A CASE STUDY OF THE REPORTED USE OF METACOGNITIVE READING STRATEGIES BY POSTSECONDARY INSTRUCTORS OF DEVELOPMENTAL READING COURSES WITH STRUGGLING ADULT READERS TO INCREASE COMPREHENSION

by

Audrita Drayton

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of

The College of Education

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Florida Atlantic University

Boca Raton, Florida

May 2016

A CASE STUDY OF THE REPORTED USE OF METACOGNITIVE READING STRATEGIES BY POSTSECONDARY INSTRUCTORS OF DEVELOPMENTAL READING COURSES WITH STRUGGLING ADULT READERS TO INCREASE COMPREHENSION

by

Audrita G. Drayton

This dissertation was prepared under the direction of the candidate's dissertation advisor, Dr. Traci P. Baxley, Department of Curriculum, Culture, and Educational Inquiry, and has been approved by the members of her supervisory committee. It was submitted to the faculty of the College of Education and was accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

Traci P. Baxley, Ed.D.

Dianne A. Wright, Ph.D.

Guillermo "John" Hardman, Ph.D.

Mary Louise Duffy, Ph.D.

Gail E. Burnaford, Ph.D.

Emery Hyslop-Margison, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Curriculum, Culture, and Educational Inquiry

Valerie J. Bristor, Ph.D.
Dean, College of Education

Deborah Floyd, Ed.D.
Dean, Graduate College

04/05/2016
Date

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my chair, Dr. Traci P. Baxley, as well as my committee members, Dr. Wright, Dr. Duffy, Dr. Burnaford, and Dr. Hardman, for leading and guiding me through this arduous process. Each of you, at different times and in many ways, were instrumental in seeing this dissertation through to its completion. Thank you for all of your support and assistance.

ABSTRACT

Author:	Audrita G. Drayton
Title:	A Case Study of the Reported Use of Metacognitive Reading Strategies by Postsecondary Instructors of Developmental Reading Courses With Struggling Adult Readers to Increase Comprehension
Institution:	Florida Atlantic University
Thesis Advisor:	Dr. Traci P. Baxley
Degree:	Doctor of Philosophy
Year:	2016

This qualitative research study examined developmental reading instructors' reported use of metacognitive reading strategies as well as what other approaches they used to improve and increase the reading comprehension of their struggling adult readers. The researcher collected data using two interviews per participant and document analyses. Although studies have deemed metacognitive reading strategies effective in increasing the reading comprehension of struggling readers, the results indicated that the participants did not typically instruct their struggling adult readers in the use of metacognitive reading strategies. The implications for the study were related to instructional practice in developmental reading courses, policy changes, and struggling readers.

DEDICATION

This manuscript is dedicated to my family, particularly my husband, Reverend Dr. Tony Drayton, daughters, Anya Burrs Freemon and Shantel Drayton, and grandchildren, Avaughna Burrs and Marquitis Burgess, Jr., as well as my extended family, father and mother (Leo and Anita Wright), sister (Patricia Daniels) and Mr. and Mrs. Charles Drayton, who have been there for me through all of things that I have experienced from the beginning to the end of this process. For being patient and understanding through my moments of nadir as well as my moments of zenith, I thank you. I also dedicate this work to my late father, Andrew Goldwire, Jr., and to my late grandmothers, Marie Johnson, Minnie Lou Goldwire, and Nancy Williams, who were influential during various times in my life.

A CASE STUDY OF THE REPORTED USE OF METACOGNITIVE READING STRATEGIES BY POSTSECONDARY INSTRUCTORS OF DEVELOPMENTAL READING COURSES WITH STRUGGLING ADULT READERS TO INCREASE COMPREHENSION

TABLES

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Reading comprehension is problematic for some K-12 and postsecondary students. Juel (1988) conducted a study regarding reading motivation and found that "40% of poor readers in the fourth grade would rather clean their room than read" (p. 442) with one student stating, "I'd rather clean the mold around the bathtub than read" (p. 442). Hock et al. (2009) asserted that 26% of eighth-grade students cannot comprehend significant materials needed and used every day. The researchers further stated that, "in some of the largest urban school districts in the United States, nearly 65% of adolescents read below "satisfactory" level on state reading assessments" (p. 21). Fritschmann, Deshler, and Schumaker (2007) contended that students with learning disabilities are far below grade level and, in fact, when they enter seventh grade are reading at a fourth-grade level. The Alliance for Excellent Education declared that students have difficulty becoming proficient in content areas because of their low reading levels. "Scores for 13 year old students have risen only three points since 1975 and scores for 17 year old students have dropped 5 points since 1992" (Perie, Moran, & Lutkus, 2005, p. iv).

The research literature paints a disconsolate portrait of possible challenges to increasing reading comprehension. Vipond (1980) has contended that college students who read poorly focus on details in texts, but not necessarily important information while Marshall and Glock (1978-1979) have argued that students have trouble making inferences and understanding literary devices. Baker (1985) has declared that students do not recognize what they know or do not know; therefore, they seem unable to judge their

own understanding of expository texts, whereas Caverly (1997) espoused the notion that a challenge to increasing reading comprehension may be that college students are not ready to meet the demands of college level reading. According to Baker (1989), challenges to increasing the reading comprehension of society may be related to students who use an insufficient number of strategies rather than a variety of strategies; students' inability to transfer or generalize strategies; and students' failure to regulate their learning through planning, checking, evaluating and regulating**.** Additionally, perhaps the challenge to increasing reading comprehension is a lack of reading comprehension instruction in K-12 classrooms or postsecondary institutions (Durkin, 1978-1979; Mason, 2013; Ness, 2009; Pressley, Wharton-McDonald, Mistretta-Hampston, & Echevarria, 1998).

The standards and standardized testing associated with the No Child Left Behind Act's (NCLB) implementation may be considered a challenge to increasing reading comprehension; although at this time, it is no longer being used as a barometer for the academic performance of students because some states have denounced its use and have adopted Common Core State Standards (U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2013), but the residual effect of the NCLB Act of 2001 may continue to be a part of the educational dilemma (i.e., students having difficulty comprehending text). NCLB encompassed accountability through the implementation of tested standards and high-stakes testing. It created a competitive, high-stakes test driven educational landscape unlike any other, at least thus far, in U.S. history. According to some, the focus of education during NCLB's implementation was more likely slanted toward being proficient on state standardized tests and, perhaps, that narrowed curricula all over the

United States, and may have caused educators to address matters that were to be on tests rather than teaching reading comprehension (Harvey & Goudvis, 2013; Klein, Hamilton, McCaffrey, & Stecher, 2000). Koretz, and Barron (1998), Linn (2000), Linn, Graue, and Sanders (1990) and Stecher, Barron, Kaganoff, and Goodwin (1998) have posited that too much time was being spent preparing students to take high-stakes tests.

> Although the policymakers who design and implement such systems often believe they lead to improved instruction, there is a growing body of evidence which indicates that high-stakes testing programs can also result in narrowing the curriculum and distorting scores. (Klein et al., 2000, p. 4)

Heubert and Hauser (1999) have speculated that questions have been raised about the appropriateness of using test scores alone for making high-stakes decisions. The narrowly focused testing that results from standardized testing associated with NCLB continues to be problematic despite states abnegating its use in determining student academic performance. Harvey and Goudvis (2013) asserted that classroom instruction has been directed toward splinter skills in reading such as teaching students to score well on standardized tests using test preparation, phonics and determining main idea from texts, while other researchers (Ness, 2009; Nist & Holschuh, 2000) propagated the notion that strategy instruction may increase reading comprehension. More specifically, Ness (2009) claimed that standardized tests impact the nature and content of reading instruction to such an extent that instruction is, more or less, test preparation that may not include the use of metacognitive reading comprehension strategies to increase reading comprehension. For example, the participants in Ness' (2009) study were concerned with

covering content related to standardized testing rather than reading comprehension instruction or thinking tools.

As previously noted, the NCLB Act is considered to be null and void for some states and has been replaced by the reforms that may result from the Race to the Top grant. President Obama signed the American Recovery and Investment Act of 2009, which was "designed to stimulate the economy, support job creation and invest in critical sectors, including education" (Race to the Top, 2009, p. 37804). It provided approximately 4.35 billion dollars to Race to the Top grant fund winners for the purpose of creating educational innovation and reform; improving student performance; closing the achievement gap; increasing graduation rates; helping students to succeed in college and employment as well as implementing plans related to four educational reform areas. The four stated reform areas of Race to the Top included adopting standards and assessments; developing data systems to measure student growth and success as well as improve instruction; recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals; and turning low performing schools around. States must "demonstrate success in raising student achievement and have the best plans to accelerate their reforms" (USDOE, 2009, p. 2) before receiving Race to the Top funds. Florida was a recipient of the Race to the Top funds in order to advance academic reforms. Because the Race to the Top Program originated in 2009, there is no definitive evidence to support the notion that using the funds will be effective in raising student achievement and producing educational reforms.

"More than 8 million adolescents have not mastered the reading skills necessary for them to successfully respond to demanding secondary school requirements or

compete for meaningful jobs in the workplace" (Hock & Deshler, 2003**,** p. 21**)**. Durkin (1978-1979) concluded that very little comprehension instruction was taking place in elementary schools. Similarly, Ness (2009) declared that comprehension instruction was probably not occurring in secondary schools as well. According to American College Testing (ACT, 2006), there are not enough high school teachers who teach reading skills or reading strategies; they teach their content. This report further alluded to the notion that perhaps English teachers have not taught reading due to their preconceived ideas that students learn how to read before entering secondary school and because they do not always know how to teach reading. Is it the case that educators have gleaned valuable information from content area pedagogy, but have not stepped outside of that arena to meet the reading comprehension needs of students and have placed a great deal of emphasis on curricula related to state assessments rather than reading comprehension for life? Has this alleged literacy crisis infiltrated the walls of higher educational institutions? ACT (2006) has suggested that 51% of high graduates who took the ACT are able to meet the academic demands of college reading tasks.

Pugh, Pawan, and Atommarchi (2000) have maintained that 85% of the learning that takes place in colleges happens because of independent reading. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2008) reported that approximately 29% of community college students and 19% of students in public 4-year institutions have taken remedial coursework in their first year of study. The American Institute for Research (AIR, 2006) reported that

> More than 75% of students at two-year colleges and more than 50 percent of students at four-year colleges do not score at a proficient level of literacy.

> Proficiency refers to being able to complete "complex literacy skills such as comparing credit card offers with different interest rates or summarizing the arguments of newspaper editorials. (AIR, 2006, p. 1)

This evidence suggests that the challenges regarding reading comprehension are apparent at all educational levels in the United States.

Statement of the Problem

Researchers have suggested that there are a number of possible reasons for the decline in literacy rates that are so much a part of U.S. society. According to Kamil (2003), 8.7 million 4th- to 12th-grade students have trouble understanding textbooks; as a result, they are reading below their grade levels and are at-risk for academic challenges or failure. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP, 2011) reported that a majority of the students who took the 2009 assessment scored at or above basic and only 3% advanced. Durkin (1978-1979) concluded that very little reading comprehension instruction is occurring in elementary schools while, Ness (2009) suggested that reading comprehension instruction is minimal in secondary schools. It appears that more time is being spent covering content for classes in an effort to improve standardized test scores (Ness, 2009).

Klein et al. (2000) argued that a considerable amount of time is spent preparing students for high-stakes assessments. Nelson and Manset-Williamson (2006) noted that as students age, there is a tendency for them to lose motivation in reading, and by the time they enter fourth grade, their reading comprehension has declined. According to Tierney and Garcia (2011), there is no K-16 collaboration/academic relationship; therefore, there is no alignment of standards or expectations for the institutions. As a

result, the literacy problems appear to influence not only K-12 and postsecondary institutions, but may also affect the economic/employment system of the United States. According to the American College Testing (2006), researchers reported that "eighty percent of businesses had a moderate to serious shortage of qualified workers" and "38% of applicants taking employer administered tests lacked the requisite reading skills" (p. 5).

This study examined the reported use of metacognitive reading strategies by instructors of developmental reading courses with struggling adult readers to increase reading comprehension as well as what instructors of developmental reading courses report using to improve the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this dissertation study was to discover and to describe the metacognitive reading comprehension strategies postsecondary instructors of developmental reading courses report using with struggling adult readers. The researcher also aimed to determine what these instructors reported using to improve the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers at the Sunshine State College (SSC) of south Florida. Metacognitive reading comprehension strategies are strategies that cause one to think about what one understands and what one does not understand as reading occurs or tasks completed (El-Hindi, 1997). Baker and Brown (1984) defined metacognitive strategies as the awareness and control of cognitive tasks. For purposes of this study, metacognitive strategies are as approaches to address reading comprehension challenges when such comprehension breaks down. The use of metacognitive reading strategies suggests that a reader may be aware of what fix-up (repair) strategy may be useful when

reading comprehension breaks down and, if comprehension continues to be impeded, what more appropriate strategy the reader might use to repair comprehension. Ofodu and Adedipe's (2011) definition of metacognition further informs the study:

> Metacognition [is the] level of thinking that involves active control over the process of thinking that is used in learning situations. Planning the way to approach a learning task, monitoring comprehension, and evaluating the progress towards the completion of a task. (p. 343)

Metacognitive strategies are purposeful, deliberate tools for comprehending and monitoring of comprehension before, during and after reading which researchers (Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995) have shown to be effective. For purposes of this study, metacognitive reading strategies maybe further defined as strategies or tools that one may use to monitor and to control the reading process as well as comprehend written texts.

The research literature documented that metacognitive reading comprehension strategies are effective for improving reading comprehension (Eilers & Pinkley, 2006; Falk-Ross, 2001-2002; Mealey & Nist, 1989; Nash-Ditzel, 2010; Nist & Holschuh, 2000; Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995; Trainin & Swanson, 2005; Wichadee, 2011). In the study, this researcher investigated the extent to which postsecondary instructors of developmental reading courses reported using metacognitive reading comprehension strategies with struggling adult readers to improve their reading comprehension and what instructors of developmental reading courses reported using to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers.

Research Questions

The study will address the following research questions:

1. What do instructors of developmental reading courses at Sunshine State College report using to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers?

2. What metacognitive reading comprehension strategies do instructors in developmental reading courses at Sunshine State College report using with struggling adult readers to improve reading comprehension?

Theoretical Framework

The researcher made three assumptions in this study. The first assumption was that metacognitive reading strategies are effective in increasing the reading comprehension of struggling readers (Eilers & Pinkley, 2006; Falk-Ross, 2001-2002; Mealey & Nist, 1989; Nash-Ditzel, 2010; Nist & Holschuh, 2000; Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995; Wichadee, 2011). According to Falk-Ross (2001-2002), some first year college students enter college with limited reading comprehension strategies. College courses require a great deal of independent reading of complex texts (Pugh et al., 2000) as well as completing assignments such as answering questions and writing summaries (Taraban, Kerr, & Rynearson, 2004). Consequently, college students will need to know how to monitor and to control their thinking and learning through metacognitive reading strategies (Baker & Brown, 1984; Brown, 1985; Cross & Paris, 1988; Flavell, Friedrichs, & Hoyt, 1970; Mokhtari, Sheorey, & Reichard, 2008; Wichadee, 2011).

The second assumption was that developmental reading instructors do not typically teach metacognitive reading strategies to struggling adult readers to increase reading comprehension (Dole, Duffy, Roehler, & Pearson, 1991; Grubb et al., 2011, 2013). Remedial college courses continue to cover "drill and practice of sub-skills"

(Grubb et al., 2011, p. 1) rather than instruction in and the use of metacognitive reading strategies to increase reading comprehension.

Finally, the third assumption was that society has been experiencing a dire literacy situation and that researchers (AIR, 2006; Hock & Deshler, 2003; Kamil, 2003; Mason, 2013) have suggested that instruction using metacognitive reading comprehension strategies may alleviate it to some degree. Thus, determining if instructors are actually taking advantage of these research-based strategies to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers is paramount.

Metacognition is the framework upon which metacognitive reading strategies are constructed and defined as the active control over thinking, planning, monitoring and evaluation of learning tasks (Ofodu & Adedipe, 2011). It is "characterized by remembering, comprehending, focusing, attention, and processing information" (Babbs & Moe, 1983, p. 423). According to Babbs and Moe (1983), metacognition, in the context of reading, begins with metacognitive knowledge and concludes with strategic reading behaviors. Other researchers (Carretti, Caldarola, Chiara, & Cornoldi, 2013; Eker, 2014; Myers & Paris, 1978; Baker and Brown, 1980; and Brown, 1985; Ofodu and Adedipe, 2011; Pacello, 2014; Paris, Newman, & McVey, 1982) have espoused various notions regarding metacognition in reading. Metacognition in reading may include readers being aware of the reading process; how readers monitor and control constant reading processes'; readers being aware of their abilities, and readers being able to determine which strategy is appropriate for particular learning contexts, and purposes**.**

In order to understand the underpinnings of metacognitive reading strategies, one must understand, be able to distinguish and to explain what metacognition is or is not;

and one must understand the connection between metacognition and reading. Some strategies are categories as cognitive strategies; some as metacognitive strategies and yet others may be referred to as reading comprehension strategies; nevertheless, knowledge of metacognition becomes significant when determining which strategies may be appropriate for use in this study. An explanation of metacognition is in the definition of terms section.

Definition of Terms

1. Ofodu and Adedipe (2011) define metacognition as "the level of thinking that involves active control over the process of thinking that is used in learning situations. Planning the way to approach a learning task, monitoring comprehension and evaluating the progress towards the completion of a task" (p. 343).

2. Metacognitive Strategies are effective tools used to help learners to become consciously aware of what they have learned and to recognize situations in which they would be useful (Wichadee, 2011). They encompass deliberate, effortful, conscious actions or processes as well as declarative, procedural and conditional knowledge used during the reading process to improve comprehension.

3. Comprehension monitoring, self-monitoring, or self-regulating is recognizing when comprehension breaks down and knowing what to do when it becomes an impediment (Dole et al., 1991; Eilers & Pinkley, 2006; Mason, 2013; Ofodu & Adedipe, 2011; Palincsar & Brown, 1984; Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995; Reid & Lienemann, 2006).

3. "Reading Comprehension is the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning through interaction and involvement with written language" (Snow, 2002, p. 11).

4. Reading Strategies are planned ways to control and to alter readers' decoding of text, understanding of words and constructing of meaning from text (Afflerbach, Pearson, & Paris, 2008a, 2008b).

5. Reading skills are "automatic actions that result in the decoding and comprehending of texts with speed, efficiency, and fluency, usually without the reader's awareness of the components or controls involved" (Afflerbach et al., 2008a, 2008b).

6. Struggling readers in college are those students who are ill-equipped to meet the academic challenge of college-leveled materials as well as those who have not met the cutoff scores set for college entrance examinations (Alvarez, Armstrong, Elish-Piper, Matthews, & Risko, 2009; Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Nash-Ditzel, 2010). On the other hand, the USDOE (2005) defined struggling readers as "students who read at least two years below grade level, including limited English proficient students and students with disabilities" (p. 57257). Although the focus of the study are postsecondary instructors and what they report relative to metacognitive reading strategies use with struggling adult readers, the USDOE's definition of struggling readers may be applied to older readers who have been placed into developmental reading courses because it is likely that they were below grade level readers while in the K-12 system. Struggling readers who attend Sunshine State College maybe defined in terms of their entrance test results from the administration of the Postsecondary Education Readiness College Placement Test, PERT (Sunshine State College, 2013a). PERT scores range from 50 to 150. A passing reading score for the PERT is a score above 103; consequently, students who do not achieve scores above 103 will be required to enroll in Developmental Reading 1 or Developmental Reading 2. Students scoring between 50 and 83 will have to enroll in

Developmental Reading 1 while students scoring between 84 and 103 will have to take Developmental Reading 2 (Sunshine State College, 2013a).

Significance of Study

Researchers have suggested that strategy instruction positively affects the reading comprehension of postsecondary students (Eilers & Pinkley, 2006; Eker, 2014; Falk-Ross, 2001-2002; Mealey & Nist, 1989). Some researchers (Falk-Ross, 2001-2002; Mealy and Nist, 1989; Nash-Ditzel, 2010; Nicaise & Gettinger, 1995) used comprehension strategies with their struggling adult readers. This study will extend the line of research to evaluate the use of research-based, effective strategies in postsecondary settings. The study will contribute to the research literature related to reading comprehension. Many research studies exist that refer to good versus poor readers (Baker & Brown, 1984; Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995); strategies taught in the classroom and student use of strategies (Falk-Ross, 2001-2002; Hock & Mellard, 2005; Nietfeld & Schraw, 2002; Scharlach, 2008). Nonetheless, there appears to be a modicum of research concerning the reported use of metacognitive reading strategies by postsecondary instructors of developmental reading courses with struggling adult readers to increase reading comprehension. Using the years 2003 to 2013 and peer reviewed status as parameters for searches, this researcher completed World Wide Web searches regarding the reported use of metacognitive reading comprehension strategies by instructors of developmental reading courses. This search yielded 1,220 results; that is, 753 from ERIC and 467 from Education Full Text. Of the 1,220 results, 125 were related to reading comprehension and reading strategies associated with metacognition. Determining the extent that reading comprehension strategies are, or not taught in

classrooms will shed light on national literacy concerns related to struggling adult readers. Stakeholders in turn will be able to readdress current literacy concerns regarding reading comprehension to effectuate change in developmental reading toward a more prominent use of metacognitive reading strategies as well as strategy instruction.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The study addressed the following research questions:

1. What do instructors of developmental reading courses at Sunshine State College report using to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers?

2. What metacognitive reading comprehension strategies do instructors of developmental reading courses at Sunshine State College report using with struggling adult readers to improve reading comprehension?

This literature review provides the history of reading comprehension; metacognition, developmental education; postsecondary struggling readers, and comprehension strategy instruction. This researcher identified literature for this review through on-line databases such as ERIC, Education Full Text, and JSTOR using various descriptors. The greatest number of results was in the general area of reading strategies and the smallest college instructors in developmental reading courses reported use of metacognitive reading comprehension strategies with struggling adult readers.

K-12 and postsecondary students as subjects; metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies and reading comprehension strategies, metacognition/cognition, reading comprehension, struggling, unprepared, underprepared, and marginalized readers were search criteria. Research related to reading comprehension instruction was also examined, developmental education and remedial education were addressed; and learning disabled and learning disability were included**.**

The studies pertaining to college level reading comprehension focused on student use of strategies, achievement data associated with strategy use and evaluation of specific reading strategy program, or applications. Self-reported data generally relate to whether students know about and use strategies, as well as strategy effectiveness (Applegate, Quinn, & Applegate, 1994; Nash-Ditzel, 2010; Taraban et al., 2004). Of the 26,776 studies identified, approximately 1,092 may be categorized as studies related to student use of strategies (Falk-Ross, 2001-2002; Hock & Mellard, 2005; Nietfeld & Schraw, 2002; Scharlach, 2008), what good versus poor readers do when reading, successful learners and less successful learners (Kaufman & Randlett, 1983; Tei & Stewart, 2003). Interestingly, Mealey and Nist (1989) concluded that the research literature related to the reading comprehension of at-risk college students is insufficient while Eckert (2008) pointed out that there is a dearth of research using reading comprehension instruction at the collegiate level.

Although research regarding student perceptions of metacognitive strategy instruction, student motivation, self-efficacy, and student use of strategies are evident in the literature (Applegate et al., 1994; Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2011; Nash-Ditzel, 2010; Nicaise & Gettinger, 1995; Wichadee, 2011); those topics were not a part of this study because the researcher focused on the reported use of metacognitive reading strategies as well as other approaches employed by the participants with their struggling adult readers to increase reading comprehension.

Traditional reading comprehension instruction has occurred using a series of sub-skills (Dole et al., 1991; Grubb et al., 2011; Grubb & Gabriner, 2013) and, according to Crain (1988), teachers have taught reading through wide reading, discussion and

classroom activities. Afflerbach et al. (2008a, 2008b) declared that "skills were equated with habits such as (a) recognizing units of thought (sentences), words, and typographic devices; (b) reading hygiene (proper light, distance from eyes, seating); or oral and meaning interpretation" (pp. 366–367). Trabasso and Bouchard (2002) noted that explicit teaching of reading comprehension happened during formal reading instruction in content areas using learning skills prior to the 1970s.

According to Gambrell, Block, and Pressley (2002), understanding or comprehension of text is the most important thing when it comes to reading; and some researchers have contended that reading comprehension strategies may be a key to unlocking understanding of written text for struggling readers (Falk-Ross, 2001-2002; Mealey & Nist, 1989; Nash-Ditzel, 2010; Nist & Holschuh, 2000; Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995; Wichadee, 2011). Others have suggested that the results of some reading comprehension strategy instruction studies are inconsistent because various factors could possibly account for the gain in academic achievement (Stallworth-Clark, Scott, & Nist, 1996). Fritschmann et al. (2007) also argued that there are not enough studies regarding the transfer of strategies to other contexts and insufficient research addressing the issues of reading comprehension with at-risk college level students (Mealey & Nist, 1989).

Various researchers (Durkin, 1978-1979; Ness, 2009; Pressley et al., 1998; Mealey & Nist, 1989) have suggested that reading comprehension instruction is occurring, minimally, in classrooms at the K-12 and postsecondary levels. Durkin (1978-1979) conducted a study to determine if comprehension instruction occurred during reading and social studies and if so, what amount of time was used for instruction and found that 1% of instructional time was used for comprehension instruction; while Ness'

(2009) study examined whether comprehension instruction was occurring in science and social studies as well as teacher attitudes about reading comprehension instruction and its usefulness; and found that only 3% or 82 minutes were used for comprehension instruction. Mealey and Nist (1989) stated that, "In spite of the seemingly endless number of comprehension strategies and teaching techniques that are available for use in college classrooms, recent studies indicate that little direct instruction occurs" [of this sort] (p. 484). On the other hand, Grubb et al. (2011; Grubb & Gabriner, 2013) argued that perhaps a balanced approach to instruction may be in order. The researchers have contended that there ought to be a mix of direct instruction (modeling, guided practice, and independent practice) and constructivist instruction with an emphasis on student-centered methods such as cooperative groups and projects. Several researchers referenced Durkin's (1978-1979) study and have concurred with the finding that very little reading comprehension instruction is actually taking place in elementary and secondary schools, or postsecondary institutions (Berkeley, Scruggs, & Mastropieri, 2010; Block & Pressley, 2002; De Corte, Verschaffel, & De Ven, 2001; Duffy, 1981; Flood & Lapp, 1990; Lloyd, 1995-1996; Mealey & Nist, 1989; Ness, 2009; Pressley et al., 1998; Scharlach, 2008).

History of Reading Comprehension Practice

Reading comprehension has been a hotly debated topic since the 1970s and continues to be a part of the current educational landscape. Reading comprehension is, according to Kingston (1967), "a process of communication by which a message is transmitted graphically between individuals" (p. 72). Robinson, Faraone, Hittleman, and Unruh (1990) noted that the reading process encompassed: "1) reading as a facilitator and

caretaker of memory (prior to 1826); 2) reading as an expressive art (1826-1882); and 3) reading as a receptive process (1883-1910)" (p. 59). The reading comprehension curriculum, according to Dole et al. (1991) "was built from the strong behavioral and task-analytic notions about learning that prevailed throughout the early and middle parts of this century" (p. 240). Reading consisted of a set of skills with subparts that included decoding and comprehension. In order for students to improve their reading comprehension, it would be necessary for educators to teach skills separately and for students to reach minimal levels of proficiency (Dole et al., 1991). Dole et al. (1991) maintained that when readers mastered skills, they were competent comprehenders.

Alexander and Fox (2004) examined reading research and practice for the past 50 years that included delineated periods. The prevailing notion, conditional learning, from 1950 through 1965 was behavioristic with an emphasis on reading as a perceptual activity that encompassed phonics and reading that occurred as a result of repeatedly coupling stimuli and responses along with rewards and punishments; the reader learned to read through habit formation. Reading happened through skills in a sequential manner. From 1966 through 1975, the focus was natural learning through which the learner became an active learner constructing meaning from text. The focus of reading was information processing, prior knowledge, schema theory, individualistic interpretation of text, and explicit instruction from 1976 through 1985. During the sociocultural learning period, 1986 through 1995, there was recognition of multiple forms of knowledge: complexity of knowledge, existing knowledge interference, sociocultural nature of schools and classrooms, and conditional knowledge as domain dependent.

In the Engaged Learning Era, 1996 to the present, there is concern for nonlinear text (hypermedia and hypertext) where students are engaged and motivated readers. During this period the view of reading shifted from learning to read and reading to learn to a more integrated and developmental perspective. Reading comprehension found its roots, during the time, in behavioral psychology and conversely, over the years, reading has taken on quite a cognitive connotation with the teaching of reading comprehension as "holistic routines and strategies" (Robinson et al., 1990, p. v).

Metacognition

Various researchers have defined metacognition. For example, Babbs and Moe (1983) declared metacognition to be one's knowledge of cognition that is the "intellectual functioning of human mind and the ability to monitor one's own cognition" (p. 423); Cross and Paris (1988) defined metacognition as the knowledge and control that one has over one's thinking and learning, and Flavell (1979) characterized metacognition as "knowledge and cognition about cognitive phenomena" (p. 906). However, Ofodu and Adedipe's (2011) definition of metacognition was used in this study as the operational definition. Ofodu and Adedipe's (2011) definition of metacognition encompasses Babbs and Moe (1983), Cross and Paris (1988) as well as Flavell's (1979) definition of metacognition (i.e., control of thinking, monitoring of comprehension, planning how to approach a learning task and evaluating progress toward completion of a task). Flavell et al. (1970) and Flavell (1979) conducted a study of preschool and elementary children where the participants paid close attention to a set of items with the goal of recalling those items from memory. The researchers concluded that young children have limited knowledge relative to "cognitive phenomena and do relatively little monitoring of their

own memory, comprehension and other cognitive enterprises" (p. 906). Flavell (1979) developed a Model of Cognitive Monitoring that included metacognitive knowledge, metacognitive experiences, goals or tasks, and actions or strategies. Metacognitive knowledge has to do with an individual's stored world knowledge regarding cognitive tasks, goals, actions and experiences whereas metacognitive experiences are conscious experiences related to intellectual activity; and goals/tasks refer to the objective of the cognitive activity. Flavell (1979) stated that "metacognition plays a significant part in oral communication, oral persuasion, oral comprehension, reading comprehension . . . problem solving . . . various types of self-control and self-instruction" (p. 906).

Brown (1985) and Baker & Brown (1984) based their work on Flavell's Model of Cognitive Monitoring. The researchers have argued that metacognition has two related clusters; knowledge about cognition (knowing that) and regulation of cognition (knowing how). Knowledge of cognition refers to the awareness that readers have regarding their own cognitive resources as well as the compatibility between the reader and the demands of a reading task. Regulation of cognition encompasses planning, checking the outcomes of strategies, monitoring the effectiveness of an attempted action and testing, revising and evaluating strategies. They noted that knowledge of cognition can be stated, stable, fallible, and late developing whereas regulation of cognition is unstable, occasionally stated and age dependent.

Cross and Paris (1988) argued that knowledge about strategic reading can be categorized by declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge and conditional knowledge. Schraw and Moshman (1995) observed that knowledge of cognition encompasses metacognitive awareness; namely, declarative, procedural and conditional knowledge.

Cross and Paris (1988) situated their descriptions of declarative, procedural and conditional knowledge in the context of reading. So, declarative knowledge for them refers to understanding the content or concepts found in a reading passage (the "what" of reading). Procedural knowledge has to do with the understanding of "how" skills are applied. Conditional knowledge deals with understanding "when" pertinent strategies are necessary to be utilized and why they impact reading. On the other hand, Schraw and Moshman (1995) situated their notions in the context of metacognitive theories with broad based explanations of each knowledge sector. The researchers contended that declarative knowledge is knowledge that one knows about oneself and about the knowledge of factors upon which one's performance impinges. Procedural knowledge is the knowledge "about the execution of procedural skills" (p. 353); and conditional knowledge is about knowing "when and why to apply various cognitive actions" (p. 353). Although both sets of researchers use different contexts as their referential points, both streams of knowledge converge and are applicable to reading comprehension.

This study examined the reported use of metacognitive reading strategies by instructors of developmental reading courses with struggling adult readers as well as what instructors of developmental reading courses and a learning specialist reported using to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers. Consequently, declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge will inform this study as the researcher needs to know the parameters of how metacognitive reading comprehension strategies must be used in the context of the reading classroom. Knowledge of what constituted declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge aided this researcher in determining if, in fact, college instructors were using metacognitive reading strategies

with struggling adult readers. Declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge were important to this study because determining if college instructors of developmental reading courses were using metacognitive reading strategies may include the manner in which they presented those strategies. For example, instructors may initiate instruction by explaining what metacognitive strategies are; the procedure for using metacognitive strategies and where, when, and why to use them.

Babbs and Moe (1983) asserted that when metacognition connects to reading, the reader's metacognitive knowledge is the starting point and ends with utilizing strategic reading behaviors. These authors described the flow of such a transaction in five sequential steps; specifically, (a) reader's conscious control of reading; (b) reader's goal of reading; (c) reader focuses on own cognitive processes and demands of task; (d) reader strategically plans for the regulation and monitoring of reading; and (e) reader periodically assesses reading success. Although these steps describe the implementation of strategic reading behaviors associated with students, the descriptions were beneficial for this researcher in identifying what instructors of developmental reading courses may present during instruction relative to increasing the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers. The steps represent what this researcher may discover during interview sessions.

> It is at least conceivable that the ideas currently brewing in this area could someday be parlayed into a method of teaching children [and adults] to make wise and thoughtful life decisions as well as to comprehend and learn better in formal educational settings. (Flavell, 1979, p. 910)

Metacognition is the theoretical framework for the study because it is a foundational unit upon which metacognitive reading comprehension strategies are constructed; and an in-depth understanding of the concept is germane to the proposed investigation.

Developmental Education

Reading difficulties in the United States is not a new phenomenon in higher education. Educators have made this pronouncement for at least two centuries. In the 19th century it was believed that prospective college students did not have basic skills in reading, spelling and writing; and in fact, according to Brubacher and Rudy (1997), American colleges required basic skills for entry into college. Even prestigious institutions such as Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and Columbia had unprepared students and used developmental courses to assist over half of the student body (Boylan, 1987). Many freshmen at Harvard could not write a short sentence regarding text from a chapter in a history book. The problem was so widespread that Harvard educators declared that there was a "literacy crisis" (Wyatt, 1992, p. 12). Because so many students were unprepared for college, the University of Wisconsin established the first preparatory department in 1849 in an effort to teach reading, writing, and mathematics because the students "lacked sufficient background to succeed in more advanced college courses" (Boylan, 1987, p. 4); and, in 1889, more than 80% of colleges in America had preparatory programs. By the 1940s preparatory programs were being phased out and the use of remedial/developmental education was being ushered into higher education.

What is developmental education? Developmental education is an approach in which academically challenged students, after taking standardized assessments, are

required to take remedial reading, mathematics or writing courses if their scores did not meet the standard of the college or university (Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Jaggars & Hodara, 2011). Developmental education and remedial education are synonymous terms that some researchers used interchangeably when referring to the unprepared, underprepared, or marginalized students. According to Enright and Kerstiens (1980), somewhere between 30% and 60% of postsecondary institutions offered and planned to offer remedial education. Remediation continued to be at the forefront of college history in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. In the 1960s and 1970s open admission became the mantra (Wyatt, 1992), and Boylan observed that the nation was focused on the "poor, the disadvantaged and the nontraditional" student (Boylan, 1988). Remedial/developmental education continues to thrive well into the 21st century in postsecondary institutions.

Postsecondary Struggling Readers

Who are the postsecondary struggling readers in developmental education? They are the unprepared, the underprepared, or the marginalized readers who do not pass standardized college measures and who find it difficult to deal with the demands of academics on college campuses. Alvarez et al. (2009) described struggling readers within the confines of elementary, secondary, and postsecondary teachers because definitions of struggling readers vary depending upon the context. Struggling readers in college are those students who are not ready to meet the academic challenge of college-leveled materials as well as those who have not met the cutoff scores set for college entrance examinations (Alvarez et al., 2009; Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Alverman (2001), on the other hand, declared that the literature does not clearly define the term struggling reader; consequently, defining such a term would be similar to "nailing gelatin to a wall"

(p. 676) and that meaning is dependent upon purpose and the individual developing the definition. "Struggling reader can refer to youth with clinically diagnosed reading disabilities as well as to those who are unmotivated, in remediation, disenchanted, or generally unsuccessful in school literacy tasks" (Alverman, 2001, p. 678). Frankzak (2006) noted that a more appropriate term for those considered to struggle with reading is marginalized reader, which she defined as students who experience problems with reading in school. Boylan, Bonham, and White (1999) asserted that two thirds of the students in developmental courses are White while the remaining third are minorities; African American and Hispanic students account for a majority of the minority group.

Hardin (1998) developed a seven characteristic typology of developmental education students based upon their reasons for being placed into developmental education; namely, the poor chooser; the adult student; the student with a disability; the ignored; the limited English proficient student; the user and the extreme case. Zhang (2003) suggested that 47% of adults in America have "very limited literacy skills and that "individuals with low literacy skills are unable to find decent jobs, and are likely to live in poverty" (p. 43). Struggling adult readers, at the collegial level, are those students who are unprepared to meet the academic challenge of college-leveled materials as well as those who have not met the cutoff scores set for college entrance examinations (Alvarez et al., 2009; Cohen & Brawer, 2008).

> Literacy can be thought of as a currency in this society. Just as adults with little money have difficulty meeting their basic needs, those with limited literacy skills are likely to find it more challenging to pursue their goals—whether these involve

job advancement, consumer decision making, citizenship, or other aspects of their lives. (Kirsch, Jungeblut, Jenkins, & Kolstad, 2002, p. xxi)

Comprehension Strategy Instruction

Eckert (2008) wrote an article about the existence of a pedagogical gap between secondary and postsecondary literacy instruction. The writer examined bridging this gap by using the intersection of teaching literary theory and teaching reading theory. Based upon the results of a survey by the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (Sanoff, 2006), there is a gap in the perception of professors and high school teachers relative to student preparedness for college. Eckert (2008) confirmed these survey results and observed that 41% of college professors believed students to be unprepared for college-leveled assignments while high school teachers believed that 15% of students were unprepared for college. Eckert (2008) went further contended that perhaps this gap is related to a lack of continuity of literacy instruction between K-12 and higher education. This writer went on to declare that there is a great deal of research and practice using reading comprehension instruction in secondary sectors; but, there is a dearth of research that connects to postsecondary education.

Eckert's (2008) purpose was to examine "the intersections between teaching literary theory and teaching reading strategies as a means of bridging the pedagogical gaps between secondary and postsecondary institutions and between compensatory and mainstream literacy/literature instruction" (p. 110). The researcher hypothesized that the problem may be that, in the primary and intermediate levels, time is an issue and that there is not enough instructional time for active reading and strategy instruction. Orlando, Caverly, Swetnam, and Flippo (2003) noted that students critically read texts without the

benefit of knowing just how to attain such a feat. In other words, teachers or instructors assumed that students critically read without explicit instruction.

Zhang (2003) argued that "the problem is not lack of ability, but lack of preparedness" (p. 14). According to Eckert (2008) students have to make a cognitive leap between learning reading strategies and interpretation of literary matters if they are, indeed, to become a part of the collegial venue. A number of researchers have argued that, in order for students to actually take ownership of reading strategies, they must be able to transfer them (Reid & Lienemann, 2006; Simpson, Stahl, & Francis, 2004), but Means and Knapp (1991) have taken transfer a bit further by arguing that there should be a "Focus on complex, meaningful problems and global tasks to facilitate . . . transference" (p. 286). This researcher argues that explicit instruction in how to use reading strategies to transference and how to read critically are necessary for struggling adult readers. Being able to function at the collegiate level in literacy matters is a necessity for college students. This study examined the reported use of metacognitive reading strategies by instructors of developmental reading courses with struggling adult readers to increase reading comprehension and what developmental reading instructors report using to increase reading comprehension. According to the related literature, academic survival in college hinges, to some degree, on critical reading, strategy instruction, and transference of strategy use for the struggling adult reader. Researchers concluded that being aware of what constitutes enhancement of reading comprehension in higher education is relevant to the study because this researcher interviewed and examined documents to get depth of understanding with regard to the reported use of metacognitive reading strategies and whatever may have been used by instructors of

developmental reading courses and a learning specialist with struggling adult readers to increase reading comprehension.

