RMLE *Online*
Research in
Middle Level Education

Integrated Reading and Language Arts Instruction

Robert J. Stevens
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA

Abstract

The goal of the middle school organization is to create a learning environment that matches the developmental abilities and needs of young adolescents. This research attempts to operationalize that goal by integrating reading and English classes in large urban middle schools. The Student Team Reading and Writing (STRW) program reconfigured instruction to actively engage students in learning. The program used cooperative learning processes to take advantage of the cognitive, social, and motivational benefits of students working together on academic content. After a yearlong implementation, the researcher found students in STRW performed significantly higher on reading comprehension, reading vocabulary, and language expression achievement. The article concludes with a discussion of the implications of this research for providing integrated and engaging instruction in middle school.

Reading and Language Arts Instruction

For 40 years the philosophical goal of the middle school movement in the United States has been to make schools more responsive to the unique needs and abilities of young adolescents. The recommendations have included creating a more personalized learning environment, creating more meaningful curricula, and encouraging students to think reflectively and solve problems (e.g., Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989; Eichhorn, 1966; Mertens & Flowers, 2003; National Middle School Association, 2003). The goals of the middle school philosophy are both affective and academic, taking into consideration the important developmental issues of young adolescents to develop a more effective and responsive learning environment (Mertens & Flowers, 2003). The goal of this study is develop and evaluate a research-based instructional model to integrate reading and language arts instruction that embodies the middle school philosophy.

A primary motivation behind these changes is that recent research has indicated that during the middle grades there is a significant downturn in many indicators of students' learning and motivation. Perhaps one of the more troubling areas is middle school students' declining literacy skills performance (reading and writing) as indicated in the National Assessment of Educational Progress 2003 reading report card (Donahue, Daane, & Grigg, 2003). Poor reading performance in particular is troubling since reading and writing skills are central to learning and academic performance in other content areas (Biancarosa & Snow, 2004). Other research suggests that the structural and instructional characteristics of middle schools are unresponsive to the development and needs of students, resulting in declining student achievement, attendance, and motivation during early adolescence (Mullins & Irvin, 2000; Oldfather, 1995).

Research on schools that have adopted and implemented middle school philosophy indicates some potential benefits on student achievement (Mertens & Flowers, 2003). Yet some research suggests that in spite of organizing schools around a middle school philosophy, student achievement does not always show significant gains (Anfara & Lipka, 2003). While structural and organizational change is necessary, it may not be sufficient to produce measurable changes in student learning (Anfara & Lipka; Stevenson & Erb, 1998). Middle schools must also focus on changing classroom processes and instruction (e.g., Flowers, Mertens, & Mulhall, 2000).

Background of the Project

This project was conducted in collaboration with two urban middle schools in a metropolitan district on the East Coast. The schools received a grant from the Edna McConnell Clark foundation to engage in school-wide restructuring. During the 1999–2000 school year, the researcher engaged in discussions about literacy instruction with a team of administrators and teachers from the two schools. The school personnel were particularly concerned about poor reading and writing performance of their students. The researcher shared ideas from previous research in elementary literacy instruction by the researcher and colleagues (e.g., Stevens, Madden, Slavin, & Farnish, 1987; Stevens & Slavin, 1995). During those discussions, the researcher developed instructional processes and materials (in collaboration with a research assistant) to adapt the previous research to the instructional needs and abilities of young adolescents. We based these adaptations in part on the existing research literature and in part on discussions with the teachers. The initial plan was to pilot the ideas in three sixth grade classes during the 2000–2001 school year, with potential expansion and evaluation of the literacy instruction methods during subsequent years.

Student Team Reading and Writing

The goal of this Student Team Reading and Writing (STRW) program was to develop a model for middle school literacy instruction that addresses some of the issues described above. Reorganization efforts focused on reading and English classes in sixth through eighth grades in two urban middle schools. The program elements were based upon research in classroom organization, reading and writing instruction, and cooperative learning. The goals for the design of the model were to a) integrate reading and English classes, b) use good literature as a basis for reading instruction, c) engage students in meaningful instructional tasks, d) provide explicit instruction in comprehension strategies, e) use writing as a focus for language arts instruction, and f) use cooperative learning to promote learning and positive peer relations.

