

Reading Horizons

Volume 42, Issue 1

2001

Article 10

SEPTEMBER/OCTOBER 2001

Inquiry into Reading Assessment: Teachers' Perceptions of Effective Practices

Mary B. Campbell*

*Saint Xavier University

Copyright ©2001 by the authors. *Reading Horizons* is produced by The Berkeley Electronic Press (bepress). http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/reading_horizons

Inquiry into Reading Assessment: Teachers' Perceptions of Effective Practices

Mary B. Campbell

Abstract

Teachers confront a number of challenges in assessing children's literacy and one of the most fundamental is the selection of appropriate assessment tools. Teachers also continuously seek meaningful ways to document and assess student performance in formative and summative ways. The purpose of this study was to determine what elementary teachers believe are the most effective assessment practices for gathering data about the reading performance of their students. Data collection was accomplished through the use of a Reading Assessment Survey distributed to 12 elementary schools throughout the greater Chicago area. The survey contained a listing of 38 assessment practices and a four-point Lickert-type scale, ranging from "not effective" to "highly effective," for teacher response. The data were analyzed by simple percentages. A discussion of the findings examines the views of beginning and experienced teachers, as well as primary and intermediate teachers. The conclusions suggest promising research directions.



Inquiry into Reading Assessment: Teachers' Perceptions of Effective Practices

Mary B. Campbell
Saint Xavier University

Abstract

Teachers confront a number of challenges in assessing children's literacy and one of the most fundamental is the selection of appropriate assessment tools. Teachers also continuously seek meaningful ways to document and assess student performance in formative and summative ways. The purpose of this study was to determine what elementary teachers' believe are the most effective assessment practices for gathering data about the reading performance of their students. Data collection was accomplished through the use of a *Reading Assessment Survey* distributed to 12 elementary schools throughout the greater Chicago area. The survey contained a listing of 38 assessment practices and a four-point Lickert-type scale, ranging from "not effective" to "highly effective," for teacher response. The data were analyzed by simple percentages. A discussion of the findings examines the views of beginning and experienced teachers, as well as primary and intermediate teachers. The conclusions suggest promising research directions.

Reading is one of the most frequently measured abilities (Smith, 1994). “No other component of the curriculum has been subjected throughout its history to such intense controversy over both its basic methods and its content” (Venezky, 1987, p. 159). The current focus of the controversy centers on the best way to assess reading and how it should be accomplished. Policy-makers call for standardized testing as a way to provide valid and reliable summative data on student achievement. Conversely, educators argue for the importance of teacher directed (curriculum-embedded) assessment, shifting the emphasis towards multiple measures that are formative and adaptable to the changing needs of students and instructional opportunities. The tension resulting from this controversy has never been higher in the history of American education. To argue for greater teacher voice in matters of curriculum and assessment does not imply that decisions outlined by district and state policy-makers are without merit. It is evident that education benefits significantly by direction and definition from the greater community at large: but if teachers are not in front of the initiatives, and guiding the decisions, the results will likely lack coherence and power.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine what teachers believe are the most effective reading assessment practices; ones that yield significant and appropriate information about student reading growth and progress, and help teachers to plan future instruction and make critical judgments about student performance.

Background for the Study

Curriculum-embedded reading assessment refers to the “data gathering that teachers do in conjunction with giving instruction” (Hoffman, Worthy, Roser, & Rutherford, 1998, p. 291). This type of assessment is generally not administered simultaneously to students; rather it is implemented selectively as determined by teachers.

Curriculum-embedded assessment is shaped and reshaped by a process of dynamic complexity. Senge (1990) defines dynamic complexity as the territory of change “when cause and effect are not

close in time and space and obvious interventions do not produce expected outcomes because other unplanned factors dynamically interfere” (p. 365). Thus complexity, dynamism, and unpredictability are not merely things that tend to get in the way, they are perceived to be normal. To view curriculum-embedded reading assessment with such a mindset may allow politicians, educators, business people, and parents to understand more fully the complexity of assessing reading performance.

The reality that so much work has been carried out already on reading assessment emphasizes an obvious fact, that it is extraordinarily difficult to get at what happens when a person is reading (Harrison, Bailey, & Dewar, 1998; Smith, 1994). The term “reading comprehension” is often used as if it refers to a dichotomous knowledge state; a student either does or does not understand a certain passage or text. This is far from the case. Understanding written text is dynamic, fluid, socially and culturally located, and it acquires temporary stability only in goal-related and purposive contexts, which may have little to do with the understandings, which are generated in other contexts (Harrison, 1994). Similar to this dichotomous view of reading comprehension is the preoccupation with word recognition. To determine reading competency solely through measures of word recognition belies a compelling knowledge base, which documents that reading is significantly more than the decoding of words.

