprehension strategies for sixth grade students. There are many positive results that can come from this study. Readers of the study will observe the self-questioning strategy used to help students comprehend texts. Students in the study will be exposed to this strategy to help break down the text they are reading. They will also be taught strategies for identifying definitions of vocabulary through context clues in the text that will aid in comprehension. Students will have the opportunity to learn how to distinguish the main character, plot, conflict, climax and resolution of fictional stories.

#### *Statement of the Problem*

The purpose of this study is to determine the level of difference in reading comprehension scores as measured by the *Qualitative Reading Inventory – 4* for sixth grade literature students prior to the instruction of the self-questioning reading comprehension strategy and after the instruction of the self-questioning reading comprehension strategy. This study will take place with sixth grade literature students at St. Mary's Tri-Parish School in Durand, WI, for an eight week period in the Fall of 2005.

#### *Research Hypothesis*

A review of literature shows that students who use reading comprehension strategies demonstrate strong reading comprehension skills. Studies have also shown that

students who have strong reading comprehension skills score higher on comprehension tests. Therefore, the research hypothesis for this study is that students who use reading comprehension strategies score higher on reading comprehension tests.

#### *Limitations of the Study*

There were fourteen participants who completed the study. The small size limits the conclusion, that sixth grade students display any statistically significant difference between reading comprehension scores prior to the instruction of the self-questioning reading comprehension strategy and after instruction of the self-questioning reading comprehension strategy.

## Chapter II: Literature Review

Reading is fundamentally important for success. It opens the door to personal freedom or shuts the door to opportunity. Learning to read is a means to an end. If children have difficulty learning to read early, how can they be expected to excel in other subjects as well? The best prevention of reading difficulties, therefore, is early intervention strategies at the pre-school/kindergarten level. Instead of heated debates on which approach is best suited for early reading success, educators should be discussing the most efficient method(s) that produces the best results (DeMoulin & Loye, 1999, p.43).

In this review of related literature, the four main topics that will be discussed are reading programs in the elementary schools, reading programs in the middle schools, vocabulary development in students, and diverse classrooms.

### *Reading Programs in the Elementary Schools*

The reality is there is no one reading program that is the best. Children learn to read in different ways and differ in the type of instruction they need to become proficient readers. The most important concept is that all children are taught by a research based method of reading instruction that introduces them to reading. Once children are taught by these methods, the instructor will be able to identify the method of reading instruction the child needs for greater success (Duffy, et al., 2003).

Two major types of reading instruction used in elementary schools are direct phonics instruction and whole language instruction.

Direct instruction is defined as intense, direct and explicit instruction in reading. The direct instruction model promotes mastery of meaningful reading through explicit teaching. Direct instruction involves an emphasis on fast-paced, scripted, well-sequenced, rule-based and highly focused lessons. Students in direct instruction classes are usually instructed in small groups and given several opportunities to respond in unison and individually, with immediate feedback using a specific correction procedure. Teachers using direct instruction generally employ a three-step instructional sequence. They model (provide the correct response), lead (have the student say the correct answer with the teacher), test (give immediate feedback and probe on the task initially attempted (Shippen, et al., 2005, p. 176).

In her article, *Phuss Over Phonics*, Mary Jalongo defines phonics as “direct instruction on the sounds of language and the symbols (letters) that correspond to those sounds” (1998, p. 1). Phonics provides a foundation for students to learn to read, because once a child learns the relationship between letters and sounds in “alphabetic code, he or she can read by sounding out each of the words – a process called decoding” (DeMoulin & Loye, 1999, p. 40). “Advocates of direct phonics instruction will tell you that phonics is a key, a way to “break the code” of language” (Jalongo, 1998, p. 3).

Typically, children learn phonics in the very early stages of reading. They begin by learning the letter sounds of the alphabet and then they learn to blend the sounds together to make very simple CVC (consonant, vowel, consonant) words. Once these skills are mastered, students learn to blend consonant letters together to make larger words. A positive outcome often seen in phonics instruction is the ability for students to sound out many words, even long and difficult words can be sounded out by very young



children. However, on the flip side, learning to read exclusively through phonics can become extremely boring and repetitive. The downfall with phonics is that it can become a kill-and-drill method where children become robotic in their reading approach (Demoulin & Love, 1999).

Phonics has been the subject of great debate during the past several years. Early reading instructors insisted on the use of phonics independent from any other method. A problem discovered with this intense instruction is that children can amazingly sound out long difficult words, but are unable to comprehend what the written text is about. Also, direct phonics instruction will not lead to complete spelling accuracy as many of its proponents contend. For example, a second grade student observed by Jalongo spelled words phonetically because he has been trained in this method. In his writing he wrote “flicewater” instead of “flyswatter” (1998, p. 3). In past direct phonics instruction first and second grade classrooms, time was spent solely on “sounding out” words. By the time the students were in third and fourth grades they had difficulty with reading comprehension because their main focus for reading was sounding out the words and not the comprehension of the text. It is comprehension, not word-calling that defines the complex process of learning to read (Jalongo, 1998).

The whole language method was quite popular in the 1980s. There seems to be a pendulum-effect attitude in the field of education that sways from one extreme to the other whenever a new teaching method is introduced. During the 1970s, direct phonics was the preferred method. However, national and state reports indicated that a majority of elementary school children were not reading at basic levels. In response to this reading crisis,

the whole-language concept caught on during the 1980s and the direct phonics instruction was considered defunct. Perhaps predictability, the lack of rousing success with this new approach caused some educators to call for a return to the older, “better” ways. In the 1990s the pendulum in the process of swinging back was intercepted, before it went to the extreme of “all phonics,” by a balanced approach to reading instruction. Even though there has been an increased emphasis on explicit phonics in reading instruction in recent years, research continues to indicate the benefits of a balanced approach to reading instruction (Farstrup & Samuels 2002; Guthrie, Schafer & Huang 2001; as cited by Smith, 2003a, p. 3).