Nash-Ditzel (2010) conducted a case study to determine the impact of metacognitive reading strategies on five college students who were mandatorily placed in developmental reading as a result of their college entrance test scores. The research questions were:

> 1) Could reading strategies that seem to assist younger students also improve college students' reading behaviors? and 2) Could such strategies enable college students to become self-regulating readers, that is, readers who monitor and control their reading process to comprehend texts. (p. 45)

The study took place in a community college in central New Jersey for two semesters. The subjects of the study were 19- to 20-year-olds. Each subject received additional reading support in the form of pull-out, push-in, or basic skills support at some point during their elementary or middle school careers.

Over the two semester period, the participants were taught how to connect to text, how to use fix-up strategies for unknown words, ask questions, make inferences, summarize and synthesize text and annotate text. Additionally, the strategies were introduced and students were instructed about when, where and how to use them with several examples as well as instructor think-alouds. Next, Nash-Ditzel (2010) emphasized the value of each strategy; students worked together either in small groups or pairs to implement the strategies using authentic texts; and completed independent assignments using each strategy. At the end of the lesson sequence, instructor and students would conference individually to review their progress for each strategy. The

researcher's data sources included interviews (primary source), think-aloud protocols, informal observations and document analysis (notebooks, textbooks, and study materials). Nash-Ditzel (2010) found that the reading behavior of the five participants changed considerably; and that students purportedly moved from declarative knowledge (knowing) to procedural knowledge (knowing how) and to conditional knowledge (knowing where and when) which helped them to become more self-regulated readers. The researcher also found that the participants used their strategies a great deal and in varying contexts; thus, it appeared that the researcher taught the participants to use strategies to transfer or generalization to other reading contexts.

"All 5 participants learned to be more mindful while reading as they applied the reading strategies to a variety of texts, shifted their reading behaviors and consequently became more self-regulated readers" (Nash-Ditzel, 2010, p. 55). The researcher emphasized the fact that self-regulation did not happen magically, but rather through constant modeling, practicing, assessing and feedback. Simpson and Nist (2003) framed transfer in this manner—in order for students to take ownership of strategies, the strategies must be presented more than once and students must have a number of opportunities to practice them. This study was particularly useful for the purpose of supporting the idea that strategy instruction may possibly aid students in increasing reading comprehension and that it may also impact academic achievement which would be beneficial to the study because the researcher examined the reported use of metacognitive reading strategies by instructors of developmental reading courses with struggling adult readers to increase reading comprehension. Nash-Ditzel's (2010) study may also be useful for this study because self-regulation is an important component of

metacognitive reading strategies that college instructors of developmental reading courses and a learning specialist may incorporate into strategy instruction as means of increasing the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers.

Falk-Ross (2001-2002) conducted a study at an urban, inner-city university that specialized in fine arts using four student volunteers enrolled in the college's reading course because they did not make passing scores on their entrance examination/reading test known as Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE). All of the subjects were reading below an eighth-grade level and had trouble understanding what they read. There were two males (Robert, 19 years and Raymond, 21 years) and two females (Rose, 18 years and Susan, 22 years); they comprised a diverse group—specifically, Polish, Mongolian, and African American. Using social constructivism as its theoretical framework, the purpose of the study was to examine students' progress in relation to reading and writing connections, language, vocabulary and purposes for reading. Kucan and Beck (1997) suggested that "social interaction is between reader and text and on reflection among teacher and students as they help one another to construct meaning about the process and product [of reading]" (p. 276).

Falk-Ross (2001-2002) used the notions of Kucan and Beck (1997) and Blumenfeld et al. (1991) to support what she termed the New Literacy. Willinsky (1990) defined the New Literacy as

> Those strategies in the teaching of reading and writing which attempt to shift the control of literacy from the teacher to the students; literacy is promoted in such programs as a social process with language that can from the very beginning extend the students' range of meaning and connection. (p. 8)

The study's instruction included the I-Search Project—an inquiry based research project in which students research an important or relevant topic, independent and shared reading of a book as well as weekly group discussions, and direct instruction of reading comprehension strategies. Reading comprehension strategy instruction consisted of identifying purposes and foci for college reading, identifying and comparing genres, skimming for essential chapter material, discussion of morphemic analysis, note taking strategies, and formats for summary statements. Falk-Ross (2001-2002) spent approximately one hour of class time to examine genres using resource materials; and one to two hours developing the I-Search Project paper through small group discussion in addition to students comparing papers. On a weekly basis, at the end of class discussions, the students had to write and to conference with the researcher in order to build on each weeks lesson rather than working through the process without regard for reflection.

Falk-Ross (2001-2002) used the TABE (pre/post), field notes, participant observations, audiotapes of class members' discussion and literacy artifacts such as journal entries and photocopied versions of student work samples as data sources. The researcher noted that changes occurred in the reading comprehension of the subjects; specifically, "reading became more focused, more critical and more productive" (p. 282). The results of the posttest reflected, "mild differences in reading comprehension measures between the pretest and posttest scores" (p. 286). According to the researcher, each of the subjects made a gain of at least three grade levels in reading. Therefore, one can surmise that each was reading at an 11th-grade level if what Falk-Ross finds and reports is accurate. Falk-Ross (2001-2002) contended that although her case study had a small number of subjects in one program, there was a depth of knowledge that was

garnered relative to "more effective instructional approaches for students' own construction of useful literacy strategies for success in college classes and application in their chosen careers" (p. 285). The researcher suggested that, "the application of reading strategies for vocational and professional purposes must begin in earlier grades, especially for students from nonmainstream populations, to equally provide all students with choices for successful careers" (p. 285). Further, this case study supports the idea that strategy instruction for college students is beneficial in positively impacting academic contexts as well as other venues and contexts. Falk-Ross (2001-2002) used qualitative methods such as field notes and observation to inform her study. Because students will not be participants in this dissertation study, the researcher did not collect any data regarding student achievement, motivation and any other information related to students.

Nicaise and Gettinger (1995) examined a 5-week intervention program designed to improve the reading comprehension of four college students (one White female, one Native American female, and two White males) from a Midwestern university who volunteered to be a part of the study. They ranged in age from 23 to 30 years of age; three were undergraduates and one graduate. The 10-session study included the instructor meeting individually with each participant for 90 minutes twice a week. The goals of the intervention program were to build background knowledge; to help students acquire and practice predicting; clarifying, summarizing, and setting goals; activate students' existing schemata; increase students' metacognitive awareness; and to enhance students' feelings of self-efficacy. The training session included six steps: (a) description of targeted strategy; (b) rationale for using strategy; (c) instructor demonstrated

application of strategy; students immediately modeled strategy and feedback given; (d) students practiced strategy using controlled training materials; (e) students were tested using three controlled passages or chapters; and (f) once the students mastered the controlled material as evidenced by a score of 90%, they applied the strategy to a self-selected text.

The results of the Nicaise and Gettinger's (1995) study revealed that all of the participants in the study made gains on the Nelson-Denny Reading Test. Follow-up testing revealed all of the subjects scored at least 80% reading comprehension accuracy on the measurement; strategy use—significant gains ($p<.05$) were made for prediction by Participants 2 and 3; clarification by Participants 3 and 4; summarization by Participants 1, 2, and 3 and goal setting by all subjects. The subjects reported using the rereading strategy along with active comprehension strategies such as clarifying difficulties, identifying significant information and concept mapping. Self-efficacy scores were higher for all participants and the data from the interviews reflected that the subjects engaged in positive self-talk. As for strategy generalization, the researchers found that all of the subjects were "able to use the four strategies within 90% accuracy or higher" (Nicaise & Gettinger, 1995, p. 324). The final finding had to do with treatment of acceptability survey. The criterion for satisfaction of the intervention was 59 or higher and all subjects' scores ranged from 66 to 76.

Researchers and writers have referred to comprehension strategies as cognitive strategies, metacognitive reading strategies, reading comprehension strategies, reading strategies, reading-as-thinking or strategies (see Table 1). Although the categories for comprehension strategies may vary, many researchers use the same strategy name for

what may be termed metacognitive reading strategy, cognitive or reading strategy. For example, Daniels and Bizar (2005) referred to connecting as reading-as-thinking while Nash-Ditzel (2010) referred to connecting to text as a metacognitive reading strategy.

The research literature blurs with respect to what constitutes metacognitive, cognitive, reading strategies, and strategies; consequently, for purposes of the study, this researcher used some of the strategies listed in Table 1, namely, connecting, questioning, inferring, summarizing, synthesizing, annotating, evaluating, self-monitoring, analyzing, and visualizing, as a foundation for the study.

Table 1

Categories of Comprehension Strategies

Comprehension Strategies	Researcher/Study
Components of Reading-as-Thinking	Daniels & Bizar (2005)
Visualizing Connecting Questioning Inferring Evaluating Analyzing Recalling Self-monitoring	Daniels and Bizar (2005) contends that Reading is interactive, constructive, strategic and thinking. They describe reading-as-thinking as a "repertoire of specific mental tools or patterns" (p. 39) used to develop meaning from text.
Reading Strategies	Falk-Ross (2001-2002)
Identifying purposes for reading Identifying & comparing Genres Skimming Discussion of Morphemic Analysis Note-taking Strategies Summary Statements	Four art students in study Examined students' progress in reading and writing connections, language and vocabulary Art students gained at least three grade levels
Reading Strategies	Mokhtari, Sheory, & Reichard (2008)
Setting Purposes Predictions Paraphrasing Summarizing Resolving Conflicts Evaluating Self-understanding	Study included three college students Explored perceived and actual use of reading strategies First language and second language readers use a range of strategies that reveal careful planning, monitoring evaluation of text understanding Participants reported using 30 strategies; however, some strategies were not used while others were used infrequently. Also, strategy use was transferred across three languages.
Metacognitive Reading Strategies	Nash-Ditzel (2010)
Connecting to Text Fix-up Strategies for Vocabulary/Confusing Sentences Asking Questions Making Inferences Summarizing & Synthesizing Text Annotating Text	Case study examined impact of metacognitive reading strategies with 5 college students. Students became self-regulated learners and were able to transfer strategies to other contexts.
Strategies	Nicaise & Gettinger (1995)
Building Background Knowledge Predicting Clarifying Summarizing Setting Goals	Study included four college students Examined 5 week intervention designed to improve reading comprehension All subjects made at least 80% on Nelson-Denny Reading Test. Strategy use showed significant gains

(table continues)

Table 1 *(continued)*

Comprehension Strategies	Researcher/Study
What good readers do: Before Reading: set goals, skims & activate prior knowledge During Reading: read, take notes, pause to reflect, identify important information, attuned to topic sentences & paragraphs, underlining, paraphrasing, inferences, referent pronoun, analyze text structure, interpret, evaluate, monitor problems & summaries After Reading: selective reading, summary, reflection, evaluate text, monitoring understanding & "additional reading to flesh our readers' understanding" (p. 297)	Pressley (2002) Pressley (2002) writes about skilled reading, Reading instruction and comprehension strategies and discusses the "nature of effective comprehension instruction . . . in metacognitive terms (p. 291).
Reading Comprehension Strategies Comprehension Monitoring Cooperative Learning Graphic & Semantic Organizers Story Structure Question Answering Question Generation Summarization Multiple Strategy Instruction	National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICH, 2000) Report based upon meta-analysis of literature regarding alphabetics, fluency, comprehension, teacher education and Reading instruction and computer technology and Reading instruction. With regard to comprehension instruction, NRP found that it can "effectively motivate and teach readers to learn and to use comprehension strategies that benefit the reader" (pp. 4-6).

Chapter Summary

The research literature on reading comprehension strategies, whether cognitive or metacognitive, reflects the positive impact that reading comprehension strategies have had on the secondary and postsecondary struggling readers, particularly in relationship to increasing reading comprehension. As Biancarosa and Snow (2006) have contended, research is replete with evidentiary support for the use of metacognitive reading comprehension strategies with struggling readers. Now the question must be, what are we to do with such information in the face of the NCLB Act of 2001 with its high accountability standards that are typically tied to one state standardized test with implications that can be felt throughout the United States as well as globally. For some

states NCLB is history and the Race to the Top has replaced it for the purpose of awarding granted funds to be used for educational reform (USDOE, 2009). Race to the Top is a fledgling venture that has been in existence since 2009; therefore, there is no definitive data that substantiates any particular educational reform. Further, if the expert researchers have gathered a great deal of evidentiary support for the use of reading comprehension strategies, one must wonder, with all these data, why literacy rates continue to decline exponentially.

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

The ability to read is a foundational principle that undergirds the academic success of students in K-12 as well as postsecondary institutions. White (2004) argued that reading instruction in public schools typically ends in the fifth or sixth grade. If what White purported is valid, then how does the at-risk reader prevail academically in the upper grades and into the postsecondary sector. Vacca and Padak (1990) have noted that at-risk readers possess a very limited bank of strategies to increase reading comprehension while Taraban et al. (2004) have suggested that college students may not comprehend the advanced academic materials that they read. Trainin and Swanson (2005) have linked the use of metacognitive strategies to the improvement of academic performance as well as performance in work environments. The purpose of the study was to discover and to describe what developmental reading instructors reported relative to metacognitive reading strategy use with struggling adult readers and what instructors of developmental reading courses reported using to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers.

Review of Statement of the Problem

Some K-12 and postsecondary students have difficulty comprehending written materials. Vacca and Padak (1990) have asserted that some students are at risk for reading failure because they do not read enough; they lack knowledge of the reading process; they do not see themselves as capable readers; they do not value reading; they have a limited repertoire of strategies, or they have not learned how to learn through

reading. Durkin (1978-1979) and Ness (2009) have suggested that reading comprehension instruction is not occurring in K-12 classrooms while Juel (1988) has posited that motivation may impede reading comprehension because of "failure experiences associated with reading" (p. 442). Comprehension instruction may include, but not be limited to strategy instruction. Strategies, whether metacognitive, cognitive or simply reading, are effective in increasing reading comprehension; however, the problem may lie in the fact that teachers or instructors do not explicitly teach strategies to struggling readers.

Review of Research Questions

This study addressed the following research questions:

1. What do instructors of developmental reading courses at Sunshine State College report using to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers?

2. What metacognitive reading comprehension strategies do instructors of developmental reading courses at Sunshine State College report using with struggling adult readers to improve reading comprehension?

Role of Researcher

In qualitative research designs, the researcher is the instrument (Creswell, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2002). According to Guba & Lincoln (1981),

> Since as often as not the naturalistic inquirer is himself the instrument, changes resulting from fatigue, shifts in knowledge, and cooptation as well as variations resulting from differences in training, skill and experience among different instruments, easily occur. But this loss in rigor is more than offset by the

> flexibility, insight and ability to build on tacit knowledge that is the peculiar province of human instrument. (p. 113)

Objectivity is not generally associated with qualitative research because the researcher was the primary instrument in data collection and analysis and, as a result, the researcher brought to the study biases and assumptions that filtered through the researcher's experiences, worldview, and philosophical stance (Merriam, 1998). Merriam (1998) pointed out that "reality is not an objective entity" (p. 22) in qualitative research and that there are many interpretations of reality that are co-constructed by the researcher and the participants while Stake (2010) asserted that subjectivity is fundamental to understanding human activity.

> I want both objectivity and subjectivity to thrive. Where truth can exist, we need to measure well. Where subjective viewing can add to the depth of perceptions, it should. In either case . . . we need to help the reader see the biases we are trying to deal with. (Stake, 2010, p. 166)

Rubin (2012) has contended that the researcher has to display the biases that may present themselves during the study. Thus, for over 13 years, this researcher has taught reading in public elementary, middle and high schools. Accordingly, the knowledge, experiences and biases that this researcher brought to this research study are part of the lens through which all things were filtered with regard to deficits in reading comprehension that struggling readers may have to face. The researcher made three assumptions relative to the study. First, the researcher made the assumption that instructors of developmental reading courses do not typically instruct struggling adult readers in the use of metacognitive reading strategies. Secondly, this researcher made the

assumption that it is necessary to determine if college instructors of developmental reading courses are actually using research-based, efficacious strategies to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers because it appears that society is experiencing a serious literacy situation (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006). Researchers have suggested that instruction in metacognitive reading strategies may alleviate the literacy crisis to some degree (Nash-Ditzel, 2010; Nist & Holschuh, 2000; Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995; Wichadee, 2011). Finally, the researcher made the assumption that because self-regulation and control of one's cognitive processes are important and have been proven to be effective, investigating the reported use of metacognitive reading strategies by instructors of developmental reading courses and a learning specialist with struggling adult readers may extend the literature and may inform policy makers in an effort to effect change in metacognitive reading strategy use. The researcher's assumptions drive the study.

This researcher was the sole individual collecting data from interviews and documents for this study, which took place via telephone and one of the participant's residence because of the instructors' schedules. Through triangulation, peer debriefing, memos, researcher notebook, and member checking, issues related to trustworthiness were established. The researcher collected and analyzed the data, simultaneously (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006; Miles & Huberman, 1994). After collecting data, the researcher used member checking to establish credibility of the findings (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Creswell, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Roulston, 2010; Toma, 2006). The process used for member checking included the researcher providing transcribed copies of the interview transcripts to the participants for them to review for

accuracy. After member checking, the researcher read, reread, and analyzed interview transcripts. Initially, this researcher coded transcripts using Pre-Data Collection Codes (see Appendix A) and an experienced K-12 reading teacher recoded the same transcripts as a means of establishing inter-rater reliability. Inter-rater reliability was unattained; consequently, the researcher and the K-12 reading teacher dialogued relative to the discrepancy of codes. This researcher and the K-12 reading teacher reached an agreement related to the coding prior to coding additional data. After consensus, the researcher continued coding the documents using a revised list of codes. This researcher recorded patterns, developed categories and made connections or links among the categories in an effort to identify major themes, develop matrices and write a summary of the findings.

Research Design

This dissertation study used a case study design to examine the reported use of metacognitive reading strategies by instructors of developmental reading courses with struggling adult readers to increase reading comprehension and what instructors reported using to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers because it lends itself to "insight, discovery and interpretation rather than hypothesis testing" (Merriam, 1998, pp. 28–29); and "in-depth understanding of a case" (Creswell, 2007, p. 78; Patton, 2002; Yin, 2003). Merriam (1998) defined case study as "a thing, a single entity, a unit around which there are boundaries" (p. 27); and Cronbach (1975) referred to case study as "interpretation in context" (p. 123). Yin (2003) described case study as an "empirical inquiry" that examines a phenomenon in "real-life contexts" (p. 13). According to Merriam (1998), case studies can be particularistic, descriptive and heuristic.

Particularistic refers to the focus of a case study; descriptive has to do with the richness of description; and heuristic means discovery of new meaning, revelation or illumination of knowledge and understanding. This case study was descriptive. As a result of using a case study design, the researcher paid close attention to and described, in thick, rich terms, what instructors of developmental reading courses and a learning specialist reported about metacognitive reading strategy use with struggling adult readers as well as what instructors reported using to increase reading comprehension of struggling adult readers to gain a deeper understanding of what the participants did to assist struggling adult readers. Furthermore, the resulting data provided a thick, rich description (Blankenship, 1991; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998, 2009) of strategy use or nonuse as described by the informants.

Sampling Plan

According to Maxwell (2005), the "most important consideration in qualitative selection decisions" is choosing times, settings, and individuals that may inform one's research questions. "Particular settings, persons or activities are selected deliberately to provide information that is particularly relevant to your questions and goals and that cannot be gotten as well from other choices (p. 97)." Weiss (2008) pointed out that the goal of sampling should be to choose participants that are knowledgeable and that can "significantly instruct us" (p. 17). Polkinghorne (2005) ascribed to the notion of using a small number of participants; however, further noted that, "multiple participants may deepen the understanding of the investigated experience" (p. 140). This study was qualitative in nature as this researcher sought to explore and to get a detailed understanding of developmental reading instructors and one learning specialist reported

use of metacognitive reading comprehension strategies and what else the reading instructors reported using with struggling adult readers using a case study approach that was bounded by context, Sunshine State College, and as a result, a purposeful sample of four instructors and one learning specialist were used for the study. A purposeful sample is a sample that is determined by the researcher based on certain criteria that the researcher sets forth.

According to Merriam (1998), purposeful sampling is "based on the assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned" (p. 61). Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (2012) noted that purposive sampling encompasses the researcher's judgment in selecting the sample of subjects that may provide the best understanding of what the researcher may investigate. Patton (1990) recommended using a small purposeful random sample rather than purposeful sample because "random purposeful sampling adds credibility to the sample when the potential purposeful sample is larger than one can handle and because it reduces judgment within a purposeful category" (p. 183). Patton (1990, 2002) also noted, however, that purposeful random samples are not generalizable; but do provide information rich cases and produce in-depth understandings related to the case. Patton (2002) defined information-rich cases as cases from which one can learn a great deal about important issues related to a specific purpose or purposes of naturalistic inquiry. According to the U.S. General Accounting Office (USGAO, 1990), "studying information-rich cases yields insights, and an in-depth understanding rather than empirical generalizations" (p. 228).

For purposes of this study, the researcher used a small purposeful. Numerous researchers (Creswell, 2007; Fraenkel et al., 2012; Merriam, 1998) have posited that small samples are conducive to gathering thick-rich descriptive data. Merriam (2009) posited that the number of participants necessary for qualitative research depends on the researcher's questions, the data collected and the analysis; and Creswell (2007) noted that a case study should contain no more than four or five cases. This research study included four instructors of Developmental Reading 2 and one Learning Specialist from Sunshine State College who were housed at various campuses.

Site. The site used for this study was a public state college, Sunshine State College (a pseudonym), located in south Florida. A total of approximately 49,000 students were enrolled with 42,000 being enrolled in credit courses while the remaining 7,400 were enrolled in noncredit courses (Sunshine State College, 2011-2012). The student populations' racial and ethnicity were White, 26% Black, 24% Hispanic, 4% Asian, and less than 1% Native American (Sunshine State College, 2011-2012). Fifty-eight percent of the student body was female and 42% were males; 36% were full-time in credit bearing and college preparation courses while 64% were part-time (Sunshine State College, 2011-2012). Sunshine State College's student body is diverse with 165 countries representing the students (Sunshine State College, 2011-2012). There were approximately 3,200 faculty members at the college; a majority employed on a part-time basis while 1,038 were full-time employees (Sunshine State College, 2013b). Of the 2,200 part-time faculty members, 67% were White; 16% Black, 10% Hispanic with other minorities and not reported totaling approximately 6% (Sunshine State College, 2013b).

Gaining access to a setting for research purposes may or may not be problematic depending upon the researcher's relationship with stakeholders in the setting. Glesne and Peshkin (1992) argued that gaining entry into a setting is a process.

> It refers to your acquisition of consent to go where you want, observe what you want, talk to whomever you want, obtain and read whatever documents you require, and do all of this for whatever period of time you need to satisfy your research purposes. (p. 33)

The researcher gained entry into this state college to conduct the study through Sunshine State College's Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IRE) after receiving Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval from Florida Atlantic University. First, the researcher submitted a written request to conduct the study to the director of the IRE (see Appendix B). After the director reviewed the written request, the director solicited supporting documentation such as a copy of the proposal, safeguards to protect the participants' confidentiality, consent form, sampling requested and administrative processes. Then the director of the IRE convened a committee to review the documentation and granted approval. Finally, the director of the IRE sought formal approval from administrators. They approved the request, and then the director of the IRE granted the final approval for the study (Sunshine State College, 2011). After approval, this researcher contacted four instructors of developmental reading courses and one learning specialist who met this researcher's criteria as potential participants. There were approximately 27 instructors slated to teach Developmental Reading 1 and Developmental Reading 2. This researcher specified the criteria used to select

participants (i.e., one or more years of experience as a reading instructor); as a result, four instructors and one learning specialist participated in the research study.

Participants. Merriam (2009) pointed out that there are a number of factors that one must consider when determining how many participants may be necessary to complete a research study.

> It always depends on the questions being asked, the data being gathered, the analysis in progress, and the resources you have to support the study. What is needed is an adequate number of participants, sites or activities to answer the questions posed at the beginning of the study. (p. 80)

Guba and Lincoln (1981) contended that sampling maybe accomplished through saturation or redundancy as determined by the purpose of the information gathered while Patton (1990) recommended using minimum samples based on "expected reasonable coverage of a phenomenon" related to the purpose of the study as well as "stakeholder" interests. Additionally, Patton (1990) argued that sampling builds in an element of flexibility so that, in the event that something occurs during fieldwork, that changes may be needed to the sampling design, that additional samples may be added and to "build a rationale and have criteria for that minimum" (p. 186).

A purposeful sample of 4 instructors of developmental reading courses and 1 learning specialist from Sunshine State College in south Florida were used because the purpose of the study was to get an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon under investigation rather than statistical generalizations (Patton, 2002) and because of the limited number of developmental education instructors who taught reading. The participants were selected based upon having one or more years of experience as Reading

instructors (K-12 or postsecondary institution); holding a master's degree or higher with at least 18 hours of study related to their positions and a willingness to participate in the study. According to Robinson (2011), credentials for "faculty teaching general education courses at the undergraduate level" (p. 5) include a doctorate or master's degree in teaching or a master's degree with at least 18 hours of graduate semester hours in teaching as "comparable to those [credentials] required by the accrediting association of the receiving institution" (p. 5). The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS, 2006), the accrediting agency, according to its guidelines for accreditation, "an institution gives primary consideration to the highest earned degree in the discipline" (p. 1) and specifically sets forth that faculty teaching general education courses must possess a doctorate or master's degree in teaching or a master's degree with 18 graduate hours related to teaching. Additionally, the participants were Professor 1, 2, 3, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Adjunct Instructor, Learning Specialist or OPS Professional at Sunshine State College.

There were approximately 27 instructors teaching Developmental Reading 1 and Developmental Reading 2 for the 2013 fall semester; however, due to a change in the regulation of state colleges, this study included four developmental reading instructors and one learning specialist classified as full-time or part-time. All of the participants qualified for the study because they were full-time or part-time instructors or learning specialists and have at least a master's degree with 18 graduate hours or a doctorate. Although Participant 2 was a learning specialist and held a bachelor's degree, he became a part of the study because he volunteered and because the number of potential participants has decreased due to Senate Bill 1720. Participants 1, 4, and 5 have been

instructors for an average of 17 years while Participant 3 has been a professor for 1 year and Participant 2 has been a learning specialist for 8 years (see Table 2). All of the participants except Participant 2 have taught Developmental Reading 2 (see Table 2).

Table 2

Description of Participants

Participant	Degree	Courses Taught	Years of Experience	Title
1	Master's Degrees – Elementary Education Reading	Developmental Reading 2, EAP0420, EAP1520, EAP 1620, EAP1584 & EAP1680	5.5 years 8 years	Adjunct Professor Tutor
2	Bachelor's Degree – Adeptus Minor Level 3 Certification	None	8 years	Learning Specialist Published Author
3	Master's Degree – Writing Level 3 Certification	Developmental Reading 2, Developmental Writing I & II, English Composition I & II, English Composition I Lab & Business Writing	1 year 6 years	Adjunct Professor Writing Tutor
4	Master's Degree - English as a Second Language	Developmental Reading 1 & 2, Developmental Writing I & II, Strategies for College Success, Developmental Math & College Reading & Writing	14 years	Associate Professor
5	Master's Degree - Curriculum & Instruction	Developmental Reading 1 & 2, English I & Introduction to the College Experience	27 years	Adjunct Professor

The number of sections of Developmental Reading 2 varied by campus. In the fall of 2012, according to Sunshine State College's Credit/Prep Sections Report (2013c), the central campus had seven sections; the north campus had six sections; and the south campus had nine sections. Some sections of Developmental Reading 2 were a part of the study.

The Florida Department of Education (FLDOE, 2013), in describing Developmental Reading 1 and Developmental Reading 2, referred to the courses as topics rather than courses (see Appendix C). The topics to be covered in Developmental Reading 1, or REA 007 were main idea, supporting details, author's purpose and tone, fact and opinion, organizational patterns, relationships, vocabulary in context, inference, drawing conclusions, reasoning and argument (see Appendix D) while Developmental Reading 2, or REA 017 included the same topics with one exception, bias (see Appendix E). Sunshine State College (2013d) described Developmental Reading 1 (REA 07) and Developmental Reading 2 (REA 0017; Appendix E) as courses with similar course learning outcomes with slightly different purviews. For example, Developmental Reading 1 encompassed the reading process, reading aids, basic vocabulary skills and literal comprehension skills (Sunshine State College, 2013d, p. 1). Developmental Reading 2 re-examined reading skills taught in Developmental Reading 1, and "emphasizes critical and analytical reading" (Sunshine State College, 2013e, p. 1). In addition, "Students apply higher level reading strategies to college-level reading selections" (Sunshine State College, 2013e, p. 1). Accordingly, this study may not capture metacognitive strategy use in Developmental Reading1; however, there was a greater chance that metacognitive reading strategies maybe used in Developmental Reading 2 with struggling adult readers.

Confidentiality was afforded each participant; accordingly, pseudonyms were used for each because they were afforded confidentiality. The researcher did not personally know the participants; consequently, participation was strictly voluntary. Maxwell (2005) contended that researchers ought to give participants something for their

time and the inconvenience involved with the research study such as "helping out in the setting, provide some gift or service" (p. 85). The participants received a gift card for participating in the study and received a summary of the results of the study.

Data Collection

Data collection occurred weekly or as soon as was possible according to the instructors as well as a learning specialist's schedules using documents and interviews as data sources. Weeks one through seven included document collection because the researcher used the documents to invite informants to discuss their strategies in more detail. Documents (i.e., lesson plans, assessments, assignments, PowerPoint presentations, lectures, course syllabi, and handouts) were analyzed weekly on various days, (see Table 3) to determine what instructors reported regarding the use of metacognitive reading strategies with struggling adult readers and what instructors of developmental reading courses and a learning specialist reported using to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers. During Weeks one through seven, this researcher collected five documents from each instructor. One of the five documents was a syllabus and the participants determined the remaining four documents. For example, one instructor provided an assignment, PowerPoint, lesson plan, and lecture while another instructor furnished an assessment, handout, lesson plan, and an assignment. The researcher received the documents electronically. The instructors did not remove all identifying information from the documents; therefore, this researcher removed all identifying information. The researcher collected 25 documents, five for each of the five participants. All of the participants were willing to provide all of the

documents; however, Participant 2 did not use a syllabus as a learning specialist; consequently, there was no syllabus to give to the researcher.

Interviews took two to seven weeks. There were conflicts with interview scheduling, as a result, the time for interviews changed according to the needs of the participants. The researcher interviewed the participants twice during the two to seven week period. The initial interview took 20 to 30 minutes while the second interview took no less than 45 minutes or no more than 60 minutes at times that were suitable for them. Because conflicts occurred during interview scheduling, it was not possible to interview two instructors, per week, during the 2- to 7-week period (see Table 3). As recommended by Miles and Huberman (1994). The researcher collected and analyzed the data, simultaneously.

Table 3

Data Collection Timeline

Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Week 6	Week 7
DC	DC	DC/II	DC/II	DC/II	DC/II	DC/II
DC	DC	DC/II	DC/II	DC/II	DC/II	DC/II
DC	DC	DC/II	DC/II	DC/II	DC/II	DC/II
DC	DC	DC/II	DC/II	DC/II	DC/II	DC/II
DC	DC	DC/II	DC/II	DC/II	DC/II	DC/II

Note. DC = document collection. II = instructor interviews.

Documents. Krippendorff (1980) has described content analysis as a "technique for replicable and valid inferences from data to their context" (p. 21). Hsieh and Shannon (2005) defined qualitative content analysis as a "research method for the subjective interpretation of the content of text data through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns" (p. 1278). Merriam (1998) has asserted that content analysis is systematic and can be used for describing the content of written communications and also that documents are a good source of data because they are free, easily accessible, and include information that may, in some cases, require researchers to use a great deal of time and effort in gathering the information. Merriam (1998) further asserted that documents are "stable, objective sources of data" that are unobtrusive as the researchers' presence will not modify the phenomenon being studied (p. 126) whereas Lincoln and Guba (1985) have posited that documents may be analyzed and reanalyzed without change; documents may be rich sources of information; documents may be contextually relevant; documents may be grounded in contexts, documents may be "legally unassailable" and "nonreactive" (p. 277). Guba and Lincoln (1981) have noted that data analysis using documents "lends contextual richness and helps to ground an inquiry in the milieu of the writer. This grounding in real-world issues and day-to-day concerns is ultimately what the naturalistic inquiry is working toward" (p. 234). Accordingly, this researcher collected 25 documents and conducted interviews as data for the purposes of triangulation of data sources.

To document the participants' instructional approaches and to determine what instructors reported about metacognitive reading strategy use with struggling adult readers, 25 documents were collected and used for this study to determine if

metacognitive reading strategies or any other approaches were noted on them. The researcher collected five documents (syllabi, assignment, lesson plan, assessment, lecture, handout, and PowerPoint) per instructor during Weeks one through three. The participants determined what four documents were to be collected and the fifth document was the class syllabus. The researcher thoroughly examined and used those documents during the interviews so that instructors referred to them to show what they self-reported. Using the documents aided this researcher with triangulation of the data sources (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Creswell, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Roulston, 2010; Yin, 2003) and provided support for this researcher's assumption that college instructors of developmental reading courses do not typically instruct struggling adult readers using metacognitive reading comprehension strategies. The researcher examined and analyzed each document and completed a Document Summary Form (see Appendix F) and a Content Analysis Form (see Appendix G) for each document to determine how the documents related to instructor reported use of metacognitive reading strategies with struggling adult readers and what instructors of developmental reading courses reported using to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers. After the documents were examined and analyzed, Document Summary Forms and Content Analysis Forms were completed immediately afterward. The Document Summary Form, a one page document, included the source of the document, date received/picked up, document type, significance of the document and a list of metacognitive reading strategies (see Appendix F). The Content Analysis Form, a one page document with 10 questions, required yes or no responses and nine additional questions that must be answered with explanations (see Appendix G). The researcher read, reread and coded

each Document Summary Form and each Content Analysis Form, then analyzed the documents; noted patterns and developed themes, created matrices (Miles & Huberman, 1994) and wrote a report immediately thereafter.

Interviews. Interviews were necessary because open-ended questions permitted this researcher to probe participants' responses to questions and allowed this researcher to dig deeper into what the participants were thinking and feeling about the phenomenon (Patton, 1990). Patton (1990) asserted that interviewing allows one to gain entry into another person's perspective–worldview. Stone and Miller (1991) conducted a study to examine the effects of Effective Reading on developmental reading students. Even though Stone and Miller (1991) used both qualitative as well as quantitative methods, of particular importance to this study was the use of semi-structured, one-on-one interviews with predetermined open-ended questions because the researcher may respond to what was occurring at that moment in time and to probe responses; because interviewees' worldview may emerge; and because new ideas may become known (Merriam, 1998) regarding four instructors of developmental reading courses as well as a learning specialist's reported use of metacognitive reading strategies to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers.

Fraenkel et al. (2012) described semi-structured interviews as questionnaires designed to obtain detailed answers to specific questions. The use of semi-structured interview will give the participants an opportunity to expound upon their knowledge or lack of knowledge regarding metacognitive reading strategies. Polkinghorne (2005) cautioned the researcher regarding what is termed produced account of interviews. According to Polkinghorne (2005) the produced accounts of interviews are considered to

be co-created between the researcher and the participants; consequently, the participant remains the author of what is described while the researcher is considered to be the "supportive editor" (p. 143).

One-on-one semi-structured interviews using a 19-question open-ended Interview Protocol (see Appendix H) was used with four college instructors of developmental reading courses and one learning specialist because the interview is the best way to obtain unobservable information in a case study of individuals (Patton, 1990). The researcher developed the Interview Protocol based upon the work of Ness (2006) who sought to determine if comprehension instruction was taking place in secondary content area classrooms. The researcher modified it with Ness' permission (see Appendices I and J). Ness' Teacher Interview Protocol included 13 questions pertaining to K-12 teachers and their practices. This researcher modified Ness' Teacher Interview Protocol by adapting the questions to reflect instructors of developmental reading courses, the target population, metacognitive reading strategies, reading instruction and the activities associated therewith. The participants were interviewed because they have at least one year of experience teaching Reading in K-12 or higher education institutions; hold a master's degree (except Participant 2) with 18 hours suitable for the position held and were willing to be a part of this study and because they could "provide substantial contributions to filling out the structure and character of the experience under investigation" (Polkinghorne, 2005, p. 139). Polkinghorne has suggested selecting exemplars during sampling for "what they promise to contribute to the clarification of the topic being examined" (p. 140). The researcher interviewed each participant twice. The initial interview took 20 to 30 minutes and the second interview no less than 45 minutes

or no more than 60 minutes. The interviews were tape-recorded with participant permission, simultaneously, and the resulting data transcribed on the same day as the interview or as soon as possible thereafter. The interviews were tape-recorded because it is an "unimpeachable data source; it ensures completeness of data; can be reviewed as often as needed to develop a full understanding [of a phenomenon]; can be reviewed for nonverbal cues; . . . and provide reliability checks" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, pp. 271–272).

Kvale and Brinkman (2009) declared that "no standard procedures or rules exist for conducting a research interview or an entire interview investigation" (p. 99). Kvale (1996) suggested that the "purpose of interviews is to obtain descriptions of the life-world of the interviewee with respect to interpreting the meaning of described phenomena" (pp. 5-6). Polkinghorne (2005) argued that "one-shot interviews are typically insufficient to produce and rich descriptions are necessary for worthwhile findings" (p. 142) while Seidman (2006) suggested using a sequence of three interviews. Although Seidman contended that "anything shorter [than 90 minutes] seems too short and any longer period of time "causes unraveling of the interviewers' purpose and the participants' confidence that the interviewer will do what was promised" (p. 24); the instructors were interviewed twice. The first interview took 20 to 30 minutes and the second interview no less than 45 minutes and no more than 60 minutes. The interviews were relevant as a means of determining what instructors do to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers.

This researcher did not conduct three 90-minute interviews as Seidman (2013) suggested because this 10-week study did not provide enough time to complete three 90-

minute interviews per participant. Interviewing included rapport building, probing questions, and participant feedback of transcribed interviews (Seidman, 2013). Based upon the participants' schedules, the individual interviews were completed (i.e., two interviews and a written transcription of the interviews were given to the participants to review for member checking). The interviews explored the reported use of metacognitive reading strategies by instructors with struggling adult readers and what instructors reported using to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers.

Credibility and Trustworthiness. Lincoln and Guba (1985) postulated that "no single item of information should ever be given serious consideration: (p. 283); therefore, this case study used multiple sources of evidence in what Yin (2003) called "converging lines of inquiry" (p. 98) and some researchers refer to as triangulation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1987). Patton (1987) asserted that there are four types of triangulation; specifically, data, investigator, theory, and methodological, whereas Lincoln and Guba (1985) argued that triangulation may be accomplished by different methods or designs. They further noted that different designs would not be possible in a naturalistic study. Triangulation by methods or data sources may be used to establish validity (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). However, this researcher must note that validity and reliability attached to qualitative research is very different from quantitative research.