Integration of reading and English classes. The first, and perhaps most challenging aspect of the restructuring was to change the time allotted to and schedule of reading and English instruction to break out of the departmentalized structure (e.g., Beane, 1993). There is a great deal of overlap between what is taught in reading and English. Thus reading and English were conceptualized as two parts of a continuum of literacy skills including learning to read, developing fluency, developing comprehension, reading to learn information, and writing to convey information. To take advantage of the connections between reading and English and to facilitate students' ability to transfer what they learn, it is important to have one teacher teach both areas, preferably in one class. In this way a teacher can teach learning to read, reading to learn, and writing to express what one learns in an integrated fashion (Beane, 1995). By integrating the two subjects, it was possible to have a double period for literacy instruction (instead of 45-minute periods for reading and for English, the schedule was restructured as a 90-minute block for Literacy). The longer class proved valuable because it allowed teachers more flexibility to change their instructional activities and, most importantly, provided time for students to engage in extended reading and writing activities without interruption.

Literature as a basis for reading instruction. To make reading tasks more meaningful, challenging, and interesting to students, the STRW program uses a literature anthology as the basis for the reading material. The literature anthology provides reading material written by famous authors (e.g., O. Henry, Langston Hughes) like students would encounter in an English class, but with reading instruction and comprehension tasks that help them develop their ability to comprehend what they read and learn from their reading. Through the use of literature, students learn about different genres of writing and become more familiar with famous, well-published authors that they could choose to read more extensively on their own. The thought was that the students would become more motivated for reading as they read high-quality reading material (Paris, Wasik, & Turner, 1991; Wigfield, 2004).

At the same time, the high quality literature provides very valuable writing models the teachers can use in writing instruction. Students' read and observe the effect of things like the rich descriptions, plot development, and figurative language of famous authors. The teacher refers to these examples when teaching those elements in the writing portion of their literacy instruction. As such, the writing of famous authors becomes both the model and the motivation for students in the writing process.

One teacher's pedagogical skill provided an excellent example of this integration and cross-fertilization between reading literature and writing. As the students read the unit on O. Henry's short stories, the teacher developed a list of five characteristics that seemed to fit all of the author's stories (character development, problem development, attempts to solve the problem, an unexpected twist in the plot, and problem resolution). She taught these characteristics to the students to help them better comprehend O. Henry's stories. Later that week, after reading and discussing three O. Henry short stories, the teacher started a writing unit on short stories. She used the same characteristics from the reading lessons to guide students in planning and drafting their own short stories. O. Henry's style became the model as students wrote short stories from their own experiences.

Meaningful instructional tasks. A significant problem in traditional reading instruction is that the follow-up activities often have little or no relationship to what the students have read (Stevens, Madden, Slavin & Farnish, 1987). As a result, students often do not consider the instructional tasks as meaningful or important. A goal of the STRW program was to engage students in discussions and written activities that were meaningful and would extend their literal and figurative comprehension of the literature they were reading (e.g., Ivey & Broaddus, 2001; Thompson, Mixon, & Serpell, 1996). Often students read the first part of a literature selection and stop to engage in a discussion with a peer about the characters and their motivation, the problem in the story, and their predictions of how the problem in the story might be resolved. They also discuss questions related to the author's purpose or style, and the interpretation of figurative language or literary techniques used. Following the discussion, the partners write their responses to the questions and then continue reading the story. This approach engages students in more meaningful activities related to what they have read and uses cooperative learning (described below) to facilitate engagement and learning.

The discussions about the characters and the problem in the story help improve students' comprehension of the story; and while discussing, one student often recalls information from the story the other did not. Students' interactions during the predictions often involve students coming up with different ways the characters might solve the problem in the story, or what might happen next in the story. Prediction questions are powerful comprehension questions that require students to integrate their comprehension of the story with their prior knowledge (e.g., how people solve problems like those in the story). Discussing their predictions with a peer gets students to process more deeply the information from the story and link it to what they already know. Prediction questions have an additional benefit of increasing students' motivation to continue reading the story. After making a prediction, students are eager to continue reading the story to find out if their prediction is right.