Whole language is another method used to teach reading to young children. “Whole language represents the skilled stage of reading, given it’s reliance on the graphic word, whereas phonics represents the unskilled stage owing to its emphasis on the intermediary role of phonological processing in word recognition” (Post, 2004, p. 99). Using the whole language method is similar to teaching from a basal text book. The focus is to teach students to become competent in reading (fluency and comprehension) and to be able to communicate what they have read through their personal ideas, both orally and in written form.

When using whole language, reading becomes part of the Language Arts area in the curriculum. This method exposes students to many different kinds of texts and genres of literature. Students use prior knowledge and visual skills to help them read the text. Students are also introduced to different methods of communication by use of writing

skills. In the article *Building a Whole Language Writing Program* authors Jennifer Porcaro and Karen Gudeman Johnson shadow a third grade teacher who implements the whole language method and observe a writing workshop that is based on the whole language approach. “The theory behind the program is that, in order to look more critically at their own work, children must have a working knowledge of the writing process they use when writing” (Porcaro & Johnson, 2003, p. 75).

### *Reading Programs in the Middle Schools*

Many teachers at the middle school level implement the use of basal textbooks, trade books and language experience to teach reading along with direct phonics and whole language instruction.

Throughout the years, these four major approaches—phonics, basal, trade books and language experience—have waxed and waned in popularity. Generally, once one approach has dominated long enough for its shortcomings to be recognized, it is replaced by a different approach with different shortcomings. The search for which of these methods is best has led educators to conclude that each method has undeniable strengths (Foertsch, 2003, p.10).

Foertsch (2003) reports indicate that the use of trade books goes hand in hand with whole language. In the late 1980s trade books became part of the larger whole language movement. In this approach to teaching reading, students choose a trade book they want to read independently and confer with the teacher when they need individual help. This is also known as individualized reading. Trade books can also be used in a whole class setting using one title. During this approach, students stay in the same place throughout the book. This pacing can allow for group reading and partner reading along

with group activities throughout the book. The use of trade books is often implemented in addition to other reading programs (Ediger, 2002).

Ediger (2002) identifies that the use of basal texts in classrooms has been a popular method in teaching reading. This is in part because they include a teacher's manual that defines objectives, lesson ideas and assessment opportunities, making teaching easier, especially for new teachers. This is a very flexible method for teachers because the teacher's manual can be used en toto or in part as the teacher chooses. Basal texts are carefully written for each grade level by a team of reading specialists and usually come with workbooks that focus on comprehension, English skills, writing skills and other opportunities related to reading. In *The Psychology of Reading Instruction*, Ediger states, "the content may become too easy which can make for boredom or a lack of interest, nor should it be too complex making for pupil failure" (2002, p. 3). This identifies downfall of using basal texts, because students learn at different paces.

The final method of reading instruction is language experience discussed by Foertsch. "This approach is based on the premise that the easiest material for children to read is their own writing and that of their classmates. The stories that children themselves compose, orally or in writing, are the primary reading materials" (2003, p. 10). This method has been used more widely in Australia and other countries, but appeared in the United States in the late 1980s.

It is evident that there are many different reading programs available to teach children to read. It is also evident that there is not "one" best program to use because individuals integrate information differently using each method.

### *Vocabulary Development in Students*

There are important influences that lead to the development of vocabulary knowledge in students. Two major influences that affect vocabulary development are home influences and school instruction. As cited in Biemiller (2003), Hart and Risely reported that children of working class parents (who interact with their children as much as parents of advantaged families) have vocabulary levels comparable to those from advantaged families. Additionally, the author went on to say that children who spent more one-on-one time with adults developed a larger vocabulary than those who had limited contact.

Author Carl B. Smith states, “Most educators think of vocabulary as one skill taught in many different ways. However, there are many different levels of vocabulary proficiency that a student must work through” (2003b, p. 2). The four levels of vocabulary proficiency identified are listening vocabulary (words whose meanings we recognize when we hear them), reading vocabulary (words whose meanings we recognize when we encounter them in our reading), writing vocabulary (words we know well enough that we can use them in our writing) and speaking vocabulary (words we use in our speaking). Students do not necessarily have all levels mastered just because they have one mastered. The levels tend to lead from one to the other in a progressing order, with listening being the lowest and writing the highest.

As students attempt to increase their vocabulary, there are many different teaching methods to use. Just as in teaching reading, there is not one perfect method to use with all students. Smith (2003b) identifies three factors that affect the methods of teaching vocabulary as:

- Active processing: when students are doing something with a word more than just parroting the definition – they are more likely to remember that word
- Different contexts: we can learn much about a word’s meaning through different contexts in which it is used. And the more different contexts we encounter with that word, the more flexible we become with that word and its meaning and the more likely it is that we will remember it.
- Using several techniques for reviewing that word instead of only one: Just as learners acquire vocabulary more readily through encountering words in varying contexts, varying kinds of review activities apparently enhance vocabulary development. Each review activity reveals a word and its meaning in a different way, offering its own perspective on the word and its meaning (p.2-3).

In the article *Drama Activities that Promote and Extend Your Students’ Vocabulary Proficiency* the author identifies ideas to help students learn and practice vocabulary. “Using drama activities to teach target vocabulary words can be an effective and motivating instructional practice for all students, especially those with learning problems” (Alber & Foil, 2003, p.1).

There are endless ways to teach and practice vocabulary. Teachers of vocabulary need to identify research based methods and determine which method works best for the students in his/her class. The scale of methods used to teach and practice vocabulary ranges from drill and practice to multiple choices of games. Any of these methods can be used on an individual basis or with partners or groups.

### *Teaching in Diverse Classrooms*

“The premise – one teaching and learning approach fits all – is not working for a growing number of student populations. Twenty-first century classrooms challenge traditional teacher-centered curriculum to meet the increasingly diverse needs of students and make the required increases in achievement gains” (Brown, 2003, p. 49). This section focuses on teacher-centered learning vs. learner-centered learning. It will also focus on acknowledging students sociocultural contexts and providing these students recommendations for reading comprehension.

In the article *From Teacher-Centered to Learner-Centered Curriculum: Improving Learning in Diverse Classrooms*, author Kathy Laboard Brown discusses the difference between teacher-centered learning and learner-centered learning in diverse classrooms.