Researchers and writers have positioned themselves on one or the other side of the qualitative/quantitative debate; namely, that validity and reliability in qualitative research are described in quantitative terms; yet others have voiced their concerns regarding validity and reliability in qualitative ideas and thoughts. Lincoln and Guba (1985) contended that traditional or conventional paradigms of trustworthiness such as

internal validity, external validity, reliability, and objectivity are not appropriate for naturalistic paradigms and have suggested that, perhaps, alternative approaches to trustworthiness like credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability are in order whereas Maxwell (2005), on the other hand, espoused the use of terms such as descriptive validity, interpretive validity, theoretical validity, generalizability, and evaluative validity. Lincoln and Guba (1985) recommended using five "major techniques" (p. 304) in order to demonstrate trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries; particularly, prolonged engagement; not going native; triangulation based upon sources, methods, investigators and theories peer debriefing, and member checking.

Issues that may be a part of this study are a potential threat to reliability and validity of self-reported data and the generalizability of the researcher's findings. As previously discussed, qualitative research designs are not typically associated with issues of reliability, validity or generalizability. Nevertheless, researchers/writers such as Creswell (2007); Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, and Allen (1993); Fraenkel et al. (2012); Lincoln & Guba (1985); Merriam (1998), and Miles and Huberman (1994) have suggested that credibility, authenticity, transferability, dependability, and confirmability may be more appropriate for qualitative research designs. Although Creswell (2007) preferred alternative terminology to represent the notions of validity and reliability, Creswell proposed the use of eight qualitative validation strategies; namely, "prolonged engagement and persistent observation" (p. 207), triangulation to substantiate evidence, peer review or debriefing, negative case analysis, elucidating researcher bias, member checking, rich, thick description, and auditing, to establish trustworthiness of studies.

This single case study included four developmental reading instructors and one learning specialist as participants; the resulting data may not be generalizable to a larger population as this researcher did randomly sample the participants which would "strengthen external validity" (Merriam, 1998, p. 208). To demonstrate trustworthiness in this study, the researcher used triangulation of sources, peer debriefing, researcher notebook, member checks and the establishment of inter-rater reliability. Because this study was projected to last for 10 weeks, it was not possible for this study to include prolonged engagement to increase trustworthiness and going native was not possible as well because the researcher did not have an opportunity to become overly acquainted with the participants in the 10-week schedule of the study. The researcher used documents and interviews to triangulate the data. Interviewing and document analysis were used to confirm instructors of developmental reading courses reported use of metacognitive reading strategies with struggling adult readers as well as what instructors of developmental reading courses used to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers. Peer debriefing involves using an outsider as a means of keeping the researcher honest about meanings, methodology and interpretations associated with a study (Fraenkel et al., 2012; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This researcher conferred with an experienced reading teacher in the K-12 system to keep this researcher honest through discussion of what occurred during the process of completing the proposed study. This researcher and the reading teacher contributed to the trustworthiness of the coding by reaching an inter-coder agreement of within a range of 80% to 90% as recommended by Miles and Huberman (1994). After each of the participants' interviews, the participants received a transcribed copy of the interview as a

means of verifying the data. Participant 4 was the sole participant who gave input about the content of the transcript. Lincoln and Guba's (1985) recommendations for building trustworthiness during studies included maintaining field journals, mounting safeguards, on-site team interactions, triangulation, gathering referential materials, debriefing, and developing and maintaining an audit trail. Fassinger (2005) noted that "the process of auditing is yet another way that the interpretive lenses of the researcher are obviated and scrutinized in grounded theory (indeed in any qualitative study)" (p. 163). The researcher maintained a researcher notebook and an audit trail for trustworthy purposes; nevertheless, the researcher did not work with a team, nor collect referential materials as ways to build trustworthiness because the researcher was the sole investigator for this study.

Data Analysis

The researcher collected and analyzed data from document analyses and interviews, simultaneously, throughout the study (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Because data analysis is an iterative process, the researcher read and reread the data several times. After closely reading, reflecting and writing margin notes, establishing commonalities and patterns, this researcher coded the data with multicolored markers on the printed text using the Pre-Data Collection Codes in Appendix A. For example, if the researcher noted metacognitive reading strategies, then this researcher circled the notation using a brightly colored red marker. Next, the researcher closely examined each data source and used multicolored index cards to write and to physically layout each code with its supporting evidence. For instance, if activities using metacognitive reading strategies were noted using goldenrod-colored index cards, then the researcher laid out all of the cards to

support that contention. Document analysis included reading and closely examining course syllabi, and four participant-chosen documents (i.e., assessments, lesson plans, assignments, PowerPoint presentations, lectures, and handouts) for the purpose of determining and writing about the documents' significance (Miles & Huberman, 1994) in relation to instructors' reported use of metacognitive reading strategies with struggling adult readers to increase reading comprehension and what instructors reported using to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers. Using Document Summary Forms, the researcher summarized the documents. After completing Document Summary Forms, each form was be coded using a list of codes (see Appendix F) that were developed prior to reading and analyzing the documents using this researcher's research questions (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Miles and Huberman (1994) recommended early analysis of data, collecting and analyzing data simultaneously; and the use of a start list of codes that are to be developed prior to fieldwork while Creswell (2007) suggested developing initial codes after reading and analyzing the data as well as making margin notes. The researcher used the same coding scheme written above for documents and interviews. The researcher displayed the results in matrices (Miles & Huberman, 1994). For purposes of determining emerging categories and theme and to write a report, the researcher analyzed and interpreted the matrices.

The researcher conducted two interviews for each instructor during a two to six week window of time (see Table 3). The first interview was 20 to 30 minutes and the second interview was for no less than 45 minutes or no more than 60 minutes. Each interview was recorded with permission; handwritten notes were taken and the resulting information was be transcribed immediately thereafter. Stake (1995) suggested that

"within a few hours of the interview, the researcher should prepare a written facsimile, with key ideas and episodes captured" (p. 66). The researcher checked the resulting typewritten record, handwritten notes and tape recordings for accuracy of information (Richards, 2009, p. 57) by comparing the recorded data to determine if the result of each mirrored the other or have a similitude of meaning. The participants received a copy of the transcribed interviews so that any discrepancies may be noted and resolved (member checking). The researcher used member checking to establish the credibility of this study's findings. After member checking was completed, the researcher read and reread the transcripts several times with reflective thought and made margin notes. According to the previously established coding scheme above, the researcher coded the data. When commonalities and patterns were established, themes located, then the researcher described, in thick, rich terms, what the data suggested using matrices and a written summary of the findings.

Instrumentation, Tools, and Protocols

The researcher used an Interview Protocol, Document Summary Form and Content Analysis Form to gather data. The Interview Protocol had 19 open-ended questions that the researcher asked the participants to answer during one-on-one interviews. The Interview Protocol that this researcher used for this study was developed by Ness (2006); consequently, this researcher was given permission to use Ness' Interview Protocol via email communication (see Appendices I & J). This researcher modified Ness' Teacher Interview Protocol by adding six questions pertaining to metacognitive reading strategies and instructors of developmental reading courses. Initially, the interview questions referred to general information about the instructors and

then questions were geared toward developmental reading instructors' and learning specialist's use of metacognitive reading strategies or other approaches to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers. During the 10-week study, the researcher administered the semi-structured open-ended Interview Protocol. After applicable documents were gathered, examined, and analyzed (see Appendices F & G), the researcher completed Document Summary Forms and Content Analysis Forms. Document Summary Form included the name of the document, the date of receipt or the date of pick-up of document, the significance of the document in relation to the study and a checklist of metacognitive reading strategies. The Content Analysis Form encompassed 10 questions that required yes/no responses and plus nine questions that required written explanations.

Pilot Study

This researcher piloted the Interview Protocol, Pre-Data Collection Codes, and Content Analysis Form at Central State College (a pseudonym) in south Florida for the purpose of conducting interviews, determining inter-rater reliability of Pre-Data Collection Codes (see Appendix A), and using the Content Analysis Form to analyze documents. This researcher contacted the department chair at Central State College via email to elicit volunteers to participate in the pilot study. Two instructors volunteered to participate in the pilot study. Participant 1 had 26 years of experience as an adjunct professor teaching Developmental Reading 1 (REA 007) and Developmental Reading 2 (REA 0017), while Participant 2 had approximately one and a half years of experience as an adjunct professor teaching REA 007 and REA 0017.

The researcher interviewed the participants using a 16-question Interview Protocol developed by Ness (2006) and modified by this researcher with permission. The researcher interviewed the two participants, instructors of developmental reading courses at Central State College, twice. The initial interview was for 20 minutes while the second interview for no less than 45 minutes or no more than 60 minutes. Each interview was tape-recorded, with permission, using an audiotape recorder. After each interview, the researcher transcribed the audiotaped notes and forwarded copies of the transcriptions to the participants for review. Once the transcripts were thoroughly reviewed by the participants to determine the completeness and accuracy of them (Fassinger, 2005), the researcher read and reread the transcripts, captured reflective thoughts through margin notes to develop codes that were added to the Pre-Data Collection Codes (Miles & Huberman, 1994). In addition, this researcher also noted that the arrangement of the Interview Protocol questions were inconsonant and needed rearrangement so that similar questions were together. Additionally, the researcher added one statement and two questions; namely, "Define metacognitive reading comprehension strategies; What is the difference between skills and strategies; and Do you think that there is a difference between reading strategies and metacognitive reading strategies? Why/Why Not?" to the Interview Protocol to facilitate a more in-depth understanding of the phenomenon at-hand and to, thoroughly, answer this researcher's research questions.

Furthermore, as a part of this pilot study, an experienced K-12 reading teacher tested the dependability, or inter-rater reliability of the researcher's codes through representative sampling of interview transcripts because coding definitions became more clear throughout the process (Miles & Huberman, 2006). Miles and Huberman (1994)

referred to inter-rater reliability in terms of check-coding and asserted that it is best for more than one person to code five to 10 pages of an initial set of notes. Subsequent to the researcher coding the transcripts, the reading teacher read and coded every other page of the interview transcripts rather than five to 10 pages as Miles and Huberman (1994) suggested. Miles and Huberman (1994) suggested that, "intercoder agreement should be up in the range of 90%" (p. 64). After the reading teacher coded all transcripts, then the researcher and the reading teacher discussed the coded text to determine agreement or disagreement as to the coded text (Miles & Huberman, 1994). There was a divergence of opinion between the researcher and the reading teacher with regard to the coded text. The researcher and reading teacher agreed upon one solitary code; consequently, the initial inter-rater reliability was .048%. The researcher and the reading teacher engaged in several conversations to clarify coding inconsistencies and to reexamine the transcripts again using some of the same codes as well as a derivation of the original codes. The researcher and reading teacher reached a consensus regarding the coded text, then the researcher recoded the remaining transcripts and completed another test of inter-rater reliability using Miles and Huberman's (1994) formula (i.e., total number of agreements divided by total number of agreements plus disagreements). The researcher and the reading teacher were able to agree on a majority of the codes, which yielded an inter-rater reliability score of 90%.

Finally, this researcher collected five documents from the participants—one syllabus and the remaining four documents as determined by the participants. The researcher read the documents first and analyzed them using the Content Analysis Form, a one-page document that included 10 questions that required yes or no responses and

nine questions that required written explanations. The participants assisted this researcher in analyzing the syllabi and a handout, using the Content Analysis Form, in an effort to find evidence of metacognitive reading strategy use. One participant actually completed the Content Analysis Form whereas the other participant did not complete the process. Therefore, the researcher did not have adequate information to conclude with certainty that having the participants involved in this part of the pilot study process was beneficial in answering the research questions before this researcher. After completing Content Analysis Forms for each document, then this researcher coded the data using the Pre-Data Collection Codes, noted that additional codes were necessary. Subsequent to a final review of the Content Analysis Form, this researcher noted that the questions and statements contained therein did not appropriately align with the research questions. This researcher changed the order of the research questions from a general question and ending with more a specific question; therefore, it was necessary to realign each statement and question properly. For example, originally Question 1 of the Content Analysis Form connected to Research Questions 1 and 2 rather than Research Question 2, which referred directly to metacognitive reading strategies. Nonetheless, the researcher had to revise the Content Analysis Form to reflect that the researcher not only changed the order of the research questions, but also eliminated one of the three questions that posed by the researcher. The researcher added a blank line to the Content Analysis Form to record completion dates and added numbers to the questions and statements. After editing the form, the researcher began to reread the documents and to complete new Content Analysis Forms. This researcher coded each document using Pre-Data Collection Codes (see Appendix A); yet, it was obvious that the list had a very limited

number of codes. As the researcher coded the documents, the researcher did not include additional codes at that particular time, but rather after the coding of the interview transcripts.

Data Collection Procedures With Timeline

The data collection procedures depended upon the schedules of the participants; however, for purposes of this study, this researcher set aside 10 weeks for data collection using interviews and documents. During a two to seven week period, the researcher conducted the interviews. Because Participant 1 did not respond to emailed requests for an initial interview, this researcher made contact with Participant 1 via telephone. The researcher interviewed instructors and a learning specialist as their schedule permitted during the two to seven week period. The researcher interviewed each participant twice with the initial interview scheduled for 20 to 30 minutes and the second interview for no less than 45 minutes and no more than 60 minutes. The study included document analysis. Documents such as lesson plans, assessments, assignments, PowerPoint presentations, lectures, course syllabi and handouts were collected during Weeks 1 through 7 and analyzed weekly on various days (see Table 3) to confirm what instructors reported regarding the use of metacognitive reading strategies with struggling adult readers. The participants provided the researcher with four documents, chosen by the participants, and one syllabus for 25 documents. The researcher collected and analyzed the data simultaneously as recommended by Miles and Huberman (1994). Either during the 10-week study, or sometime in the immediate future, reports related to all of the data sources were completed.

Limitations

A limitation of self-reported data of the study is that participants may be unable to explain their experiential actions.

> Any gaze is always filtered through the lens of language, gender, social class, race and ethnicity. . . Subjects or individuals are seldom able to give full explanations of their actions or intentions; all they can offer are accounts, or stories about what they did and why. (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003, p. 24; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 12)

Another limitation of the study related to participants' experiences. Polkinghorne (2005) has suggested that "people do not have complete access to their experiences. The capacity to be aware of or to recollect one's experiences is intrinsically limited. People do not have a clear window into their inner life" (p. 139). According to Merriam (1998), limitations that may be associated with the use of documentary data related to the fact that some documents maybe developed for purposes, which do not align with the investigator's research purposes; and current definitions of the concepts may not be applicable to the data. Determining authenticity and accuracy of documentary materials may be a limitation because some documents may include built-in biases with which the researcher may not be cognizant.

An additional limitation was the amount of time reserved for the study. Ten weeks were reserved for the study, which may not have been enough time to examine this researcher's line of research, participants' reported use of metacognitive reading comprehension strategies and what they reported using to increase the reading

comprehension of struggling adult readers, to capture the true essence or the richness of what occurred in classrooms during comprehension instruction.

Delimitations

There were several delimitations for the study. A delimitation of the study was the use of one public state college in south Florida because of its proximity to the researcher's place of employment as well as residence. Another delimitation of the study included data sources. In the study, interviews and document analyses were the data sources however, observation of classroom instruction would have offered another avenue for confirming what approaches the participants used to increase or improve their students reading comprehension. Finally, the research study should have included analyses of textbooks that the participants used with their struggling adult readers as a means of confirming the content of the textbooks as well as what instructors included during reading instruction.

CHAPTER 4. FINDINGS

This research study investigated the reported use of metacognitive reading strategies by four instructors of developmental reading courses and a learning specialist as well as what other approaches the participants may have reported using to increase and improve the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers. First, data collection procedures were presented and a discussion of data analysis. Finally, the findings were presented using three categories (Rote Routines, Planned Procedures and Thinking Tools) and by a theme (Eclectic Approaches to Reading Comprehension).

Research Questions

This researcher sought to determine what instructors of developmental reading courses at Sunshine State College reported using to increase and improve the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers using the following questions:

1. What do instructors of developmental reading courses at Sunshine State College report using to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers?
2. What metacognitive reading strategies do instructors in developmental reading courses at Sunshine State College report using with struggling adult readers to improve reading comprehension?

Data Collection Procedures

The researcher examined the reported use of metacognitive reading strategies as well as other approaches instructors of developmental reading courses and a learning

specialist used to improve and increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers. After approval by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) as well as Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IRE) at Sunshine State College, the researcher elicited participants who taught Developmental Reading 2 for the study by emailing the department chairs of developmental reading from all campuses based upon a recommendation by the Director of the IRE. There were five participants involved in this research study. Participants 1, 3, and 5 were adjunct professors, while Participant 4 was an associate professor. Participant 2 was the sole learning specialist involved with the study. All of the participants were experienced instructors except Participants 2 and 3 (see Table 2).

To address the need for sufficient data with five participants instead of the originally proposed 16, this 10-week study included two interviews in addition to the collection of five documents per participant for 25 documents. Using Content Analysis and Document Summary Forms (see Appendices G and F); the researcher analyzed the documents. During the interviews, the researcher used data from the Content Analysis as well as Document Summary Forms (see Appendix F) for triangulation purposes. The researcher triangulated these data by asking participants questions about concerns and issues that emerged from the documents. For example, during the analysis of Participant 3's syllabus, the researcher observed that higher-level reading strategies were included in the document. Consequently, the researcher asked Participant 3, "What are higher level reading strategies?" Through the results from the document analyses, both interviews were informed.

The researcher interviewed the participants using a 19-question semi-structured Interview Protocol (See Appendix H). The researcher recorded the interviews, transcribed the data immediately thereafter and forwarded copies of the transcripts to the participants for member checking. Participants 2 and 4 needed to clarify a few points; however, Participant 2 tabled his clarification until the second interview. Participant 4 made changes directly to the transcript and sent it back to the researcher. The researcher analyzed the data through an iterative process of reading, rereading, analyzing, and the writing of margin notes.

Data Analysis and Procedures

The researcher read each document several times and completed Content Analysis and Document Analysis Forms for each document (see Appendices G & F). The researcher read and reread both forms and coded them using the list of manually generated through a pilot study, Interview Protocol, and *ATLAS.ti*, a computer program (see Appendix J). Saldaña (2009) recommended that for "small-scale studies, code on hard-copy printouts first, not via a computer monitor" because manual coding affords the researcher "ownership and control" over the data; then employ the use of a computer program (p. 22). Basit (2003) suggested that the method used to analyze or to code data depended upon the "size of the project, the funds and time available and the inclination and expertise of the researcher" (p. 152). Therefore, the researcher initially coded the data manually using hard copies, colored markers, and index cards. Then the researcher sorted and categorized the data as well as developed themes based upon that procedure as Saldaña (2009) recommended (see Appendix A). The themes that emerged from the initial coding were "holistic approach to increasing reading comprehension," "skills-

based strategies," and "metacognitive reading strategies." Next, the researcher uploaded the participants' interview transcripts to *ATLAS.ti* for recoding. Although 156 codes emerged, the researcher grouped, regrouped, and categorized the codes. In addition, the researcher extricated extraneous codes from the list of codes; therefore, they were not a part of this study (see Appendix A). The researcher developed a table for research questions that included three categories and a theme (see Table 4) based upon the *ATLAS.ti* coding. The theme (Eclectic Approaches to Reading Comprehension) and three categories; namely, Rote Routines, Planned Tactics, and Thinking Tools emerged through the collapsing of various codes. The *ATLAS.ti* computer program was useful because it contributed to the validation, credibility, and trustworthiness of the researcher's initial codes. Additionally, the researcher correlated the definitions of Rote Routines, Planned Tactics, and Thinking Tools with the codes (see Table 5).

Table 4

Categories and Themes for Research Questions

Theme: Eclectic Approaches to Reading Comprehension	
Questions	Categories
Research Question 1: What do instructors of developmental reading courses at Sunshine State College report using to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers?	• Rote Routines • Planned Tactics
Research Question 2: What metacognitive reading comprehension strategies do instructors in developmental reading instructors at Sunshine State College report using to with struggling adult readers to improve reading comprehension?	• Thinking Tools

Table 5

Researcher Definitions and Correlated Codes

Word or Phrase	Definitions	Codes
Skills	• Afflerbach et al. (2008a) – "Autonomous actions that . . . usually occur without awareness of the components or control involved" (p. 368) • Manoli & Papadopoulou (2012) - "Automatic behaviors" (p. 820) • Dole et al. (1991) - "Skills are more or less automatic routines associated with lower levels of thinking and learning" (p. 242) • Harris & Hodges (1995) – ". . . skill is also used to refer to parts of acts that are primarily intellectual, as those involved in comprehension or thinking " (p. 235) • Paris, Wasik, & Turner (1996) – "Skills are information processing techniques . . . applied to text unconsciously" (pp. 610-611)	ACT – Activity ASG – Assignment ASM – Assessment RI – Reading Instruction SK – Skills TP – Test Preparation

(table continues)

Table 5 *(continued)*

Word or Phrase	Definitions	Codes
General Reading Strategies	• Afflerbach et al., 2008a) - "Deliberate, goal-directed attempts to control and modify the reader's efforts to decode text, understand words & construct meanings of text" (p. 368) • Manoli & Papadopoulou (2012) - ". . . strategies are deliberate actions, plans consciously deployed by learns in order to copy with comprehension difficulties" (p. 820) • Paris, Lipson, & Wixson (1983) - "Strategies are deliberate actions . . ." (p. 295) • Dole et al. (1991) - "Strategies emphasize intentional and deliberate plans under the control of the reader." (p. 242) • "Strategies imply metacognitive awareness—reflect on what's done" (Dole et al. 1991, p. 242) • Harris & Hodges (1995) – Comprehension Strategy ". . . a systematic sequence of steps for understanding text, as in the SQ3R Study Method." (p. 39) • Harris & Hodges (1995) – Strategy – "In education, a systematic plan consciously adapted and monitored, to improve one's performance in learning." (p. 244) • Paris, Wasik, & Turner (1996) – "Strategies are actions selected deliberately to achieve particular goals." (p. 611)	ASAR – Assist Struggling Adult Readers MBRCS – Most Beneficial RCS NSI – No Strategy Instruction NSU – No Strategy Use RCS – Reading Comprehension Strategies SDS – Student Developed Strategy ST – Strategies TS – Tools /Strategies VOC – Vocabulary

(table continues)

Table 5 *(continued)*

Word or Phrase	Definitions	Codes
Metacognitive Strategies	• Wichadee (2011) - Metacognitive strategies are effective tools used to help learners to become consciously aware of what they have learned & to recognize situations in which they would be useful. • El-Hindi (1997) - Metacognitive strategies can be defined as strategies that cause one to think about what they understand & do not understand as they read and/or complete tasks. • Baker & Brown (1984) - Metacognitive strategies are the awareness & control of cognitive tasks • Pressley & Afflerbach (1995) - Metacognitive strategies are purposeful, deliberate tools for comprehending & monitoring of comprehension before, during and after reading which researchers have shown to be effective.	ANA – Analyzing ANT - Annotating AR – Active Reading C - Connection CWT – Conversation with Text CK – Conditional Knowledge DK – Declarative Knowledge DPCK – Declarative, Procedural & Conditional Knowledge EVAL – Evaluation INF - Inferring MRS - Metacognitive Reading Strategies MBMRS – Most Beneficial MRS PK – Procedural Knowledge QUA – Question Answering QUG – Question Generation SM – Self-Monitoring SU – Summarizing SYN – Synthesizing TH – Thinking UMRS – Use Metacognitive Reading Strategies VIS – Visualization

Research Question 1

What do instructors of developmental reading courses at Sunshine State College report using to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers?

Three categories and one theme emerged through the analyzed data (See Table 4) from two interviews as well as five documents per participant with regard to Research Question 1 and Research Question 2. The theme (Eclectic Approaches to Reading Comprehension) and categories (Rote Routines, Planned Tactics, and Thinking Tools) emerged through combining and eliminating various codes (see Appendix A). Rote Routines and Planned Tactics were associated with Research Question 1. Rote Routines

encompassed learning through repetition and unconscious methods such as reading skills used to increase reading comprehension.

Eclectic Approaches to Reading Comprehension

Eclectic approaches referred to the various approaches and strategies that instructors of developmental reading courses used during the study. They included approaches such as Rote Routines, Outliers Not Really Skills as well as Planned Tactics.

Rote Routines

The Rote Routines category included codes for artifacts such as activities, assignments and assessments, reading instruction, test preparation, skills, and any other codes related to the use of skills. Each participant had a slightly different perspective of what constituted a skill or its definition. Afflerbach et al. (2008a, 2008b) defined skills as automatic, unconscious actions that include decoding and comprehending of text. Both Participants 1 and 2 defined skills in terms of something that students had to do; however, Participant 2 extended the definition in the following statement, "What are you doing in order to find main idea." While on the other hand, Participants 3, 4 and 5's definitions were markedly different. Participant 3 when referring to how skills were defined said, "skills are more of the principle usage, uh, you know, of being able to read and write," whereas Participant 4 felt that skills were to be "applied to a reading as opposed to a problem." Now, Participant 5 thought of skills as a concept to be learned and "would be, how do you find the main idea . . .?" The participants' understanding of skills was different; however, the notion of students doing something was a common focal point. Data from both interviews as well as the documents supported the reading instruction

category. Participants 1, 3, and 5 described their typical days of reading instruction whereas Participants 2 and 4 talked about their atypical days of reading instruction.

Typical Day of Reading Instruction. Reading instruction for Participant 1 typically consisted of the presentation of a reading skill through PowerPoint and practice of the reading skill using textbook based materials and discussion. Discussion was important to Participant 1 because the students who did not understand the lesson were more likely to ask questions during such discussions. Participant 1 acknowledged that students who had not passed their reading assessment and who were placed into developmental reading have a very difficult time working with skills and as a result she "spends a little more time with these skills because [she] know that [they are] going to struggle . . . typically the prep student struggles with those skills." In the following slice of discourse, Participant 1 gave a general overview regarding a typical day of reading instruction in her classroom that included the Direct Instruction Model (Eggen & Kauchak, 2006) using a skill.

> Uh, I usually teach the skill. I usually present the skill using PowerPoint and then we'll do some practice within class. While I'll have them practice the skill and, uh, with all the prep classes, the co-requisite of a lab requirement [where they have] outside of the classroom they have to go to the Student Learning Center on campus and do outside classes. But within the classroom, I present the material; I show them how to do it; we do it together and then they try it with some of the practice in the textbook and then we discuss the answers.

Participant 1's documents included a Study Guide, Topic and Main Idea, Main Idea and Supporting Details, Transitions and Patterns of Organization PowerPoint

presentations, and a syllabus (see Table 7). The Study Guide was essentially a clone of the final examination that the participant was scheduled to give at the end of the course. It consisted of paragraphs covering a variety of topics for purposes of determining what skills students understood such as topic, main idea, supporting details, organizational patterns, and transitions. The Topic and Main Idea, Main Idea and Supporting Details as well as the Transitions and Patterns of Organization PowerPoint presentations were overwhelmingly skills-based and used for the purpose of assisting students with how to locate main idea, supporting details, transitions, and patterns of organization. The syllabus contained student-learning outcomes such as main idea, supporting details, inferences, and other skills. The syllabus was the foundation for what the course contained based on the course objectives. The documents and interview transcripts of Participant 1 supported the notion of skills-based reading instruction. Therefore, the researcher found that Participant 1 reported using skills-based reading instruction to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers; such as, main idea, supporting details, patterns or organization, bias, and so forth (see Table 6).

When asked about a typical day of reading instruction, Participant 2's response centered on human resource type matters such as paying the staff, ensuring that the materials for staff were well stocked as well as working with students after all other matters had been resolved because he was actually a learning specialist charged with tutoring students who did not get a passing score on the college's entrance examination. Participant 2's day was atypical insofar as instruction was concerned as exemplified by the following discourse from Interview 1.

> A typical day here is I come in and I tend to the staff and make sure they're all getting paid and, uh, make sure the materials are all stocked [and] make sure they're stocking the materials that we have used for students. Then in the course of a day I will end up sitting with several students. It's summertime now, but sometimes they only get, may be, one student in a day and I have to give my staff a chance, but, uh, yeah, I usually have several sessions a day, uh, and one example of a session might be a student coming in who is preparing for a test and he has [inaudible] study issues. Usually he or she is able to come in and I'll say what are you doing to prepare for the test? Well, I made flash cards and I read the chapter and that's all, you know, so we start going into other kinds of, uh, study strategies that are available to him which is fine, but I always keep those on the periphery and I want to focus on the metacognitive techniques. I always want to start with what they're so doing. So I kind of gave you an idea of the routine day where I'm just making sure the lab is up and running smoothly and then I'm looking for opportunities to get pass all the routine and really get into the learning strategies with whomever is in front of me.

Participant 2, a learning specialist, worked with various students on different subjects not just reading; so the researcher readdressed reading instruction in the second interview. In the second interview, the researcher specifically asked the participant to expound on the reading instruction question once more using a specific reading skill such as bias because the initial explanation for a typical day of reading instruction focused on assisting a student with preparation for a math test rather than a concept associated with reading.

> Well bias is largely basically, here's one thing you can do. You can look at their folder progress and see how they did in earlier skills like main ideas because if they're having trouble with main ideas, they're probably having trouble identifying major details. And of course with bias, if all your major details are on one side of the argument, you can automatically tell, first of all, what the main idea is, you know, that is authored by blah, blah, blah, but you could also tell that there's a slant, there's an imbalance, sometime is being left out of the picture, you know. So, uh, I think, very often what happens in terms of reading especially in regard to higher order concerns, and writing as well, it's the largest points of support that the student is losing sight of so much of the skills that we have depend on the points of support like the major details or the main idea in an essay.

Although Participant 2 answered the questions regarding a typical day of reading instruction, he also explained that the task before him was tutoring using skills-based content with students that did not pass the college's standardized assessment and that "instruction actually happened in the classroom." Participant 2's primary purpose in the lab was to hone and sharpen the comprehension skills of students through various assignments through assessments. Students' performance on lab assessments drove tutoring sessions. If the students passed the assessment, then they would proceed to the next assignment until they were prepared to retake the college's reading test. Conversely, if the students performed poorly and did not pass the assessment, then Participant 2 would sit with them to remediate the targeted skills. Essentially, the lab's purpose was to remediate skills using assessment and tutoring when necessary. Participant 2 solidified this contention when he said,

> Uh, so the lab component exists parallel to the students' class and conceivably they get some work done in class and cover some skills and okay, so you know, we have this traditional skills-based approach because we want to be able to zoom in on particular areas and see how they do on that particular area.

Therefore, Participant 2 prepared students to take and to pass their reading examination. There was no reading instruction in the traditional sense with a lesson presented before a group of students using PowerPoint, modeling, guided practice, independent practice and assessment (Eggen & Kauchak, 2006) as evidenced by what Participant 2 said in the following segment of discourse from interview two,

> So, the instruction is pretty much in class, but basically when they come to the lab, we test them first. So, basically they just come into the lab and pretty much we give them the opportunity to test out of all of those skills. So let's say they come in to work on the location of main ideas, uh, that they should be locating main ideas. [that] they pretty much have the opportunity to take a ten item quiz to test out of having to do any lab work. Okay, so, if they get 70 or higher on that location of main ideas quiz, we sign a folder and they are done. But if they get less than 70%, then a tutor intervenes and goes over the skill with them together and they do some remedial work to prepare and then they basically take a second test so that we can see if we can raise that score.

Although there was no instruction using conventional methods, there was skills-based practice or work that the lab provided to students. Participant 2 did not provide a Course Syllabus to the researcher nevertheless he did provide five documents, Developmental Reading, Developmental Reading 2 Lab Checklist; Coaches Report; How

to Complete Your Lab Assignments; Locating Main Idea, The Alternative Test, and Main Idea (see Table 7). The documents that Participant 2 provided were fundamentally skills-based; hence, they supported the assertion that tutoring under the auspices of the Student Learning Center was skills-based. For example, when responding to "what are reading skills," based upon a review of the How to Complete Your Lab Assignments, Participant 2 remarked that there is a "lab checklist, the column on the left [read] skills and those are all, most of those are skills."

Participant 2 presented additional documents such as "Locating Main Idea Alternative Test and Main Idea Test in lieu of a Course Syllabus. Both documents incorporated questions associated with finding main idea, which actually supported the notion that the course was fundamentally skills-based. The researcher found that although Participant 2 did not instruct students as most instructors typically taught lessons, he coached them in developing and enhancing strategies that they were already using and skill building specifically for the purpose of assessing strengths and weaknesses related to the college's reading examination. The skills Participant 2 reported using were main idea, implied main idea, supporting details, bias, transitions, and others (see Table 6).

Participant 3, the neophyte of the participants, had been teaching since the fall of 2013. Although she had been teaching for a little less than a year, the researcher permitted the participant to be a part of the study because she volunteered and because the pool of potential participants dwindled because of the passing and the institution of Senate Bill 1720 whose impact is virtually unknown. Instruction for Participant 3

consisted mainly of PowerPoint presentations, chapters from textbooks, group work, sharing out, and assignments as evidenced by the following quote.

> Well, uh, I can only really go based off of the class that I taught. It was an eight week course, so I met with them each day from Monday through Thursday for that hour and fifteen minutes. So we did a variety of things usually starting with a chapter. I would give a lesson on PowerPoint and within that lesson we would stop periodically and do group work from the book or you know, uh, individual work from the book and share as a class. We may also have had a quiz on any given day, but normally I would teach a lesson using visuals from PowerPoint adapting it to the textbook and then ending the day with a homework assignment, uh, from the textbook that would be due the next day.

Participant 3 provided a Course Syllabus, Implied Main Idea PowerPoint, REA007 Midterm Exam Review, SQ3R: Becoming An Active Reader, and REA 0017 *Life of Pi* Book Report Directions (see Table 7). The Course Syllabus provided an overview of Developmental Reading 2 that included "an intensive review of reading skills necessary to be successful in college . . ." and that "students will apply higher level reading strategies to college-level reading selections." It also encompassed course learning outcomes like identify the topic and stated/implied main idea, identify specific information, distinguish between major and minor details, analyze, author's purpose, evaluate the author's use of facts and opinions, identify the transition words, and detect bias. The Implied Main Idea PowerPoint and REA0017 Midterm Exam Review included implied main idea, drawing conclusions, supporting details, inferences, topic, and comparison. The REA 0017 Midterm Exam Review incorporated only skills whereas the

Implied Main Idea PowerPoint was comprised of questions like "whom or what the passage is about; what point is the author making about the topic; do the details in the passage support this idea." Under metacognitive reading strategies, a description and discussion of SQ3R: Becoming an Active Reader PowerPoint ensued. Even though higher-level reading strategies were included in the Course Syllabus, the majority of it referred to the use of skills that undergirded the course. The researcher found that Participant 3 reported using main idea, supporting details, implied main idea; and patterns of organization, among others (see Table 6).

For Participant 4, reading instruction was different for every class session. Consequently, there was no typical day of instruction as she included various methods during instruction.

> There is no typical day, uh, because I do something different every single day. I have static assignments that we do almost every week, the critical reading assignment, so certainly discussing that would be something that we would do one of the two days a week we would meet, uh, for the five weeks that they were in session, one day we will certainly discuss that. Uh, there would be some sort of, we would, usually I would start the class by discussing whatever homework was due and collecting it and then we have some sort of lesson based on whatever we're covering that week and then some sort of activity. A lot of going over homework as I hand it back and discussing what they did or didn't do correctly, et cetera.

Participant 4 did not specifically state that reading instruction was skills-based when asked about a typical day of reading instruction; yet, when talking about activities,

in-class assignments and homework she described some that students were required to complete that were related to skills. The following quotes exemplify Participant 4's use of skills,

> Well, like I mentioned, I have the critical reading assignments that I sent you that were in the Directions Packet which is a static, holistic, reading assignment that students complete weekly on different readings, uh, so with the Reading 0017 class which is what I sent to you, you'll see the list of readings in the packet. It's actually excerpts from the college textbooks because one of my goals is to get my students ready to read college textbooks. Uh, and so for each of those excerpts they write a summary that's scored using a rubric and then they answer the questions listed and they answer all the questions every single time. Uh, they are graded, graded on questions they got wrong on skills that I covered. A couple of the assignments that they do for main idea and for patterns of organization is to read an article that I give them and then for every paragraph identify the topic, the main idea, whether or not the main idea is stated or implied and then when we do patterns of organization, they also identify the pattern of organization for that particular paragraph and I have an assignment called "Hide and Seek: Find the Main Idea" where they read a commentary and they have [sorry, uh] and they have to underline the main idea every single time they find it and then justify which one of those they believe is the main idea. Uh, what else do we do? It's very difficult . . . we have a lot of assignments.

Participant 4 submitted five documents that included a Course Syllabus, REA 0017 Directions Packet, Reading Quiz, Identifying Bias and Tone in Editorial Cartoons

PowerPoint, and REA 0017 Exam 3 (see Table 7). The Course Syllabus, the framework for the course, contained key terms such as effective reading, skills, evaluate arguments, main idea, details, tone, author's purpose, fact/opinion, synthesizing, and so forth. Although the syllabus contained terms that may be associated with metacognitive reading strategies (i.e., evaluate, analyze, synthesize), the researcher found that it mostly supported the use of skills as mechanisms to enhance and increase reading comprehension. The researcher found that the documents as well as the interviews supported the notion that Participant 4 used skills-based reading instruction to increase the reading comprehension of her struggling adult readers. The skills Participant 4 reported using were main idea, implied main idea, support/major details, patterns of organization, and so forth (see Table 6).

Participant 5 used skills with her struggling adult readers to increase their reading comprehension. For Participant 5 a typical day of reading instruction was "usually a review of a skill taught prior to the class, go over material; class discussion; class activity of a skill, [and] a wrap up at the end of class." Participant 5 made additional comments about reading instruction in the following statements.

> [inaudible] sometimes I'll add a class reading to that and the class reading will have, will cover the skill that we have already done up to that point. They may moan and groan, but I say 'is this a reading class and they'll say yes. Oh, what's the purpose of it?' And they just laugh.
>
> Well, the class readings are usually given at the second class usually at the end of the lesson. I teach whatever the lesson is, the skills for that week, two times. On a Monday the second class and then the . . . the first class and the second class is a

> review, uh, a wrap up of whatever the skill. I gave the information about teaching class discussion inferences and the class reading is always on that second class and that is to cover the skills that I have been taught up to that point in the curriculum so far. Uh, it it'll cover like main idea, supporting details, true and false, inferences, possibly bias, uh, patterns of organization and I will continue adding different skills to the, uh, required class readings to whatever we have been up to at that point-in-time in the class.

Participant 5's artifacts were a combination of skills and inferences categorized as skills or metacognitive reading strategies. Participant 5 provided five documents (i.e., Course Syllabus, Inference, Making Inferences from Written Material [Lesson Plan], Newsweek Magazine Journal, and Take a Moment and Look at Cartoon—Reading Between the Lines and Inferences) for the purpose of analyzing each document to determine what instructors of developmental reading courses used to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers. Inference categorized as a reading skill goes under the Rote Routines category. In the Course Syllabus and the Newsweek Magazine Journal, a preponderance of what the researcher found within the documents related to the use of skills like topic, main idea, and details as a mean of increasing reading comprehension. For example, Newsweek Magazine Journal guidelines required specific tasks such as "a summary paragraph of which included thesis of the article, the author's purpose, and some of the details the author uses to support his/her viewpoint." The Course Syllabus captured the overall requirements for Developmental Reading 2 under course learning outcomes of tasks that students would be able to accomplish because of taking the course. Some of the outcomes were

Identify the topic and stated/implied main idea in a multi-paragraph selection in print and online; distinguish between major and minor details in a multi-paragraph selection and analyze author's tone and support with examples, including denotative and connotative meaning, and figurative language.

The researcher found that Participant 5 reported using main, supporting details, patterns of organization, inference, bias, tone, transitions, false/true, and higher level reading strategies.