Explicit instruction on text comprehension strategies. A rich body of research over the past 25 years suggests that comprehension strategies are effective in significantly improving students' reading performance (National Reading Panel, 2000). Most of that research emphasizes the importance of explicit instruction on comprehension strategies and applying those strategies to content-area reading (Biancarosa & Snow, 2004). Comprehension strategies help students better comprehend what they are reading and have the potential to be generalized to reading across content areas with appropriate instruction (Block & Pressley, 2002; Pressley, 2000). During upper elementary and middle school, students are transitioning from learning to read to reading to learn (Alvermann & Moore, 1991; Anderson & Armbruster, 1984). Teachers should not only teach comprehension strategies, but should also apply them in content area reading to facilitate students' ability to generalize them to new content and different tasks.

Teachers in the STRW program explicitly teach students strategies about the structure of text (narrative and expository text structures). For example, with narrative text the students are taught about the important plot elements of main character, setting, problem, and solution and are taught to understand them at both the literal

and figurative level. Students also are taught strategies to comprehend figurative language and to understand the author's purpose. In some cases teachers extended students' strategic skill by using comprehension strategies to express their ideas in writing. For example, after her students had mastered using strategies to comprehend metaphor in text, one teacher taught students to use the same strategy to write with metaphors. The connection between what students learned in reading and what they were doing in writing helped extend students' ability to comprehend metaphorical expressions.

Writing as the focus for language arts instruction. Since the National Writing Project of the mid-1970s, writing has increasingly become the focus of language arts instruction (Strickland, Bodino, Buchan, Jones, Nelson, & Rosen, 2001). Writing instruction that teaches students strategies for planning and composing helps motivate students to write; as a result students tend to write longer and qualitatively better work (Graham, Harris, & Mason, 2005). This is particularly true in middle level education for students who are struggling.

The writing focus in STRW engages students in learning about language expression and language structure with the goal of improving their own writing. Students are motivated by the goal of expressing their ideas well as they share their writing with their peers. Students also are powerful role models for one another in writing and often students attempt a new genre in writing after hearing someone else's attempt at it. For example, students started out writing descriptive narratives about their own experiences, usually simply a recitation of events. In one class, however, a student wrote a descriptive paragraph entitled "The Mess in My Locker." The composition was written in a humorous fashion that, when read aloud, had the whole class laughing. The student essentially became a role model. During the next couple weeks many of the students enlivened their own writing with the use of humor and satire.

Using cooperative learning to promote learning and more positive peer relations. One important aspect of developmentally appropriate instruction in middle school is that classrooms should be restructured to promote both learning and positive peer relations (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989; National Middle School Association, 2003). This is particularly important for young adolescents because peer relations take center stage during this period and research suggests that a student's relations with his or her peers play an important role in the student's attachment to school. Students who do not develop positive peer relations during early adolescence are much more likely to drop out of school. Yet, students often perceive less support for peer relations in the middle school and often more negative peer relations leading to less attachment to school during these years (Seidman, Allen, Aber, Mitchell, & Feinman, 1994). Young adolescents tend to enjoy working with peers (Ares & Gorrell, 2002) and seem to benefit academically from discussing literacy tasks with one another (Guthrie & Davis, 2003; Ivey & Broaddus, 2001).

Cooperative learning is an alternative classroom structure that has been shown to facilitate academic learning, positive peer relations, and positive attitudes toward school (Johnson & Johnson, 1989; Slavin, 1995). Typically cooperative learning uses group goals, where for one member of the group to succeed all of the members of the group must succeed. As a result, positive interdependence develops within the group—the peers support and motivate one another, leading to more positive peer relations and more social acceptance of one another. At the same time, the individual accountability promotes each individual's learning, resulting in greater achievement. In essence, cooperative learning uses peers as both an instructional and motivational resource, taking advantage of students' increasing sense of independence and stronger peer orientation during adolescence.