Additionally, Brown states that the characteristics of the teacher-centered approach are associated primarily with the transmission of knowledge. Primarily, the achievement of the students is at the forefront of a teacher-centered curriculum. Teachers are pressured to meet accountability standards, and often sacrifice the needs of the students to guarantee exposure to the standards. Another characteristic of a teacher-centered approach is to focus on content more than on student processing. Teachers focus on creating relationships with students that are fixed in intellectual explorations of selected material. The control for learning is basically held in the hands of the teacher where the teacher uses personal knowledge to help the learners make connections. The effort to get to know the learner and how they process information is secondary. Direct

instruction is the predominant teaching technique used in teacher-centered learning (2003).

Brown identifies the characteristics of the learner-centered approach as quite contradictory to those of the teacher-centered approach. Learner-centered approach is defined as “a foundation for clarifying what is needed to create positive learning contexts to increase the likelihood that more students will experience success” (McCombs, 1997 as cited by Brown, 2003, p. 50). The focus of the learner-centered approach is on individual learners’ “heredity, experiences, perspectives, backgrounds, talents, interests, capacities, and needs” (Brown, 2003, p. 50). In the learner-centered approach the learning characteristics of all learners are put under a microscope, studied, identified, and individualized. There is a nominal amount of direct instruction used in the learner-centered approach to teaching.

Differentiated instruction meets the needs of diverse student populations by coupling student needs with a focus on content, process, and learning profiles. With the learner-centered approach, teachers bring command of content knowledge but design flexibility for learners to construct their learning. Learners needs and characteristics take precedence over knowledge of facts and skills (Brown, 2003, p. 52).

As identified there are different teaching strategies that can be implemented. This leads to the discussion of reading comprehension in sociocultural diverse classrooms and how to improve in this area. To obtain the most out of each student in the area of reading comprehension professional educators need to respond flexibly to each situation and each



student's abilities within a particular text. Author Dawnene Hammerberg (2004) suggests the following recommendations for teachers of socioculturally diverse classrooms:

**1. Know, respect, and empower your students.** This requires that

teachers view their students as capable of understanding themselves and their words in multiple ways. It entails building an atmosphere of respect, support, and academic achievement, coupled with the use of texts and reading for culturally relevant purposes.

**2. Explain what resources or knowledge a student might have to draw**

**upon to understand a particular text.** In a sociocultural approach, we can overtly explain to children that they have knowledge resources to draw upon (e.g. skills and abilities) and identify resources (e.g. roles in the classroom, social ways of being, cultural identities).

**3. Know that learning occurs through social interaction – skills and techniques are not enough.** Encourage conversations and connections.

Not only should we help children make connections to the known and use what they know to support further learning, but we should also encourage them to use what they know to answer questions.

**4. Open up educational notions of text.** We need more than using comprehension strategies in and of themselves to regurgitate an author's meaning. We need include discussion about the multiple answers, perspectives, and interpretations possible. Interactive discussion is a key element, so that students can learn to comprehend beyond decoding the words. Opening up educational notions of text also allows us to think in

terms of critical literacy or literacy for social change, because the author's meaning is situated in the readers' heads in such a way that the message can be questioned, critiqued, and used in socially empowered ways (p. 655).

These recommendations have been suggested for sociocultural diverse classrooms, but they apply to all classrooms. Following these recommendations could lead to more success in the area of reading comprehension, especially in diverse classrooms (Hammerberg, 2004).

In conclusion, the areas discussed in the review of related literature were reading programs at the elementary level, reading programs and the middle school level, vocabulary development and teaching in diverse classrooms.

Ivy & Fisher (2005) state the following:

Educators are flooding the professional learning community with requests for strategies that work to improve reading comprehension in the upper elementary and secondary grades. In these achievement-driven times, we want to know what works best to raise test scores, improve comprehension, and motivate students to read. The answers are not simple for most students, particularly for older students still learning about literacy. Getting to the bottom of older readers' comprehension and motivation difficulties requires careful, ongoing assessment of instructional practices and students' literacy needs (p.9).

## Chapter III: Methodology

### *Introduction*

This chapter will include information about the description of the subjects involved in the study. It will also include information about the instruments used to collect the data. There will be a discussion of the procedure used to collect the data and data analysis procedures will be given.

### *Subject Selection and Description*

There were 14 sixth grade students at St. Mary's Tri-Parish Catholic School. All sixth grade students from St. Mary's Tri-Parish Catholic School were involved in the study. The school principal was contacted prior to involving the students to gain approval of the study. Once approval from the principal was attained, the parents were contacted by form of a letter. The letter stated what the students were going to be involved in, the risks, and the benefits of the study. The letter also stated that the results would be completely confidential.

### *Instrumentation*

The instrumentation that was used during this study was the *Qualitative Reading Inventory – 4*. The *Qualitative Reading Inventory -4* is an instrument used to determine reading comprehension levels at differing reading levels. Subjects read short articles and answered implicit and explicit comprehension questions. They were scored by percentage which indicated the level of comprehension (independent, instructional, frustration) they resided at. This instrument was a valid tool in determining reading comprehension levels.

### *Data Collection and Procedures*

Permission to perform this study with St. Mary's Tri-Parish Catholic School Sixth Grade students was verbally sought from the principal of St. Mary's Tri-Parish Catholic School. This study occurred during the Fall semester of 2005. Once permission was granted, a letter was sent out to the parents of the sixth grade students. The letter informed the parents about the study and allowed them to give consent for their child's participation.

The eight week study began with students taking the *Qualitative Reading Inventory – 4* to determine their level of reading comprehension. Thereafter, the students were taught the *Self-Questioning Reading Comprehension Strategy* to use while reading selections from the text book and other reading sources. The students had the opportunity to practice this strategy two or three times each week for six weeks. Throughout those six weeks the students were also learning strategies for defining vocabulary words through context clues and identifying the main character, plot, conflict, climax and resolution of fictional stories. In the eighth week the students took the *Qualitative Reading Inventory – 4* again to determine their level of reading comprehension.