Table 6

Researcher Question 1: Skills Reported by Participants

Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5
• Main Idea • Supporting Details/Major Details • Patterns of Organization • Bias • Tone • Transition • Topic • Comparison & Contrast • Drawing Conclusions • Conversation with Text • Higher Level Reading Strategies • Purpose • Inference	• Main Idea • Implied Main Idea • Supporting Details/Major Details • Bias • Transition • Topic Sentence • Relationships • Fact & Opinion • Inference • Argument	• Main Idea • Supporting Details • Implied Main Idea • Patterns of Organization • Bias • Transition • Theme • Inference • Author's Purpose • Fact/Opinion • Context Clues • Point-of-View • Valid Argument • Logical Fallacy • Higher Level Reading Strategies	• Main Idea • Implied Main Idea • Supporting Details/Major Details • Patterns of Organization • Bias • Tone • Author's Purpose • Fact/Opinion • Relationships • Contextual Clues • Inference • Higher Level Reading Strategies • Point-of-View	• Main Idea • Supporting Details • Patterns of Organization • Inference • Bias • Tone • Transitions • True/False • Higher Level Reading Strategies

Table 7

Participants' Content Analyses Findings

Participants	Documents	Findings
1	❖ Course Syllabus ❖ Do Not Write on Test ❖ Study Guide ❖ Topic & Main Idea ❖ Transitions	❖ All documents confirmed the use of reading skills.
2	❖ Coach's Report ❖ Developmental Reading 2, Lab Checklist, Spring 2014 ❖ Location of Main Idea ❖ Location of Main Ideas: Alternative Test ❖ How to Complete Your Lab Assignments	❖ All documents confirmed the use of reading skills.
3	❖ Course Syllabus ❖ REA0017 Life of Pi Book Report ❖ SQ3R ❖ Implied Main Idea ❖ REA017 Midterm Exam Review	❖ All documents supported the use of reading skills except SQ3R which confirmed the use of planned tactics.
4	❖ Course Syllabus ❖ Reading Quiz ❖ REA0017 Directions Packet ❖ REA0017 Exam 3 ❖ Identifying Bias & Tone in Editorial Cartoons	❖ All documents confirmed the use of reading skills
5	❖ Course Syllabus ❖ Inference ❖ Making Inferences From Written Material---Lesson Plan ❖ Newsweek Magazine Journal ❖ Take a Moment & Look at Cartoon—Reading Between the Lines, Inferences	❖ All documents confirmed the use of reading skills

A typical day of reading instruction among the participants had similar characteristics and individual participants approached reading instruction differently (see Table 7). First, during instruction each of the participants included some kind of practice work either individually or by groups. Participant 4 spent a great deal of time reviewing homework whereas Participant 3 mentioned that she assigned homework, but did not indicate what actually occurred during instruction. As for Participants 1, 2, and 5, they did not indicate that they used homework during instruction when responding to the question regarding a typical day of reading instruction.

Secondly, all of the participants except Participant 2 used discussion as an aspect of their reading instruction. Discussion included answering questions, sharing as a class, reviewing homework as well as class discussion associated with the lessons taught. Participant 2, learning specialist, did not instruct classes of student, but rather tutored students on a one-to-one basis. Consequently, his tutoring sessions did not include discussion as was typical in the instructors' classrooms. Thirdly, although Participants 1 and 3 were the participants who talked about the use of textbooks during reading instruction, it may be inferred that all of the participants used textbooks as a requirement for their courses based upon their syllabi as well as Participant 2's admission that the students who attended the Student Learning Center (lab) were required to supplement their learning through the use of a specific textbook. It is possible that the courses were actually textbook driven; however, that aspect could not be determined or substantiated by the present study because the researcher did not include content analyses of textbooks in this study.

Fourthly, Participants 1, 3, and 4 used PowerPoint presentations during reading instruction. Both Participants 1 and 3 explicitly stated in responding to the question regarding a typical day of reading instruction that they used PowerPoint presentations, nevertheless, Participant 4 presented this researcher with a PowerPoint that she used when she taught bias and tone and did not include it during her discussion of a typical day of reading instruction.

Fifthly, Participants 1 and 5 were the only participants who actually stated with certainty that they used reading skills during reading instruction whereas Participants 2, 3, and 4 did not, but by implication through all of the data collected, one may conclude that they used reading skills as the pith of their lessons. Finally, Participant 2, a learning specialist, acknowledged that instruction took place in the classroom and that his role was simply to tutor developmental reading students who had not been successful when they took the college's entrance examination. Nonetheless, when he responded to the typical day of reading instruction question, he mentioned metacognitive technique and defined it as a formula (i.e., IOM Strategy) used with his students to increase their reading comprehension. Participant 2 developed this strategy and it included identifying, objectifying and modifying whatever strategies students produced. Participant 2 was the only participant who actually named a general reading strategy or metacognitive reading strategy. The remaining participants spoke generally about what they did during reading instruction and those explanations did not include identifying any strategies in particular. In addition, Participants 1 and 5 mentioned the word "skills" in their discourse, while Participants 3 and 4 gave no name to what they were covering, but simply said, "variety of things" and "based on whatever we're covering that week." Although one may infer

that Participants 3 and 4 used skills based upon the syllabi submitted by the participants for the researcher's review, skills were not emphatically stated. Whatever Participant 2 used to tutor was dependent upon the needs of the students; however, in responding to the typical day of reading instruction question, he talked about metacognitive techniques as a "quick and simple formula" known as IOM Strategy that is used to aid students with developing their own strategies. The last part of the strategy, modify, included "metacognitive feedback."

The participants answered the typical day of reading instruction; however, there were additional instances of reading instruction that they spoke about during their interviews. Overall, all of the participants except Participant 2 used some form of the direct instruction model with their struggling adult readers. The direct instruction model includes a review of work; presentation of content; guided practice, independent practice; feedback and wrap-up review (Eggen & Kauchak, 2006; Simpson & Nist, 2000). It is also known as explicit instruction. Participants 1, 3, 4, and 5 used all of the components of the direct instruction model (i.e., modeling, guided practice, independent practice, review of work as well as feedback). Nash-Ditzel (2010) pointed out that effective instruction should include repeated modeling, practice, assessment, feedback and judicious review of strategies. The participants used direct instruction but the center of instruction was reading skills not strategies. There was an expectation that the participants may have used direct instruction with all instructional foci "not just mere exposure to a specific strategy (Simpson & Nist, 2000, p. 532)." The goal of strategy instruction is to ensure that strategies are being applied appropriately (Paris et al., 1996).

Consequently, strategy instruction ought to be rigorous, straightforward and continuous (Simpson & Nist, 2000).

Using explicit instruction or the direct instruction model requires a great deal of planning, commitment and effort. Developmental reading instructors, who are mostly adjunct professors, may lack the experience and knowledge associated with theory based courses that may have included the use of the direct instruction model with strategies and metacognitive reading strategies. Planning instruction using the direct instruction model is laborious, time consuming and may be an issue for developmental reading instructors because they would not necessarily receive appropriate compensation for their time and effort in enhancing instruction (Nash-Ditzel, 2010) so that they meet the diverse needs of their students. The components of instruction are crucial for increasing the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers using strategies or metacognitive reading strategies. Developmental reading instructors would benefit from on-going professional development focused on reading theories and Nash-Ditzel (2010) proclaimed, "a successful instructor does need a strong foundation in current reading theories" (p. 59) and reading research (Simpson & Nist, 2000). Because the goal of the developmental reading courses is to increase reading comprehension, it is vital that instructors are knowledgeable about reading theory if they are to improve comprehension and to "better serve" (p. 59) their students. What was striking about instruction, based upon the interview data, was the fact that there was no intricate discussion of how instruction might occur. There were very broad ideas of what constituted reading instruction that included reading skills, but those ideas did not include actual descriptions of strategies; what, why, how, when and where to use the strategies. Additionally, for all of the

participants except Participant 2, instruction did not contain monitoring of comprehension that would include evaluating the effectiveness of strategies. The conclusion of the matter is that instruction as described by the participants was solely reading skills based, but should have included direct instruction of strategies because they are effective in improving the reading comprehension of struggling readers (Falk-Ross, 2001-2002; Mealey & Nist, 1989; Nash-Ditzel, 2010; Nist & Holschuh, 2000; Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995; Trainin & Swanson, 2005; Wichadee, 2011).

Table 8

Typical Day of Reading Instruction

Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5
❖ Present skill ❖ Model how to use skill ❖ Guided & independent practice ❖ Discussion	❖ Handles personnel matters ❖ Assist students with whatever concept they having problems with ❖ Attempts to get students to name the strategy they use ❖ Works with students' strategies ❖ Uses metacognitive techniques	❖ Starts with a chapter ❖ Presents lesson via PowerPoint ❖ Group work ❖ Independent word from textbook ❖ Share as a class ❖ Quiz given ❖ Homework assigned	❖ "There is no typical day", ❖ Start class by discussing homework (feedback) ❖ Lesson presented based on what is covered ❖ Static assignments ❖ Critical reading assignment ❖ Activity	❖ Review skill ❖ Go over material ❖ Discussion ❖ Class activity of skill ❖ Wrap-up

Self-Reported Use of Skills. All of the participants reported using skills to increase the reading comprehension of their struggling adult readers. They used a variety of skills such as main idea, supporting details, higher level reading strategies; bias, inferences, patterns of organization as well as other skills (see Table 6). Five out five participants used main idea, supporting details, bias, and inference to increase reading comprehension while four out five participants used patterns of organization, tone, transition, and higher level reading strategies.

Participant 1 described how she taught main idea in the following excerpt.

> Uh, with the main idea I always did it with as I said everything with a PowerPoint and I could pull out [I'm actually pulling out a PowerPoint now that I can show you and if you want I can email you this so you can have this], but basically what I did is I would always teach the idea of main idea and then, uh, would and then, uh, I would teach them, uh, where to find the main idea and we would actually have paragraphs. First, I would show them the paragraph and show them how to find the main idea and then I'd show a slide with a paragraph and they would have to find the main idea themselves and we would do it as a group so that if [one or two students could fine] a few other students can't find it I ask the students who found it how they found it.

Participant 1, when queried about how she assisted struggling adult readers, she said,

> And when they're trying to find the answer, I point out tips and tricks. For example, main idea, finding the main idea in a passage is one of the hardest skills to learn. And I, I approach it either from, you know, finding topic and then say

what's the point that the author is trying to say or I help them find the supporting details which is always easier to find . . .and then I say okay which sentence does the supporting detail point back to and then from there they're typically able to supply [me with] the main idea. So that's the kind of help that I give students.

Participant 1 who was an instructor as well as a tutor indicated that the Student Learning Center (lab) was a requirement associated with Developmental Reading 2 courses. The lab work supplemented the participant's course and included the practice of skills as well as the assessment of skills that served as a precursor to taking and passing the required standardized college entrance test.

While Participant 1 stated definitively that main idea is the hardest skill for students to deal with, Participant 2, who mentioned main idea a great deal throughout each interview, asserted that finding the major details in text may be an effective way of finding main idea as well as other skills. However, he did not elaborate on how he would tutor main idea except to say that he used whatever strategy that student created. In other words, Participant 2 would assist the student with identifying the strategy, objectifying the strategy as well as modifying the strategy. Participant 3, on the other hand, concurred with Participant 1 when she said, that "students are having the most issue with were skill sets such as being able to find the main idea either stated or implied in a passage in a reading passage." In addition, not only did Participant 3 teach main idea but she also included implied main idea that she believed students had greater difficulty understanding as evidenced by the following excerpt.

Yeah, yeah. Implied main idea always come (sic) after main idea. They have a really hard time with implied main idea so I really have to make it clear to them

that you're still looking for the main idea but now it's not going to be stated anywhere in the passage and you have to be able to figure out four multiple choice answers or write it yourself. That one for sure would be taught first even though it seems kind of like double, whoa, like double meaning here so you really, you know, as long as I've been tutoring at Sunshine State and teaching in the classroom, it is a very hard skill and to be able to read a whole page worth of information and then to say what's the main idea of that passage, but you can't choose any of the sentences in the passage. You have to come up with it on your own. So with that particular skill for sure needs extra encouragement and practice.

Participant 4 espoused the notion that teaches reading in a holistic manner and, while in the context of the reading process, spoke about approaching reading through coalescing of various skills as a whole rather than through isolated skill instruction. Participant 4 described her classroom instruction thusly,

I have a very holistic approach, uh, as you can see from the critical reading assignments. I don't believe that, we, you can read something and identify the main idea and not the tone and not know the pattern of organization because they're reflected in the main idea. So, I talk about what good readers do and I tell them that one thing good readers can do is when they're reading . . . if I were to go to a good reader and say and ask them any of those questions on that list, they could answer them even if they don't know that they can answer them and so that's one of the things that we talk about. And so, I introduce that with the idea that good reading as being very holistic. It's very, very difficult to them, but I

> don’t know how to do it any other way and then I do break down, break it down and so we start with activating strategies, vocabulary and context and then we go to stated main idea and details, implied main idea, patterns and relationships, inference, and critical reading, tone, purpose, fact and opinion, bias evaluating an argument if we have time at the end of the semester.

Although Participants 1 and 3 contended that main idea was the most difficult skill, Participant 5 asserted that finding patterns of organization was a monumental challenge for her students because they were unfamiliar with the intricacies of text organization. The following excerpt supported her declaration,

> The biggest problem I find is being able to find the patterns of organization, the cause and effect, the easy [inaudible] ones and the transition ones. They do poorly because they don’t know specific, um, skill within each pattern of organization. The conclusion is easy, um; sometimes they get mixed up for time order or is it transition. Because I tell[ing] my students that with transitions it has to be in order. If they are building a building, they can’t put the roof on if you don’t have the floor down.

Higher-Level Reading Strategies. Other reading skills that all of the participants except Participant 2 talked about were higher level reading strategies. Although the word strategy was included in the title, they were actually skills listed under Student Learning Outcomes on the participants’ Course Syllabi. Participant 2 did not submit a Course Syllabus; consequently, there was no discourse about higher-level reading strategies included in the study by Participant 2. Participant 1 explained what

developmental reading courses included and that each level included skills such as implied main idea and inferences as denoted by the following excerpt.

> Higher level reading strategies as I said, uh, REA 0017 is the second level reading course for the native English speaker. REA 0007 which is level one, then they learn the skills, but in level two, they learn skills more in-depth and they learn more skills. [In level one] In level two they learn implied main idea and in level one they don't. In level two they learn inferences, in level one they don't.

Participant 3's notion of higher level reading strategies centered on teaching main idea and supporting details using "other strategies." Participant 3 explained what she meant by higher level reading strategies in the following excerpt; however, the explanation was somewhat obtuse and perplexing; however, the content of the excerpt contained skills such as main idea and supporting details.

> I think it's mostly based on that, uh, other strategies are being able to present with main idea. The main idea we teach them is that the main idea should act as an umbrella to give them a visual here. The main idea is the umbrella and all of the supporting details should fall under that umbrella and that's that you can decipher whether it is the main idea or just a supporting detail. Everything under that statement applies to those supporting details. So if you're using the supporting details as the main idea it won't work at a certain point. Yeah, uh, I was just trying to think of an example, but I'd probably need a PowerPoint to do that, but, you know, if if I was saying that, uh, there are [inaudible] groups that, but I think that there is a protein aspect of the pyramid, that would be a supporting detail that could never access the main idea so we do teach them strategies to use and I think

that each instructor might differ in their strategies, but I think a lot of that is based on the instructor, uh, but the things that come up per lesson and per chapter.

Participant 4 asserted that the college was responsible for the term higher level reading strategies and she surmised that they included such skills in the syllabus when she said, "That is not something that I wrote. That is something that the college wrote. I would assume that they would be inference and critical Reading including tone, purpose, bias, fact, opinion and evaluating an argument. That would be my assumption, but I didn't write it."

Participant 5 reported that, "Higher level reading strategies [are] is being able to infer; being able to figure out where all the patterns of organization are. Therefore, they put it under the critical reading skills. Being able to find out what the main idea is."

All participants reported that inferences were among the skills that they used to increase the reading comprehension of their struggling adult readers. Participants 1, 4 and 5 were the only participants who included inference in their discourses regarding higher level reading strategies. Reading research indicates that making inferences aid readers in developing reading comprehension (Grabe, 1999; Graesser, Singer, & Trabasso, 1994; Nahatame, 2014).

Inferences as Skills. With regard to inferences, the most interesting and surprising fact that came out of the interviews for Participant 3 was a lack of discourse related to inferences. In other words, Participant 3 did not mention the word inference, infer, inferring or any other derivative of the concept during the interviews despite the fact that the Course Syllabus encompassed such language as "analyze the details to infer what the author is implying and draw logical conclusions in a paragraph and multi-

paragraph section" as well as "synthesize the information in a text in order to make inferences and draw logical conclusions." Besides the Course Syllabus, Participant 3's Implied Main Idea PowerPoint was the only document that included support for the use of inferences as a skill rather than as a strategy. For example, in the PowerPoint, Participant 3 set forth statements such as "Logical (Good) Inferences are solidly based on specific statements in the passage; are not contradicted by any information in the passage; rely on the author's words more than reader's background or common sense and focus on the author's words" which language align with the notions of McKoon and Ratcliff 's (1992) local inferences and Graesser and Kruez's (1993) knowledge based inferences that included the reader as well as the text.

Though Participants 1 and 2 mentioned the word inference during the course of their interviews, this researcher found that there was no confirmatory support for how inference categorization ought to be. Participant 1, during interview two, in response to a question related to higher level reading strategies stated that, "In level two they learn inferences, in level one they don't." and "The purpose and tone we actually, is a separate lesson on its own. And as well as inferences and conclusions that's a lesson on its own." She simply mentioned inferences as something learned in Developmental Reading 2. And in the same interview, Participant 1 explained how she would teach inferences using text from orally told story and the listeners' background knowledge.

> How I would teach inferences is I would use a cartoon in the PowerPoint, uh, I would use a story. One of the stories that I have used in the past was about this gentleman [who] has a dog and one day he comes home and the neighbor's rabbit, he finds the neighbor's rabbit dead in his dog's mouth. So the man flips out and

he goes, 'Oh my God my dog killed the neighbor's pet rabbit.' So he washes, so he notices that the rabbit is a little dirty, cleans the rabbit and sticks the rabbit back in the cage, right. And so later or the next day the neighbor comes over and says, 'Did you hear what happened to my rabbit?' The guys goes, 'no what happened to your rabbit?' So the neighbor says, 'My rabbit died so I buried it.' The next day I come home it was washed and put back in its cage. It's a variation of that story, but it . . .

The researcher found that the text was presented orally, not in a written format, it could not be determined whether the text was locally coherent or easily accessible as the text was read aloud. It could not be determined if, in fact, an inference was actually made without having the benefit of being present during instruction. In other words, there was not enough information to conclude that the excerpt above is representative of inferences made online (Graesser & Kruez, 1993) or local inferences (McKoon & Ratcliff, 1992).

Participant 4 mentioned inferences several times in the context of instruction and activities; however, she did not elaborate on inferences with depth outside of those parameters are evidenced by quotations found on Table 8. Participant 4 referenced her use of brainteasers and editorial cartoons as she taught inferences; however, there was no direct explanation of what brainteasers and editorial cartoons entailed, but according to Graesser and Kruez (1993) logic based inferences like brain teasers are generated off-line rather than online. Additionally, two documents (Course Syllabus and Directions Packet) that contained references to inferences; however, the information found on them could not substantiate that inferences were actually taught or exactly how inferences were taught only that inferences should have been taught in the classroom as well as the lab

(see Table 8). Consequently, any further discussion related to inference is under metacognitive reading strategies, Research Question 2.

Table 9

Participant 4's Inference Related Quotes

Interview 1	Interview 2	Documents
"Oh, in-class I gave you an example of the tone activity that I do, uh, you know. I have, I use brainteasers to teach inference. I use editorial cartoons to teach inference, tone, purpose and bias. I think I sent you that."	"That is not something that I wrote. That is something that the college wrote. I would assume that they would be inference and critical Reading including tone, purpose, bias, fact, opinion and evaluating an argument. That would be my assumption, but I didn't write it."	Syllabus: "Analyze the details to infer what the author is implying and draw logical conclusions in a paragraph and multi-paragraph section" "Synthesize the information in a text in order to make inferences and draw logical conclusions."
"And so, I introduce that with the idea that good reading as being very holistic. It's very very difficult to them, but I don't know how to do it any other way and then I do break down, break it down and so we start with activating strategies, vocabulary and context and then we go to stated main idea and details, implied main idea, patterns and relationships, inference, and critical reading, tone, purpose, fact and opinion, bias evaluating an argument if we have time at the end of the semester."	"Yes, along with the skills there is a little bit of active Reading in there, but it's mostly main idea, details, vocab in context, inference, tone, bias, purposes, et cetera. So the students, it's an adaptive program so one student may do one question and another student may do a 100."	Directions Packet: "Lab 2 – Deadline 2/5 Inferences and Conclusions"
"I also take my students to the art gallery when we talk about critical reading because of the critical reading skills like tone and bias and purpose, uh, and of course, inference. You're using things like editorial cartoons. I think starting with something visual or even aural and then working my way to the text is also quite effective and it does seem to work pretty well for my guys."		
"Um, then later, when I get a little bit more discrete with it, I actually start using inference through that PowerPoint that I sent you with the cigarettes, uh, and how an image of un-smoked cigarettes is neutral; therefore, numbers of smoked cigarettes is neutral."		

Participant 5 mentioned inferences in the context of instruction, activities related to instruction, and critical reading skills without reference to any other details. There

were five documents submitted by Participant 5 for this study; however, only three of them were useful in determining whether inferences ought are considered skills or strategies. The purpose of the Course Syllabus was to set forth the requirements of the course not to identify the step-by-step manner in which inferences would be presented to the students. As a result, there was no way to determine, based upon the Course Syllabus, whether inferences may be categorized as skill, strategy, or metacognitive reading strategy. The Inference Assessment, the Inference Lesson Plan, Take a Moment and Look at Cartoon, and other documents associated therewith contained various relevant pieces of information to substantiate how inferences may have been used (i.e., skill, strategy, or metacognitive reading strategy, see Table 9).

Table 10

Participant 5's Inference Related Quotes

Interview 1	Interview 2	Documents
"Inferencing is how to read between the lines. First, I looked around and saw a picture and try to figure out what's going on. Then we do discussion—how do you see what you see. I give them some other activities. I say the dog will cringe when you touch him . . . [what does that mean]. And I'll give more activities where the students make statements and discuss why that would be or why is that so [inaudible]."	"I gave the information about teaching inferences and the class Reading is always on that second class and that is to cover the skills that I have been taught up to that point in the curriculum so far. Uh, it it'll cover like main idea, supporting details, true and false, inferences, possibly bias, uh, patterns of organization and I will continue adding different skills to the, uh, required class readings to whatever we have been up to at that point-in-time in the class."	Syllabus: "Analyze the details to infer what the author is implying and draw logical conclusions in a paragraph and multi-paragraph section." "Synthesize the information in a text in order to make inferences and draw logical conclusions." "SKILL: Chapter 6 Inferences & Class reading"
Interview 1	Interview 2	Documents
"Higher level reading strategies is being able to infer; being able to figure out where all the patterns of organization are. So they put it under the critical reading skills."	"Class activity could be a review of, let's say inferences. They may be a handout without possible multiple choice questions, there may be a paragraph reading where they will have to, uh, closely read a paragraph and figure out whatever the skill is going to be [inference]. You may have a, uh, a PowerPoint presentation so there can be a variety of different activities, uh, to do."	Inference Assessment: "Mark the letter of the inference most logically based on [the] each of the following. 1. A woman, holding a canvas money bag and several rolls of coins, leaves a mall bank. a. The woman is taking the money to a business she owns in the mall. b. The woman has robbed the bank. c. The woman has withdrawn money from the bank. d. The woman is a coin collector." "Read the passage and mark the letter of the answer to each item that is logically supported by the information given." "From this passage, we can infer: "From the passage we can conclude that"

(table continues)

Table 10 *(continued)*

Interview 1	Interview 2	Documents
"So, how you teach inferences, do you have to go in unison and you also know that not every class is the same."		Lesson Plan-Making Inferences from Written Material: "You are expected to reason out or infer the meaning an author intended (but did not say) on the basis of what he or she did say. In a sense, the inferences you make act as bridges between what is said and what is not said." "You should recognize -- A. THE TOPIC B. MAIN IDEA C. KEY IDEAS D. ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERN OF EACH PARAGRAPH" "ASK YOURSELF 2 QUESTIONS WHEN MAKING INFERENCES... 1) WHAT IS UNUSUAL OR STRIKING ABOUT THIS PIECE OF INFORMATION? 2) Why is it included here?" "The author presents the factual information then goes beyond that information to express opinions or to make a hypotheses or generalizations based on those facts." "Inferences must be based on available evidence" "Inferences are logical associations between what is directly stated and what seems to be meant, implied or suggested, but not stated." "You must understand the stated ideas and facts before you can move to higher levels of thinking, which include inference making." Take a Moment & look at Cartoon; Inferences Reading Between the Lines; Inferences-Intrepreting What We Read "Now which two inferences are most logically based on the information given in the cartoon." "Which is most logically based on the information provided?"

(table continues)

Table 10 *(continued)*

Interview 1	Interview 2	Documents
		A student always sit in the back of the class. 1. The student dislikes the course. 2. The student is unprepared for class. 3. The student feels uncomfortable in the front of the room. 4. The student is farsighted." "Discovering the ideas in writing that are not stated directly is called making inferences or drawing conclusions." "HOW DID YOU ARRIVE AT You used your experiences and general knowledge of people. Secondly, you made informed guesses based on the facts you observed." "Circle the letter of the most logical answer to the questions: 1) To get the main point of the passage, the reader must infer a) the location of the reservation. b) what kind of company the president headed. c) the meaning of the word hora. 2) From the passage, we can infer that a) The audience believed the president's speech b) The audience did not believe the president's speech"
"I talk about that in the classroom when I talk about inferences. I say what can I infer; everybody likes to sit in the back of the room. One might say I don't like the teacher so they sit in the back, two they fall asleep so they want to sit in the back and three, they sit in the back because they don't want to be called; four, you know, that they're a poor student and then we discuss that. Why do I talk about assumptions?"		

Outliers Not Really Skills

There were differences found among the participants specifically related to Participant 1's use of conversation with textbook and Participant 5's use of false/true items as skills. Participant 1 described conversation with the textbook as an opportunity for students to have their side of the conversation as the authors have already presented their side in the context of the book. She further explained that conversation with a textbook is writing margin notes, underlining, questioning and other ways of actively engaging in reading of the text. Conversation with a textbook required deliberate and intentional processing of the text; therefore, is not a skill because skills are automatic and unconscious plans or actions (Dole et al., 1991). The researcher found that conversation with a textbook will be discussed under the umbrella of thinking tools associated with Research Question 2. Participant 5 talked about true/false in the context of skills instruction during her second interview. Although it is possible for cause and effect, a pattern of organization, to be assessed through a true or false test item (Linn & Gronlund, 1995), Participant 5 did not discuss them in the context of cause and effect. The researcher found that true/false is not a skill but rather a test item used to measure educational objectives (Linn & Gronlund, 1995).

The second category associated with Research Question 1 was Planned Tactics. Planned Tactics were conscious ways that included general reading strategies such as rereading and chunking text used to improve reading comprehension.

Planned Tactics

The second category associated with Research Question 1 was Planned Tactics. The researcher also found that all of the participants reported using various approaches to

increase the reading comprehension of their struggling adult readers. Initially, the participants struggled to come up with definitions for strategies, thereafter, each participant declared their notions of strategies. Participants 1, 2, and 3 used similar wording such as "way, to go about and to help" to denote a plan may be at the root of their definitions. Participant 5 and Participant 4 did not use the same verbiage, but the underlining meaning was the use of a plan. Participant 5 stated that a "strategy is [inaudible] how to attack reading and is a process of being able to find that skill" while Participant 4 described "strategy as something that is applied. So, for example, I teach active reading strategies, uh, including vocabulary context, including discovering what reading rate is, how to activate background knowledge, SQ3R, et cetera."

The researcher found that the participants used various approaches to assist their students with reading comprehension problems. The data revealed a number of commonalities as well as differences in the kinds of approaches the participants used to instruct their students. The approaches encompassed reading skills, thinking tools and planned tactics.

Participant 1 referred to strategies as "a way to help, uh, for me it's a way to help find your skills; help you use your skills." Participant 1 used various strategies to assist the students with increasing their reading comprehension. One tool/strategy Participant 1 gave to her students was to "make them become better readers by giving or telling they have to do these journals for me. I also make 10% of their overall grade." Participant 1 declared that,

> The rubric has the questions on it and as I said they have to every week they choose one book and every week they have to read chapters of that book, at least

two chapters and then answer those three questions; tell me what you've read, what do you think is gonna happen next and what do you think of the book so far. I don't want a three sentence answer to what happed in the book so far.

Other tools that Participant 1 gave her students were the ability to locate main idea and supporting details as well as "how to understand the reading materials so that they can become effective readers for their college life." Additionally, Participant 1 asserted that rereading helped her while she completed her master's degree program and it would be beneficial for her students. "And I told them that if they get into the habit now in their prep classes to reread their material so when they get into their core classes they're used to it already." The most beneficial reading comprehension strategies that Participant 1 used included finding a quiet place to help one focus; turn off technology, and annotation in textbooks.

Participant 1 also used question answering and "tips and tricks" to assist her struggling adult readers with reading comprehension issues. For example, in the following excerpts, Participant 1 used general questions and a rough outline for finding main idea.

> Main idea, finding the main idea in a passage is one of hardest skills to learn. And I approach it either from, you know, finding topic and then say what's the point that the author is trying to say or I help them find the supporting details which is always easier to find and then I say okay which sentence does the supporting detail point back to and then from there they're typically able to supply [me with] the main idea. So that's the kind of help that I give students. Because I have given the whole list of the series so that they can go on and read more, uh, and the tool I

> give them is to point out how they can find the main idea, where they can find the supporting details, [and] how to understand the reading materials so that they can become effective readers for their college life.
>
> I teach them as they go through and they find the main ideas and supporting details, they can create a rough outline in their notes to get the point, uh, of the chapter so that when they go back and study the materials, they've already created their study guide by having that rough outline by writing down the main idea and the supporting details or by having it highlighted in their textbook and that's kind of having their side of the conversation.

Participant 1 also used skills as strategies interchangeably as exemplified in the following quotations.

> Just the reading skills, the strategies that I I go to during the course of the semester. Having a conversation with the textbook, finding the main idea and the supporting details, learning how the passage is organized, the pattern of organization, figuring out the implied main, those are the reading strategies that teach the students basically to become an active reader because I tell them that reading the textbook is a different strategy than going on *Facebook* or reading a novel.

Participant 1 talked at length about using various tools and strategies when the researcher asked about the tools and strategies used in the classroom to increase reading comprehension. In addition, Participant 1 included skills as well as strategies in assisting her students with reading comprehension issues.

> I teach them as they go through and they find the main ideas and supporting details, they can create a rough outline in their notes to get the point, uh, of the chapter so that when they go back and study the materials; they've already created their study guide by having that rough outline by writing down the main idea and the supporting details or by having it highlighted in their textbook and that's kind of having their side of the conversation.

Skills as Strategies. Participant 1 began the dialogue by talking about reading skills then included strategies, but by the end of that particular slice of the conversation, she had made her way to skills such as implied main idea, patterns of organization, supporting details and other skills, but rather than calling them skills she referred to the skills as reading strategies. The researcher found that Participant 1 reported using strategies in her classroom as supported by the data from the interviews. As for the documents that Participant 1 supplied, "Do Not Write on Test, Study Guide and the Syllabus do not include typical strategies while the Topic and Main Idea PowerPoint and Transitions and Organizational Patterns PowerPoint do contain what Participant 1 referred to as "general point strategies and time transitions." General point strategies were guidelines about how to find main idea and time transitions are "words that lead you to major details that the author has listed."

> To recognize main idea of a passage, you must think as you read. Here are three strategies that will help you find the main idea: 1) Look for general verses specific ideas; 2) Use the topic to lead you to the main idea and 3) Use clue words to lead you to the main idea. To find the topic of a selection, ask yourself: who or

what is the selection about. After you find the topic, ask yourself: What main point is the author making about the topic."

The researcher found that Participant 1 reported using various strategies or approaches such as using journals, locate main idea and supporting details, how to understand reading materials, rereading, and so forth, in her classroom to increase the reading comprehension of her students (see Table 10).

Participant 2 (learning specialist) discussed the use of strategies that he termed Identify, Objectify and Modify Strategy (IOM) and Levels of Imagination. With the IOM Strategy, a student in a tutoring session would identify the strategy that he or she was currently using to tackle a particular problem. Participant 2 would help the student to objectify or to name the strategy in step two and finally help the student to modify the strategy. Participant 2's philosophy was simply to use whatever the student had already been using as a basis for a strategy then take the strategy through the IOM process. According to Participant 2, the IOM Strategy is a relatively easy metacognitive technique. When probed about his thoughts relative to metacognitive techniques, Participant 2 made the following statement that further explained the ideology behind the IOM Strategy.

> Sure, what I normally is, uh, it's a very quick and easy formula that I have in the back of my mind. Well, it's a quick formula, a simple formula, but it's certainly not easy. Uh, basically when a student comes to me and is having trouble they are already doing something. They already have a strategy and the worst thing you can do with a student is, uh, basically ignore that and then just unload a strategy

on top of them and say here forget about what you're doing do this. Uh, it eventually devalues the process of what learning actually is.

Participant 2 described, at length, the IOM Strategy and even included visualization as a part of that strategy; yet, the IOM Strategy will be discussed in the next section. When responding to a question about how he assisted struggling adult readers with increasing their reading comprehension, Participant 2 also spoke about the Levels of Imagination Strategy. The participant spent a great deal of time conversing about the Levels of Imagination Strategy; namely, auditory, visualization and abstract, which he developed. Participant 2 contended that the imagination is a fundamental necessity for reading comprehension and in fact, he stated that, "And I tell the students that they want something that works every time. A strategy that works every time and simply means doing what reading requires to begin with and that's basically using your imagination." Participant 2 described the first level of imagination as auditory because the students ought to be able to read text and to hear what the author is writing about, but also "translate the words on a page into some kind of dialogue that, uh, is spoken and, uh, though, if it's clear that they can hear somebody talking." Visualizing was the second level of imagination. According to Daniels and Bizar (2005), visualization is a component of Reading-as-Thinking that contended that reading is interactive, constructive, strategic and thinking; hence, the researcher discussed this matter within the bounds of this section, planned tactics. The third level of imagination was abstract. The abstract level of imagination, in essence, was reading text and being able to identify information in order to complete graphic organizers using information garnered from the text.

So, the third level of imagination is obviously the abstract level where they begin to map out the passage. If it's a short story it would be the story arc and you would see the story looped, possibly. There's a little detour in the story, uh, little things like that. Like little side stories or whatever, however they map out the story or if it's an argument you would see the point and the things that are trying to support it. If it's cause and effect you would see arrows going on or however, they would see that in there, uh, abstract imagination, and the abstract imagination is crucial to critical thinking. Uh, and in fact the language speaks in terms of that kind of visualization all the time through its transitions like on the other hand it's obviously a comparison or contrast, uh, [that they basically] it's a visual manifestation of a metaphor. They say on the other hand, they don't really mean [on the] literally on somebody's hand, they just mean next to that idea in an abstract framework. So the three levels of imagination that's that's usually the way that I work with them to see whether they are really developing a rich internal experience on the letters and words on the page.

The researcher found that levels one and three of the Levels of Imagination Strategy are ways to assist struggling adult readers; yet, the second level on its face is primarily metacognitive and this researcher discussed this matter in detail in the next section. As far as other strategies were concerned, Participant 2 firmly contended that other "official strategies" are peripheral and that he is "not familiar with much of the literature that's been done on them. I'm familiar with some of them" and expressed the idea that as a rule, he worked with students first to develop whatever strategy they already use and will deviate from that plan if the students do not seem interested in

attending to their own strategies or if the students are English Language Learners having difficulty with the English language. In the event that students are uninterested in developing strategies or have difficulty with the language, Participant 2 presented them with two ready-made strategies from which to choose one in an effort to invite students to take ownership of the chosen strategy. In the example below, Participant 2 did not teach students how to use peripheral strategies instead coached them and allowed them the freedom to choose their own strategies, but he did not elaborate on what he did once they choose the strategy except to say, "I'll help them incorporate it." Some of the approaches that the Participant, curtly, discussed and mentioned were SQ3R, SQ4R, PQRST, fluency, PRW and miscue analysis.

> Uh, well, if you if you go that route, if you basically say, let's say you have a box and you reach for it and say here are a bunch of reading strategies; let's use this one. I think that when you do that you are basically bypassing the opportunity to work with metacognition. So, I don't really use learning strategies like that, okay, but bearing that in mind, we do have them floating all over the lab. We have SQ4R; we have diagramming; we have using transitions [and] we have all kinds of things like that. Uh, but those I keep on the periphery and if you want to use those things you basically have to bring the student into decision making mode where they grab two of those strategies let's say, and let's say I grab SQ4R and PQRST or whatever, those various strategies. At least have two of them in front of the student and have them decide which one they want to use. At least they are evaluating, uh, and it starts to get them more metacognitive to where you want to put them in charge. So, once again, if I use a learning strategy with a student I am

kind of ignoring their process. No, I wouldn't necessarily do that, but if I brought one in, I would at least let them into a position of power where they will decide which one they want to use and then I'll help them incorporate it.

Although in many instances throughout transcripts one and two, Participant 2 expounded a great deal about using the IOM Strategy and the Three Levels of Imagination Strategy, there was no actual instruction that took place in the lab, in fact, assessment and passing the state assessment were the driving forces behind what was done in the name of tutoring. Then again, it must be reiterated that Participant 2 actually coached the tutees instead of instructing them.

When responding to a question regarding his familiarity with metacognitive reading strategies, Participant 2 acknowledged that he was very familiar with them, but not those strategies in the "published world" then explained that he was essentially familiar with miscue analysis in the context of student read alouds. The purpose of miscue analysis is to provide the tutor with an in-depth understanding of the comprehension issues related to the strengths and weaknesses of students as they read various texts (Harris & Hodges, 1995). The tutee would read aloud as the tutor recorded the mistakes made by the tutee while reading the texts such as calling out words and other fluency issues. Participant 2 contended that

> Miscue analysis is not necessarily a reading [strategy], it's not necessarily a metacognitive strategy for the students, it's for the tutor. So that, and this is very common, to have processing issues just like mechanical, sort of brain or visual issues which we, uh, they will often misread words, okay, or it could be just a laziness as far as just leaving off the endings of words, you know something like

> that. And of course as you and I read we sometimes substitute a word, like we read we say a word that is actually not on the page and that's actually quite normal. Okay so in miscue analysis that's recognized, so but the problem is somebody does a miscue like that, say read a word incorrectly, if the word they substitute actually screws up the meaning of the text, then that's called a low quality miscue and that could be a problem. And so what that provides is an opportunity to discuss what happens at that point with, uh, comprehension. I clearly, when my students are doing that, they are not monitoring their own comprehension. If you and I read a word incorrectly and the meaning gets screwed up, we actually pause and have to backtrack because it's like wait a minute, it doesn't make sense anymore. But if the student just keeps going, then we know that something is wrong there and we can point at that word and then say don't worry about whether you read it correctly or not, I'm noticing that you read a different word there and now that indicates that you weren't paying attention to what the author was . . . that gives you a chance to basically get into that self-monitoring that broke down.

Within the context of miscue analysis, Participant 2 argued that tutors are able to "get into that self-monitoring that broke down," but does not elaborate as to how that would look or what would be done with the knowledge. Fluency in the context of tutoring sessions again was an avenue that tutors used to help them get a better understanding of the difficulties that students deal with when comprehending various texts. Even though Participant 2 situated the fluency in awareness and monitoring of strategies, there was no indication that there was instruction related to how to use awareness and monitoring

through fluency. In the final category, thinking tools, the researcher will discuss the significance of the matter. As far as document analyses were concerned, the data supported the notion that tutoring included a skills-based approach that was assessment driven.