Significance of Student Team Reading and Writing

Each of the components of the STRW program has research-based support for its individual effectiveness, as cited above. However, the elements have not been combined in a way so their additive effects can be studied in classrooms with young adolescents. The combination of elements results in a relatively large change in behavior for both students and teachers in these classrooms, resulting in less didactic instruction and more student autonomy, while at the same time providing explicit instruction with guided practice and actively engaging students in meaningful literacy practice activities. As with any such field study, there are questions about teachers' ability to implement faithfully a new method in their classroom as well as the impact of the program on students' achievement.

Method

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the STRW instructional model of integrated reading and English instruction for urban middle school students. The STRW model was contrasted to a departmentalized model of instruction where each teacher taught one subject to multiple classes in the same grade. The nature of the traditional instruction is described below.

Participating Schools

The participating schools were five middle schools in a large urban school district in a metropolitan area on the East Coast. The schools were comprised of sixth through eighth grades and primarily served a disadvantaged population (67% of students on free or reduced lunch). The researcher attempted to match the two experimental schools with three comparison schools based upon average achievement scores in reading and language arts and upon ethnicity and socioeconomic background of the students, based upon school district data. Because of the large size of the two STRW schools the researcher used three comparison schools in an attempt to get an adequate match on initial achievement. The study included more than 3,900 students across the five participating schools.

A total of 49 teachers participated in this study, of which 20 implemented the STRW instructional model. The sixth grade teachers were elementary certified and the seventh and eighth grade teachers were certified secondary English teachers.

Implementing Student Team Reading and Writing

During the 2000–2001 school year, teachers piloted the STRW program in three sixth grade classes. The researcher or research assistant observed the participating classes two to three times a week. We also conducted frequent meetings with teachers (weekly at first, scaling back to monthly as the project continued) to discuss how the program was working and any concerns or questions of the teachers.

Training. During the 2001–2002 school year, 20 teachers in two middle schools implemented the STRW program in their reading and English classes. The teachers in the experimental schools were trained in the Student Team Reading and Writing (STRW) in eight half-day sessions during the summer of 2001. The training consisted of an explanation of the processes and the rationale behind them. During the training, teachers participated in a simulation of major components of the program. The teachers were given a detailed manual that described each of the components. Before the beginning of the school year, the teachers were given all of the books and materials they needed to implement STRW.

Coaching. During the first three months of implementation, the researcher and research assistant observed and gave feedback to the teachers as they implemented the program. The goal was to coach the teachers to become proficient in the instructional model and to improve the quality of their implementation of the program. The project staff also met with the teachers during and after school, often attending meetings of the reading and language arts department. At these meetings teachers' questions and problems were discussed to resolve any problems they were having and to use their feedback to improve the program. As the teachers became more proficient with STRW, the amount of coaching and meetings decreased to the point where the project staff were simply monitoring the teachers' implementation on a periodic basis.

Implementation fidelity. After a semester of implementation and coaching, the researcher felt that teachers were implementing STRW effectively. Next, the researcher and research assistant observed teachers to measure their implementation of the program to ascertain a measure of program fidelity across the classrooms. Each teacher was observed on three randomly selected days and each observation was on a different day of the week (see Appendix A for a copy of the implementation measure). The observations were unannounced, and teachers were not aware of the purpose of the observation. Since project staff had been in their classrooms frequently, their presence for the implementation checks was not unusual.

On any given day only a portion of the elements of STRW (described above) were relevant for that particular point in the cycle of instruction. Therefore, the observers rated the teacher's implementation as a percentage

of the procedures described and appropriate for that point in the cycle, which were actually used during the period. The implementation score was computed by averaging across the three observation days to get an average level of implementation. Each teacher had an average implementation of 83% or higher. As a group, the teachers averaged 91% implementation, thus the author considered this a high-fidelity implementation.