### *Data Analysis*

The data collected was analyzed using scores from the students first *Qualitative Reading Inventory – 4* and the second *Qualitative Reading Inventory - 4*.

### *Limitations*

The subject size was limited at only 14 participants. Only one class of one private school in the school district participated in this study, therefore the results should be used cautiously due to possible internal validity problems.

## Chapter IV: Results

The purpose of this study was to determine the level of difference in reading comprehension scores as measured by the *Qualitative Reading Inventory – 4* for sixth grade literature students prior to the instruction of the self-questioning reading comprehension strategy and after the instruction of the self-questioning reading comprehension strategy. This study began by determining each student's readability level. The levels were determined by examination of previously taken achievement tests and by evaluating word lists read by each student. Once the readability levels were determined, the study continued by presenting the students with a reading comprehension pretest. During the succeeding six weeks the students were taught and given opportunities to practice the self-questioning reading comprehension strategy on passages and articles. In the eighth week of the study the students were given a reading comprehension posttest. Once the results were determined the scores from the pretest were compared to the results of the posttest. Twelve of the fourteen students' demonstrated improvement in the reading comprehension test scores. Two of the fourteen students' results remained the same. There were no scores that declined during the study. An overall analyses of the study indicated that there was improvement in reading comprehension scores when using the *Self-Questioning Reading Strategy*.

*Item Analysis*

Table 1

## Student 1 Profile Sheet

Subject: 1

Grade: 6

Sex: M

## Silent Reading

|  |         |             |
|--|---------|-------------|
| Date   | 10/7/05 | 11/10/05    |
| Passage Name/Selection                                       | Pele    | Abe Lincoln |
| Readability Level  | 6       | 6           |
| Passage Type Narrative/Expository                            | N       | N           |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar %                               | 55%     | 58%         |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar                                 | F       | F           |
| # Correct Explicit   | 3       | 3           |
| # Correct Implicit   | 3       | 3           |
| Level % Comprehension  | 75%     | 75%         |
| Comprehension Level<br>Frustration/Instructional/Independent | Ins.    | Ins.        |

Subject number 1 took the pretest and posttest at the sixth grade reading level.

This student had familiar concepts with the pretest selection as well as the posttest selection. The scores indicate that the student answered 75% of the comprehension questions correctly, scoring at the instructional comprehension level on both tests. This student made no improvement in the reading comprehension percentage level from the pretest to the posttest.

Table 2

## Student 2 Profile Sheet

Subject: 2

Grade: 6

Sex: M

## Silent Reading

|   |                        |               |
|---|------------------------|---------------|
| Date  | 10/5/05                | 11/11/05      |
| Passage Name/Selection                                    | Martin Luther King Jr. | Margaret Mead |
| Readability Level   | 5                      | 5             |
| Passage Type Narrative/Expository                         | N                      | N             |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar %                            | 67%                    | 33%           |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar                              | F                      | U             |
| # Correct Explicit  | 2                      | 3             |
| # Correct Implicit  | 3                      | 3             |
| Level % Comprehension                                     | 63%                    | 75%           |
| Comprehension Level Frustration/Instructional/Independent | Frus.                  | Ins.          |

Subject number 2 took the pretest and posttest at the fifth grade reading level.

This student had familiar concepts with the pretest selection and unfamiliar concepts with the posttest selection. The test results imply that the student answered 63% of the comprehension questions correctly on the pretest and 75% correctly on the posttest improving by 12% from the frustration level to the instructional comprehension level.

Table 3

## Student 3 Profile Sheet

Subject: 3

Grade: 6

Sex: F

## Silent Reading

|  |         |             |
|--|---------|-------------|
| Date   | 10/4/05 | 11/15/05    |
| Passage Name/Selection                                       | Pele    | Abe Lincoln |
| Readability Level  | 6       | 6           |
| Passage Type Narrative/Expository                            | N       | N           |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar %                               | 67%     | 75%         |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar                                 | F       | F           |
| # Correct Explicit   | 3       | 4           |
| # Correct Implicit   | 3       | 4           |
| Level % Comprehension  | 75%     | 100%        |
| Comprehension Level<br>Frustration/Instructional/Independent | Ins.    | Ind.        |

Subject number 3 took the pretest and posttest at the sixth grade reading level.

This student had familiar concepts with the pretest selection as well as the posttest selection. The test scores suggest that the student answered 75% of the comprehension questions correctly on the pretest, scoring at the instructional comprehension level. This student made a significant improvement in the reading comprehension percentage level from the pretest to the posttest. There was a 25% increase and the student improved from the instructional to the independent comprehension level.



Table 4

## Student 4 Profile Sheet

Subject: 4

Grade: 6

Sex: F

## Silent Reading

|  |         |             |
|--|---------|-------------|
| Date   | 10/4/05 | 11/14/05    |
| Passage Name/Selection                                       | Pele    | Abe Lincoln |
| Readability Level  | 6       | 6           |
| Passage Type Narrative/Expository                            | N       | N           |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar %                               | 50%     | 92%         |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar                                 | U       | F           |
| # Correct Explicit   | 3       | 3           |
| # Correct Implicit   | 2       | 3           |
| Level % Comprehension  | 63%     | 75%         |
| Comprehension Level<br>Frustration/Instructional/Independent | Fru.    | Ins.        |

Subject number 4 took the pretest and posttest at the sixth grade reading level.

This student had unfamiliar concepts with the pretest selection and familiar concepts with the posttest selection. The results indicate that the student answered 63% of the comprehension questions correctly on the pretest, scoring at the frustration comprehension level. This student made a 12% improvement in the reading comprehension percentage level from the pretest to the posttest increasing from the frustration level to the instructional level.