Consequently, the researcher found that the instructors used very little instruction or gave little direction to the tutees relative to strategies, but there was a great deal of dialogue with respect to identifying, objectifying and modifying strategies as well as imagination. Did dialogue and coaching cross over into instruction? This researcher was unable to determine when or if the bridge from coaching to instruction was traversed; however, the researcher found that Participant 2 reported using the IOM Strategy, miscue analysis, Levels of Imagination, SQ3R, etc. to increase the reading comprehension of his tutees (see Table 10).

Participant 3 defined strategies as "more ways to think about how to do it. . . . and the strategies would be okay how do I figure out how to unpack this reading. Let me define some words, let me annotate, let me ask questions to get to the main idea of this piece." Participant 3 started out by defining strategies and ended by including an example of a reading strategy in the defining of words as well as two metacognitive reading strategies.

Participant 3 contended that the biggest concern that students have is with "skill sets" like "being able to find the main idea either stated or implied in a passage in a reading passage" and assisted them by breaking down text, or unpacking text to determine main idea and supporting details." Participant 3 further stated that,

I mean, especially when you consider they're coming right out of high school and into a college class and now they have to deal with theory and classical usage of that theory. I think they get bogged down in the details and so what I try to do in that class was really make them break it a part. Can you separate the main idea of shorter passage from its supporting details and can you say in your own words what the particular passage may be its two or three paragraphs? Can you sum up the idea of this passage in your own words? Uh, I think that it's something that they can really take with them throughout the rest of their college experience. Uh, other things that they may have [inaudible] deciphering between valid argument and logical fallacy so if they are reading a passage that its steeped in opinion and bias, um, they shouldn't take it at face value. They need to really think critically about what they are reading. You know, break it apart and say is this logical, is this a logical way to look at this issue may be they're reading about gun control and they start reading all this bias about why all the gun control laws and not Reading is from a neutral place, uh, but mostly how I help, how I would say I help people with reading comprehension skills is to break it down piece by piece until they can put the proper pieces back together themselves with an understanding of the what the passage is trying to tell them or the purpose of the passage from the writer's point-of-view.

Participant 3 described in greater detail what occurred during the unpacking of texts in the following quote:

Right, yeah, it's a term they use within the program, uh, but to me it means unpacking is the equivalent to breaking it down. If you have a large, just say you

were assigned 20 pages to read, you know, the best way to do that is, to me, would be give it a skim over. You go through the 20 pages, familiarize yourself with you're going to be reading about, but then you have to go back and now you actually have to read the words too. For a student who, may be, might just kind of get bored or overwhelmed by the amount of information in 20 pages; maybe they read five pages at a time over a couple days, but they really, you know, that way they can really break it down may be for the five pages they are adamant at annotating, underlining, asking questions in the margins whatever they need do. Uh, you know, and the beauty of it is that everybody is different, everybody approaches assignments differently so what may work for one student may not work another. One student may unpack by breaking it up over several days and another student may break it up by chopping it in half and doing that so it literally, I wasn't, I don't think I attempted to teach them, well, this is the only way you can do this, but here are several options and, you know, give an example like that. That's how I would describe unpacking it.

Reading skills were the contextual makeup of the assistance given by Participant 3 to her students. The tools and strategies that Participant 3 also gave her students to increase their reading comprehension were read aloud and questioning. Read aloud is generally used by instructors to model for students so that they can hear what good examples of reading sound like. Although, traditionally, the read aloud is not necessarily a strategy taught by instructors to struggling adult readers, Participant 3 used what she termed "reading out loud" to get her students to be attentive to texts so that they focused solely on the text as evidenced by the following quotations:

What came to mind as you were asking me that was the idea of reading out loud, uh, and I think that this could work with a student who is struggling with reading and one that is struggling with dealing with their own errors at their own rate. Uh, it's something that I think I kind of go to this a lot with my students and definitely when we're in my reading class for example, we try to unpack an article. Like I will give them an article written about drunk driving and, uh, and the legal limit for alcohol is like 21, uh, or 18. Uh, a lot of time I give it to them to read and they would miss very essential details that the writer the author of the article makes his or her point and so when I said, but did you read this part and then I would read it out loud and then the light bulb went on with oh that's the supporting detail. But yeah it's giving a statistic and of course it's a supporting detail, it's not acting as, you know, its main detail it's supporting the detail. Uh, so reading out loud is definitely one that I do a lot or work with a lot and it seems, I think they feel silly doing it, you know, they are sitting in their real or their reading something out loud to themselves, but honestly they're going to pick up on every word because they have to. So that's one that I like to do and also the active reading like [inaudible] taking notes, make sure you are asking questions or getting yourself a question before you read it and then after you read it, the chapter, can you answer the question. So constantly you're challenging the brain to think critically about what they're reading as how it's applying to them or what they are supposed to be learning, one of their learning outcomes out of it. Um, thus there are different strategies that I like to use with my reading students and my writing students. Um, I think that it eventually all applies to, you know the same common goal which is

to communicate effectively, uh, through writing and speaking, so I do. Oh, oh, while they were reading, uh, you know, sometimes in textbooks they have questions to consider, you know, at the beginning of the chapter so they could either go to a thing like that which might be more helpful because those questions are generated specifically to reflect on the chapter or they could generate their own questions by simply asking what is this author trying to convince me of, what is this author's purpose. So, you know, to have that question for themselves as they read it really could go either way. They could either generate it themselves or take it from the text. Uh, so, by giving examples I suppose, I could give a direction on how to generate, but again, it's not what I spent a whole lesson on generating questions or learning how to generate questions. It becomes more a part of the whole act of active verses passive reading lesson so it's a component of a given lesson, but it's not its own.

Additionally, Participant 3 believed that read alouds and thoroughly completing work were the most beneficial reading strategies that she used with her students. She mentioned read aloud, but spent the majority of her conversation explaining how important completely and "effectively" answering questions were for struggling adult readers.

Uh, I would go back to where things were about reading out loud, uh, when it comes to finished work as well, you know, in terms of may-be they wrote a reading response for questions for, you know, a passage for reading, uh, going back and and seeing if they actually answered the question. I think that's also an issue is when it comes to comprehension, you can be given a set of questions and

> answering all those questions will create a bigger understanding and a better answer to it, but they will only answer one out of the three questions. You know, so it's like, you know, making sure you're are reading and understanding one thing asked of you, and you know, cautiously checking to make sure you have effectively answered all of those questions. So, a lot of, so it's a lot of kind of checking yourself and making sure that you're not sitting on top of things. Uh, reading critically, you know, thinking critically, [I was there things] I try to push both with the students, thinking about why this matter, answering the so what, uh. I don't know if you were ever told that when you were writing a paper that you need to answer the so what, why should the audience care. Now on the same token, you should think like that as a reader, like so what. The writers, the author should be able to answer that for you as a reader. So be critical and don't take anything, everything as face value and ask questions.

What questions would Participant 3 ask that would be considered strategies? The documents provided by Participant 3 were SQ3R: Becoming an Active Reader, Implied Main Idea PowerPoint as well as REA0017 Midterm Exam Review. They contained the following questions,

> What is the passage about; What is the author's purpose; How is this information relevant to the course; What is the topic; What is the main idea; Is the quote a major or minor detail; Who or what is the passage about; What point is the author trying to make about the topic and Do the details in the passage support this idea?

The questions supported the assertion that Participant 3 used questions as strategies to increase the reading comprehension of her students.

When the researcher asked Participant 3 about the higher level reading strategies found in the syllabus, she replied,

> I think it's mostly based on that, uh, other strategies are being able to present with main idea. The main idea we teach them is that the main idea should act as an umbrella to give them a visual here. The main idea is the umbrella and all of the supporting details should fall under that umbrella and that's that you can decipher whether it is the main idea or just a supporting detail. Everything under that statement applies to those supporting details. So if you're using the supporting details as the main idea it won't work at a certain point. Yeah, uh, I was just trying to think of an example, but I'd probably need a PowerPoint to do that, but, you know, if if I was saying that, uh, there are [inaudible] groups that , but I think that there is a protein aspect of the pyramid, that would be a supporting detail that could never access the main idea so we do teach them strategies to use and I think that each instructor might differ in their strategies, but I think a lot of that is based on the instructor, uh, but the things that come up per lesson and per chapter.

The researcher found that Participant 3 reported using strategies or approaches such as prediction, text features, read aloud, fluency, etc. in her classroom to increase the reading comprehension of her students (see Table 10).

Participant 4 articulated several ideas about strategies, but encapsulated that notion in the use of terms such as skills, strategies and metacognitive reading strategies interchangeably. She defined a strategy as "something that is applied. So, for example, I teach active reading strategies, uh, including vocabulary context, including discovering what reading rate is, how to activate background knowledge, SQ3R, et cetera."

Nevertheless, in the interview, Participant 4 expanded the list of active reading strategies by including annotating and summarizing. She exclaimed that there are no differences between reading strategies and metacognitive reading strategies. "I would say no because without the reader thinking about the strategy, I don't know how a reader can be an effective reader. Reading and critical thinking go hand-in-hand." Therefore, it was logical to conclude that there would be no distinction in her responses relative to strategies and metacognitive reading comprehension strategies. Strategies and metacognitive reading strategies maybe defined differently, according to some experts in the literature. Consequently, annotating and summarizing are metacognitive reading strategies and the researcher will discuss them under thinking tools.

Participant 4's response about how she assisted struggling adult readers with comprehension issues included feedback from assignments as well as assessments and item analysis so that the students were able to determine what their strengths and weaknesses were in terms of reading comprehension and used the diagnostic assessment to determine if, in fact, the students were properly placed. Feedback and item analysis, tools, prepared students for their standardized reading test rather than a general reading strategy. In addition, Participant 4 assisted her students by having office hours and being available to have one-on-one conversations with students who were having difficulty. In addition, there was a mandatory lab component attached to the Developmental Reading 2 course that students were required to attend. Whenever Participant 4 recognized that a student was having difficulty, she would have a word with the student, but would not push the issue because her philosophy was that students have entered into higher education; therefore, must be responsible for their education and she stated that

> Because it is college, I don't necessarily provide as much support as may be my students would like, uh, until they come seek me for the support because I really think that it is an important part of the college journey. If I do find that a student is having a particular problem of course, I talk to the student while I recommend that the student come to my office during office hours so that we can go over in detail and some choose to take advantage of that and some don't.

Participant 4 used skills and strategies interchangeably. After reviewing the Course Syllabus, the researcher inquired about higher level reading strategies and found it very puzzling that the participant acknowledged that she had nothing to do with those strategies and, in fact, the verbiage came directly from the college. "That is not something that I wrote. That is something that the college wrote. I would assume that they would be inference and critical reading including tone, purpose, bias, fact, opinion, and evaluating an argument. That would be my assumption, but I didn't write it." Furthermore, when responding to a question about the two reading strategies associated with the Directions Packet, Participant 4 referenced the learning outcomes listed on the Course Syllabus. The learning outcomes were identify topic and stated/implied main idea; identify specific information; distinguish between major and minor details; analyze the author's primary purpose; analyze author's tone and support; evaluate author's use of facts and opinions; determine primary and secondary patterns of organization; identify transition words, and identify relationships. Those skills were included for instructional purposes. Therefore, if what Participant 4 answered correctly, then it would be fair to conclude that the participant's idea of what constituted a strategy or metacognitive reading comprehension strategy was somewhat obscure. With regard to the documents

provided by Participant 4, the Course Syllabus, Reading Quiz 2, and Identifying Bias and Tone in Editorial Cartoons and REA0017 did not contain references to strategies; however, REA 0017 Directions Packet included the following:

"What two reading strategies will you apply to your future college courses? Why did you choose these two points? [Reading strategies are listed in course learning outcomes on pages 2 & 3 of the syllabus.]"

The researcher found that the interviews and one document (REA 0017 Directions Packet) supported the use of strategies or approaches by Participant 4 to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers whereas the Course Syllabus, Reading Quiz 2, and Identifying Bias, and Tone in Editorial Cartoons did not support the use of strategies (see Table 9).

Participant 5 used skills as strategies. When Participant 5 gave affirmative responses for questions relating to the use of strategies, in fact Participant 5's response began with strategies and moved toward skills. For example, Participant 5 said that a "Skill is a basic concept for someone to learn." Then stated that, "A skill would be how do you find the main idea, alright . . ." and at the same time Participant 5, stated that "Strategy [inaudible] how to attack reading and is a process of being able to find that skill. In another example, Participant 5 described higher level reading strategies as skills used in her classroom. In addition, Participant 5 defined skills and strategies in pretty much the same way without clearly distinguishing hem in the following statement in response to how to differentiate between skills and strategies:

> A skill would be how do you find the main idea, alright, and the strategy is how do you go about trying to find the main idea. Would you go try to find the

definition? No. Would you go try to find what? So you would look for, like, the supporting detail. The specific statement that would be support the main idea, so what is the paragraph about and where is the supporting detail? What are they telling you about?

For Participant 5 the line between skills and strategies seemed to converge and the researcher could not determine where one began and the other ended. Although Participant 5 responded affirmatively when queried about the use of strategies, she inevitably reverted to the use of skills as strategies.

Again, Participant 5 initiated the response with an explanation clearly directed toward the idea of strategies, but veered off course directly toward finding main idea as the focal point rather than the components of the SQ3R Method. Conversely, there were also instances that reflected the use of strategies during instruction by Participant 5. For example,

I would have them start first to go back to reread the article and make a little outline of what were the keys points of they're . . . of what they just read and then just, uh, pick out the main points. Thus these are the important things to, uh; they will be able to explain why the plants are such and such, uh.

When asked for a more detailed explanation of SQ3R Method, Participant 5 contended that as a Reading Coach the researcher should be knowledgeable about SQ3R and said,

You know that. Don't you know that? Survey, [inaudible] questions, read, recite and review. I use [SQ3R]; I teach them how to use that. As a reading coach you should know that. I do that at the beginning. We start with the main idea. So we

have to review it and then we ask questions especially if it is like main idea. And then we will, um, look . . . what are we looking for? So then we're going to reread it and we're going to review it and then we're gonna go back to see what are we looking for and that method is taught in elementary school. It should be any ways taught in elementary schools. Say that should be."

Other strategies that Participant 5 discussed during the discourse were the use of note cards, songs, mnemonic devices, and process of elimination. The resulting data from both interviews and documents analyses supported the notion that Participant 5 used strategies in her course. The researcher found that Participant 5 reported using SQ3R, rereading, outline, note-cards, etc., in her Developmental Reading 2 course to increase the reading comprehension of her students (see Table 10).

Table 11

Research Question 1: Approaches Reported by Participants

Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5
• Locate Main Idea/ Supporting Details • Journals • How to understand reading materials • Rereading • Find quiet place & turn off technology • Guided/Scaffolded Questions • How passage is organized • Figuring out implied main idea • Purpose for reading • Tips & Tricks: Topic, Point Author makes; find supporting details, finding main idea • Skills as strategies • Higher level reading strategies • Conversation with textbook • Annotation • Create rough outline • General Point Strategies • Time Transitions	• IOM Strategy • Levels of Imagination • Miscue Analysis • Student developed Strategy • SQ3R • SQ4R • PQRST • PRW • Fluency • Coaching • Self-monitoring • Skills as Strategies	• Chunking Text • Read Aloud • Questioning • Thoroughly Complete Work • SQ3R • Define Words • Annotate • Ask Questions • Breaking Down Text • Determine Main Idea • Skim over text • Read aloud • Fluency • Active Reading • Questions to consider • Answering all the questions • Purpose • Higher Level Reading Strategies • Skills as Strategies • Prediction	• Vocabulary in Context • Reading Rate • SQ3R • Feedback • One-0n-one meeting/office hours • Active Reading • Fluency • Activate background knowledge • Annotating • Summarizing • Feedback • Item Analysis • Higher level reading strategies • Reading strategies—learning outcomes (skills) • Skills as Strategies	• Chunking Text • SQ3R • Rereading • Find Main Idea & Supporting Details • Outline of Key Points • Note Cards • Songs • Mnemonic Devices • Process of Elimination • Question Answering • Inferring • Review previously assigned work • Feedback • Grades • Inferring • Higher Level Reading Strategies • Skills as Strategies

Summary of Research Question 1

Research Question 1 was: "What do instructors of developmental reading courses at Sunshine State College report using to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers?

The categories for Research Question 1 were Rote Routines and Planned Tactics and one theme, Eclectic Approaches to Reading Comprehension. Every participant, to some extent, used Rote Routines or Planned Tactics to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers. Additionally, the theme was associated with Research Question 2 and the sole category for that question was Thinking Tools. Thinking Tools included metacognitive as well as cognitive approaches that used to improve and increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers.

Thinking Tools

The researcher found that all of the participants reported using metacognitive reading strategies to improve the reading comprehension of their struggling adult readers. Two of the five participants were familiar with metacognitive reading strategies. Participants 1 and 2 were acquainted with metacognitive reading strategies while Participants 3, 4, and 5's responses indicated that they were unfamiliar with them. Participant 1, though she did not define metacognitive reading strategies as this researcher had previously defined them, she was aware that metacognition was the basic building block of metacognitive reading strategies. Her definition included "being consciously aware of trying to understand what you're reading" and declared that she teach[es] that throughout each skill that [she] teach them." Participant 1 when asked whether or not she used metacognitive reading strategies she proclaimed that she used

them, but that she also taught her students what she termed “metacognitive skills” such as the purpose for reading a textbook would be different from the purpose of reading a novel with the big idea being that she

> Teach[es] them that reading their textbook, they’re reading to understand what the author wrote so that they can apply it to their homework, apply it to their project, use it the next semester when they go to the next level and then eventually on to their careers whereas reading a journal you’re just reading it to get the story.

The metacognitive reading strategies that Participant 1 used with her struggling adult readers were addressing skills such as main idea, supporting details, patterns of organization, inferences, implied main idea and transitions. Metacognitive reading strategies may be defined as deliberate, effortful, and conscious ways used to monitor and to control the actions that occur during the reading process; consequently, even though Participant 1 had stated that she used metacognitive reading strategies, the implication was that perhaps what she may have been used were skills as strategies as well as conversation with textbook. Participant 1 spoke about conversation with a textbook in the following segment of discourse,

> So I actually have to make them consciously aware that the main idea might not be there. They might have to come up with a point on their own. So it’s just, it’s just helping them, it’s basically different ways of having us teaching the students how they have a conversation with the textbook so that they can understand what they’re reading and learn from their textbooks.

While Participant 1 began the statement with the use of skills to assist struggling adult readers, she ended it with a declaration that having a conversation with the textbook

is the ultimate goal so that students are able to gleam understanding from the text. The conversation with the textbook that Participant 1 mentioned was what she termed active reading which encompassed annotating and summarizing of various texts that she explained in the excerpt below.

> I will tell them to, with their textbooks, if they purchase the textbooks to use a pen, write in the book, take notes, takes notes in the margin, [and] have a conversation with the textbook. The authors already had their side of the conversation; it's now the students' turn to have their side of the conversation by marking up the textbook, taking notes in the margins.

During active reading instruction, Participant 1 demonstrated how to have the conversation with the textbook through dialogue, modeling and a step-by-step process. She had displayed declarative as well as procedural knowledge, two of the actual components of metacognition, through the following snippets from Interview two:

> Show them my thought process with the passages out of the textbook with any extra material that I provide them or any material that the lab provides them. I'm able to sit down with them one-on-one and we go through the passage. I help them find what they need so that they can understand so I'm actually doing the scaffolding so that they can understand and after a couple of practices, they're able to understand it better on their own, but [it's the] what I'm using in the classroom to teach everybody, I'm actually sitting with them one-on-one.

And even though Participant 1 did not use conditional knowledge in this particular example, she actually responded "yes" when asked if she discussed where, why and when to use strategies.

> Yeah, I'm showing them how to do it where I take, I literally take a page of a book and I project it on the screen and I highlight, I underline, I mark, I put question marks in the margin, uh, or I literally mark up the textbook in front of them to show them how to do it. It's not like I'm just telling them. Because I'm a visual learner I like to show them what I'm doing too just so that they can see it also. Oh, yes of course.

Accordingly, the researcher found that Participant 1 said that she used declarative, procedural and conditional knowledge when she instructed struggling adult readers to use metacognitive reading strategies. During actual instruction, there was confirmatory support for her use of procedural and declarative knowledge only and there was a lack of support for the use of conditional knowledge during instruction as presented in the following quotations.

When asked how she taught main idea, Participant 1 responded thusly:

> Uh, with the main idea I always did it with as I said everything with a PowerPoint and I could pull out [I'm actually pulling out a PowerPoint now that I can show you and if you want I can email you this so you can have this], but basically what I did is I would always teach the idea of main idea and then, uh, I would teach them, uh, where to find the main idea and we would actually have paragraphs. First, I would show them the paragraph and show them how to find the main idea and then I'd show a slide with a paragraph and they would have to find the main idea themselves and we would do it as a group so that if [one or two students could fine] a few other students can't find it. I ask the students who found it how they found it.

During the second interview, Participant 1 said,

> Well, I would do, I would kind of combine patterns of organization and transitions because they're . . . because you need to know the transitions in order to figure out how the passage is organized. And I usually break down the patterns of organization by the different categories; listing, time, compare and contrast, categorization, uh, I can think of the rest right now, but I always make sure I teach listing and time together or one right after the other because the a lot of the transitions that those patterns use are shared. So I tell the students, yeah, look for the transitions to figure out the patterns of organization, but the difference between time and listing is that time is based on the clock and calendar, listing could be reorganized.

Again, there was no confirmatory support that Participant 1 actually used conditional knowledge; however, it was evident that declarative knowledge and procedural knowledge were apparent during instruction. Also during the second interview, Participant 1 remarked,

> How I would [learn] teach inferences is I would use a cartoon in the PowerPoint, uh, I would use a story. One of the stories that I have used in the past was about this gentleman has a dog and one day he comes home and the neighbor's rabbit, he finds the neighbor's rabbit dead in his dog's mouth. So the man flips out and he goes oh my God my dog killed the neighbor's pet rabbit. So he washes, so he notices that the rabbit is a little dirty, cleans the rabbit and sticks the rabbit back in the cage, right. And, so, later or the next day the neighbor comes over and says did you hear what happened to my rabbit. The guys goes, 'no what happened to

your rabbit?' So the neighbor says my rabbit died so I buried it. The next day I come home it was washed and put back in its cage. It's a variation of that story, but it . . .

Of the five documents that Participant 1 provided (i.e., Syllabus, Assessment and Topic & Main Idea PowerPoint), the terminology listed on the three of the documents may be indicative of metacognitive reading strategy inclusion within the course. For instance, the Course Syllabus encompassed higher level reading strategies and included the following language, "Students apply higher level reading strategies to college-level reading selections." Nonetheless, Participant 1 asserted that higher-level reading strategies were skills associated with the level two reading course not strategies. Furthermore, the syllabus also contained terms like analyze, synthesize, evaluate, and inferences that are a part of metacognitive reading strategies. There was nothing to indicate that those terms were actually being taught declaratively, procedurally or conditionally; therefore, the researcher found that although they were associated with metacognitive reading strategies, they are not used in that manner as evidenced by the following response about how instruction was conducted. "I would embed it in the lesson. No, I would embed it in the skill. And I would teach them to analyze, uh, within the lesson of teaching them the purpose and the tone of the passage."

The Topic and Main Idea PowerPoint included "general point strategies" (i.e., what person, place, event or thing is the author discussing?; the topic is repeatedly referred to throughout the paragraph; look for general verses specific ideas) not metacognitive reading comprehension strategies.

The researcher found that Participant 1 reported using tutoring, consciously decipher reading passages, touching upon all skills, active reading, etc., as metacognitive reading strategies to improve the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers (see Table 10).

Participant 2 claimed to be "very familiar" with metacognitive reading strategies, but he stated that, "now if you're talking about official strategies out there in the published world, not familiar with much of the literature that's been done on them. I'm familiar with some of them."

When asked to explain further regarding his response, he asked whether the researcher had ever heard of miscue analysis; then he explained that

> Miscue analysis is not necessarily a reading [strategy], it's not necessarily a metacognitive strategy for the students, it's for the tutor." If being familiar with metacognitive reading strategies is not similar to miscue analysis, then one must consider the possible disconnect between what was asked and the response that was given.

In other words, Participant 2 answered the question, but the information given did not related directly to the topic at hand; namely, metacognitive reading strategies. The tutors used miscue analysis to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the struggling adult reader (i.e., stress, intonation) and the information gathered used to assist the struggling adult reader with whatever the impediment to comprehension may have been. Participant 2 gave a rather lengthy explanation of miscue analysis and possible implications for what the tutors might discover in the following excerpt.

So that, and this is very common, to have processing issues just like mechanical, sort of brain or visual issues which we, uh, they will often misread words, okay, or it could be just a laziness as far as just leaving off the endings of words, you know something like that. And of course as you and I read we sometimes substitute a word, like we read we say a word that is actually not on the page and that's actually quite normal. Okay so in miscue analysis that's recognized, so but the problem is somebody does a miscue like that, say read a word incorrectly, if the word they substitute actually screws up the meaning of the text, then that's called a low quality miscue and that could be a problem. And so what that provides is an opportunity to discuss what happens at that point with, uh, comprehension. I clearly, when my students are doing that, they are not monitoring their own comprehension. If you and I read a word incorrectly and the meaning gets screwed up, we actually pause and have to backtrack because it's like wait a minute, it doesn't make sense anymore. But if the student just keeps going, then we know that something is wrong there and we can point at that word and then say don't worry about whether you read it correctly or not, I'm noticing that you read a different word there and now that indicates that you weren't paying attention to what the author was . . . that gives you a chance to basically get into that self-monitoring that broke down.

Participant 2 was correct about miscue analysis not being a metacognitive reading strategy and, as a result, there can be no declarative, procedural or conditional knowledge because there was no reading instruction. Next, the Participant defined metacognitive

reading strategies as “monitoring comprehension and monitoring comprehension strategies and further declared that,

> If somebody has a habit of reading that works really well, fine. If they have one that breaks down and doesn’t seem to work sometimes then they’re making an effort to change it, that’s that’s metacognitive learning at work. I’m mostly concerned with that one because I want to see that the students are making an effort to change the approach and that that effort to change the approach is always operative because that’s what’s required in college. Yeah, so that’s basically the two things that I described, breaking down and awareness of comprehension.

Participant 2 did not actually define metacognitive reading strategies in a typical sense, but defined them in terms of two aspects; namely, monitoring comprehension and monitoring comprehension strategies and explained in the following interview slice that when students’ comprehension breaks down, whatever tool they use to better comprehend text maybe modified and he dubbed that notion “metacognitive learning.”

> So, if somebody has a habit [has a habit] of reading that works really well, fine. If they have one that breaks down and doesn’t seem to work sometimes, they they’re making an effort to change it, that’s that’s metacognitive learning at work. I’m mostly concerned with that one because I want to see that the students are making an effort to change the approach is always operative because that’s what’s required in college.

Participant 2 acknowledged that he used metacognitive reading strategies with his students when he said,

> There's no other way. If I'm not reaching for metacognitive strategies when I'm tutoring, I'm not doing my job. So, I do know that's very difficult sometimes to coach metacognition and I do know that occasionally when the communication is very difficult with the student who doesn't speak English very well or if they're just not into strategies, then I still have to do something. I will stop coaching then I will start telling. I'll just say do this, try this. Now when you go in there I want you to do it this way and I'll give them a way of doing it, that's fine. To me it indicates that I've failed or it's too difficult, but the primary, you know, intention is to always coach metacognition no matter who I'm dealing with.

The kind of metacognitive reading strategy that Participant 2 said that he used was the IOM Strategy. The IOM Strategy was made-up of three components; namely, identify the strategy that the students are already using; objectify the strategy by giving the strategy a name, and modify the strategy if deemed ineffective. Participant 2 described how he coached students using the IOM Strategy in the following excerpts from interviews one and two:

> The metacognitive strategies that I primarily operate in the back of my mind is IOM Strategy which is identify the strategy the student is using, objectify it, help the student objectify it by naming it, getting control over it and modifying that strategy so that it works better. And that the cycle that goes, so, let's see . . . so they identify it, they objectify it saying oh that's my strategy x and doesn't always work. Here is what I did to fix it so that it works all the time and now I'm gonna try it again and if my results are better, good. If they're better, but not quite there yet, I need to do another, I need to identify exactly I'm doing again, I need to

> objectify it further possibly and definitely modify it again. So continuing to go through that process is . . . I'm always referring to that in my mind and I'm very often trying to get the students . . . so, that thing we just did what do you call that? I want them to have ownership of whatever strategies they have going on, you know.

Is the strategy that the student brings to the tutoring session considered to be metacognitive in nature and can what Participant 2 does in the name of developing a strategy be considered a metacognitive reading strategy? There was nothing the researcher noticed that may substantiate that whatever strategies the students used during reading were actually metacognitive reading strategies. Furthermore, there was no evidentiary support for the use of declarative, procedural or conditional knowledge during coaching sessions. Participant 2 considered the IOM Strategy as the most beneficial metacognitive reading strategy even though he did not teach his tutees how to use it, when, where and why to use it, but coached them through the steps of his strategy.

> It's not something that I teach them flat out. I don't say now they identify the questions, now you objectify, now you modify it. It's too difficult to actually try to do that way. It's simply the procedure that I take them through without telling them what it is and it's a procedure when it starts to generate results it just keeps going. The idea is they start to do it, they see it turning out results and continue to identify what it is that they are doing. It's the power over by naming it, naming what it is, take it apart look at it, fix it put it back together and does it work better now that I'm . . . Say, I go back and I take the test this time and I'm looking at the test differently now. What was my test score this time? Is it working?

Another metacognitive reading strategy that Participant 2 acknowledged using was the Levels of Imagination Strategy (i.e., auditory, visualization and abstract). The participant asserted that the first level was auditory and that students, during that stage, have to hear the author speaking through the text while the second level, visualization, was concerned with the literal visualization of what the reader saw as he or she read the text. The first level of imagination was auditory. The researcher could not determine if that particular part of the imagination strategy was metacognitive. Now, the second level, visualization, a metacognitive reading strategy in the literature, yet the participant did not actually teach visualization, but sort of discussed how important it was to comprehension. And finally, the third Level of Imagination Strategy, the abstract level, that Participant 2 described as "mapping out what is happening in terms of cause and effects, [major] details, examples, relationships and things like that, abstract relationships."

When asked to describe how he would teach struggling adult readers to use metacognitive reading strategies, Participant 2 responded by saying

> We've already talked about that by connecting to what they are doing already and getting through the job. If what they're doing matches the strategy that we already have available like SQ4R, we can reach for it and say, hey, look we came up with something that looks a lot like this. It's a big confidence issue then because if they came up with something that is similar to the experts, it's like they trust you now more because it's like oh we're doing, you know, basically like the experts do. They trust themselves because they came up with part of it. It's a huge thing."

Participant 2 who is a learning specialist did not actually teach Developmental Reading 1 or 2, but rather tutored the students from those courses who struggled to comprehend texts; therefore, he did not have a syllabus to provide for this study. Notwithstanding the absence of the syllabus, Participant 2 provided five documents; namely, Coach's Report, Developmental Reading 2—Lab Checklist, Location of Main Idea, How to Complete Your Lab Assignments, and Location of Main Ideas: Alternative Test. The purpose of the lab was to supplement instruction; consequently, every document provided by Participant 2 was a skills-based assessing tool and information about how to work on assignments. The only document that related to any aspect of metacognition was the Coach's Report that contained "awareness and reading habits." The tutors completed it as progress reports used by instructors of Developmental Reading 1 or 2 to drive their instruction. In other words, not a single document was useful in supporting the use of metacognitive reading strategies. The researcher found that Participant 2 reported using reading strategies and visualization as metacognitive reading strategies (see Table 11).

Participant 3 was not familiar with metacognitive reading strategies and thought that they involved "how the brain processes information." As a result, the researcher defined metacognitive reading strategies for the Participant and after the definition, Participant 3 declared, "So, I guess in a nutshell no," in response to being familiar with metacognitive reading strategies. Although she could not define metacognitive reading strategies, Participant 3 answered affirmatively to using them and further stated that,

> You're trying to [get] them comprehending, reading comprehension and that appears to be kind of right of the alley of how you're describing metacognitive

> processes. Um, yeah, I suppose I am. Why am I teaching it . . . Well, I mean, it's so important I can't emphasize enough how important it is to the students, how important it is be able to take these skills and I mean . . . I think they sit there and they think this is so stupid well I'm in a reading class I know how to read. It's so much more than literacy. I think it goes way beyond that when you add comprehension in there. They're learning skills in communication that are going to, hopefully, stay with you not only throughout your academic career as a student, but when you attempt to become someone you're going to be an MBA or you know, in the business world or in the financial world, that comprehension is going to be so vital, so I think that it's incredibly important what they're being taught.

Participant 3 indicated that she taught metacognitive reading strategies and included therein the notion of declarative knowledge, but there was no support to establish the use of procedural or conditional knowledge during instruction. Participant 3 responded thusly when asked about a typical day of reading instruction:

> So we did a variety of things usually starting with a chapter. I would give a lesson on PowerPoint and within that lesson we would stop periodically and do group work from the book or you know, uh, individual work from the book and share as a class. We may also have had a quiz on any given day, but normally I would teach a lesson using visuals from PowerPoint adapting it to the textbook and then ending the day with a homework assignment, uh, from the textbook that would be due the next day.

During the same interview, she stated,

> But we have to look right at the source and after reading it, you know, talk about what we think his purpose was. Was it to entertain, was it something that was humorous, uh, was it meant purely to inform, you know, about the extinction rate of the Florida Panther or was it to persuade and like you could talk about the extinction of the Florida Panthers and what we should do to conserve more. So we really have to go to the source for analyzing purpose in that particular case. Uh, we do that all throughout the semester. You know, we're up and running knowing that I suppose we deal with that purpose throughout the whole semester because that help identify main idea, that help identify supporting details. You know, a lot of these learning outcomes are things that happen naturally through the progression of the semester and not necessarily free standing by themselves we're only going to evaluate fact and opinion but fact and opinion within, you know, the [inaudible] scope of the whole passage or article.

Participant 3's lesson regarding purpose incorporated declarative knowledge as well as procedural knowledge, but the conditional knowledge was not so apparent. As a final example, when asked about how she would teach struggling adult readers, Participant 3 responded that,

> I would go back to the beginning, really, with them. Those things that even though you have to get through them sort of quickly, unfortunately more quickly than may be right in terms of teaching them how to be an active reader or how being an active reader will make you a better reader and then going into SQ3R, um, the thinking, keeping with the basics or keeping the basics in mind. You can read anything as long as you can visualize what you are supposed to be doing. So,

if that means that you're supposed to be visualizing what the main idea is for everything. You could approach any reading the same way. The skill, I think that, that's a strategy, I hope that I instilled in them, so you can approach anything you read the same way, but now you just know how to define certain things that you might find within what you're reading. You might, oh that's a supporting detail and you might be able to say oh that's bias I should, you know, make a note of that that it sounds biased. So, if anything just going back to the basics of, what, talk about the purpose of this is, what does the author want us to know? Can help them with anything they come across in a reading.

Participant 3 when describing what she did to assist struggling adult readers mentioned SQ3R, visualizing, supporting details, bias and purpose. Of the five strategies mentioned, visualizing is the only metacognitive reading strategy; nevertheless, when asked if she taught it, Participant 3 acknowledged that perhaps she did teach it. In responding to the question, the participant actually talked about using visuals to teach her course rather than visualization that requires students to envision what they are reading. While Participant 3 started off with an affirmation that she taught visualization, the conversation moved quickly toward using things such as PowerPoint presentations and whiteboards. Participant 3 remarked in the following manner with regard to visualizing:

Well, I guess I did because I know that I'm a visual learner and I know so the way I teach is very big on visual elements. I'm big with PowerPoints. I'm big with, uh, writing on the white board, if I can, if space allows for it. Uh, writing as I speak to them or writing as I lecture to them or I love doing brainstorming sessions with people. Um, let's see, if I have the white board space, I would have

like to . . . so we just read this article on the continued editorial on gun control. So what are some of the main ideas that you found within this continuing editorial? And then I could write, you know, as they tell me. It's a big part of the way I teach, so, yeah, if it isn't in the learning outcomes that definitely came from me. Uh, but I do incorporate it a lot. You know, if a student is a visual learner, I'll bet it helps to some extent, but you don't know everybody's particular learning process. So, it's a good point, it's like why visual, why not, you know, oral, audio or anything else.

Accordingly, what Participant 3 communicated was the concept of learning style that she addressed during instruction rather than visualization and thus there was no confirmatory data to support the use of metacognitive reading strategies nor was there any support for the use of declarative, procedural or conditional knowledge during instruction. The majority of what Participant 3 discussed with regard to her lessons focused on skills even though she stated that she used metacognitive reading strategies with her students. Participant 3 reported using approaches such as distinguishing useful information from useless information when determining main idea in texts or theme of a book, how to process information plus "use what is needed from them and to kind of, not throw away, but don't dwell so much on the supporting details that don't tell you anything you need to know." In fact, Participant 3 believed that being able to do those things were "skills that they definitely take away with them." Nevertheless, the question remained, "Are the strategies to which Participant 3 referred metacognitive reading strategies? Is there any monitoring or controlling throughout the reading process? Are the three kinds of knowledge (declarative, procedural and conditional) that Schraw and

Moshman (1995) wrote about as part of the instruction for this participant? The researcher argued that Participant 3 explained exactly what she meant by distinguishing useful information for useless information; however, it was undetermined as to the participant's use of procedural knowledge and conditional knowledge as components of the lesson. For Participant 3, the most beneficial metacognitive reading strategy was annotating during reading. In response to that question, Participant 3 had the following to say about the most beneficial metacognitive reading strategy:

> I really like teaching very hands-on with the text. I'm one of those people who cannot get on board with the Kindle thing because I love reading a book and, like, flipping through its pages. It's a very tangible source. So, I think that one of the strategies I think is most beneficial is to teach them to really interact with their source. So, if they have a textbook, you know they have to buy the textbook, then they're allowed to highlight and write in it, I mean, I really hope that they can't sell the book by the end of it only because there are so many of their notes in it and so much highlighting. Um, then that really puts your stamp on it and like, if look back at your notes, you might not have any idea why you wrote it, but at the time it might have been the one thing that helped you get through that test. I like teaching them the strategy of really interacting with their sources.

In terms of annotating, Participant 3 taught her students active reading. Active reading included summarizing and annotating. The students mainly focused on writing marginal notes, text features as well as asking and answer questions.

> Make annotations in the margins, they would ask questions to try to answer for later, write down questions and answer questions as they go. Uh, typically more

> active with the text itself, like actually using it, touching it, highlighting it, you know, looking for bold or italicized words and defining them, uh. We teach that rather early on so that they can utilize the skill as they continue through the semester and not only in the reading course itself, but if they're taking a psychology course or a history course [inaudible] fantastic and unpack heavy reading that may be difficult to process, uh, so that it's actually something I have taken even into my writing courses.

On the surface, the Course Syllabus and the Implied Main Idea PowerPoint appeared to contain metacognitive reading strategies like higher level reading strategies, inferences and asking questions. Although the terms higher level reading strategies, inferences and asking questions appeared in the documents, there was no confirmatory support that monitoring and controlling during the reading process were apparent nor were there indicators of declarative, procedural and conditional knowledge. For example, Participant 3 had the following to say regarding higher level reading strategies.