Traditional Instruction Comparison
The teachers in the comparison group were in grade level teams—five teachers from the core subjects (reading, English, mathematics, social studies, and science) on the team. While these teams taught mostly the same students, the teams did little cross-discipline instructional planning or teaching. Grade-level teams met infrequently and their discussions focused on student discipline and related classroom management issues. The teachers met much more frequently (e.g., bi-weekly) in departmental groups to discuss instructional and curricular issues.

Each teacher taught multiple classes (usually six) of the same subject in 45-minute periods. Typically the teachers used traditional instructional methods with a primary focus on didactic instruction, and specifically they did not use cooperative learning on a daily or even regular basis. The reading teachers used a basal reading series and related adjunct materials (e.g., workbooks). Students would read the story silently and then individually answer questions about it. The English teachers used an English literature anthology for their literature component and a grammar textbook for the language arts component. They would read from the anthology and as a whole class discuss questions about the selection. The teachers also taught grammar in isolation, using grammar activities such as identifying parts of speech, selecting appropriate verb forms, and identifying and correcting run-on sentences. The writing instruction and activities were from a district-supplied curriculum guide and were geared toward the type of writing students would do in the statewide writing assessments. Writing instruction typically involved teachers assigning a topic and students working individually to develop a composition. The teacher would circulate and work with individual students as they wrote. Periodically the teacher would have individual students read what they had written to the entire class. When students were finished writing and revising their writing, they would turn in their work for teacher feedback and a grade.

Measures
Student Achievement. Student achievement was measured using the California Achievement Test (CAT). Pretest data were available from district records of the CAT given the spring prior to the study. The posttest, a different form of the CAT, was administered in May, near the end of the study.

Results

Pretest achievement. Pretests indicated that there were significant differences between the STRW and comparison schools in spite of the attempts to match the schools. School district achievement data from the previous school year were used as pretest data. The pretest scores for participating classes were used to identify matched classes for the comparison group. However, there was significant attrition from both groups. Of the 4,533 students initially enrolled in the classes in the study, only 3,986 remained in the study through post testing, resulting in a 12.5% attrition rate. Some of these students moved out of the participating school, or the district, and some simply stopped coming to school. Students with low attendance, those who missed 60 or more days of school, were dropped from the study and are included in the attrition rate.

An ANOVA on the pretest measures was used to determine if there were significant initial differences between the groups. In spite of initial matching of classrooms based on pre-achievement, student attrition during the school year resulted in significant initial differences between the experimental and comparison groups used in the analyses. For those students with both pre- and post-achievement data there were significant differences on the pretests of Total Reading, $F(1,3984) = 11.2$, $p<.01$, and Total Language, $F(1,3984) = 54.2$, $p<.01$. In both cases the comparison students had significantly higher initial achievement than did the students in STRW (see Table 1). To control for this initial difference, the researcher used the pretest as a statistical control for the posttest analyses.

Table 1
Student Achievement: Means, Analyses, and Effect Sizes

Measures		STRW	Comparison	F	Effect Size
Pretest:	Reading	-.05 (.99)	.05 (1.01)	11.2**	
	Lang. Arts	-.11 (.99)	.11 (1.00)	54.2**	
Posttest:	Read. Voc.	.17 (.71)	-.16 (.72)	4.3*	+.33
	Read. Comp.	.12 (.66)	-.13 (.73)	3.9*	+.25
	Lang. Mech.	.00 (.73)	.00 (.75)	<1.0	.00
	Lang. Expr.	.19 (.72)	-.19 (.73)	5.7*	+.38
	N of Students	1798	2188		
	N of Classes	72	88		

Note. Pretest means are z score means, posttest scores are adjusted z score means. Effect sizes are the
difference in adjusted means divided by the pooled unadjusted standard deviation.
* p<.05, ** p<.01

Posttest analyses and unit of analysis. In this type of classroom study, the teachers implement the treatment in each class, making the teacher an important source of variance in measuring the effects on students' achievement. As such it is important to use the class as the unit of analyses rather than the individual student in the posttest analyses.