Table 5

## Student 5 Profile Sheet

Subject: 5

Grade: 6

Sex: F

## Silent Reading

|   |                        |               |
|---|------------------------|---------------|
| Date  | 10/7/05                | 11/11/05      |
| Passage Name/Selection                                    | Martin Luther King Jr. | Margaret Mead |
| Readability Level   | 5                      | 5             |
| Passage Type Narrative/Expository                         | N                      | N             |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar %                            | 67%                    | 8%            |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar                              | F                      | U             |
| # Correct Explicit  | 3                      | 3             |
| # Correct Implicit  | 1                      | 2             |
| Level % Comprehension                                     | 50%                    | 63%           |
| Comprehension Level Frustration/Instructional/Independent | Fru.                   | Fru.          |

Subject number 5 took the pretest and posttest at the fifth grade reading level.

This student had familiar concepts with the pretest selection and unfamiliar concepts with the posttest selection. The test scores imply that the student answered 50% of the comprehension questions correctly on the pretest and 63% correctly on the posttest improving by 13%, but still remaining at the frustration level.

Table 6

## Student 6 Profile Sheet

Subject: 6

Grade: 6

Sex: F

## Silent Reading

|   |         |             |
|---|---------|-------------|
| Date  | 10/6/05 | 11/14/05    |
| Passage Name/Selection                                    | Pele    | Abe Lincoln |
| Readability Level   | 6       | 6           |
| Passage Type Narrative/Expository                         | N       | N           |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar %                            | 33%     | 83%         |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar                              | U       | F           |
| # Correct Explicit  | 3       | 4           |
| # Correct Implicit  | 3       | 4           |
| Level % Comprehension                                     | 75%     | 100%        |
| Comprehension Level Frustration/Instructional/Independent | Ins.    | Ind.        |

Subject number 6 took the pretest and posttest at the sixth grade reading level.

This student had unfamiliar concepts with the pretest selection and familiar concepts with the posttest selection. The results suggest that the student answered 75% of the comprehension questions correctly on the pretest, scoring at the instructional comprehension level. This student made a significant 25% improvement in the reading comprehension percentage level from the pretest to the posttest increasing from the instructional level to the independent level.

Table 7

## Student 7 Profile Sheet

Subject: 7

Grade: 6

Sex: M

## Silent Reading

|  |         |             |
|--|---------|-------------|
| Date   | 10/6/05 | 11/10/05    |
| Passage Name/Selection                                       | Pele    | Abe Lincoln |
| Readability Level  | 6       | 6           |
| Passage Type Narrative/Expository                            | N       | N           |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar %                               | 58%     | 83%         |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar                                 | F       | F           |
| # Correct Explicit   | 1       | 3           |
| # Correct Implicit   | 1       | 3           |
| Level % Comprehension  | 25%     | 75%         |
| Comprehension Level<br>Frustration/Instructional/Independent | Fru.    | Ins.        |

Subject number 7 took the pretest and posttest at the sixth grade reading level.

This student had familiar concepts with the pretest selection and the posttest selection.

The test scores indicate that the student answered 25% of the comprehension questions correctly on the pretest, scoring at the frustration comprehension level. This student made a increase of 50% in the reading comprehension percentage level from the pretest to the posttest improving from the frustration level to the instructional level.

Table 8

## Student 8 Profile Sheet

Subject: 8

Grade: 6

Sex: M

## Silent Reading

|  |         |             |
|--|---------|-------------|
| Date   | 10/6/05 | 11/14/05    |
| Passage Name/Selection                                       | Pele    | Abe Lincoln |
| Readability Level  | 6       | 6           |
| Passage Type Narrative/Expository                            | N       | N           |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar %                               | 67%     | 100%        |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar                                 | F       | F           |
| # Correct Explicit   | 3       | 4           |
| # Correct Implicit   | 3       | 4           |
| Level % Comprehension  | 75%     | 100%        |
| Comprehension Level<br>Frustration/Instructional/Independent | Ins.    | Ind.        |

Subject number 8 took the pretest and posttest at the sixth grade reading level. This student had familiar concepts with the pretest selection and the posttest selection. The test results imply that the student answered 75% of the comprehension questions correctly on the pretest, scoring at the instructional comprehension level. This student made a suggests a significant increase of 25% in the reading comprehension percentage level from the pretest to the posttest improving from the instructional level to the independent level.

Table 9

## Student 9 Profile Sheet

Subject: 9

Grade: 6

Sex: F

## Silent Reading

|  |         |             |
|--|---------|-------------|
| Date   | 10/6/05 | 11/10/05    |
| Passage Name/Selection                                       | Pele    | Abe Lincoln |
| Readability Level  | 6       | 6           |
| Passage Type Narrative/Expository                            | N       | N           |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar %                               | 67%     | 25%         |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar                                 | F       | U           |
| # Correct Explicit   | 3       | 3           |
| # Correct Implicit   | 2       | 4           |
| Level % Comprehension  | 63%     | 88%         |
| Comprehension Level<br>Frustration/Instructional/Independent | Fru.    | Ins.        |

Subject number 9 took the pretest and posttest at the sixth grade reading level.

This student had familiar concepts with the pretest selection and unfamiliar concepts with the posttest selection. The scores indicate that the student answered 63% of the comprehension questions correctly on the pretest, scoring at the frustration comprehension level. This student increased to 88% in the reading comprehension percentage level on posttest improving from the frustration level to the instructional level.

Table 10

## Student 10 Profile Sheet

Subject: 10

Grade: 6

Sex: M

## Silent Reading

|   |             |                   |
|---|-------------|-------------------|
| Date  | 10/4/05     | 11/14/05          |
| Passage Name/Selection                                    | Biddy Mason | Immigration Pt. 1 |
| Readability Level   | UMS         | UMS               |
| Passage Type Narrative/Expository                         | N           | E                 |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar %                            | 75%         | 25%               |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar                              | F           | U                 |
| # Correct Explicit  | 3           | 4                 |
| # Correct Implicit  | 3           | 2                 |
| Level % Comprehension                                     | 60%         | 60%               |
| Comprehension Level Frustration/Instructional/Independent | Ins.        | Ins.              |

Subject number 10 took the pretest and posttest at the upper middle school reading level. This student had familiar concepts with the pretest selection and unfamiliar concepts with the posttest selection. The results imply that the student answered 60% of the comprehension questions correctly on both the pretest and the posttest remaining at the instructional comprehension level.