> Other strategies are being able to present with main idea. The main idea we teach them is that the main idea should act as an umbrella to give them a visual here. The main idea is the umbrella and all of the supporting details should fall under that umbrella and that's that you can decipher whether it is the main idea or just a supporting detail. Everything under that statement applies to those supporting details. So if you're using the supporting details as the main idea it won't work at a certain point. Yeah, uh, I was just trying to think of an example, but I'd probably need a PowerPoint to do that, but, you know, if if I was saying that, uh, there are [inaudible] groups that , but I think that there is a protein aspect of the

pyramid, that would be a supporting detail that could never access the main idea so we do teach them strategies to use and I think that each instructor might differ in their strategies, but I think a lot of that is based on the instructor, uh, but the things that come up per lesson and per chapter.

Participant 3 used skills and higher level reading strategies as synonyms with no distinction between the terms although she acknowledged that there was a difference between skills and strategies based upon the following quotation:

> Skills and strategies, well, uh, I will say that skills are more of the principle usage, uh, you know, of being able to read, uh, you know actual literacy being able to read and write. The act of it more than anything else while I think strategies are more ways to think about how to do it. Uh, so I guess you can say that skills are the practical use then, you know, and the strategies would be okay how do I figure out how to unpack this reading. Let me define some words, let me annotate, let me ask questions to get to the main idea of this piece.

The Course Syllabus also contained the terms inferences, analyze, synthesize and evaluate in conjunction with the skills listed under learning outcomes. Neither in interview transcript one nor in interview transcript two does Participant 3 mention instruction related to making inferences. Therefore, when the researcher asked Participant 3 about how she conducted instruction relative to analyzing, synthesizing and evaluating, she responded as follows:

> But we have to look right at the source and after reading it, you know, talk about what we think his purpose was. Was it to entertain, was it something that was humorous, uh, was it meant purely to inform, you know, about the extinction rate

of the Florida Panther or was it to persuade and like you could talk about the extinction of the Florida Panthers and what we should do to conserve more. So we really have to go to the source for analyzing purpose in that particular case. Uh, we do that all throughout the semester. You know, we're up and running knowing that I suppose we deal with that purpose throughout the whole semester because that help identify main idea, that help identify supporting details. You know, a lot of these learning outcomes are things that happen naturally through the progression of the semester and not necessarily free standing by themselves we're only going to evaluate fact and opinion but fact and opinion within, you know, the [inaudible] scope of the whole passage or article.

Therefore, Participant 3 discussed the skill and purpose, rather than instructing her students about how to analyze, evaluate or synthesize information. It is unclear how Participant 3 taught her students to analyze, evaluate, and synthesize and it seemed that she was looking and talking for the purpose of identifying main idea and supporting details and not necessarily for other purposes. The researcher found that Participant 3 reported using active reading, visualizing, SQ3R, back to basics, etc. as metacognitive reading strategies to increase the reading comprehension of her students (see Table 10).

Participant 4 was clearly unfamiliar with metacognitive reading strategies (MRS) as evidenced by her statement, "I would say not at all," but inferred that it is a "strategy to teach students how to read and how to think about what they're reading, but as I said in my last interview, I actually have not had any courses in reading." Despite the fact that she readily admitted to not being aware of how to define metacognitive reading

strategies; Participant 4's response made it clear that she had some knowledge of metacognitive reading strategies without the benefit of having had coursework.

Although Participant 4 did not take reading courses she remarked, "Um, like I said in the last question I will define metacognitive reading strategies as a strategy that a student is aware that he or she is using in order to be an effective reader." In her response to the question, Participant 4 made it clear that she could not define metacognitive reading strategies and, as a result, the researcher understood that she required a definition for metacognitive reading strategies. The researcher reminded Participant 4 that the remaining questions focused on metacognitive reading strategies and that the next question was "Do you use metacognitive reading strategies?" She responded, "I would assume so, I'm teaching reading. But again if you're not willing to provide me with a definition, I appreciate that that might be a part of your study, that's very difficult for me to answer." At that point, the researcher acquiesced to the participant's suggestion and described metacognitive reading strategies as "an awareness of the reading process. It's monitoring and controlling throughout the reading process." Therefore, the researcher provided a definition for metacognitive reading strategies for Participant 4 and though Participant 4 did not initially have a complete grasp of the terminology (i.e., metacognitive reading strategies), she had a rudimentary knowledge and understanding of the tenets of metacognitive reading strategies as evidenced by what she said in the following statement:

> Then I would argue that I very much utilize it, metacognitive reading strategies because by all purposes to make students aware of what it is that they are doing while they're reading. I do use it because I think effective readers need to be

> conscious readers. They need to be aware of what it is that they're doing and they need to be aware of the mistakes that they're making and how to correct those mistakes. Students far too often and I talk about this in one of the first days of class think that Reading is passive [as] their eyes drift across the page and something magical happens and they're somehow going to understand what they're reading and that clearly doesn't happen at all.

Participant 4 responded positively concerning whether or not she used metacognitive reading strategies and considered active reading strategies as annotating and summarizing which were considered to be metacognitive reading strategies pursuant to the literature. According to Participant 4, active reading was the most beneficial metacognitive reading strategy and, in effect, she went a little further and added, "I think teaching my students how to be active readers is probably the most effective strategy that I can give them."

Participant 4 dialogued a lot about annotation as well as how she taught her students to annotate during instruction. In fact, before actually teaching the students about annotating, Participant 4 assessed her students' knowledge of annotating using a diagnostic examination that included a question related to it. Hence, the students would attempt to define annotation before instruction in the use of it. Participant 4 based her instruction on her student's diagnostic results. Instruction would proceed in the following manner:

> I ask them to annotate it and then the first question on the exam is, "what does annotate mean?" Then you define it because nobody has an idea. So, when I go over the diagnostic exam I have a PowerPoint and then the PowerPoint chart of

the reading is annotated and then we have a discussion about what it means to annotate and how it's moving beyond highlighting or underlining, um, taking marginal notes and interact with the text and responding with the text. So, uh, so, I have a lesson and I define it and I show them an example of what I'd done and then I go ahead and have them annotate, uh, the critical reading assignment and when they turn them in, I'll take a look at the annotations and I'll give them some feedback, whether or not I think they're going in the right direction, whether or not I think that they need to interact a little bit more. I give them some feedback. I don't do a ton of feedback. I I really, I teach them the best practices-- a lot of ways that I teach, therefore, if you don't want it, giving you the best practices is entirely up to you whether or not you're going to utilize them and personalize them. Annotating is something that I think is very personal. I'm really more interested in getting them writing on the text. You're noting where the main idea is, noting shift, noting tone, paying attention to connotative language for example, to help them identify tone.

When asked about the kinds of metacognitive reading strategies used in her classroom, Participant 4 commented that,

The critical reading assignments I think would be an example of metacognitive reading strategy we use to explicitly answer questions that successful readers can instantly answer. Asking students to think about themselves in terms of being an introspective reader not taking the reading process for granted. Teaching students active reading strategies including annotating and the summarizing would be

some examples. Always asking students to consider and then . . . back in some ways point-of- view.

The documents that supported the fact that Participant 4 used annotation were Reading Quiz 2 and Directions Packet. There were two pieces of relevant data on the Reading Quiz 2 that substantiated the use of annotation and those pieces of data were "While reading, annotate the article" and "1. Article annotation" while the Directions Packet corroborated the use of annotation through the following quotations: "You will hand in the annotated reading, which will be stapled behind the assignment; Summary and annotation. Print out and annotate the reading (25 points)."

Another metacognitive reading strategy that Participant 4 used was summary. In response to the question about instructing students regarding how to write a summary, Participant 4 had the following to say in two slices of discourse.

> Like I said, I think, uh, teaching them how to write a summary is something that absolutely helps reading comprehension. It helps them break down the reading into its most important part, the main idea, the major supporting details and the tone. I do require students to include tone in summaries, uh, because I believe that if they can identify the main idea and identify the tone, then they will have at least understood the basis of a reading. Uh, I think presenting reading in a holistic manner works very well for me and for my students so they can see the way the skills go together, uh, and teaching them how to annotate. I think teaching my students how to be active readers is probably the most effective strategy that I can give them.

Like I [said previously] yes I certainly teach them how to write a summary. Yeah, so they have a diagnostic exam and they're asked to write a summary for the diagnostic exam and then they're given feedback on those. They're given examples; they're given an example summary based on that diagnostic exam. I have a discussion with them to what should be included in a summary. Uh, they, I have them evaluating the summary checklist in the directions packet. After they've written the summary, they should be answering those questions. They actually have to turn that handout in. I tell them that if they [respond] no to the question, they should revise the summary before turning it in so they can either do the checklist or the questions on the evaluating your summary sheet are the same as the points on the rubric that I use before the summary. Um, and then of course, they're given feedback on their summaries so they can continue to improve them. So, they see what a correct summary looks like. They are told in a lecture what a summary should include. They practice writing their own summaries and for the first couple of critical reading assignments, I, um, ask them questions before they leave the class for the day for the homework and for them to predict a little bit about what you think the main idea is gonna be, what do you about think the major details the very first Reading 1 do from the textbook has each major detail in bold. I tried to say to them how many major details you think there are and somebody will count up and they'll say six. And I'll say how you know; there are six sections in bold. So, I try to use readings that will scaffold them, um and help, first give a little bit more guidance and then move away from that. So for the first reading it's something that lends itself very easily to a summary. The second

reading a little lesser, but we still have that conversation in class. Uh, I cover what I expect to see for the mere details and by the third summary they're writing it on their own.

Two of the three documents supported the idea that Participant 4 used summarizing during instruction with struggling adult readers. For example, the Directions Packet contained the following data chunks that supported the use of summaries; namely, "DO NOT FORGET THE SUMMARY; Summary and Annotation; Write a summary (include title in quotation marks and author) (75 points); For each assignment, turn in a completed "Evaluating Your Summary Form." The researcher found that Participant 4 reported using active reading (annotation & summarizing), critical reading assignments, ask students to become introspective readers, question answering, etc. as metacognitive reading strategies with her struggling adult readers based upon the document analyses as well as both interviews (see Table 11).

Participant 5 was not familiar with metacognitive reading strategies and her response to the question was, "I have no idea what it is." Because Participant 5 was unfamiliar with metacognitive reading strategies, the researcher defined them.

After receiving the definition of metacognitive reading strategies, Participant 5, she remarked, "I think they do that automatically. I never knew the term for it say especially in the sciences." Participant 5's statement led this researcher to understand that because students monitor and control what occurred during the reading process, there was no need for actual teaching; accordingly, Participant 5 did not teach metacognitive reading comprehension strategies. Participant 5's responses, at that point, were

somewhat antithetical because when she read Question 15 regarding whether or not she used metacognitive reading strategies, she answered, "yes" and then further stated, that

> When I find students, they have to read a lot of passages, in-class reading passages. If I find find some students which I have found that, uh, that are in the reading special programs through elementary, middle and high school, I do find students that have been in the, uh, reading help programs, I do pull them aside and I will have them, and I will chunk their reading parts and do that with them because they'll say I just read but I don't know what I just read. And then I'll say let's read these couple of passages and what does this mean to you. So, I do this automatically not knowing the term or what it's called.

Participant 5 had clearly stated that she was not familiar with metacognitive reading strategies and after receiving the definition for them responded affirmatively, and then stated that students monitor and control their reading during the reading process automatically. Participant 5 answered the aforementioned question affirmatively without providing metacognitive reading strategy instruction for her students and on the other hand, stated that what she did with students who required "reading help programs" was to have them to break whatever it is that they are reading into chunks, which is presumably a metacognitive reading strategy. What Participant 5 described was more of a reading strategy rather than a metacognitive reading strategy as there was no indication that the participant used procedural or conditional knowledge, a requirement for the strategy to be metacognitive in its essence. Moreover, there did not appear to be any monitoring or controlling mentioned, discussed or used during the reading process. Participant 5's rationale for using metacognitive reading strategies was that it allowed one "to make

putting it [text] into smaller chunks then they can be able to explain it to you and then go on." When asked about the particular kind of strategies that she used, Participant 5 discussed small group instruction with about two to three students using a series of short reading passages. Participant 5 explained that

> [She] would usually do it [read] and then I would have them try to explain to me what I read and if they still looked lost to me, then I would have them read to me and explain to me what they were about. It would generally be read at least two or three times before I have them address what the questions were. And doing that many times I found again that they have no idea what the words meant.

Essentially, Participant 5 used a small group setting to have several short passages read and reread again by both she and her students. There was no indication that there was declarative, procedural or conditional knowledge used in this small group situation nor monitoring or controlling occurring during the reading process.

Participant 5's Course Syllabus included higher level reading strategies which she defined as ". . . being able to infer; being able to figure out where all the patterns of organization are. So, they put it under the critical reading skills. Being able to find out what the main idea is." The researcher concluded that Participant 5 did not distinguish between skills and strategies based upon interview one and used skills and strategies interchangeably as synonyms.

Under the planned tactics category, Participant 5's inferences were skills. Though inferences were determined to be skills, Participant 5 used question answering to make inferences or draw conclusions. For instance, Participant 5 used "What is unusual or striking about this piece of information; Why is it included here; How did you arrive at

the inferences" to assist students with making inferences. Question answering is a metacognitive reading strategy and reading comprehension strategy (Nash-Ditzel, 2010; NICH, 2000).

Participant 5 submitted five documents. Of the five documents, Newsweek Magazine Journal and syllabus included information regarding summaries. The participant did not actually teach her students how to write summaries as evidenced in the following comment from interview one. "No, I assigned it as part of a general grade." And then in interview two, when asked about how she would teach summarizing she said, "I would have them start first to go back to reread the article and make a little outline of what were the keys points of they're . . . of what they just read and then just, uh, pick out the main points. Thus these are the important things to, uh; they will be able to explain why the plants are such and such, uh."

Participant 5's responses about summarizing were divergent; therefore, the researcher contended that she did not teach summarizing because Participant 5's first response was a definite no and the second response referred to how she would teach summarizing if she actually did it. Having the ability to do something is very different from actually completing the task. The Course Syllabus outlined what have should been taught throughout the course and a majority of what was found on the syllabus was skills-based even though there were terms such as analyze, evaluate and synthesize found therein. The terms were crouched in the context of understanding the skills associated with the course and as such, were not metacognitive reading strategies. The researcher found that the documents that Participant 5 supplied supported the belief that skills were a major part of teaching in her classroom not metacognitive reading strategies. The

researcher also found that Participant 5 reported using chunking reading parts, small group instruction, rereading, question answering, as metacognitive reading strategies to increase the reading comprehension of her students (see Table 12).

Table 12

Research Question 2: Metacognitive Reading Strategies Reported by the Participants

Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5
• Tutoring • Consciously decipher reading passages • Make aware of thinking process • Touching upon all skills • Metacognitive Skills • Finding the main idea & supporting detail • Figuring out patterns of organization • Using Transitions • Active Reading • Question Answering-Guide/Scaffold • Question Generation • Teach inferences and implied main idea • Conversation with textbook • Annotation • Thinking Process • DPC Knowledge-YES	• Miscue Analysis • Self-Monitoring • Metacognitive Learning • IOM Strategy • Levels of Imaginations • Question Generation • Coach Metacognition • Connecting to what Students are already (IOM) • Metacognitive Technique • Question Answering • Tutoring • DPC Knowledge--NO	• Active Reader • Visualize • SQ3R • Back to basics—Purpose, What the author wants use to know • Supporting Details • Bias • Distinguishing useful information from useless information • How to process information (digest) • Use what's needed, but don't dwell • Ask Questions • Answer questions • Learning Style-Visual • Annotating/ Note-taking • What does the author want us to know • Purpose • Self-Monitoring • Summary • DPC Knowledge-YES	• Active Reading—Annotation, Summarize • Critical reading assignments—used to explicitly answer questions • Asks students to be introspective readers • Teach the writing process • Question Answering • DP Knowledge-YES	• Chunk reading parts • Small group instruction • Rereading • Read Aloud • Question Answering • Learning Styles—auditory & visual • Inference • Feedback • DPC-YES/NOT REALLY

Note. DK = declarative; PK = procedural knowledge; CK = conditional knowledge.

Summary of Research Question 2

The second research question of this study was, "What metacognitive reading strategies do instructors in developmental reading courses at Sunshine State College report using struggling adult readers to improve reading comprehension?

A category, Thinking Tools and a theme, Eclectic Approaches to Reading Comprehension, were associated with Research Question 2. The researcher found that Participants 4, 1, 3, and 2 used metacognitive reading strategies while Participant 5 did not use metacognitive reading strategies with struggling adult readers to improve their reading comprehension.

CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Study Summary

This study examined developmental reading instructors' and a learning specialist's reported use of metacognitive reading strategies and reported approaches used to increase and improve reading comprehension of their students. The study is important because research has suggested that metacognitive reading strategies are effective in increasing the reading comprehension of struggling readers (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Falk-Ross, 2001-2002; Mealey & Nist, 1989; Nash-Ditzel, 2010; Nist & Holschuh, 2000; Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995 and Wichadee, 2011). The Study Summary will be presented first followed by a Discussion of Results in the context of chapter 2. And, finally, Implications and Recommendations for Future Research will be presented.

Research Questions

This research study posed the following questions:

1. What do instructors of developmental reading courses at Sunshine State College report using to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers?

2. What metacognitive reading strategies do instructors in developmental reading courses at Sunshine State College report using with struggling adult readers to improve reading comprehension?

Discussion

This study examined developmental reading instructors' and a learning specialist's reported use of metacognitive reading strategies and reported approaches used

to increase or improve reading comprehension of their students. There were two findings associated with Research Question 1. The first finding was that all of the participants primarily used reading skills (an acquired ability) to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers. Reading skills are foundational to developmental reading courses and defined for the purposes of this study as unconscious, automatic processes used during the reading process to increase reading comprehension (Afflerbach et al., 2008a, 2008b; Dole et al., 1991; Harris & Hodges, 1995; Manoli & Papadopoulou, 2012; Paris et al., 1996). There were three understandings generated through the first finding, reading skills usage by all participants, associated with Research Question 1. Firstly, a majority of the participants used reading skills, solely, as well as one-to-one type tutoring and conferencing during instruction. Secondly, two of the five participants used other approaches such as conversation with a textbook and false/true type test items during reading instruction. Lastly, inference, in this study, was skills-based instead of a metacognitive reading strategy.

The second finding associated with Research Question 1 was that all of the participants used some reading strategies (systematic plan). Strategies for purposes of this study are conscious, effortful and deliberate processes or actions (Afflerbach et al., 2008a, 2008b; Dole et al., 1991; Harris & Hodges, 1995; Manoli & Papadopoulou, 2012; Paris et al., 1983; Paris et al., 1996). Three insights emerged through Finding 2 for Research Question 1. First, there was only one participant who identified general reading strategies in the context of a typical day of reading instruction while the others used a side-bar approach or unintentional approach. Second, there were commonalities and differences among the participants related to the particular kinds of general reading

strategies that they used. The participants used reading skills (i.e., unconscious, automatic processes or actions) as if they were general reading strategies (i.e., conscious, deliberate and effortful processes). Lastly, the participants used alternative approaches not considered general reading strategies.

Regarding Research Question 2, there was one finding; specifically, the participants used two metacognitive reading strategies (see Table 10) to improve reading comprehension of their struggling adult readers. Several insights were evident in the findings. Metacognitive reading strategies are deliberate, effortful and conscious plans used to monitor and to control what happens during the course of reading and includes declarative, procedural and conditional knowledge (Baker & Brown, 1984; El-Hindi, 1997; Paris et al., 1983; Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995; Wichadee, 2011).

There were insights that emerged in the findings related to metacognitive strategies. First, two of the five participants were familiar with metacognitive reading strategies although a majority of the participants categorized various approaches as metacognitive reading strategies, not distinguishing one from the other. In addition, some of the participants declared that they used metacognitive strategies; however, the confirmatory support from the interviews as well as the document analyses was virtually nonexistent. Secondly, there were commonalities as well as differences in reference to specific kinds of metacognitive strategies (i.e., active reading, annotating, and summarizing) or approaches (learning styles, writing process, etc.) used to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers. Thirdly, there was a lack of discourse related to inference as a metacognitive strategy because the participants talked about inferences as reading skills and not as metacognitive reading strategies. Inference, as a

metacognitive reading strategy, would be a conscious, deliberate and effortful process that includes self-monitoring as well as declarative, procedural and conditional knowledge whereas inference as a reading skill would be an automatic and unconscious process, or action. Finally, self-monitoring, an important aspect of metacognition, received very little attention from a majority of the participants.

Eclectic Approaches to Reading Comprehension

Eclectic approaches to reading comprehension included a variety of strategies as well as approaches reported by instructors of developmental reading courses. They encompassed Rote Routines, Planned Tactics, Alternative Approaches, and Thinking Tools.

Rote Routines

The evidence revealed that all of the participants used reading skills and, to an extent, general reading strategies to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers. The finding concerning the participants' use of reading skills could be expected because the FLDOE's State Course Description (FLDOE, 2013) and Sunshine State's Course Description (Sunshine State College, 2013c, 2013d) contained what was specifically included in REA 0017 and what was supposed to be taught in the course (see Appendices C & D). Consequently, REA 0017 Developmental Reading 2, according to the FLDOE and Sunshine State's Course Descriptions, was skills based and this researcher expected to find that reading instruction was fundamentally skills-based due to mandated course objectives and historical precedence.

The stated objective of Developmental Reading 2 according to the FLDOE was to assist students with passing the college's reading portion of the entrance examination.

The purpose of the examination was to assess students' reading comprehension; so, the fundamental idea behind the course was to build understanding so that students were able to pass the examination as well as complete other college-leveled tasks and assignments. Further, the participants in the study used skills as the primary foci and structure for instruction as any other matter presented during instruction was secondary and appeared to be incidental rather than conscious or deliberately planned.

In answering Research Question 1 regarding what instructors of developmental reading courses and a learning specialist reported using to increase the reading comprehension of their struggling adult readers, all of the participants used main idea, supporting details, inference, and others (see Table 6) to increase reading comprehension in their instruction. The participants placed a great deal of emphasis on teaching students to identify main ideas and supporting details. As a reading instructor in a local K-12 school district, this researcher expected to find that the participants addressed identifying main ideas and supporting details more often than any other reading skill because these skills are typically the focus for instruction and are quite difficult for students who struggle with reading comprehension.

With regard to inference, the researcher expected to find that all of the participants used inference to increase reading comprehension of their struggling adult readers as it is customary for instructors to incorporate inferences during reading instruction. Inference includes drawing conclusions based upon what authors present in the text as well as the background information of the readers and can be made automatically, without awareness or with great conscious effort (Chikalanga, 1992; Graesser & Kruez, 1993; McKoon & Raticliff, 1992; Nahatame, 2014). What the

researcher did not anticipate was the need to make distinctions about inference as a reading skill, general reading strategy or metacognitive strategy. Clearly, there is a difference between inference, the reading skill, verses inference, the metacognitive strategy. That distinction was absolutely necessary for this study because of the categories (i.e., rote routines, planned tactics and thinking tools) that were found to exist through the participants' interviews as well document analyses and because the research literature distinguished inference as a skill and inference as a strategy. The researcher had to situate inference under rote routines or thinking tools. Inference as a reading skill is an unconscious action whereas inference as a metacognitive reading strategy is a conscious, deliberate action. Consequently, there was a need to differentiate between inference as a reading skill and inference as a metacognitive reading strategy.

Research Question 1 was what do instructors of developmental reading courses and a learning specialist reported using with struggling adult readers and as such, it was imperative to distinguish inference as a reading skill and inference as metacognitive reading strategy. Additionally, instruction using inference as a reading skill would look very different from instruction of inference as a metacognitive reading strategy because reading skills are considered to be automatic, unconscious processes whereas metacognitive reading strategies are effortful, conscious processes that include comprehension monitoring (self-monitoring) and the use of metacognitive knowledge; specifically, declarative, procedural, and conditional. So, if instruction is to be structured appropriately, then understanding the difference between inference as a reading skill and inference as a metacognitive reading strategy was fundamentally important. If skills are automatic actions and some inferences are generated automatically, then one would

conclude that some inferences may be skills; however, there are some inferences that require deliberate and intentional thought. The literature related to the difference between skills and strategies is ambiguous to say the least. The evidence revealed that one of the five participants used inference in the context of this study as a reading skill and not a metacognitive strategy to increase the reading comprehension of their students. After viewing and reviewing the data collected during this study, it became quite apparent that inference really took a back seat to main idea and supporting details although the literature supported the notion that inference as a metacognitive strategy is effective in increasing reading comprehension (Nash-Ditzel, 2010) while the use of reading skills is unsubstantiated. Koda (2005) exemplified that sentiment thusly,

> Although researchers generally agree that strategic reading and skillful reading differ, skills and strategies are not clearly distinguished in the literature. The two terms frequently are used interchangeably in references to a broad range of processing tasks, behavior and abilities. The confusion becomes particularly confounding when processing operations such as inference and cognate recognition are referred to as strategies in strategy studies and as skills in the reading literature. (p. 209)

In addressing Research Question 1 regarding what the participants used to increase the reading comprehension of their struggling adult readers, they reported using one-to-one instruction, conferencing or tutoring. All of the participants used one-to-one instruction; however, what actually occurred during these sessions could not be determined based upon the data collected. Observations would have captured the specifics of one-to-one instruction. Some studies found in the research literature support

the use of one-to-one instruction or conferencing using strategies with students (Falk-Ross, 2001-2002; Nash-Ditzel, 2010; Nicaise & Gettinger; 1995) and not skills. According to the literature, one-to-one instruction or conferencing using general reading strategies or metacognitive reading strategies are effective and may be efficacious in determining the specific strengths and weaknesses of developmental reading students. Results of one-to-one instruction maybe used to drive tutoring sessions and classroom instruction. It is valuable as a component of an entire unit in conjunction with direct instruction of other strategies (Falk-Ross, 2001-2002) as it may have a positive impact on reading comprehension. The literature substantiates the use of one-to-one instruction, tutoring or conferencing (Falk-Ross, 2001-2002; Nash-Ditzel, 2010; Nicaise & Gettinger; 1995) in increasing reading comprehension; therefore, it should be a part of the participants' regimen of instruction.

The evidence also revealed that two of the participants considered conversation with a textbook and false/true to be reading skills. Conversation with a textbook is akin to annotating students' textbooks. It is not a reading skill, but instead a metacognitive reading strategy. The fact that the participant did not distinguish conversation with a textbook from reading skills is very problematic because it is important for instructors of developmental reading courses to understand the basics of reading pedagogy and theory in order to know exactly what their struggling adult readers may need to increase reading comprehension. In other words, knowing the difference between reading skills and metacognitive reading strategies and applying them would become the foundation upon which reading instruction builds. Therefore, if metacognitive reading strategies are the focus of reading instruction, then there would be a need to include declarative, procedural

and conditional knowledge. In addition, false/true test items are not reading skills. False/true [item] is actually a test item used for assessing knowledge (Linn & Gronlund, 1995); therefore, it is not a reading skill. This finding was particularly unusual because false/true test taking items are quite different from reading skills and one would not expect to find discourse using those terms synonymously as if they were equivalent notions. The researcher was well aware of the assessment driven atmosphere of K-12 system of education as well as how test preparation continues to be the instructional norm. The reason students are even enrolled in developmental reading is because they were unable to pass the college's entrance examination. As a result, the researcher expected to find that all of the participants would use some form of test preparation to aid their struggling adult readers in passing the standardized state assessment. The goal of developmental reading should be reading comprehension enhancement and not necessarily passing a state test although it is likely to help students improve their reading scores as well as help them pass their college-leveled courses. Additional research maybe needed to determine the extent to which test preparation has affected pedagogy; the long-term implications of test preparation on instruction as well as student learning outcomes and the extent to which instructors may confuse reading skills or strategy related instruction with the test preparation methods used in classrooms.

Planned Tactics

The evidence revealed the participants used general reading strategies in addition to alternative approaches. The evidence illuminated the fact that all of the participants except one, when asked about typical day of reading instruction, did not identify any specific general reading strategies that they would have used with their struggling adult

readers to increase reading comprehension. There was no direct instruction using strategies, but a "side-bar approach" wherein the participants included background knowledge, clue words for bias, and process of elimination in an "oh by the way" manner using PowerPoint presentations and textbooks. Specifically, the focus of their instruction was not strategy driven, but rather skills driven and the participants did not make deliberate, conscious efforts to make strategies preeminent and intentional. In other words, strategy instruction lacked intentionality as well as explicitness.

The objective of instruction in developmental reading is to increase reading comprehension as well as to develop independent, confident adult readers and therefore, it is imperative that the tools necessary to complete such a task are used. The research literature is filled with the notion that there is a literacy problem in the United States (AIR, 2006; Fritschmann et al., 2007; Hock & Deshler, 2003; Hock et al., 2009; NAEP, 2011; Perie et al., 2005). Additionally, that strategies as well as metacognitive reading strategies may be effective in increasing the reading comprehension of struggling readers (Falk-Ross, 2001-2002; Mealey & Nist, 1989; Nash-Ditzel, 2010; Nist & Holschuh, 2000; Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995; Trainin & Swanson, 2005; Wichadee, 2011). Consequently, instruction that is skills-based exclusively neglects the use of strategies that may really aid struggling readers in increasing their reading comprehension. Although sub-skills have typically been associated with developmental reading, there is a need to go beyond reading skills toward a more inclusive model of instruction. In other words, instructors need to utilize a model to enhance reading comprehension that would include not only skills, but active inquiry, strategies, metacognitive strategies, and approaches to enable adult students to develop their own strategies. Perhaps an

integrated model of reading comprehension is crucial to get to the heart of the comprehension issues that continue to plague struggling adult readers. There should be a consciousness on the part of instructors about what strategies or metacognitive reading strategies to teach based upon what the students' needs are with regard to increasing or improving their reading comprehension.

The evidence revealed that all of the participants used general reading strategies as well as other approaches to increase the reading comprehension of their struggling adult readers. There were a number of commonalities as well as differences in the participants' reported use of strategies. The commonalities included SQ3R, fluency, question answering, predictions, feedback, conversation with textbooks, and active reading whereas the differences included miscue analysis, figure out the questions, inter-textual connection, identifying text features, general point strategies, self-monitoring, and activating background knowledge that the participants used to increase the reading comprehension of their struggling adult readers.

A majority of the participants reported using SQ3R for reading and studying textbooks (Eggen & Kauchak, 1999; Heilman, Blair, & Rupley, 2002). There is a great deal of reading, especially textbook reading, that takes place in colleges (Pugh et al., 2000) and as a result, SQ3R is an excellent way of guiding students through comprehending large amounts of text often found in college courses. Although SQ3R was not a general reading strategy, it may-be considered a study approach used to help students to comprehend their textbooks (Eggen & Kauchak, 1999; Heilman et al., 2002). The participants used SQ3R in a variety of ways. For instance, one participant used it to compare student developed strategies to what he considered to be a strategy (SQ3R) used

by experts yet another participant used it as self-regulatory tool. Another participant used SQ3R as an "active reading strategy" while one participant crouched SQ3R in the context of teaching main idea. Whatever the context or use of SQ3R, it is clear from the literature that SQ3R is for reading and to studying textbook content (Eggen & Kauchak, 1999; Heilman et al., 2002).

The evidence also affirmed that a majority of the participants did not differentiate between reading strategies and metacognitive reading skills. Since the participants did not distinguish reading strategies from metacognitive reading strategies, it maybe concluded that they did not explicitly plan and implement instruction based upon actual differences. One cannot plan for obscurity, but for what one knows.

Other approaches that some of the participants reported using were fluency development and miscue analysis to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers. However, fluency development and miscue analysis are the result of reading aloud by instructors and "reading out loud" by students are not considered general reading strategies (Gillet, Temple, Crawford, & Cooney, 2004). There is a place for fluency development and miscue analysis in reading instruction. Fluency development and miscue analysis are not necessarily planned tactics, but are important units of reading instruction because meaning may be lost if students are reading at slow paces and without emphasis and expressiveness because their reading rates directly impact reading comprehension. If the decoding of words takes up most of the processing that occurs during reading, then comprehension breaks down.

Read alouds were also used by participants to increase reading comprehension. Read alouds are typically completed by instructors rather than students. They are

generally associated with instructors actually reading a piece of text to their students; however, the participants discussed the need for their students to "read out loud" rather than what occurs during authentic read alouds. One participant discussed read aloud in the context of comprehension monitoring that included notions associated with fluency development as used by his support staff while the other participants were concerned with the students reading "out loud" so that they could determine their own reading errors as well as their oral comprehension. Even though read alouds, miscue analysis, and fluency development are not necessarily general reading strategies, they are approaches that instructors of developmental reading courses or tutors used to instruct their students in how to increase their reading comprehension. Further, instructors and tutors use them for determining students' reading rates and for determining students' errors while reading. The data that result from the assessment of fluency development typically help instructors with determining what the students' needs are in terms of increasing their reading comprehension. In other words, the results may inform instruction for those struggling students by highlighting their weaknesses while reading; nevertheless, the participants did not use read alouds as assessment tools. The research literature does not sustain the use of read aloud, fluency or miscue analysis as planned tactics to increase reading comprehension, but as diagnostic tools for determining strengths and weaknesses of struggling readers and the data that results from them may be used to inform instruction.

Some of the participants reported using question answering to increase their students' reading comprehension. The NICH (2000) conducted a literature search for research studies examining reading comprehension, text comprehension instruction,

phonics, vocabulary, fluency, guided oral reading, silent reading, and so forth. It "identified 16 categories of text comprehension instruction of which seven appear to have a solid scientific basis for concluding that these types of instruction improve comprehension in non-impaired readers (p. 6)." The seven categories of instruction were comprehension monitoring, cooperative learning, graphic/semantic organizers, question answering, question generation, summarization, and story structure. The NICH (2000) suggested that teaching students how to use a combination of strategies would be effective for reading comprehension; however, they were concerned about "which strategies are most effective for which age groups." Because all of the research studies focused on students in K-12 system not postsecondary students, the researcher struggled to correlate between the question answering of the NICH (2000) and the reported use of question answering by the participants. Daniels and Bizar (2005) in their reading-as-thinking notion also included questioning as an element. For them, questioning consisted of "actively wondering, surfacing uncertainties, interrogating text and author (p. 40)" and Nash-Ditzel's (2010) notion of questioning was "asking questions of text (p. 48)." Reading instruction using Reading-as-Thinking strategies would look differently from skills-based method. First, instructors would incorporate multiple strategies for assisting students with reading comprehension. The strategies that Daniels and Bizar (2005) proposed would focus readers' thinking as they read various texts in order to make sense of text. Secondly, instead of using a sidebar approach or unintentional approach to strategy instruction, the participants would make a conscious effort to include strategies by planning and explicitly teaching those strategies directly to their struggling adult readers. Because the framework of instruction would no longer consist of skills but

general strategies and metacognitive reading strategies, everything connected with developmental reading courses would reflect that the participants' primary focus would be strategies and may include skills, student developed strategies as well as active inquiry. The participants would use an integrated approach to reading comprehension; consequently, the course syllabus, textbooks and the overall structure of developmental reading would be strategies based (i.e., general reading strategies and metacognitive reading strategies) with the inclusion of skills, student developed strategies and active inquiry. An integrated model of reading comprehension would be circular in structure and would not be hierarchical or top-down but instruction that would include strategies use throughout instruction. Using an integrated approach to reading comprehension will require the participants to engage in various professional development activities either on-campus or off-campus for most of the academic college year. Professional development would be a long-term investment for the instructors of developmental reading courses. It would coincide with the academic year and continue throughout the year. Professional development may include breakout sessions that incorporate current reading theories as well as pedagogy with the goal being instructors' use of whatever they learned and some kind of an activity that they would have to complete to demonstrate, or to represent their understanding as well their use of reading theories and pedagogy. In order to get state colleges to buy into a paradigm shift from skills-based to strategies based instruction, policy would have to change through legislative means. The Florida Senate would have to enact and institute legislation that would direct state colleges toward an academic framework that would focus on strategy driven reading instruction rather than the current skills-based model.

Consequently, under planned tactics, the participants did not engage in active inquiry, but rather had their students to answer questions associated with assignments. There were several general reading strategies that the participants did not share or have in common (i.e., IOM Strategy, general point strategies, text features, inter-textual connection, background knowledge, and test preparation). The IOM Strategy (IOM), a student-developed strategy, included whatever strategy the student used, objectifying, or naming the strategy and modifying the strategy. The literature supported the use of student-developed strategies (Falk-Ross, 2001-2002). Student developed strategies would enable students to take ownership of their own strategies that may lead to transfer of the strategies to various different contexts and venues. Transfer of strategies is the ultimate goal of strategy instruction; namely, that students would be capable of using strategies in a variety of contexts (Mealey & Nist, 1989; Mokhtari et al., 2008; Nash-Ditzel, 2010; Reid & Lienemann, 2006; Simpson et al., 2004).

General point strategies were more or less cues used by some developmental reading instructors to assist struggling readers with reading comprehension. They included things like having students to look for general ideas verses specific ideas; determining the topic of written text to find the main idea and using clue words to find main idea. As a reading teacher for approximately 13 years working in a local school district, the researcher has used various curriculum resources supplied by that school district that included "tips and tricks" about how students should locate main idea. Inevitably, things such as finding the main idea in the first or last paragraph or determine the topic and then determine what the author says about the topic are used in classrooms as strategies. These "tips and tricks" should not replace explicit, direct instruction of

planned tactics that are effective and may positively affect the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers.

Text features are visuals (i.e., photographs with captions; charts, bolded and italicized words, graphs, etc.) used to aid readers with comprehension. Because the researcher is an experienced reading teacher, there was an expectation that the participants would have used text features, connection (text to text; text to self; text to world) and activating background knowledge to enhance the reading comprehension of their struggling adult readers. Firstly, text features are an integral part of reading because the visuals help readers to understand the meaning an author actually assigns to text. In other words, visual cues assist readers with understanding an author's intent as it relates to meaning of the text and it enhances readers' comprehension of text. Secondly, connection has to do with relating information through text-to-text (inter-textual) connections, text to personal experiences and text to world events. The literature supported the use of inter-textual connection and activation of background knowledge to increase reading comprehension (Daniels & Bizar, 2005; Nash-Ditzel, 2010; Nicaise & Gettinger, 1995; Pressley, 2002). One participant used both strategies. This finding aligns with the literature; however, the expectation of the study was that more participants would have used connection and background knowledge as planned tactics. There have been a number of researchers/writers (Daniels & Bizar, 2005; Nash-Ditzel, 2010; Nicaise & Gettinger, 1995; Pressley, 2002) who have contended that connection and background knowledge are effective strategies for increasing and improving reading comprehension. Although connection and background knowledge are mostly in K12 reading classrooms, only one participant in this study used them to increase reading comprehension. It is the

researcher's contention that more of the participants should have used connection and background knowledge because they are beneficial for increasing reading comprehension. This suggests that the remaining four participants were either not aware of connection and background knowledge or perhaps they were unaware of the benefits that their students would have received. Perhaps the issue for the participants was a lack of reading coursework, professional development workshops and reading experience related to the use of general reading strategies or metacognitive reading strategies. Yet the issue may be that this study used interviews as well as document analyses without the benefit of observation. Observations would have given this researcher an opportunity to pay close attention to what occurred during reading instruction rather than a verbal explanation of what occurred during reading instruction using interviews. The data that resulted from interviews and document analyses were useful; however, observation of the participants in action would have given this study an additional layer of confirmatory support.

The participants used a variety of general reading strategies to increase the reading comprehension of their struggling adult readers. Multiple strategy use is efficacious in improving the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers (Afflerbach et al., 2008a, 2008b; Daniels & Bizar, 2005; Falk-Ross, 2001-2002; Nash-Ditzel 2010; NICH, 2000; Nicaise & Gettinger, 1995).