Prior to conducting the analyses the researcher tested for grade-by-treatment interactions to determine if the STRW program had differential effects at different grades. No significant grade-by-treatment interactions were found. This allowed for collapsing the data across the three grades, thereby increasing the power (by increasing the number of teachers) in subsequent analyses. To facilitate the combining of the data across grades, all data were converted to z scores, which normalized the data for each grade with a common mean (zero) and standard deviation (1.0).

An analysis of covariance was used to control for the significant pre-achievement differences between the groups. All means presented in the tables are adjusted means to reflect the use of the covariate in the analyses (See Table 1). (It should be noted that unlike unadjusted z-scores, adjusted z-scores do not necessarily have standard deviations of 1.0.)

Posttest achievement. The results indicated that the STRW classes had significantly higher achievement at the end of the year on measures of reading vocabulary, F(1,158) = 4.31, p<.05, reading comprehension, F(1,158) = 3.95, p<.05, and language expression, F(1,158) = 5.74, p<.05. There were no significant differences on the measure of language mechanics, F<1.0. The means, standard deviations, and effect sizes are presented in Table 1. For the three significant main effects the effect sizes ranged from +.25 to +.38, indicating that the

STRW classes scored a ¼ to ⅓ of a standard deviation higher on standardized achievement tests than did the comparison classes. (The effect size equals the difference in the group means divided by the comparison group standard deviation.)

Conclusions

These results support the hypothesis that restructuring a middle school's reading and language arts instruction by using research-based instructional procedures, good literature as the basis for instruction, cooperative

learning processes, and integrating reading and writing instruction can result in significantly higher student achievement on measures of vocabulary, comprehension, and writing expression. The combination of curricular and instructional components used in STRW was carefully selected to actively engage and to motivate young adolescents in learning, which is a main component of the middle school philosophy. While each element has been shown effective in isolation, this study puts them together programmatically to build a research-based model for middle school literacy instruction. As a result of this approach, STRW was very different from traditional reading and English instruction received in similar middle school classrooms in this urban school district.

The results indicate that such curricular and instructional changes can lead to significantly higher achievement, as indicated by effect sizes of 1/4 to 1/3 of a standard deviation difference (effect sizes of +.25 to +.38) in reading comprehension, reading vocabulary, and writing expression as measured on a standardized achievement test. These differences can be considered reasonably substantial differences given that the outcome measure was a standardized achievement test and standardized tests are designed to produce stable scores across time, thus making them resistant to change. Further, as most school administrators would readily recognize, an increase of one-quarter standard deviation or more on a standardized test indicates a meaningful improvement in student's performance.

The positive achievement effects in this study provide support to central aspects of the middle school philosophy. Anderman, Maehr, and Midgley (1999) and Lounsbury (2000) among others have suggested that actively engaging young adolescents in their own learning and involving peers in learning activities can have potential learning and motivational benefits for students. These results support that view.

Another important aspect of this study was that these results were obtained in a large urban school district where middle schools tend to be very large and potentially impersonal, and in this case one where the concern for poor student achievement motivated administrators to seek financial support and external collaboration to restructure their literacy program. In this case the combination was fruitful, yielding benefits of increased achievement for students greatly in need.

This study has opened a path to potential future research into the impact and transportability of STRW. This study was predicated on intensive support and coaching from the project staff, a situation that is atypical of most middle schools. It would be informative to study STRW in situations of varying amounts of support to determine how much teacher training, coaching, and feedback are necessary to implement the program in a way that maintains its efficacy. This would be important for understanding the potential transportability of STRW and determining under what conditions these positive effects on student achievement can be replicated.

References

Alvermann, D., & Moore, D. (1991). Secondary school reading. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. II, pp. 951–983). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Anderman, E. M., Maehr, M. L., & Midgley, C. (1999). Declining motivation after the transition to middle school: Schools can make the difference. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 32,* 131–147.

Anderson, T., & Armbruster, B. (1984). Studying. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 657–680). New York: Longman.

Anfara, V. A., Jr., & Lipka, R. P. (2003). Relating the middle school concept to student achievement. *Middle School Journal, 35*(1), 24–32.