Table 11

## Student 11 Profile Sheet

Subject: 11

Grade: 6

Sex: F

## Silent Reading

|  |         |             |
|--|---------|-------------|
| Date   | 10/4/05 | 11/15/05    |
| Passage Name/Selection                                       | Pele    | Abe Lincoln |
| Readability Level  | 6       | 6           |
| Passage Type Narrative/Expository                            | N       | N           |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar %                               | 33%     | 58%         |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar                                 | U       | F           |
| # Correct Explicit   | 0       | 2           |
| # Correct Implicit   | 2       | 3           |
| Level % Comprehension  | 25%     | 66%         |
| Comprehension Level<br>Frustration/Instructional/Independent | Fru.    | Fru.        |

Subject number 11 took the pretest and posttest at the sixth grade reading level.

This student had unfamiliar concepts with the pretest selection and familiar concepts with the posttest selection. The scores suggest that the student answered 25% of the comprehension questions correctly on the pretest, scoring at the frustration comprehension level. This student made an increase to 66% in the reading comprehension percentage level on posttest; however, still remained at the frustration level.



Table 12

## Student 12 Profile Sheet

Subject: 12

Grade: 6

Sex: M

## Silent Reading

|  |                      |                |
|--|----------------------|----------------|
| Date   | 10/5/05              | 11/14/05       |
| Passage Name/Selection                                       | Immigration<br>Pt. 1 | Biddy<br>Mason |
| Readability Level  | UMS                  | UMS            |
| Passage Type Narrative/Expository                            | E                    | N              |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar %                               | 50%                  | 100%           |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar                                 | U                    | F              |
| # Correct Explicit   | 3                    | 5              |
| # Correct Implicit   | 3                    | 5              |
| Level % Comprehension  | 60%                  | 100%           |
| Comprehension Level<br>Frustration/Instructional/Independent | Fru.                 | Ind.           |

Subject number 12 took the pretest and posttest at the upper middle school reading level. This student had unfamiliar concepts with the pretest selection and familiar concepts with the posttest selection. The results indicate that the student answered 60% of the comprehension questions correctly on the pretest and made an incredible increase of 40% on the posttest improving from the frustration to the independent comprehension level.

Table 13

## Student 13 Profile Sheet

Subject: 13

Grade: 6

Sex: M

## Silent Reading

|  |                |          |
|--|----------------|----------|
| Date   | 10/7/05        | 11/14/05 |
| Passage Name/Selection                                       | Abe<br>Lincoln | Pele     |
| Readability Level  | 6              | 6        |
| Passage Type Narrative/Expository                            | N              | N        |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar %                               | 33%            | 50%      |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar                                 | U              | U        |
| # Correct Explicit   | 2              | 3        |
| # Correct Implicit   | 4              | 4        |
| Level % Comprehension  | 75%            | 88%      |
| Comprehension Level<br>Frustration/Instructional/Independent | Ins.           | Ins.     |

Subject number 13 took the pretest and posttest at the sixth grade reading level.

This student had unfamiliar concepts with both the pretest selection and the posttest selection. The scores imply that the student answered 75% of the comprehension questions correctly on the pretest, scoring at the instructional comprehension level. This student made a slight increase to 88% in the reading comprehension percentage level on the posttest remaining at the instructional level.

Table 14

## Student 14 Profile Sheet

Subject: 14

Grade: 6

Sex: M

## Silent Reading

|   |         |             |
|---|---------|-------------|
| Date  | 10/5/05 | 11/10/05    |
| Passage Name/Selection                                    | Pele    | Abe Lincoln |
| Readability Level   | 6       | 6           |
| Passage Type Narrative/Expository                         | N       | N           |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar %                            | 50%     | 33%         |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar                              | U       | U           |
| # Correct Explicit  | 4       | 4           |
| # Correct Implicit  | 3       | 4           |
| Level % Comprehension                                     | 88%     | 100%        |
| Comprehension Level Frustration/Instructional/Independent | Ins.    | Ind.        |

Subject number 14 took the pretest and posttest at the sixth grade reading level.

This student had unfamiliar concepts with the pretest selection and the posttest selection.

The scores suggest that the student answered 75% of the comprehension questions correctly on the pretest, scoring at the instructional comprehension level. This student improved 12%, increasing to 100%, in the reading comprehension percentage level on posttest; performing at the independent comprehension level.

*Conclusion*

The overall conclusion of this study is that twelve of the fourteen subjects made improvements from the pretest to the posttest. Two of the students' results remained the same. No subjects declined in their scores from the pretest to the posttest. The average percent of improvement of the twelve that improved is 24.42%. As a complete group the improvement percentage is 21.92%. These results demonstrate significant improvement in the sixth grade literature students' scores from the pretest to the posttest

## Chapter V: Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine the level of difference in reading comprehension scores as measured by the *Qualitative Reading Inventory – 4* for sixth grade literature students prior to the instruction of the self-questioning reading comprehension strategy and after the instruction of the self-questioning reading comprehension strategy. This study began by determining each student's readability level. The levels were determined by examination of previously taken achievement tests and by evaluating word lists read by each student. Once the readability levels were determined, the study continued by presenting the students with a reading comprehension pretest. During the succeeding six weeks the students were taught and given opportunities to practice the self-questioning reading comprehension strategy on passages and articles. In the eighth week of the study the students were given a reading comprehension posttest.

### *Discussion*

In the review of literature it was determined that students who used reading strategies while reading demonstrated strong reading comprehension skills. Also, students with strong reading comprehension skills often performed better on comprehension tests, getting high comprehension scores. In this study, the results mirrored this statement. After completing a comprehension pretest, the students were given a strategy to practice and use while taking the posttest. The results showed an increase in student comprehension, which was indicated by higher posttest scores for almost all of the students. There were no students' comprehension levels that diminished during the study.

### *Limitations*

This was a very limited study due to the small number of participants. There were fourteen students in St. Mary's Sixth Grade Literature Class that participated in the study. All of the students were Caucasian. Due to the small number of participants and the lack of diversity, this study was not generalizable to the entire population of sixth grade students.