Alternative Approaches to Comprehension

Additionally, the evidence revealed that there were various other approaches, that is, process of elimination, feedback, answering all questions, figure out the questions, read passage thoroughly, item analysis, and narrow down questions, that the participants

used related to test preparation that could not be categorized as reading skills, general reading strategies or metacognitive reading strategies. Process of elimination is a test taking skill (Linn & Gronlund, 1995) rather than a general reading strategy. Although a majority of the participants used feedback on assignments and assessments to enhance the reading comprehension of their struggling adult readers, it was a means of elucidating how students chose their answers as well as why they chose those answers to improve students' academic performance (Eggen & Kauchak, 2006). The information that resulted from the use of feedback helped students understand the way in which they were answering questions and to come up with alternative ways to think about how to answer questions for the sole purpose of passing future assessments. While feedback may be used to improve academic performance (Eggen & Kauchak, 2006), it is not recognized as a general reading strategy but rather a test preparation mechanism. The participants reported using item analysis; answering all questions and figuring out the questions and narrowing down questions to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers. Item analyses are used to, "identify faulty items and can provide information about student misconceptions and topics that need additional work (Linn & Gronlund, 1995, p. 315)." Again, the participants used test-taking approaches to increase the reading comprehension of their students. Test preparation approaches may increase students' academic perform on assessments; however, they are not considered to be planned tactics and are not supported by the literature. It is necessary for the participants to be able to discriminate planned tactics from test preparation methods. Consequently, there is a need for instructors of developmental reading courses to gain an in-depth knowledge of reading theory and reading pedagogy. Professional development is one

mechanism through which instructors can gain the insight and knowledge necessary to understand how planned tactics and test preparation differ and how to apply them appropriately.

Thinking Tools

There were a number of insights for Research Question 2: "What metacognitive reading strategies do instructors in developmental reading courses at Sunshine State College report using with struggling adult readers to improve reading comprehension?" Metacognitive reading strategies are deliberate, effortful conscious plans or actions used to monitor and to make the reader aware of what occurred during the reading process and included declarative, procedural as well as conditional knowledge (see Table 13). Declarative knowledge refers to what a reader knows about himself and the task at hand whereas procedural knowledge is knowing how to complete a learning task and conditional knowledge refers to knowing when, where and why to use a strategy (see Table 11). Paris et al. (1983) asserted that, "declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge and conditional knowledge are necessary ingredients for strategic behavior" (p. 304).

Table 13

Components of Metacognition: Declarative, Procedural, and Conditional Knowledge

Declarative Knowledge	Procedural Knowledge	Conditional Knowledge
• Recognizing when one knows something • Recognizing what one knows and does not know • Understanding what one needs to know • Knowing if strategies apply • Knowing if strategies are effective • Knowing what information is needed to complete a task or to reach a goal • Involves person, task and strategy variables	• Knowing how to use strategies to meet the demands of tasks • Involves person, task and strategy variables	• Recognizing when, why and where to use strategies -Why is the strategy effective? -When to apply the strategy? -When is it appropriate to use the strategy? • Involves person, task and strategy variables

Note. Developed based upon the work of Tarricone (2011).

Surprisingly, the study revealed that two of the participants claimed to be familiar with metacognitive reading strategies while the remaining participants were not; however, a majority of them believed metacognitive reading strategies to be important. The researcher anticipated that none of the participants would be familiar with them because, typically, readings skills have been used with struggling readers in K-12 as well as developmental reading courses in postsecondary institutions. What was particularly striking was that one participant likened metacognitive strategies to miscue analysis and although the participant acknowledged that he was very familiar with metacognitive reading strategies and that he would not be doing his job if he did not use them, the inclusion of miscue analysis as a metacognitive reading strategy was contradictory. Instructors and tutors use miscue analysis to determine the mistakes that students make as they read texts. It does not necessarily engage students in metacognition during the

process. Another participant believed that metacognitive reading strategies included understanding text as well as being cognizant of the thinking process. Although one of the participant's notion of metacognitive reading strategies included words such as understanding and awareness while the other used miscue analysis as an example, their depth of knowledge regarding its true essence was somewhat limited. Even though most of the participants were unfamiliar with metacognitive strategies, one may conclude that a majority of the participants believed that its use is significant in the quest for reading comprehension, but they do not have the experience nor the information needed to use them or to teach their struggling adult readers how to use metacognitive strategies.

The study also demonstrated that all of what the participants termed metacognitive reading strategies were not necessarily so (see Table 10). Reading skills are reflective of an unconscious, automatic effort unlike metacognitive reading strategies that are conscious, deliberate efforts used to increase reading comprehension. The participants relied very heavily upon the use of reading skills as they were infused into every facet of this study most likely because the foundation of Developmental Reading 2 was reading skills and because historically reading skills have been dominant. The participants inappropriately categorized planned tactics as metacognitive reading strategies. The participants inappropriately categorized planned tactics as thinking tools. Because developmental reading instructors are responsible for increasing the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers, it is imperative that they are knowledgeable about all aspects of reading. In order to rectify comprehension issues, instructors of developmental reading courses must be aware of the nuances of reading pedagogy, theory and research-based metacognitive reading strategies. This study seems to suggest that

these participants have a limited knowledge base associated with reading; therefore, it is not surprising that the categories of approaches and strategies were not solidified but rather fluid and free flowing notions unbound by definitional lines. Research Question 2 referred to the participants naming what particular metacognitive strategies they used to the increase the reading comprehension of their struggling adult readers. The participants were unable to delineate clearly planned tactics from thinking tools; therefore, it is highly unlikely that they could name their strategies with specificity, as they were unfamiliar with metacognitive strategies.

Three of the five participants used active reading (i.e., annotation and summary) with their students while two of the five participants talked about thinking in the reading classroom. Moreover, four of the five participants used at least one approach that was different from any other participants' approach; specifically, writing process, miscue analysis, visualizing and feedback. Active reading consisted of annotating and summarizing texts. Both annotation (Falk-Ross, 2001-2002; Nash-Ditzel, 2010) and summarizing are effective for improving the reading comprehension of struggling readers (Falk-Ross, 2001-2002; Mokhtari et al., 2008; Nash-Ditzel, 2010; Nicaise & Gettinger, 1995; Pressley, 2002). Some researchers classify summarizing in various ways such as a reading strategy, comprehension strategy or metacognitive strategy. Metacognitive strategies are associated with three types of knowledge; specifically, declarative, procedural and conditional (Cross & Paris, 1988; Nash-Ditzel, 2010; Paris et al., 1983; Schraw & Moshman, 1995) as well as comprehension monitoring (Reid & Lienemann, 2006). The researcher expected to find that all of the participants used annotation and summarizing in their practices because there is a great deal of critical reading that college

students must endure and understand in order to be successful in college. The fact that only three of the five participants used annotation and summarizing with their struggling adult readers was very telling. The two participants who did not use them focused more on passing the mandatory standardized test rather than the furtherance of reading comprehension. With regard to the second research question, naming the kind of metacognitive strategy that the participants employed with their struggling adult readers, the participants used annotation and summarizing to improve reading comprehension.

General reading strategies and reading skills are not metacognitive reading strategies; yet, the participants have contended that they are and have categorized them accordingly. At issue may be a lack of theoretical foundation and experience related to reading (Nash-Ditzel, 2010). For example, two participants actually had experience teaching reading in a public school setting while the other participants did not.

Thinking was included in the instruction dialog of two of the participants. Metacognition, thinking about the task, demands of the task as well as the reader, is extremely important to metacognitive reading strategies and, in fact, metacognition is the framework upon which they are constructed. Daniels and Bizar (2005) coined the term reading-as-thinking to mean that the act of reading is "a complex and specialized form of thinking (p. 34)." If one is not thinking as they are going through text, then there is no comprehending of text because "reading is thinking (p. 37)." Thinking is at the heart of reading comprehension (Daniels & Bizar, 2005). Both participants thought it very important for students to become "conscious readers" understanding their thought processes as "reading and critical thinking goes hand-in-hand." It is important for readers to be aware of what occurs during the reading process like comprehension breaking down

and what to do in order to get back on the road to comprehension. Although thinking is not necessarily a metacognitive strategy, it is a component of metacognition, often known as "thinking about thinking." It must be a viable means of aiding struggling readers in improving their reading comprehension. The inclusion of thinking strategies during reading instruction would be beneficial in improving reading comprehension.

The contrast among the participants regarding metacognitive strategies use ranged from teaching the writing process to visualizing. Teaching the writing process, feedback and miscue analysis are not metacognitive strategies, but are necessary components of reading comprehension instruction. Visualizing is a strategy used for helping students to understand reading material (Daniels & Bizar, 2005). Levels of Imagination Strategy, a participant developed strategy, included auditory level, visualization level and abstract level. It was included under the general reading strategy category as well as the metacognitive strategy category based upon the participant's response to specific questions. This approach draws on the imagination of those using it and parts of it are actually general reading strategies while visualization is a metacognitive strategy. Visualization for another participant was not actually visualization but instead a learning style. Although the participant spoke about using visualization to the increase the reading comprehension of her struggling adult readers, what she actually described was in reality a visual learner. Consequently, the participant did not truly use visualization to help students improve their reading comprehension but described how she used visuals with them and how they helped her, personally, to understand.

Paucity of Self-Monitoring. The evidence demonstrated that a majority of the participants did not use self-monitoring to increase the reading comprehension of their

students. Self-monitoring is a component of metacognitive reading strategies. Two of the five participants referred to self-monitoring either explicitly or implicitly during their interviews. According to Reid and Lienemann (2006), "self-regulation is critical" (p. 28) because it increases engagement as one completes tasks and it "typically" (p. 28) enhances performance. This finding was astonishing since all of the participants acknowledged using metacognitive reading strategies, but three of the participants did not include it in any of the interview sessions while one of the two remaining participants had a nominal amount to say about self-monitoring and the other was a little more verbose in his contention. Self-monitoring was situated in the context of the SQ3R Study Method for one participant while the other participant couched his understanding of self-monitoring in his self-developed strategies known as IOM Strategy and Three Levels of Imagination in addition to miscue analysis (see Table 10).

Self-monitoring is vital to metacognitive reading strategies. The participants were unaware that self-regulation included planning, monitoring, failure detention and failure correction (Reid & Lienemann, 2006). Consequently, even though one participant acknowledged that self-monitoring was included in her instruction, the data did not reveal that and eventually the finding did not support her contention that she, "employed that self-regulation throughout." On the other hand, the learning specialist felt very strongly about using metacognition and posited that students' awareness of their strategies was essential (Reid & Lienemann, 2006). One concept that this specialist focused on was "metacognitive feedback, constantly monitoring [that] their habits are actually turning out the results they want." Furthermore, he proclaimed that, "them [students] having an awareness of their own strategies is probably one of the most important things like

student self-management." In the context of the IOM Strategy, the notion of monitoring examined the effectiveness of the habit or strategy itself and not specifically the difficulties that may have occurred during the reading process; therefore, the monitoring associated with the IOM Strategy diverged somewhat from the understanding found in the literature and one may conclude that they are not the same. The act of monitoring comprehension occurs as the individual reads the text and determines if comprehension has broken down and what to do if it does break down and then what to do if the strategy chosen by the individual is not effective in that particular context. So, in other words, comprehension monitoring occurs during reading, monitoring in the IOM Strategy is not expansive in that the student does not evaluate the focus strategy in order to come up with alternative strategies during reading that may enhance reading comprehension, but holds the strategy in abeyance until there is a tutoring session. The point of self-monitoring is for the reader to pay close attention when comprehension breaks down and what to do when the break down occurs. The student only evaluates the strategy's overall effectiveness in the IOM Strategy that is somewhat different from what actually occurs during reading.

There was not an expectation that the learning specialist (Participant 2) would be the participant who had discussed self-monitoring most often and, in fact, who really demonstrated that he actually used a form of what he considered self-monitoring with his tutees. The learning specialist used planning, monitoring, failure detection and failure correction (Reid & Lienemann, 2006) with his tutees after they had read text, but not actually during reading. This finding was quite illuminating because the researcher anticipated that if any of the participants were to use self-monitoring with their students,

the instructors of developmental reading courses would have presented such confirmatory support, but contrary to expectation, the learning specialist did.

The findings indicated that the participants did not typically use metacognitive reading strategies with their struggling adult readers. The lack of discourse about monitoring comprehension was truly eye opening. Because comprehension monitoring is so vitally important and struggling adult readers are in need of such monitoring, and because the literature substantiates the use of self-monitoring approaches in increasing the reading comprehension of struggling readers (Nash-Ditzel, 2010), developmental reading instructors must employ it during reading instruction. According to the findings of this study, metacognitive reading strategies should be a focus in syllabi, instructional practice, and professional development for developmental reading instructors.

Dearth of Inference Discourse. The most surprising revelation related to Research Question 2 was the lack of discourse among participants about inference as a metacognitive reading strategy. That finding was simply astounding because the literature consistently supports the use of inference as a means of assisting students with reading comprehension problems (Grabe, 1999; Nahatame, 2014); however, the participants did not use inference as a metacognitive reading strategy, but a reading skill. Metacognitive reading strategies are conscious, effortful and deliberate while reading skills are unconscious and automatic. The participants used inference as an unconscious, automatic process rather than as a conscious, effortful process. It is very likely that the participants were unaware that inference maybe categorized as a reading skill or as a metacognitive reading strategy depended upon the nature and content of reading instruction. Based upon the resulting data from interviews as well as document analyses,

the participants used inference as a skill; however, the inclusion of observation in this study may have illuminated the nuances of inference during instruction that may have confirmed, or not confirmed that the participants used inference as a metacognitive reading strategy.

General Implications

Implications for Instructional Practice in Developmental Reading Courses.

There were several implications from the study. The first implication of the study is the need for instructors to have had some reading coursework that included reading pedagogy, reading theory, (Nash-Ditzel, 2010) research-based planned tactics (Falk-Ross, 2001-2002), and metacognitive reading strategies. The second implication is a change in the curriculum that instructors of developmental reading courses use with their students. Because the curriculum is foundational as far as instruction is concerned and, in some cases, may drive instruction, a change of curriculum is in order to encompass research-based planned tactics as well as metacognitive reading strategies. The third implication is the need for instructors to make a conscious and deliberate effort to determine what planned tactics and metacognitive strategies used during instruction and not to use a "sidebar approach" or unintentional approach to reading comprehension. In other words, the use of strategies and metacognitive strategies should not be an addendum to instruction but rather the fulcrum of it. The goal of developmental reading instruction is to increase and improve the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers so that they can pass their entrance examinations, complete their college-leveled course work as well as become confident readers. Reading comprehension instruction should include an integrated model of reading comprehension that would incorporate the use of reading

skills, planned tactics, metacognitive reading strategies, student developed strategies (Falk-Ross, 2001-2002), and active inquiry. Use of an integrated model of reading comprehension would not only increase reading comprehension but also help the students in becoming independent, confident readers capable of understanding college-leveled texts as well as entertaining texts.

The forth implication is related to the coding of the participants' interview transcripts. The coding needed to reflect the language used by the participants. For example, two of the participants talked about helping their students to think about what they have read and making them aware of their thinking process. However, the researcher did not code "thinking" as metacognition, or metacognitive reading strategies, but generally as thinking about the content or problem. Metacognition is thinking about thinking that includes monitoring and controlling, while metacognitive reading strategies are tools and/or strategies used to monitor and to control what occurs during the reading process. Although thinking is a component of metacognition, the researcher's definition of metacognition may have restricted the coding of the transcripts. If the researcher had used the language of the participants in coding the transcripts, perhaps the results of the study may have reflected a more expansive use of metacognitive reading strategies by the participants.

The fifth implication is that the participants' language be included as a foundational unit for professional development. For future developmental reading instructors, using their own language from interviews may help in incorporate innovations into their personal practices. The final implication supports that required training and preparation of instructors should include the language (key concepts and

vocabulary) of the reading discipline to describe their practice. Additionally, there is a need for instructors to be reflective practitioners who are cognizant of the need to improve their practice.

Implications: Policy Changes and Struggling Readers. Policy for professional development need to be established and instituted by the Florida lawmakers so that instructors of developmental reading courses are knowledgeable about reading pedagogy, reading theory, general and metacognitive reading strategies as ways of assisting their struggling adult readers. Professional development was, basically, an anomaly for the participants or perhaps the term professional development was a new concept for them. One out five participants reported attending professional development activities related to developmental reading. Participant 4 was the only participant who attended a conference, but she only attended one break out session. For the most part, the conference included a great deal of conversation about Senate Bill 1720 that effectively crippled developmental reading. This study would seem to indicate that there is a need for relevant and on-going professional development activities that emphasizes pedagogy, current reading theory and research-based practices related to general reading strategies and metacognitive reading strategies. Professional development should be conducted, at least partially, in-house (Nash-Ditzel, 2010) on a continuous basis because "practices accompanied by systematic professional development are more likely to be adopted and used correctly" (Reid & Lienemann, 2006, p. 12). It would include but not be limited to topics such as the reading process and the [adult] learner (Reid & Lienemann, 2006); "critical knowledge" of current reading theory and pedagogy (p. 16); direct instruction model used with planned tactics as well as metacognitive reading strategies, and so forth.

Senate Bill 1720 required state colleges to *tailor* developmental programs to meet the needs of their students with the ultimate goal of students' successfulness in college coursework (S. Bill 1720, 2013). In the past, students who took state college entrance examinations were required to take developmental education courses before taking college-leveled coursework. However, Senate Bill 1720 has effectively given students choice in how to proceed if they are not successful when taking the college entrance examination based upon certain criteria. "Students whose test scores indicate the need for developmental education must be advised of options and may enroll in the developmental education options of their choice" (The Florida Senate, 2013, p. 4). Additionally, for some students, taking college entrance examinations will be optional and they will not have to enroll in developmental education courses. "Students who entered 9th grade in a Florida public school in 2003-2004 or thereafter and who earned a standard Florida high school diploma; or students who are serving as active duty members of the U.S. Armed Services" (p. 4). The exempted students "may request assessment and may enroll in developmental education if they wish" (p. 5). What will these changes mean for state colleges?

These changes have far-reaching implications. For example, the number of developmental education instructors will decrease. As the researcher declared in Chapter 3, there were 27 potential participants and this study was initially slated to use 16 participants of those 27 potential participants; nonetheless, after the passing of Senate Bill 1720, the pool of possible participants dwindled as courses had been redesigned as hybrid courses to include reading and writing as opposed to reading only. Another probable implication of the policy change is that state colleges will decrease the number

of courses used for developmental education and combining of reading and writing courses will be the result. Because two groups of individuals are not required to take state colleges examinations, the number of students taking those assessments will diminish and with that decline, of course, the issue of dwindling tuition would naturally result. Although some students may be exempted from taking the test, those very students may be struggling adult readers in need of intensive instruction, but elect not to take courses needed to ensure that their reading comprehension increases so that they can successfully complete college-leveled work. If students who need intensive reading instruction opt out, then there will be fewer students graduating from state colleges and as a result, lower retention rates for those colleges. Lower retention rates translate into less funding for state colleges.

The long-term effect of Senate Bill 1720 will not be determined for years to come; nevertheless, there may be unintentional costly byproducts such as a less qualified workforce and loss of income for those without college degrees that may impact society-at-large not just state colleges. Because literacy problems are prevalent, perhaps, sometime in the very near future, we will see a downside to the institution of Senate Bill 1720 and exactly what that institution means for state colleges.

Recommendations

Instructional Practice. This study's contribution to the literature is that it highlights the fact that instructors of developmental reading courses do not typically instruct their students about how to use metacognitive reading strategies to improve and increase reading comprehension. Throughout the study, each participant at one point or another during the study cross-categorized Rote Routines, Planned Tactics, and Thinking

Tools. Perhaps it's more important for instructors to identify appropriate and relevant approaches based upon the needs of their students rather than appropriate categorization. Yet, it is imperative that the instructors recognize that the ultimate goal for their struggling adult readers is to note when they do not comprehend what they have read and to be able to acknowledge that discrepancy and to do something to rectify the comprehension issue (Reid & Lienemann, 2006). Additionally, instructors of developmental reading courses need to be cognizant of the approaches that they use with their students rather than use a "side-bar approach" or unintentional approach where it is "oh by the way, this will help you with understanding what you read" instead of planning for direct instruction.

Prior to instruction, instructors of developmental reading courses should consciously decide what approach or strategy to use during instruction and plan accordingly. In fact, instructors must use explicit instruction with their struggling adult readers so that students are getting an introduction, modeling, guided practice, independent practice, feedback as well as a judicious review associated with research-based general reading strategy and metacognitive strategy use over a period of time, and not just one moment in time. The direct instruction model (explicit instruction) is an effective method of instruction for general reading strategies and metacognitive reading strategies when used with fidelity (Eggen & Kauchak, 2006; Simpson & Nist, 2000).

Paris et al. (1996) have declared that there is "no consensus among researchers when it comes to defining reading strategies (p. 610)." To make the skill-strategy quandary more opaque, they argued that skills could become strategies when used "intentionally" and strategies can "go underground and become a skill (Vygotsky, 1978).

In addition, they contended that, "strategies are skills under consideration" (p. 611). The researcher was somewhat perplexed and confounded by exactly how to address the differences in the current study, especially, in light of the fact that this study used interviews and document analyses without the benefit of observations. Observations may have assisted the researcher with a more in-depth assessment of just how the participants defined and used inferences as well as the nuances of what occurred during actual classroom instruction. If the experts were at a loss when clearly distinguishing skills from strategies, then certainly it would not be astonishing to find laity perplexed by the matter. Additional research is needed to clarify the nuances of reading skills and strategies so that there is a common language coming from experts not a conundrum of murkiness, but one of transparency and clarity (Afflerbach et al., 2008a, 2008b) so that a unit of understanding can be attained by laity, not only that, but apply that understanding to instructional practice. After all, improving instructional practice ought to be the crux of instruction. Consequently, there is a need for systematic professional development.

Professional Development. Professional development is an essential component in improving the instructional practices of reading instructors. Components of professional development should include pedagogy, current reading theory, current reading research and research-based general reading strategies as well as metacognitive reading strategies with some focus on differentiating skills from strategies, distinguishing general reading strategies and metacognitive reading strategies. The key to developing professional development would be to include the voices of the participants as a backdrop to scaffolding their learning of general reading strategies and metacognitive reading strategies. The relevance of using the participants' voices can help instructors connect

their understanding of strategies and skills with reading theories, pedagogy, reading research, research-based strategies as well examining the needs of their students. In addition, professional development would include various approaches to reading comprehension that would not be limited solely to reading skills, but inclusive of general reading strategies, active inquiry, metacognitive reading strategies as well as student-developed strategies.

Systematic professional development would start at the beginning of the academic year and continue throughout the year. Initially, the participants would complete a questionnaire and based upon the results of the questionnaire, the researcher would develop the professional development framework using the participants' language. Then the participants would complete activities such as keep a reflective journal, engage in collaborative learning with their peers, examine the curriculum to determine how those texts support the use of strategies, etc and use the knowledge garnered through those activities to deepen their knowledge of tools to assist their students with increasing reading comprehension and improving their practice. Finally, the participants would complete a post-questionnaire to determine their insights and understanding of the professional development content as well as their perception of how to apply the lessons learned.

State Colleges. It is the norm for adjuncts rather than full-time professors to teach developmental reading courses and earn far less income. Part-time, adjunct professors play a crucial role in developmental reading and need to be equipped with reading theories associated with struggling adult readers (Nash-Ditzel, 2010). Perhaps the issue is a lack of knowledge about the whys of planned tactics and metacognitive strategies use

and activities associated with them (Reid & Lienemann, 2006) rather than the employment status of instructors as Nash-Ditzel (2010) has suggested. Maybe the problem has to do with credentialing associated with the hiring process. Reading course work is not a requirement for the credentialing of potential developmental reading instructors. One participant, credentialed as a developmental reading teacher, is degreed in writing and had virtually no experience in teaching reading. There needs to be a change of requirements in the credentialing process at the state college level in order to ensure that reading instructors are prepared, adequately, for the task of supporting struggling adult readers. The time has come for higher education stakeholders to recognize the need to employ scholarly instructors who are well-versed regarding reading theory and practice (Nash-Ditzel, 2010) and who are well-equipped to teach struggling adult readers how to use general reading strategies as well as metacognitive reading strategies. Historically, sub-skills have been a mainstay in higher education institutions. Today, to challenge the status quo is to use curriculum that is indicative of a more inclusive model of reading comprehension; namely, one that includes reading skills, general reading strategies tactics, metacognitive reading strategies student developed strategies as well as active inquiry.

Future Research. Does it really matter if instructors call the approaches reading skills, planned tactics or metacognitive strategies? Perhaps an inclusive model of reading comprehension may best serve struggling adult readers. An integrated model of reading comprehension would include active inquiry, reading skills, general reading strategies, metacognitive reading strategies, and a mechanism for student-developed strategies. Such a model would not be hierarchical in its functioning, but rather would resemble a circular

model wherein every aspect of the model integrated throughout instruction and not taught as separate units. Instruction would not only include active inquiry, reading skills but also various kinds of strategies with the ultimate goal of students developing their own strategies for purposes of ownership and transfer of them.

Instructional practice with such a model would no longer resemble textbook driven, reading skills-based narrow instruction containing passages and paragraphs with multiple-choice questions that have traditionally been the main staples of developmental reading of antiquity. It would be a more inclusive attempt that would include active inquiry, reading skills, planned tactics, metacognitive strategies as well as student developed strategies to increase and improve the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers. An integrated model would necessitate a shift from a curriculum that is reading skills-based solely to one that includes active inquiry, reading skills, general reading strategies, metacognitive reading strategies as well as student-developed strategies.

In other words, there would be a paradigm shift from reading skills to include other approaches used with developmental reading students. Was Participant 2's notion of students developing their strategies tenable? The literature does support the use of students developing their own strategies (Falk-Ross, 2001-2002) to increase reading comprehension, but the mechanism for how to accomplish that needs development, during an in-depth study.

Though the literature substantiated the use of one-to-one instruction and conferencing for increasing and improving the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers, they are outside the purview of this study because the study involved what

instructors of developmental reading courses reported using to aid their students reading comprehension and researcher did not collect enough data to elaborate on it. Future studies might explore the value of one-to-one instruction as part of a larger framework for reading instruction with struggling readers.

Although there were data collected via interviews and document analyses, observations and textbook analyses would have solidified the researcher's understanding of what constituted reading instruction and the nuances of what was included by the participants. Furthermore, textbook analyses would have afforded the researcher an opportunity to confirm what the researcher discovered in the documents that supplied by the participants as well as the interviews.

Further ongoing research needs to examine the ramifications of Senate Bill 1720 for state colleges, developmental reading courses, developmental reading instructors as well as students. Moreover, because there is little research involving developmental reading instructors' practices, additional studies are necessary to illuminate what they use and what they do to increase the reading comprehension of their struggling adult readers and how effective those tools are for enhancing comprehension.

Chapter Summary

This research study examined the use of metacognitive reading strategies in addition to what developmental reading instructors used to increase and improve the reading comprehension of their struggling adult readers. There were two remarkable understandings that were unearthed during the study. First, there was a dearth of discourse related to the use of inference as a metacognitive strategy. Secondly, there was limited use of self-monitoring as dictated by the literature. Typically, instructors of

developmental reading courses do not instruct their students in how to use metacognitive reading strategies; however, this study demonstrated that they use a vast array of approaches and strategies including limited metacognitive reading strategies to enhance the reading comprehension of their students. The participants used reading skills, planned tactics, limited metacognitive strategies as well as other approaches with their struggling adult readers to increase and improve reading comprehension.

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Pre-Data Collection Codes

Manual Codes	ATLAS.ti Codes	Final Codes
ACT – Activity	ACT – Activity	ACT – Activity
ANA – Analyzing	ANT – Annotating	ANT – Annotating
ANT – Annotating	AR – Active Reading	AR – Active Reading
AR – Active Reading	ASAR – Assist Struggling Readers	ASAR – Assist Struggling Readers
ASAR – Assist Struggling Readers	ASG – Assignment	ASG – Assignment
ASG – Assignment	ASM – Assessment	ASM – Assessment
ASM – Assessment	CK – Conditional Knowledge	CK – Conditional Knowledge
C – Connection	CWT – Conversation with Text	CWT – Conversation with Text
CK – Conditional Knowledge	DK – Declarative Knowledge	DK – Declarative Knowledge
CWT – Conversation with Text	DPCK – Declarative, Procedural & Conditional Knowledge	DPCK – Declarative, Procedural & Conditional Knowledge
DK – Declarative Knowledge	FB – Feedback	EVAL – Evaluation
DPCK – Declarative, Procedural & Conditional Knowledge	F/UFMRS –Familiar/Unfamiliar with Metacognitive Reading Strategies	INF – Inference
EVAL – Evaluation	LS – Learning Style	LS – Learning Style
F/UMRS – Familiar with Metacognitive Reading Strategies	MF – Metacognitive Feedback	MRS – Metacognitive Reading Strategies
INF – Inference	MRS – Metacognitive Reading Strategies	NDK – No Declarative Knowledge
IRU – Instructor Reported Use	MS – Metacognitive Skills	NCK – No Conditional Knowledge
LS – Learning Style	MT – Metacognitive Technique	NPK – No Procedural Knowledge
MRS – Metacognitive Reading Strategies	MTU - Metacognitive Tutoring	QUA – Question Answering
MT – Metacognitive Technique	NDCPK -- No Declarative, Conditional or Procedural Knowledge	QUG – Question Generation
NCK – No Conditional Knowledge	RMRS – Rationale for Metacognitive Reading Strategies	RCS – Reading Comprehension Strategies
NDK – No Declarative Knowledge	S/D MRS – Stated/Described Metacognitive Reading Strategies	RI – Reading Instruction
NPK – No Procedural Knowledge	T – Thinking	SDS – Student Developed Strategy

NDCPK -- No Declarative, Conditional/Procedural Knowledge	TO -- Test Oriented	SK – Skills
QUA – Question Answering	TP -- Test Preparation	SM – Self-Monitoring/Monitoring Comprehension
QUG – Question Generation	TSB -- Traditional Skills-Based	SU – Summarizing
RCS – Reading Comprehension Strategies	VM -- Visual Manifestation	SYN – Synthesize
RI – Reading Instruction	UMRS – Use Metacognitive Reading Strategies	TS – Tool/Strategies
SDS – Student Developed Strategy	FL – Fluency	TP – Test Preparation
SK – Skills	GO -- Graphic Organizer	VIS – Visualization
SM – Self-Monitoring/Monitoring Comprehension	ISU -- Independent Strategy Use	VOC – Vocabulary
ST – Strategies	IS -- Indirect Strategies	NDPCK – No Declarative, Procedural/Conditional Know.
SU – Summarizing	IOM – IOM Strategy	C – Connection
SYN – Synthesize	LOI -- Levels of Imagination	PK – Procedural Knowledge
TP – Test Preparation	MA -- Miscue Analysis	ST – Strategies
TS – Tools/Strategies	MAS -- Mostly About Strategies -Mentions Metacognitive	
UMRS -- – Use Metacognitive Reading Strategies	MC -- Monitoring Comprehension	
VIS - Visualization	MET -- Most Effective Tool	
V OC – Vocabulary	OS -- Other Strategies	
PK – Procedural Knowledge	OL –Outline	
	PS --Periphery Strategies	
	PRE – Prediction	
	PRO – Prosody	
	PU -- Purpose for Reading	
	RA -- Read Aloud	
	RR -- Reading Rate	
	RE – Rereading	
	SC – Scenarios	
	ST – Strategies	
	SS -- Strategies as Skills	
	SNU -- Strategies not Used	
	SW -- Strategy Works Every-time	
	SDS -- Student Developed Strategy	
	TRS -- Terrible Strategies	
	TF -- Text Features	
	TT -- Tips & Tricks	
	VOC – Vocabulary	
	UT -- Unpacking Text	
	USS -- Uses Skills as Strategies	
	HLS -- Higher Level Strategies	
	SK – Skills	
	MBMRS – Most Beneficial Metacognitive Reading Strat.	
	EC -- Extraneous Codes	

Note. Extraneous Codes were not included in the list of ATLAS.ti Codes.

Appendix B. Sunshine State College Researcher Study Approval Form

Sunshine State College

Research/Study Approval

Non-Sunshine State College Personnel

Name: _____ Date: _____

Title: _____

Agency/University: _____

Title of research/study: _____

Purpose of study: _____

Level I Approval: (Institutional Research & Effectiveness)

Name: _____ Title: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Level II Approval: (provost)

Name: _____ Title: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Level III Approval: (cluster/department administrator)

Name: _____ Title: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Buckley Amendment

Requesting Agency:_____ Date:_____

File/Data: _____

Purpose/Use: _____

Public Law 93-380, Privacy Rights of Parents and Students, commonly known as the "Buckley Amendment," limits the availability of personally identifiable records of students. Educational institutions conducting studies for the purpose of improving instruction are permitted access to these records "if such studies are conducted in such a manner as will not permit the personal identification of students and their parents by persons other than representatives of such organizations and such information will be destroyed when no longer needed for the purpose for which it is collected." Access to these records or copies of these records may not be given by you to any other person or agency.

It is under this justification and these restraints that these records are made available to you. Acceptance and subsequent use of the records will constitute recognition of and adherence to the above limitations regarding use of these records.

I understand the above limitations and agree to adhere to them.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Appendix C. State Course Description

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

STATEWIDE COURSE NUMBERING SYSTEM

STATEWIDE COURSE DETAIL

Prefix	Course Number	Lab	Course Title / Description	Status	Course Intent	Prerequisites	Corequisites	Common Prereq.	Dual Enroll.	High School Credit	Transfer Info.	Reserved Date
153 – READING												
REA – READING												
REA	001	Y	COLLEGE PREP READING-NONTRANSFERABLE READING SKILLS COURSE DESIGNED FOR THE STUDENT WHO NEEDS TO DEVELOP BASIC VOCABULARY AND READING SKILLS, WITH EMPHASIS ON THE LITERAL COMPREHENSION SKILLS.	RESERVED	PREP			N	Y	ELECTIVE	NOT AUTOMATICALLY TRANSFERABLE	1/31/2012
REA	002	Y	COLLEGE PREP READING 2-NONTRANSFERABLE WORD ATTACK, LISTENING, DICTIONARY SKILLS, VOCABULARY, COMPREHENSION, AND STUDY SKILLS.	RESERVED	PREP			N	Y	ELECTIVE	NOT AUTOMATICALLY TRANSFERABLE	1/31/2012
REA	003	Y	APPL REA/ APPL REA ESL (NONTRANSFERABLE) WORD ATTACK, LISTENING, DICTIONARY SKILLS, VOCABULARY, COMPREHENSION, AND STUDY SKILLS.	RESERVED	PREP			N	Y	ELECTIVE	NOT AUTOMATICALLY TRANSFERABLE	1/31/2012

REA	004	Y	APPL READING 2 (NONTRANSFERABLE)	RESERVED	PREP		N	Y	ELECTIVE	NOT AUTOMATICALLY TRANSFERABLE	1/31/2012
			WORD ATTACK, LISTENING, DICTIONARY SKILLS, VOCABULARY, COMPREHENSION, AND STUDY SKILLS.								
REA	005	N	APPLIED READING 2I (NONTRANSFERABLE)	RESERVED	NOT A VALID CODE		N	Y	ELECTIVE	GUARANTEED TRANSFER TO INSTITUTION OFFERING SAME COURSE.	3/10/2005
REA	006	Y	BASIC READING SKILLS	RESERVED	PREP	SCORE ON CPT TEST	N	Y	ELECTIVE	NOT AUTOMATICALLY TRANSFERABLE	1/31/2012
			(THIS COURSE DOES NOT APPLY TO THE ASSOCIATE'S DEGREE) THIS BASIC READING COURSE DEVELOPS PHONICS, VOCABULARY, COMPREHENSION, LEARNING STRATEGIES, AND STUDY SKILLS PRESENTED THROUGH A WIDE RANGE OF INTERDISCIPLINARY READINGS. THIS COURSE IS DESIGNED FOR REVIEW PRIOR TO READING SKILLS. STUDENTS MUST SATISFY APPROPRIATE EXIT LEVEL SCORES TO COMPLETE THIS COURSE SUCCESSFULLY.								
REA	007	N	DEVELOPMENTAL READING 1	ACTIVE	PREP		N	Y	ELECTIVE	NOT AUTOMATICALLY TRANSFERABLE	
			TOPICS INCLUDE: MAIN IDEA; SUPPORTING DETAILS; AUTHORS PURPOSE; AUTHORS TONE; FACT & OPINION; ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERNS; RELATIONSHIPS; VOCABULARY IN CONTEXT; INFERENCE & CONCLUSIONS; REASONING & ARGUMENT.								
REA	008	N	READING SKILLS I	ACTIVE	PREP		N	Y	ELECTIVE	NOT AUTOMATICALLY TRANSFERABLE	
			AN INTENSIVE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM DESIGNED TO UPGRADE STUDENT'S LEVEL OF READING PROFICIENCY.								
REA	010	Y	READING SKILLS LAB I (NONTRANSFERABLE)	ACTIVE	PREP		N	Y	ELECTIVE	NOT AUTOMATICALLY TRANSFERABLE	

			EMPHASIS UPON SPECIFIC INDIVIDUAL NEEDS IN VOCABULARY, COMPREHENSION, CRITICAL READING, AND RATE DEVELOPMENT. INDIVIDUALIZED, SELF-PACED PRACTICE IN SPECIFIC SKILLS -- NOT FOR COLLEGE CREDIT; CLAST REVIEW EMPHASIS.								
REA	011	N	READING SKILLS LAB II (NONTRANSFERABLE)	ACTIVE	PREP	PRIOR READING LAB COURSE	N	Y	ELECTIVE	NOT AUTOMATICALLY TRANSFERABLE	
			AN INDIVIDUALIZED PROGRAM DESIGNED TO IMPROVE READING READING HABITS. EMPHASIS IS ON COMPREHENSION SKILLS AND METHODS OF VOCABULARY BUILDING. OBJECTIVES: 1. RECOGNIZE MAIN IDEA AND SUPPORTING DETAIL 2. DETERMINE MEANING OF WORDS FROM CONTEXT 3. RECOGNIZE AUTHOR'S PURPOSE 4. DISTINGUISH STATEMENTS OF FACT AND OPINION AND DETECT BIAS 5. RECOGNIZE AUTHOR'S TONE AND OVERALL PATTERN OF ORGANIZATION 6. RECOGNIZE MAIN IDEA AND SUPPORTING DETAILS 7. RECOGNIZE VALID ARGUMENTS AND DRAW LOGICAL INFERENCES AND CONCLUSIONS							
REA	012	Y	SPECIALIZED READING (DEAF)	RESERVED	PREP		N	Y	ELECTIVE	NOT AUTOMATICALLY TRANSFERABLE	1/31/2012
			A COURSE FOR DEAF ONLY. DESIGNED TO REVIEW READING BASICS AND TO IMPROVE FUNDAMENTAL READING TECHNIQUES.								
REA	014	N	APPLIED READING	RESERVED	PREP		N	Y	ELECTIVE	NOT AUTOMATICALLY TRANSFERABLE	1/31/2012
			WORD ATTACK, LISTENING, DICTIONARY SKILLS, VOCABULARY, COMPREHENSION, AND STUDY SKILLS.								
REA	017	N	DEVELOPMENTAL READING 2	ACTIVE	PREP		N	Y	ELECTIVE	NOT AUTOMATICALLY TRANSFERABLE	
			TOPICS INCLUDE: MAIN IDEA; SUPPORTING DETAILS; AUTHORS PURPOSE; AUTHORS TONE; FACT & OPINION; ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERNS; RELATIONSHIPS; BIAS; VOCABULARY IN CONTEXT; INFERENCE & CONCLUSIONS; REASONING & ARGUMENT								

REA	019	N	DEVELOPMENTAL READING COMBINED	ACTIVE	PREP	PLACEMENT TEST SCORES.	N	Y	ELECTIVE	GUARANTEED TRANSFER TO INSTITUTION OFFERING SAME COURSE.