Ares, N., & Gorrell, J. (2002). Middle school students' understanding of meaningful learning and engaging classroom activities. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 16,* 263–277.

Beane, J. A. (1993). Problems and possibilities for an integrative curriculum. *Middle School Journal, 25*(1), 18–23.

Beane, J. A. (1995). Curriculum integration and the disciplines of knowledge. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76,* 616–622.

Biancarosa, G., & Snow, C. E. (2004). *Reading next—A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy: A report from the Carnegie Corporation of New York.* Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

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

Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. (1989). *Turning points: Preparing American youth for the 21st century.* New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Donahue, P., Daane, M., & Grigg, W. (2003). The nation's report card: Reading highlights. *Education Statistics Quarterly, 4*(1), 1–35.

Eichhorn, D. H. (1966). *The middle school.* New York: Center for Research in Education.

Flowers, N., Mertens, S. B., & Mulhall, P. F. (2000). How teaming influences classroom practices. *Middle School Journal, 32*(2), 52–59.

Graham, S., Harris, K., & Mason, L. (2005). Improving the writing performance, knowledge, and self-efficacy of struggling young writers: The effects of self-regulated strategy development. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 30,* 207–241.

Guthrie, J., & Davis, M. (2003). Motivating struggling readers in middle school through an engagement model of classroom practice. *Reading and Writing Quarterly, 19,* 59–85.

Ivey, G., & Broaddus, K. (2001). Just plain reading: A survey of what makes students want to read in middle school classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly, 36,* 350–371.

Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (1989). *Cooperation and competition: Theory and research.* Edina, MN: Interaction Books.

Lounsbury, J. (2000). The middle school movement: "A charge to keep." *Clearing House, 73,* 193.

Mertens, S. B., & Flowers, N. (2003). Middle school practices improve students' achievement in high poverty schools. *Middle School Journal, 35*(1), 33–43.

Mullins, E. R., & Irvin, J. I. (2000). Transition to middle school. *Middle School Journal, 31*(3), 7–60.

National Middle School Association. (2003). *This we believe: Successful schools for young adolescents.* Westerville, OH: Author.

National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

Oldfather, P. (1995). Commentary: What's needed to maintain and extend motivation for literacy in the middle grades. *Journal of Reading, 38,* 420–423.

Paris, S., Wasik, B., & Turner, J. (1991). The development of strategic readers. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. II, pp. 609–640). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pressley, M. (2000). What should comprehension instruction be instruction of? In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. III, pp. 546–561). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Seidman, E., Allen, L., Aber, J. L., Mitchell, C., & Feinman, J. (1994). The impact of school transition in early adolescence on the self-system and perceived social context of poor urban youth. *Child Development, 65,* 507–522.

Slavin, R. (1995). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Stevens, R. J., Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., & Farnish, A. M. (1987). Cooperative integrated reading and composition: Two field experiments. *Reading Research Quarterly, 22,* 433–454.

Stevens, R. J., & Slavin, R. (1995). Effects of a cooperative learning approach in reading and writing on academically handicapped and nonhandicapped students. *Elementary School Journal, 95,* 241–262.

Stevenson, C., & Erb, T. (1998). How implementing Turning Points improves student outcomes. *Middle School Journal, 30*(1), 45–52.

Strickland, D., Bodino, A., Buchan, K., Jones, K., Nelson, A., & Rosen, M. (2001). Teaching writing in a time of reform. *Elementary School Journal, 101,* 385–398.

Thompson, R., Mixon, G., & Serpell, R. (1996). Engaging minority students in reading: Focus on the urban learner. In L. Baker, P. Afflerbach, & D. Reinking (Eds.), *Developing engaged readers in school and home communities* (pp. 43–64). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wigfield, A. (2004). Motivation for reading during early adolescent and adolescent years. In D. Stickland & D. Alvermann (Eds.), *Bridging the literacy achievement gap, grades 4–12* (pp. 214–243). New York: Teachers College Press.