### *Conclusions*

The findings of the study revealed that after using the reading comprehension strategy, the sixth grade students received higher test scores than before using the reading comprehension strategy. This shows a correlation with the previous research conducted on this topic. Therefore, at the conclusion of the study, the research hypothesis could be accepted.

### *Recommendations*

This study was quite limited. To make the study more generalizable, I would recommend utilizing this study on a larger group of students and on a more diverse group of students. This study could be completed with a different age group by modifying the *Self-Questioning Strategy*.

A recommendation for further study is to refine the *Self-Questioning Strategy* for longer articles. During the practice portion of the study the students read longer articles and it appeared too repetitive and broken up. It is my belief that fewer interruptions during longer articles would make the reading and comprehension go more smoothly.

Another recommendation for further study is to identify a different strategy to use while reading to measure the difference in results.

## References

- Alber, S. R., & Foil, C. R. (2003). Drama activities that promote and extend you students' vocabulary proficiency. *Intervention in School & Clinic, 39*(1), 22-29.
- Berg, A., Cressman, K. S., & Pfanz, T. (1998). *Improving reading comprehension through vocabulary*. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 420 051)
- Best, R. M., Rowe, M., Ozuru, Y., & McNamara, D. S. (2005). Deep-level comprehension of science texts. *Topics in Language Disorders, 25*(1), 65-83.
- Biemiller, A. (2003). Vocabulary: Needed if more children are to read well. *Reading Psychology, 24*(3-4), 323-335.
- Brown, K. L. (2003). From teacher-centered to learner-centered curriculum: Improving learning in diverse classrooms. *Education, 124*(1), 49-54.
- Burmester, E. (2005, June). *No Child Left Behind Requirements*. State of Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. Retrieved July 14, 2005, from: [www.dpi.state.wi.us](http://www.dpi.state.wi.us)
- DeMoulin, D. F., Loye, R. D., Swan, M., Block, R., & Schnabel, J. (1999). Helping children learn to read: A program that is making the grade. *Education, 120*(1), 40.
- Duffy, A. M., Anderson, J., Durham, C. M., Erickson, A., Guion, C., & Ingram, M. H. et al. (2003). Responding to the rhetoric: Perspectives on reading instruction. *Reading Teacher, 56*(7), 684.
- Ediger, M. (2002). The psychology of reading instruction. *Reading Improvement, 41*(3), 157-164.
- Elder, L., & Paul, R. (2004). Critical thinking . . . and the art of close reading, part IV. *Journal of Developmental Education, 28*(2), 36-37.

- Falk-Ross, F. C. (2001). Toward the new literacy: Changes in college students' reading comprehension strategies following reading/writing projects. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 45*(4), 278.
- Foertsch, M. (2003). *Exemplary reading programs in illinois public schools*. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 480 092)
- Hammerberg, D. D. (2004). Comprehension instruction for socioculturally diverse classrooms: A review of what we know. *Reading Teacher, 57*(7), 648-658.
- House Education and the Workforce Committee Majority Staff (2002). *Education Reform 101*. 1-26. Retrieved October 9, 2005, from <http://edworkforce.house.gov/issues/107th/education/nclb/nclb.htm>
- Ivey, G., & Fisher, D. (2005). Learning from what doesn't work. *Educational Leadership, 63*(2), 8-40.
- Jalongo, M. R. (1998). On behalf of children: "The phuss over phonics". *Early Childhood Education Journal, 26*(1), 1-6.
- Manzo, A. V. (2003). Literacy crisis or cambrian period? theory, practice, and public policy implications. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 46*(8), 654.
- Porcaro, J. J., & Johnson, K. G. (2003). Building a whole-language writing program. *Kappa Delta Pi Record, 39*(2), 74-79.
- Post, Y. V. (2004). The introduction of text conventions and its impact on teaching literacy. *Journal of Research in Reading, 27*(1), 99-109.
- Shippen, M. E., Houchins, D. E., Steventon, C., & Sartor, D. (2005). A comparison of two direct instruction reading programs for urban middle school students. *Remedial & Special Education, 26*(3), 175-182.

Smith, C. B., Ed. (2003). *The use of "balanced instruction" in language arts curriculum.*

(ERIC Document Reproduction No.

ED 480 636)

Smith, C. B., Ed. (2003). *Vocabulary development: Elaboration for writing.* (ERIC

Document Reproduction No. ED 480 888)



## Appendix A: IRB Form



Stout Solutions • Research Services  
152 Voc Rehab Building

University of Wisconsin-Stout  
P.O. Box 790  
Menomonie, WI 54751-0790

715/232-1126  
715/232-1749 (fax)  
<http://www.uwstout.edu/rps/>

**Date:** September 23, 2005

**To:** Rebecca Baier

**Cc:** Dr. Amy Schlieve

**From:** Sue Foxwell, Research Administrator and Human Protections Administrator, UW-Stout Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research (IRB)

**Subject:** **Protection of Human Subjects in Research**

Your project, "*Reading Comprehension and Reading Strategies*" is **Exempt** from review by the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects. The project is exempt under Categories 1 of the Federal Exempt Guidelines and holds for 5 years.

Please copy and paste the following message to the top of your survey form before dissemination:

|  |
|--|
| <p><b>This project has been reviewed by the UW-Stout IRB as required by the Code of Federal Regulations Title 45 Part 46</b></p> |
|--|

Please contact the IRB if the plan of your research changes. Thank you for your cooperation with the IRB and best wishes with your project.