THIS COURSE IS DESIGNED TO DEVELOP BASIC READING SKILLS NECESSARY FOR SUCCESS IN COLLEGIATE STUDIES. TOPICS INCLUDE MAIN IDEA, SUPPORTING DETAILS, THE PURPOSE AND TONE OF THE AUTHOR, FACT AND OPINION, ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERNS, RELATIONSHIPS, VOCABULARY IN CONTEXT, INFERENCE AND CONCLUSIONS, REASONING AND ARGUMENT. CREDIT IS NOT APPLICABLE TOWARD A.A. OR A.S. DEGREES. THIS COURSE MAY BE REPEATED UP TO 3 TIMES.

Course Outline for REA0007 - DEVELOPMENTAL READ 1

Full Course Title: Developmental Reading 1 (Prep)

Course Description: This course provides students with a comprehensive approach to college reading. It covers the reading process, reading aids, basic vocabulary skills, and literal comprehension skills. REA0007 prepares students for REA0017 and helps them apply their reading skills to other college courses. REA0007 includes a required lab component. Students should expect to spend time outside of class week completing lab assignments in the Student Learning Center.

Credit Hours: 3 **Clock Hours:** 48 **Lecture Hours:** 48

Lab Hours: **Clinical Hours:**

Funding Category: College Preparatory

General Education Status: Yes

Gordon Rule: No

Pre-requisite Courses: CPT score of 0-60 (RC) or PERT score of 50-83

Co-requisite Courses: SLS1501

Materials/equipment/Links required by student: None

Course Effective Term: Spring, 2012

Course Outline Creation Term: Spring, 2008

Course Outline Revision Term: Fall, 2011

Special Fees:

- **$25.00** - Regular classroom course with intermittent instructions/use of computer lab.

Course Fee Revision Date: 5/17/2010

Course Learning Outcomes:

Identify the topic and stated/implied main idea in a paragraph in print and online.

Identify specific information in a paragraph.

Distinguish between major and minor details in a paragraph.

Identify the authorâ€™s primary purpose as persuade, inform, or entertain.

Recognize the authorâ€™s attitude.

Distinguish between facts and opinions.

Identify the following primary patterns of organization in a paragraph such as time order, simple listing, and generalization/definition and example.

Identify the transition words that are associated with each pattern.

Recognize relationships within/between sentences.

Identify and use context clues to determine the meaning of words in simple sentences.

Identify logical inferences and conclusions based on the evidence provided in a paragraph.

Recognize the point and support of an argument.

Methods of Assessment:

- **Objective Tests**
- **Essay Tests**
- **Projects**
- **Studio/Lab Performance**
- **Group Participation**
- **Comprehensive Final Exam**
- **Other**
- **1. Reading Diagnostic Exam; 2. Informal Assessment**

Course Outline for REA0017 - DEVELOPMENTAL READ 2

Full Course Title: Developmental Reading 2 (Prep)

Course Description: This course provides an intensive review of the reading skills necessary for success in college. In addition to vocabulary and comprehension, it emphasizes critical and analytical reading. Students apply higher level reading strategies to college-level reading selections. REA0017 includes a required lab component. Students should expect to spend time outside of class week completing Lab assignments in the Student Learning Center.

Credit Hours: 3 **Clock Hours:** 48 **Lecture Hours:** 48

Lab Hours: **Clinical Hours:**

Funding Category: College Preparatory

General Education Status: Yes

Gordon Rule: No

Pre-requisite Courses: CPT score of 61-82 (RC), or PERT score of 84-103, or successful completion of REA0007

Co-requisite Courses: SLS1501

Materials/equipment/Links required by student: None

Course Effective Term: Spring, 2012

Course Outline Creation Term: Spring, 2008

Course Outline Revision Term: Fall, 2011

Special Fees:

- **$25.00** - Regular classroom course with intermittent instructions/use of computer lab.

Course Fee Revision Date: 5/17/2010

Course Learning Outcomes:

Identify the topic and stated/implied main idea in a multi-paragraph selection in print and online.

Identify specific information in a multi-paragraph selection.

Identify specific information in a multi-paragraph selection.

Distinguish between major and minor details in a multi-paragraph selection.

Analyze the authorâ€™s primary purpose.

Analyze the authorâ€™s tone and support with examples, including denotative, connotative meaning, and figurative language.

Evaluate the authorâ€™s use of facts and opinions.

Determine the primary and secondary patterns of organization for a paragraph and multi-paragraph selection.

Identify the transition words that are associated with each pattern.

Identify relationships between and/or within sentences.

Detect bias.

Use contextual clues and structural analysis to clarify meanings and broaden academic vocabulary.

Identify and use contextual clues to determine the meaning of words in multiple sentences.

Analyze the details to infer what the author is implying and draw logical conclusions in a paragraph and multi-paragraph selection.

Synthesize the information in a text in order to make inferences and draw logical conclusions.

Determine whether an argument is logical, relevant, and adequate based on the evidence provided in a passage.

Methods of Assessment:

- **Objective Tests**
- **Essay Tests**
- Projects
- Studio/Lab Performance
- Group Participation
- Comprehensive Final Exam
- Other
- 1. Reading Diagnostic Exam; 2. Informal Assessment; 3. State Exit Exam

Appendix F. Document Summary Form

Source/Site of Document: _____ Date Received: _____

Document Title: _____

DOCUMENT TYPE

____syllabus ____lesson plan ____assessment ____lecture

____PowerPoint ____assignment ____handout

DESCRIPTION OF DOCUMENT

_____

_____

_____

SIGNIFICANCE OF DOCUMENT

_____

_____

_____

_____

METACOGNITIVE READING STRATEGIES

____connecting ____questioning ____inferring ____summarizing

____synthesizing ____annotating ____evaluating ____self-monitoring

____analyzing ____visualizing

Appendix G. Content Analysis Form

Title of Document: _____Date Received: _____

Source of Document: _____ Date Completed: _____

Questions	Yes	No
1. Does the document reflect metacognitive reading strategies? RQ's 2 & 3		
2. Are there any indicators of metacognitive reading strategies use in the document? RQ's 2 & 3		
3. Are there any indicators that relate to how reading comprehension is taught in the document? RQ 1		
4. Does the document describe the kinds of metacognitive reading strategies that are taught? RQ's 2 & 3		
5. Does the document describe activities related to metacognitive reading strategies use? RQ's 2 & 3		
6. Does the document describe activities related to teaching reading comprehension? RQ 1		
7. Are there any indicators of reading comprehension strategies use found in the document? RQ 1		
8. Are there any written objectives related to the use of metacognitive reading strategies in the document? RQ's 2 & 3		
9. Are there any written objectives related to the use of reading strategies? RQ 1		
10. Does the document include objectives related to reading comprehension? RQ 1		

Questions	Explanations
11. Who developed the document and when?	
12. What is the purpose of the document?	
13. Targeted audience?	
14. What key terms are found in the document?	
15. What questions emerge?	
16. How does the document relate to metacognitive reading strategies use?	
17. How does the document relate to teaching reading comprehension?	
18. What kinds of metacognitive reading strategies are in the document?	
19. What kinds of reading comprehension strategies are in the document?	

Appendix H. Interview Protocol

Time of Interview: _____ Date: _____

Place: _____ Interviewer:_____

Interviewee: _____ Position of Interviewee:_____

Experience: _____

_____

Introduction

Good morning! My name is Audrita Drayton and I am a student from Florida Atlantic University. The purpose of two interviews is to gather data from college instructors of developmental reading courses who may use metacognitive reading comprehension strategies or other strategies and methods to increase the reading comprehension of struggling adult readers.

Any information collected will be held in the strictest confidence and will be used for the purpose of this dissertation study. Are you willing to be a participant? I will need to tape record our sessions; consequently, you will need to grant me permission to record our verbal interaction. I will provide you with a transcript of the interviews so that you can verify that I have faithfully reflected your views. This will also provide you with an opportunity to correct any errors or misinterpretations. Will you consent to having the interviews recorded? The initial interview will take 20 to 30 minutes and the second interview will take no less than 45 minutes or no more than 60 minutes. You may withdraw from this study at any time.

Brief Description of Project

This dissertation study will examine college instructors of developmental reading courses' reported use of metacognitive reading comprehension strategies with struggling adult readers.

Questions

1. How long have you been a college instructor and what is your title?
2. What courses have you taught and what courses are you currently teaching?
3. How were you prepared, professionally, to teach struggling adults to read? Were there any specific courses that you took to prepare yourself to teach struggling adult readers?
4. What certifications do you hold that are related to reading and/or developmental reading courses?
5. Have you had any other teaching experiences related to reading? Please explain.
6. Describe a typical day of Reading instruction in a class session. (RQ's 1 & 2)
7. Describe the types of in-class assignments, homework assignments and activities that you give to students. (RQ's 1 & 2)
8. How do you assist struggling adult readers with reading comprehension issues? (RQ's 1 & 2)
9. What is the difference between skills and strategies? (RQ's 1 & 2)
10. Describe a typical professional development activity related to developmental reading that you have been involved with within the last year and a half. (RQ's 1 & 2)
11. What tools and strategies do you give your students to increase reading comprehension? (RQ's 1 & 2)

12. What reading comprehension strategies do you find most beneficial for your students? (RQ 1)
13. How familiar are you with metacognitive reading comprehension strategies? (RQ 2)
14. Define metacognitive reading strategies. (RQ 2)
15. Do you use metacognitive reading strategies? Why or Why Not? (RQ 2)
16. Describe the kind of metacognitive reading strategies that you use. (RQ 2)
17. Describe how you would teach struggling adult readers to use metacognitive reading strategies. (RQ 2)
18. What metacognitive reading strategies do you find most beneficial for your students? (RQ 2)
19. Do you think there is a difference between reading strategies and metacognitive reading strategies? Why or Why Not? (RQ's 1 & 2)

Appendix I. Email Communication to Dr. Ness

Study--Supporting Secondary Readers When Teachers Provide the "What", Not the "How"
3 messages

Audrita Drayton <adrayton@my.fau.edu> Sat, Dec 3, 2011 at 6:21 PM
Reply-To: adrayton@my.fau.edu
To: mness@fordham.edu

Dr. Ness:

I am a doctoral student at Florida Atlantic University, in Boca Raton, Florida. I am working on my proposal and am very interested in replicating your study.

As you and Dr. Durkin have pointed out, there seems to be very little reading comprehension instruction taking place in classrooms. Consequently, the pith of my proposal focuses on teacher/instructor self-report regarding the use of metacognitive strategies with struggling readers in secondary as well as postsecondary institutions.

If at all possible, would you be amenable to assisting me in some way with the replication of your study (i.e., observation instrument, open-ended interview instrument, etc.)?

Thank you, in advance, for your attention to the above matters.

Audrita Drayton

Appendix J. Email Communication From Dr. Ness

MOLLY NESS <mness@fordham.edu> Mon, Dec 5, 2011 at 12:16 PM
To: adrayton@my.fau.edu

I'm happy that you've found it useful. I will attach everything I still have from the work, and hope it's of some use! Please keep me posted!

Molly K. Ness, PhD
Fordham University
Division of Curriculum & Teaching
212.636.7669
www.drmollyness.blogspot.com
http://drness.wikispaces.com

Appendix K. Institutional Review Board Letter of Approval

Institutional Review Board
Mailing Address:
Division of Research
777 Glades Rd., Bldg. 80, Rm. 106
Boca Raton, FL 33431

Tel: 561.297.0777 Fax: 561.297.2573

http://www.fau.edu/research/researchint
Michael Whitehurst, Ed.D., Chair

DATE:	December 10, 2013
TO:	Gail Burnaford, PhD
FROM:	Florida Atlantic University Social, Behavioral and Educational Research IRB
IRBNET ID #:	514761-2
PROTOCOL TITLE:	[514761-2] A Case Study of the Reported Use of Metacognitive Reading Strategies by Postsecondary Instructors of Developmental Reading Courses with Struggling Adult Readers to Increase Comprehension
PROJECT TYPE:	*New Project*
ACTION:	APPROVED
APPROVAL DATE:	December 10, 2013
EXPIRATION DATE:	December 9, 2014
REVIEW TYPE:	Expedited Review
REVIEW CATEGORY:	Expedited review category # B7

Thank you for your submission of Response/Follow-Up materials for this research study. The Florida Atlantic University Social, Behavioral and Educational Research IRB has APPROVED your *New Project*. This approval is based on an appropriate risk/benefit ratio and a study design wherein the risks have been minimized. All research must be conducted in accordance with this approved submission.

- This study is approved for a maximum of **16** subjects.
- It is important that you use the approved, stamped consent documents or procedures included with this letter.
- ****Please note that any revision to previously approved materials or procedures, including modifications to numbers of subjects, must be approved by the IRB before it is initiated.** Please use the amendment form to request IRB approval of a proposed revision.
- All SERIOUS and UNEXPECTED adverse events must be reported to this office. Please use the appropriate adverse event forms for this procedure. All regulatory and sponsor reporting requirements should also be followed, if applicable.
- Please report all NON-COMPLIANCE issues or COMPLAINTS regarding this study to this office.
- Please note that all research records must be retained for a minimum of three years.
- **This approval is valid for one year.** A Continuing Review form will be required prior to the expiration date if this project will continue beyond one year.

If you have any questions or comments about this correspondence, please contact Angela Clear at:

Institutional Review Board
Research Integrity/Division of Research
Florida Atlantic University
Bldg. 80, Rm. 106
Boca Raton, FL 33431
Phone: 561-297-0777

* Please include your protocol number and title in all correspondence with this office.

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within our records.

REFERENCES

Afflerbach, P., Pearson, P. D., & Paris, S. (2008a). Skills and strategies: Their differences, their relationships, and why it matters. In K. Mokhtari, & R. Sheorey (Eds.), *Reading strategies of first- and second- language learners: See how they read* (pp. 11–24). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Afflerbach, P., Pearson, P. D., & Paris, S. G. (2008b). Clarifying differences between reading skills and reading strategies. *The Reading Teacher, 61*(5), 364–373.

Alexander, P. A., & Fox, E. (2004). A historical perspective on reading research and practice. In D. E. Alverman, N. J. Unrau, & R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp. 33–68). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Alvarez, M. C., Armstrong, S. L., Elish-Piper, L., Matthews, M. W., & Risko, V. J. (2009). *Deconstructing the construct of 'struggling reader': Standing still or transforming expectations and instruction?* Retrieved from http://americanreadingforum.org/yearbook/yearbooks/09_yearbook/Alvarez%20and%20Armstrong.htm

Alverman, D. E. (2001). Reading adolescents' reading identities: Looking back to see ahead. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 44*(8), 676–690.

American College Testing (2006). *Reading between the lines: What the act reveals about*

college readiness in reading. Retrieved from http://www.act.org/research/policymakers/pdf/reading_report.pdf

American Institute for Research (2006). New study of the literacy of college students finds some are graduating with only basic skills. Retrieved from http://www.air.org/news/index.cfm?fa=viewContent&content_id=445

Applegate, M. D., Quinn, K. B., & Applegate, A. J. (1994). Using metacognitive strategies to enhance achievement for at-risk liberal arts college students. *Journal of Reading, 38*(1), 32–40.

Babbs, P. T., & Moe, A. J. (1983). Metacognition: A key for independent learning from text. *The Reading Teacher, 36*(4), 422–426.

Baker, L. (1985). Difference in the standards used by college students to evaluate their comprehension of expository prose. *Reading Research Quarterly, 20,* 297–313.

Baker, L. (1989). Metacognition, comprehension monitoring, and the adult reader. *Educational Psychology Review, 1*(1), 3–38.

Baker, L., & Brown, A. L. (1980). *Metacognitive skills and reading* (Report No. 188). Cambridge, MA: Center for the Study of Reading. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_&ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=ED195932&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=ED195932

Baker, L., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Metacognitive skills and reading. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 353–394). New York, NY: Longman.

Basit, T. (2003). Manual or electronic? The role of coding in qualitative data analysis. *Educational Research, 45*, 143–154. doi:10.1080/0013188032000133548

Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report, 13*, 544–559.

Berkeley, S., Scruggs, T. E., & Mastropieri, M. A. (2010). Reading comprehension instruction for students with learning disabilities, 1995-2006: A meta-analysis. *Remedial and Special Education, 31*, 423–436. doi:10.1177/0741932509355988

Biancarosa, G., & Snow, C. E. (2006). *A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Blankenship, J. C. (1991). *Attrition among male nursing students* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Georgia, Athens. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com. ezproxy.fau.edu/pqdtft/docview/303918486/fulltextPDF/134BB63736D7B486C87/1?accountid=10902

Block, C. C., & Pressley, M. (Eds.) (2002). *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Blumenfeld, P. C., Soloway, E., Marx, R. W., Krajcik, J. S., Guzdial, M., & Palinscar, A. (1991). Motivation project-based learning: Sustaining the doing, supporting. *Educational Psychologist, 26,* 369–398.

Boylan, H. R. (1987). Educating all the nation's people: The historical roots of developmental education. *Research in Developmental Education, 4*(4), 3–6.

Boylan, H. R. (1988). The historical roots of developmental education. *Research in Developmental Education, 5*(3), 1-3.

Boylan, H. R., Bonham, B. S., & White, S. R. (1999). Developmental and remedial education in postsecondary education. *New Directions for Higher Education,*

1999(108), 87–101. doi:10.1002/he.10806

Brown, A. L. (1985). Metacognition: The development of selective attention strategies for learning from texts. In H. Singer, & R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models of processes of reading* (pp. 501–526). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Brubacher, J. S., & Rudy, W. (1997). Higher Education in Transition: A history of American colleges and universities (4th ed.). New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Carretti, B., Caldarola, N., Chiara, T., & Cornoldi, C. (2013). Improving reading comprehension in reading and listening settings: The effect of two training programmes focusing on metacognition and working memory. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*, 194-210.

Caverly, D. (1997, Winter). *Teaching reading in a learning assistance center*. Paper session presented at the Proceedings of the 17th and 18th Annual Institutes for Learning Assistance Professionals: 1996 and 1997, Tucson, AR. Retrieved from http://www.lsche.net/?page_id=1052

Chikalanga, I. (1992). A suggested taxonomy of inferences for the reading teacher. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 8*(2), 697–709.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (2008). Developmental education: Enhancing literacy and basic skills (5th ed.). *The American community college* (pp. 281–312). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Crain, S. K. (1988). Metacognition and the teaching of reading. *Journal of Reading, 31*(7), 682–685.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among 5 approaches. 5 qualitative approaches to inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cronbach, L. J. (1975). Beyond two disciplines of scientific psychology. *American Psychologist, 30,* 116-127.

Cross, D. R., & Paris, S. G. (1988). Developmental and instructional analyses of children's metacognition and reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*(2), 131–142.

Daniels, H., & Bizar, M. (2005). Reading-as-thinking. *Teaching the best practice way* (pp. 33–76). Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

De Corte, E., Verschaffel, L., & De Ven, A. V. (2001). Improving text comprehension strategies in upper primary school children: A design experiment. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 71,* 531–559.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2003). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln, (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (2nd ed., pp. 1–42). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 1–20). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

DiCicco-Bloom, B., & Crabtree, B. (2006). The qualitative research interview. *Medical Education, 40,* 314-321.

Dole, J. A., Duffy, G. G., Roehler, L. R., & Pearson, P. D. (1991). Moving from the Old to the new: Research on reading comprehension instruction. *Review of Educational Research, 61*(2), 239–264.

Duffy, G. G. (1981, April). *Theory to practice: How does it work in real classrooms.* Paper session presented at the meeting of Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association, New Orleans, LA.

Durkin, D. (1978-1979). What classroom observations reveal about reading comprehension instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly, 14*(4), 481–533.

Eckert, L. S. (2008). Bridging the pedagogical gap: Intersections between literary and reading theories in secondary and postsecondary literacy instruction. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 52*(2), 110–118.

Eggen, P. D., & Kauchak, D. P. (1999). *Educational psychology: Windows on classrooms* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Eggen, P. D., & Kauchak, D. P. (2006). *Strategies and models for teachers: Teaching content and thinking skills* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Eilers, L. H., & Pinkley, C. (2006). Metacognitive strategies help students to comprehend all text. *Reading Improvement, 43*(1), 13-29.

Eker, C. (2014). The effect of teaching practice conducted by using metacognition strategies on students' reading comprehension skills. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 6*(2), 269-280.

El-Hindi, A. E. (1997). Connecting reading and writing: College learners' metacognitive awareness. *Journal of Developmental Education, 21*(2), 10–22. Retrieved from

http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.fau.edu/ehost/delivery?sid=c8ff922e5-5597-4b44-8ffa

Enright, G., & Kerstiens, G. (1980). The learning center: Toward an expanded role. In O. Lenning & R. Nayman (Eds.), *New roles for learning assistance.* San Fransico: Jossey-Bass.

Erlandson, D. A., Harris, E. L., Skipper, B. L., & Allen, S. D. (1993). *Doing naturalistic inquiry: A guide to methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Falk-Ross, F. C. (2001-2002). Toward a new literacy: Changes in college students' reading comprehension strategies following reading/writing projects: Students enrolled in a college developmental reading class used critical literacy techniques to improve reading and writing skills. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 45*(4), 278–289.

Fassinger, R. E. (2005). Paradigms, praxis, problems and promise: Grounded theory in counseling psychology research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(2), 156–166.

Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist, 34*, 906–911.

Flavell, J. H., Friedrichs, A. G., & Hoyt, J. D. (1970). Developmental changes in memorization processes. *Cognitive Psychology, 1*, 324–340.

Flood, J., & Lapp, D. (1990). Reading comprehension instruction for at-risk students: Research-based practices that can make a difference. *Journal of Reading, 33*(7), 490–496.

Florida Department of Education (2013). Statewide course numbering system: Statewide

course detail. Retrieved from http://scns.fldoe.org/scns/public/pb_statewide_course_dtl_para.jsp

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Fritschmann, N. S., Deshler, D. D., & Schmaker, J. B. (2007). The effects of instruction in an inference strategy on the reading comprehension skills of adolescents with disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 30,* 245–262.

Gambrell, L. B, Block, C. C., & Pressley, M. (Eds.) (2002*). Improving comprehension instruction: An urgent priority*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gillet, J. W., Temple, C., Crawford, A. N., & Cooney, B. (2004). Assessment for internal audiences: Periodic in-depth assessments. In (author) *Understanding reading problems: Assessment and instruction* (6th ed., p. 106, 424). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Grabe, W. (1999). Developments in reading research. In M. Chalhoub-Deville (Ed.), *Issues in computer-adaptive testing of reading proficiency* (pp. 13–21). Cambridge, UK: University Press.

Graesser, A. C., & Kreuz, R. J. (1993). A theory of inference generation during text comprehension. *Discourse Processes, 16*(1–2), 145–160.

Graesser, A. C., Singer, M., & Trabasso, T. (1994). Constructing inferences during narrative text comprehension. *Psychological Review,101,* 371-395.

Grubb, W. N., Boner, E., Frankel, K., Parker, L., Patterson, D., Gabriner, K., & Wilson, S. (2011). *Basic skills instruction in community colleges: The dominance of remedial pedagogy*. Policy Analysis for California Education. Retrieved from http://edpolicyinca.org/sites/default/files/2011_WP_GRUBB_NO2.pdf

Grubb, W. N., & Gabriner, R. (2013). *Instruction in basic skills: The dominance of remedial pedagogy*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1981). *Effective evaluation*. San Franscisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hardin, C. (1998). Who belongs in college: A second look. In J. Higbee, & P. Dwinnell (Eds.), D*evelopmental education: Preparing successful college students.* Columbia, SC: National Resource Center for the First Year Experience and Students in Transition.

Harris, T. L., & Hodges, R. E. (Eds.). (1995). *The literacy dictionary: The vocabulary of reading and writing*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Harvey, S., & Goudvis, A. (2013). Comprehension at the core. *The Reading Teacher, 66*(6), 432–439. doi:10.1002/TRTR1145.

Heilman, A. W., Blair, T., & Rupley, W. H. (2002). *Principles and practices of teaching reading* (10th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Heubert, J. P., & Hauser, R. M. (Eds.). (1999). *High stakes testing for tracking, promotion, and graduation*. A Report of the National Research Council. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Hock, M. F., Brasseur, I. F., Deshler, D. D., Catts, H. W., Marquis, J. G., Mark, C. A., & Stribling, J. W. (2009). What is the reading component skill profile of adolescent struggling readers in urban schools? *Learning Disability Quarterly, 32*(1), 21–38.

Hock, M. F., & Deshler, D. D. (2003). Adolescent literacy: Ensuring that no child is left behind. *Principal Leadership, 13*(4), 55–61.

Hock, M., & Mellard, D. (2005). Reading comprehension strategies for adult literacy outcomes. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 49*(3), 192–200.

Hong-Nam, K., & Leavell, A. G. (2011). Reading strategy instruction, metacognitive awareness and self-perception of striving college developmental readers. *Journal of College Literacy and Learning, 37,* 3–17.

Hsieh, H-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(9), 1277–1288. doi:10.1177/1049732205276687

Jaggars, S. S., & Hodara, M. (2011). *The opposing focus that shape developmental education: Assessment, placement and progression at CUNY community college* (CCRC Working Paper No. 36). Retrieved from http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/publication.asp?uid=974

Juel, C. (1988). Learning to read and write: A longitudinal study of 54 children from first through fourth grade. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*(4), 437–447.

Kamil, M. L. (2003). Adolescents and literacy: Reading for the 21st century. *Alliance for Excellent Education*. Retrieved from http://www.all4ed.org/files/archive/publications/AdolescentsAndLiteracy.pdf

Kaufman, N. J., & Randlett, A. L. (1983, December). *The use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies of good and poor readers at the college level.* Paper

presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Reading Forum, Sarasota, Florida.

Kingston, A. (1967). Some thoughts on reading comprehension. In L. Hafner (Ed.), *Improving reading comprehension in secondary schools* (pp. 72-75). New York: Macmillan.

Kirsch, I. S., Jungeblut, A., Jenkins, L., & Kolstad, A. (2002). *Adult literacy in America: A first look at the findings of the national adult literacy survey* (Report No. NCES 1993-275). Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs93/93275.pdf

Klein, S. P., Hamilton, L.S., McCaffrey, D. F., & Stecher, B. M. (2000). What do test scores in Texas tell us? *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *8*(49), 1–22.

Koda, K. (2005). Developing strategic reading. In M. H. Long, & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Insights into second language reading: A cross-linguistic approach* (pp. 204–221). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Koretz, D. M., & Barron, S. I. (1998). *The validity of gains in scores on the Kentucky instructional results information system*. RAND. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monograph_reports/2009/MR1014.pdf

Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (5th ed.). The Sage COMMTEXT Series. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Kucan, L., & Beck, L. L. (1997). Thinking aloud and reading comprehension research: Inquiry, instruction, and social interaction. *Review of Educational Research, 67*, 271–299.

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Kvale, S., & Brinkman, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Linn, R. L. (2000). Assessments and accountability. *Educational Researcher, 29*(2), 4-16. doi: 10.3101/0013189X029002004

Linn, R. L., Graue, M. E., & Sanders, N. M. (1990). Comparing state and district test results to national norms: The validity of claims that "everyone is above average." *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 9,* 5-14.

Linn, R. L., & Gronlund, N. E. (1995). Assembling, administering, and appraising classroom tests and assessments. *Measurement and assessment in test* (7th ed., pp. 299-328). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Lloyd, C. V. (1995-1996). How teachers teach reading comprehension: An examination of four categories of reading comprehension instruction. *Reading Research and Instruction, 35,* 170–184.

Manoli, P., & Papadopoulou, M. (2012). Reading strategies versus reading skills: Two faces of the same coin. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 45,* 817–821.

Marshall, N., & Glock, M. D. (1978-1979). Comprehension of connected discourse: A study into the relationship between the structure of text and information recalled. *Reading Research Quarterly, 14,* 10–56.

Mason, L. H. (2013). Teaching students who struggle with learning to think before, while, and after reading: Effects of self-regulated strategy development instruction. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 29*(2), 124-144. doi: 10.1080/10573569.2013.758561

Maxwell, J. A. (2005). Qualitative research design: An interactive approach (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

McKoon, G., & Ratcliff, R. (1992). Inference during reading. *Psychological Review, 99*(3), 440–466.

Mealey, D. L., & Nist, S. L. (1989). Postsecondary, teacher directed comprehension strategies. *Journal of Reading, 32*(6), 484–493.

Means, B., & Knapp, M. (1991). Cognitive approaches to reaching advanced skills to educationally disadvantages students. *The Phi Delta Kappa, 73*(4), 282-289.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (Rev. ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *An expanded source book: Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mokhtari, K., Sheorey, R., & Reichard, C. (2008). Measuring the reading strategies of first–and second–language readers. In K. Mokhtari, & R. Sheorey (Eds.), *Reading strategies of first–and second–language learners: See how they read* (pp. 43–58). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Myers, M., & Paris, S. G. (1978). Children's metacognitive knowledge about reading.

Journal of Educational Psychology, 70(5), 680–690.

Nahatame, S. (2014). Strategic processing and predictive inference generation in L2 reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 26*(2), 54–77.

Nash-Ditzel, S. (2010). Metacognitive reading strategies can improve self-regulation. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 40*(2), 45–59.

National Assessment of Educational Progress (2011). *The Nation's Report Card: Reading 2011.* Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/main2011/2012457.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics (2008). The condition of education: Closer look. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/analysis/2008-index.asp

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel. Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for Reading instruction* (NIH Publication No. 00-4769). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Nelson, J. M., & Williamson-Manset, G. (2006). The impact of explicit, self-regulatory reading comprehension on the reading-specific self-efficacy, attributions, and affect of students with reading disabilities [Electronic version]. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 29,* 213–229.

Ness, M. (2006). *Reading comprehension strategies in secondary content-area classrooms: Teacher use of and attitudes towards reading comprehension instruction* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses. (3220521)

Ness, M. K. (2009). Reading comprehension strategies in secondary content classrooms: Teacher use of and attitudes towards reading comprehension instruction. *Reading Horizons, 49*(2), 143–166.

Nicaise, M., & Gettinger, M. (1995). Fostering reading comprehension in college students. *Reading Psychology: An International Quarterly*, *16*, 283–337.

Nietfeld, J. L., & Schraw, G. (2002). The effect of knowledge and strategy training on monitoring-accuracy. *The Journal of Educational Research, 95*(3), 131–142.

Nist, S. L., & Holschuh, J. L. (2000). Comprehension strategies at the college level. In R. Flippo, & D. Caverly (Eds.), *Handbook of college reading and study strategy research* (pp. 75–95). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ofodu, G. O., & Adedipe, T. H. (2011). Assessing ESL students' awareness and application of metacognitive strategies in comprehending academic materials. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies, 2*(5), 343–346.

Orlando, V. P., Caverly, D. C., Swetnam, L. A., & Flippo, R. F. (2003). Text demands in college classes: An investigation. In E. J. Paulson, M. E. Laine, S. A. Biggs, & T. L. Bullock (Eds.), *College reading research and practice: Articles from the journal of college literacy and learning* (pp. 118–125). Newark, De: International Reading Association.

Pacello, J. (2014). Integrating metacognition into a developmental reading and writing course to promote skill transfer: An examination of student perceptions and experiences. *Journal of College Reading and Writing, 44*(2), 119-140. doi: 10.1080/10790195.2014.906240

Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension fostering and comprehension monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction, 1*(2), 117–175.

Paris, S. G., Lipson, M. M., & Wixon, K. K. (1983). Becoming a strategic reader. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 8*, 293–316.

Paris, S. G., Newman, R. S., & McVey, K. A. (1982). Learning the functional significance of mnemonic actions: A microgenetic study of strategy acquisition. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 34*, 490-509.

Paris, S. G., Wasik, B. A., & Turner, J. C. (1996). The development of strategic readers. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. II, pp. 610–614). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Patton, M. Q. (1987). *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Perie, M., Moran, R., & Lutkus, A. D. (2005). NAEP 2004 trends in academic progress: Three decades of student performance in reading and mathematics (NCES 2005-464). U. S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (2005). Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *52*(2), 137–145.

Pressley, M. (2002). Metacognition and self-regulated comprehension (3rd ed.). In A. E. Farstrup, & S. J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading* (pp. 291–309). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Pressley, M., & Afflerbach, P. (1995). *Verbal protocols of reading: The nature of constructively responsive reading*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pressley, M., Wharton-McDonald, R., Mistretta-Hampston, J., & Echevarria, M. (1998). Literacy instruction in 10 fourth and fifth grade classrooms. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 2*(2), 159–194.

Pugh, S., Pawan, F., & Atommarchi, C. (2000). Academic literacy and the new college learner. In R. Flippo, & D. Caverly (Eds.), *Handbook of reading and study strategy research* (pp. 25–42). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Race to the Top, 74 Fed Reg. 37804 (July 29, 2009).

Reid, R., & Lienemann, T. O. (2006). *Strategy instruction for students with learning disabilities*. New York, NY: The Guildford Press.

Richards, L. (2009). *Handling qualitative data: A practice guide* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Rinehart, S. D., & Platt, J. M. (1984). Metacognitive awareness and monitoring in adult and college readers. *Forum for Reading*, *15*(2), 54–62.

Robinson, G. (2011). *Statewide articulation manual*. Florida Department of Education, Office of Articulation. Retrieved from www.fldoe.org/articulation/pdf/statewide-postsecondary-articulationmanual.pdf

Robinson, H. A., Faraone, V., Hittleman, D. R., & Unruh, E. (1990). *Reading comprehension instruction 1783-1987: A review of trends and research*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Roulston, K. (2010). Considering quality in qualitative interviewing. *Qualitative Research, 10*(2), 199–228.

Rubin, H. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (1st ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Sanoff, A. P. (2006). A perception gap over students' preparation. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://intranet.niacc.edu/pres_copy(1)/ILC/A%20Perception%20Gap%20Over%20Students'%20Preparation.pdf

Scharlach, T. D. (2008). START comprehending: Students and teachers actively reading text. *The Reading Teacher, 62*(1), 20–31. doi:10.1598/RT.62.1.3

Schraw, G., & Moshman, D. (1995). Metacognitive theories. *Educational Psychology Review, 7*, 351–371.

Seidman, I. E. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College.

Seidman, I. E. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College.

Simpson, M. L., & Nist, S. L. (2000). An update on strategic learning. It's more than textbook reading strategies. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult, 43*(6), 528–541.

Simpson, M. L., & Nist, S. L. (2003). An update on strategic learning: It's more than textbook reading strategies. In N. A. Stahl, & H. Boylan (Eds.), *Teaching developmental reading* (pp. 157–178). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Simpson, M. L., Stahl, N. A., & Francis, M. A. (2004). Reading and learning strategies: Recommendations for 21st century. *Journal of Developmental Education, 28*(2), 2-12.

Snow, C. (2002). *Reading for understanding: Toward an r & d program in reading comprehension*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Reading Study Group.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (2006). Faculty credentials. Retrieved from www.sacscoc.org/pdf/ 081705/faculty%20credentials

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Stake, R. E. (2010). *Qualitative research: Studying how things work*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Stallworth-Clark, R., Scott, J. S., & Nist, S. (1996, April). *The teaching process and postsecondary at-risk reading students': Cognitive, metacognitive, affective and instructional variables explaining academic performance*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Stecher, B. M., Barron, S., Kaganoff, T., & Goodwin, J. (1998). *The effects of standards-based assessment on classroom practices: Results of the 1996-97 RAND survey of Kentucky teachers of mathematics and writing* (CSE Technical Report 482). Los Angeles, CA: Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing.

Stone, N., & Miller, K. (1991). Developmental college reading: Secrets to our success.

Research and Teaching in Developmental Education, 7(2), 27–42.

Sunshine State College (2011). *Institutional research and effectiveness*. Retrieved from http://www.palmbeachstate.edu/ire/

Sunshine State College (2011-2012). *Annual unduplicated headcount.* Retrieved from http://www.palmbeachstate.edu/panorama/headcount-enrollment/annual-unduplicated-headcount.aspx

Sunshine State College (2013a). *Test information and test fees*. Retrieved from http://www.palmbeachstate.edu/testing/test-information-and-test-fees/default.aspx

Sunshine State College (2013b). *Sunshine state college: Full-time faculty and psav instructors*. Retrieved from http://www.palmbeachstate.edu/academicaffairs/documents/s5-ft_faculty_2012-13.pdf

Sunshine State College (2013c). *Sunshine state college: Credit/prep sections report.* Retrieved from http://www.palmbeachstate.edu/ire/documents/acadmgmt/sections_latest.pdf

Sunshine State College (2013d). *Course outline for REA 007: Developmental reading 1*. Retrieved from http://www.palmbeachstate.edu/academicservices/curriculum-and-programs/course-outlines.aspx

Sunshine State College (2013e). *Course outline for REA 0017: Developmental reading 2*. Retrieved from http://www.palmbeachstate.edu/IE_CourseOutlines/IE_ShowOutline.asp?show=Y&CourseID=REA0017

Taraban, R., Kerr, M., & Rynearson, K. (2004). Analytic and pragmatic factors in college students' metacognitive reading strategies. *Reading Psychology, 25*(2), 67–81.

Tarricone, T. (2011). *The taxonomy of metacognition*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Tei, E., & Stewart, O. (2003). Effective studying from text: Applying metacognitive strategies. In E. J. Pauslon, M.E. Laine, S. A. Biggs, & T. L. Bullock (Eds.), *College reading research and practice* (pp. 223–234). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

The Florida Senate (2013). *Summary of CS/CS/SB 1720*. Retrieved from http://www.flsenate.gov/Committees/BillSummaries/2013/html/501

Tierney, W. G., & Garcia, L. D. (2011). Remediation in higher education: The role of information. *American Behavioral Scientist, 55*(2), 102–120.

Toma, J. D. (2006). Approaching rigor in applied qualitative research. In C. F. Conrad, & R. C. Serlin (Eds.), *The sage handbook for research in education: Engaging ideas and enriching inquiry* (pp. 405–422). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Trabasso, T., & Bouchard, E. (2002). Teaching readers how to comprehend text strategically. In C. C. Block, & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction* (pp. 176–200). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Trabasso, T., & Magliano, J. P. (1996). Conscious understanding during comprehension. *Discourse Processes, 21*(3), 255–287.

Trainin, G., & Swanson, H. L. (2005). Cognition, metacognition and achievement of college students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 28*(4), 261–272.

U. S. Department of Education (2005). Striving Readers Program, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education. *Notice* (70 FR 47816- 47821). Federal Register, 70(189), 57257-57258. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister/announcements/2005-3/093005b.pdf

U. S. Department of Education (2009). *Race to the top program: Executive summary.* Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/executive-summary.pdf

U. S. Department of Education (2013). *Obama administration approves NCLB flexibility for New Hampshire 39 states and DC now approved for waivers*. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/obama-administration-approves-nclb-flexibility-request-new-hampshire-39-states-a

U.S. General Accounting Office (1990). *Case study evaluations*. Transfer Paper 9. Washington, DC: General Accounting Office.

Vacca, R. T., & Padak, N. D. (1990). Who's at risk in reading? *Journal of Reading, 33*(7), 486–488.

Vipond, D. (1980). Micro- and macroprocesses in text comprehension. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 19*, 276–298.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Weiss, R. S. (2008). *Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interview*. New York, NY: Free Press.

White, H. L. (2004). Nursing instructors must also teach reading and study skills. *Reading Improvement, 41*(1), 38–50.

Wichadee, S. (2011). The effects of metacognitive strategy instruction on EFL Thai students' reading comprehension ability. *Journal of College Teaching and Learning, 8*(5), 31–40.

Willinsky, J. (1990). *The new literacy: Redefining reading and writing in the schools.*

New York, NY: Routledge.

Wyatt, M. (1992). The past, present, and future need for college reading courses in the *U. S. Journal of Reading*, *36*(1), 10–20.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Zhang, J. (2003). In defense of college developmental reading education. *Journal of College Literacy and Learning, 30*, 43–49.