Appendix A
STRW Implementation Measure

Directions:
1. Identify the items that *should* occur in the classroom according to the class's place in the flow of instructional activities. (Appropriate?)
2. Indicate whether you observed the teacher / students doing the behavior listed. (Observed?)

Explicit instruction related to the literature selection	Appropriate		Observed	
Teacher explicitly teaches how to pronounce the new vocabulary.	Y	N	Y	N
Teacher explicitly teaches the meaning of the new vocabulary.	Y	N	Y	N
Teacher uses rapid review procedure to develop automaticity.	Y	N	Y	N
Teacher monitors student responses and gives feedback.	Y	N	Y	N
Teacher introduces new story topic/theme.	Y	N	Y	N
Teacher relates vocabulary to topic/theme of new story.	Y	N	Y	N

Story discussion				
Students make predictions prior to reading selection.	Y	N	Y	N
Students give reasons for their predictions.	Y	N	Y	N
Class discusses questions about selection students have read.	Y	N	Y	N
Class discusses whether their predictions were accurate.	Y	N	Y	N

Cooperative learning follow up activities—Literature selection				
Students read the selection silently first.	Y	N	Y	N
Students read story aloud with partner, alternating reading turns.	Y	N	Y	N
Listening partner helps/corrects partner who is reading.	Y	N	Y	N
Students discuss their ideas about the questions prior to writing.	Y	N	Y	N

Cooperative learning follow up activities—Vocabulary				
Students practice pronouncing new vocabulary with partner.	Y	N	Y	N
Partner gives appropriate feedback on pronunciations.	Y	N	Y	N
Students write meaningful sentences with starred vocabulary.	Y	N	Y	N
Partners use checking technique to give one another feedback on meaningful sentences.	Y	N	Y	N

Selection-related writing				
Students discuss their ideas related to the selection-related writing assignment prior to beginning to write.	Y	N	Y	N
Students work independently to write their draft.	Y	N	Y	N
Students share their draft with a partner for feedback.	Y	N	Y	N
Partners tell writer one thing they like and one thing they'd like to know more about on the draft.	Y	N	Y	N

Reading comprehension lessons				
Teacher provides explicit instruction on comprehension skill.	Y	N	Y	N
Teacher models the skill on the first example or two.	Y	N	Y	N
Students work cooperatively on the first few practice exercises.	Y	N	Y	N
Teacher monitors students as they work, reteaching if necessary.	Y	N	Y	N
Students do subsequent practice independently with partner check.	Y	N	Y	N
Partners give one another corrective feedback.	Y	N	Y	N

Explicit instruction on writing concept lessons	Appropriate		Observed	
Teacher provides instruction ("how to") for concept lesson.	Y	N	Y	N
Teacher provides models for concept lesson.	Y	N	Y	N

Student practice in writing				
Students discuss their ideas with a partner prior to writing draft.	Y	N	Y	N
Students work independently in writing the draft.	Y	N	Y	N
Students share their draft with a partner for feedback on their ideas and organization.	Y	N	Y	N
Partners give writer feedback (content)—what they like.	Y	N	Y	N
Partners give writer feedback (content)—want to know more about.	Y	N	Y	N
Students revise their work based upon feedback.	Y	N	Y	N
Partners give feedback on mechanics. (use checklist)	Y	N	Y	N
Teacher circulates and monitors students while they work.	Y	N	Y	N
Teacher reads students' writing and gives content feedback.	Y	N	Y	N
Teacher reads students' writing and gives grammar feedback.	Y	N	Y	N
Class celebrates writing by selected oral readings of work.	Y	N	Y	N

Explicit instruction on grammar and English usage				
Teacher provides explicit instruction on grammar/usage skill.	Y	N	Y	N
Teacher models the skill on the first example or two.	Y	N	Y	N
Students work cooperatively on the first few practice exercises.	Y	N	Y	N
Teacher monitors students as they work, reteaching if necessary.	Y	N	Y	N
Students do subsequent practice independently with partner check.	Y	N	Y	N
Partners give one another corrective feedback.	Y	N	Y	N