**\*NOTE: This is the only notice you will receive – no paper copy will be sent.**

SF:dd

## Appendix B: Parent Letter

Dear Parents,

I am going to be conducting a study during Grade 6 literature class for work on my thesis this Fall. I am planning on starting the study September 29, 2005 and finishing up around the beginning of November. A description of the study is on the following pages. I am asking for your consent to have your students participate in this study. Please read the following pages of information and return them to me by Friday, September 26, 2005.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Becky Baier

## Appendix C: Consent to Participate

**Consent to Participate in UW-Stout Approved Research**

**Title:** Reading Comprehension and Reading Strategies

**Investigator:**

Rebecca J. Baier  
St. Mary's School  
Durand, WI  
715/672-5617  
baier\_becky@yahoo.com

**Research Advisor:**

Dr. Amy Carole Schieve  
423 McCallmont Hall  
UW-Stout  
Menomonie, WI  
schlievea@uwstout.edu  
715/232-1332

**Description:**

The students in the sixth grade literature class will be asked to participate in a research project conducted by Mrs. Baier. The students will be asked to take a Qualitative Reading Inventory –IV Test at the beginning of the study. Following the test the students will be taught reading comprehension strategies and will have the opportunity to practice them for a six to eight week period. At the end of that period the students will take the Qualitative Reading Inventory – IV Test again to see if there are any changes in the reading comprehension scores.

**Risks and Benefits:**

During this study the students will be exposed to reading comprehension strategies. I foresee no risks to the students during this study. I do however see benefits for the students. The students will be taught reading comprehension strategies that they will be able to use in any subject or reading they encounter. These are skills that will be useful throughout their lives.

**Special Population:**

This study is going to be done on the sixth grade literature class at St. Mary's School in Durand, WI.

**Time Commitment:**

The participants are asked to participate in this study for a period of six to eight weeks during the Fall semester of the 2005-2006 school year.

**Confidentiality:**

Your name will not be included on any documents. We do not believe that you can be identified from any of this information. This informed consent will not be kept with any of the other documents completed with this project.

**Right to Withdraw:**

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may choose not to participate without any adverse consequences to you. Should you choose to participate and later wish to withdraw from the study, you may discontinue your participation at this time without incurring adverse consequences.

**IRB Approval:**

This study has been reviewed and approved by The University of Wisconsin-Stout's Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB has determined that this study meets the ethical obligations required by federal law and University policies. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study please contact the Investigator or Advisor. If you have any questions, concerns, or reports regarding your rights as a research subject, please contact the IRB Administrator.

**Investigator:**

Rebecca J. Baier  
715/672-5617  
baier\_becky@yahoo.com

**IRB Administrator:**

Sue Foxwell, Director, Research Services  
152 Vocational Rehabilitation Bldg.  
UW-Stout  
Menomonie, WI 54751  
715/232-2477  
foxwells@uswtout.edu

**Advisor:**

Dr. Amy Carole Schlieve  
423 McCallmont Hall  
UW-Stout, Menomonie, WI 54751  
schlievea@uwstout.edu  
715/232-1332

**Statement of Consent:**

By signing this consent form you agree to participate in the project entitled "Reading Comprehension and Reading Strategies"

---

Signature

Date

---

Signature of parent of guardian

Date

## Appendix D: Self-Questioning Strategy for Fiction Text

### **Self-Questioning Strategy - Strategy for Reading Comprehension of Fiction Text**

Prior to reading the story ask yourself two questions you would like answered as you read the story.

Once reading begins, STOP after 4-5 paragraphs and ask yourself a question about the preceding paragraphs. Then, ask yourself a prediction question about what will come/happen next. Read another 4-5 paragraphs and answer the question you asked about them (if you can), ask yourself another questions about those paragraphs, and ask another predictions question. Continue this pattern until the story is finished.

When we begin learning this strategy we will be writing the questions and answers on a piece of paper. As we continue to practice the strategy we will be writing less and less and doing more questioning in our heads. The final step is to do all of the questioning in our heads.

Name of Text \_\_\_\_\_

After reviewing the title of the text, write 2 questions that you want answered as you read the story.

1.

2.

Read 4-5 paragraphs. STOP.

Questions 1 –

Answer –

Prediction question –

Read 4-5 paragraphs. STOP.

Answer previous prediction question –

Question 2 –

Answer –

Prediction Question –

Read 4-5 paragraphs. STOP.

Answer previous prediction question –

Question –

Answer –

Prediction Question –

Read 4-5 paragraphs. STOP.

Answer previous prediction question –

Question –

Answer –

Prediction Question –

*Continue this pattern until the story is finished.*

At the end of the story see if you can answer the two questions asked prior to reading.

Answer to Question 1 –

Answer to Question 2 –



## Appendix E: Self-Questioning Strategy for Non-fiction Text

### **Self-Questioning Strategy - Strategy for Reading Comprehension of Non-fiction Text**

Prior to reading the story ask yourself two questions you would like answered as you read the story.

Once reading begins, STOP after 2-3 paragraphs and ask yourself two questions about the preceding paragraphs. Read another 2-3 paragraphs and ask yourself another two questions about those paragraphs. Continue this pattern until the story is finished.

When we begin learning this strategy we will be writing the questions and answers on a piece of paper. As we continue to practice the strategy we will be writing less and less and doing more questioning in our heads. The final step is to do all of the questioning in our heads.

Name of Text \_\_\_\_\_

After reviewing the title of the text, write 2 questions that you want answered as you read the story.

1.

2.

Read 2-3 paragraphs. STOP.

Questions 1 –

Answer –

Question 2 –

Answer -

Read 2-3 paragraphs. STOP.

Question 1 –

Answer –

Question 2 –

Answer –

Read 2-3 paragraphs. STOP.

Question 1 –

Answer –

Question 2 –

Answer –

*Continue this pattern until the story is finished.*

At the end of the story see if you can answer the two questions asked prior to reading.

Answer to Question 1 –

Answer to Question 2 –

## Appendix F: Student Profile Sheet

## Student Profile Sheet

Subject:

Grade:

Sex:

## Silent Reading

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Date   |  |  |
| Passage Name/Selection                                       |  |  |
| Readability Level  |  |  |
| Passage Type Narrative/Expository                            |  |  |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar %                               |  |  |
| Concepts Familiar/Unfamiliar                                 |  |  |
| # Correct Explicit   |  |  |
| # Correct Implicit   |  |  |
| Level % Comprehension  |  |  |
| Comprehension Level<br>Frustration/Instructional/Independent |  |  |