In today’s classrooms, teachers’ choices about what reading curriculum to teach or how to assess student learning are diminishing (Coles, 1998; Hoffman, Rosner, & Worthy, 1998; Stephens et al, 1995). Additionally, decisions that are open to teachers often have fairly rigid boundaries. Elaborate reading curriculum guides with objectives and standards to be taught are not uncommon. In some settings these systems are supported by an array of topical, unit, and semester tests to monitor teacher and student progress through the prescribed reading curriculum. Schools that organize in such a directive manner most often have as the basic premise that they are guaranteeing a basic level of learning for all students by ensuring that all teachers are following a standard system for teaching and assessment. But when followed closely, such efforts tend to place serious limits on learning possibilities for students. Reading in such schools invariably gets reduced to small pieces of knowledge organized by a predetermined sequence with

considerable stress placed on coverage and evidence of performance (Stiggins, 2001). In this process the fullest meanings of the reading process and student learning are reduced to technologies.

Calkins (2001) states that what really matters in reading assessment are things that cannot be mandated; matching readers with books, understanding readers' habits, values, and self-perceptions, determining the strategies and sources of information that individual readers use and do not use, and their problem solving, critical and creative thinking skills. The more that politicians and administrators try to mandate and specify these things, the more narrow the goals become. Assessing readers does not mean simply collecting data. It also means understanding the patterns in readers' behaviors and the logic behind what they are doing so that teachers can make moment-to-moment informed decisions.

Pressure is mounting on educators to show results in terms of achievement and performance (Linn, 2000). And consequently, teachers are looking to find more meaningful

ways to document student performance. For assessment practices to be successful, they most likely will need to be culturally determined, that is from the culture of the classroom. Anything that is too far away from practice is unlikely to succeed. This is evident throughout our nation's schools in the form of standardized testing. Politicians may argue that test scores are rising, but raising test scores does not necessarily demonstrate reading competency. In fact, many of the externally mandated assessments actually displace teaching and learning rather than enhance them (Swope & Miner, 2000). Additionally, they clearly have reduced the decision-making power of teachers in many schools and are negatively influencing the direction of curricular and pedagogical practices (Coles, 1998; Hoffman et. al., 1998; Stephens et. al., 1995). The day-to-day assessments in classrooms require the support of those most closely aligned with it. This may mean modifications of current assessment purposes, priorities, methods, or a completely new paradigm.

Teachers' views about assessment purposes and priorities, such as selection, accountability, and support for learning will be influential in

determining the future of reading assessment practices (Afflerbach,

1998; Neill, 2000; Stiggins, 2001; Tierney, 1998). It is the teacher who must determine the selection, balance, and coherence of assessment practices in classrooms.

Methodology

Subjects and Sampling. Twelve elementary schools participated in this study. A cluster sampling design was used to randomly select the participating institutions from a population of 123 neighboring elementary schools. The settings were K-6 schools classified as urban or suburban, public or private, and were located in the greater Chicago area. The school principals granted permission to place the *Reading Assessment Survey* in the school mailboxes of the K-6 teachers. A total of 312 questionnaires were distributed to all full-time K-6 teachers. One hundred and sixty-three surveys were returned; thus a response rate of 53 percent was realized.

Table 1 reports the data on the demographic characteristics of the teachers and schools in the sample population. The majority of the respondents were working primarily in suburban school settings (68%) and in public schools (89%). Most described their schools as having considerably (5%) or predominately (48%) diverse populations. Primary teachers represented 64 percent of the participants, while experienced teachers comprised 58 percent of the sample.

Data Collection. The data were collected from a survey instrument, *Reading Assessment Survey*, designed and constructed by the author of this study. The survey consisted of two parts; Part I addressed the demographics and Part II listed 38 reading assessment practices with a Likert-type scale. The practices were derived from the literature on reading assessment

(Afflerbach, 1998; Calkins, 2001; Neill, 2000; Stephens et. al., 1995; Stiggins, 2001; Tierney, 1998; Wixon, Valencia, & Lipson, 1994) and the opinions of academics and teachers in the field. The two academics and seven teachers who contributed to the survey were all from the Chicago area and selected by the researcher. The academics were

university reading professors and the teachers included four primary and three intermediate teachers.

The respondents were asked to indicate their opinions of the degree of effectiveness for each listed assessment practice by checking the appropriate box. A four-point scale was used with choices ranging from “not effective” to “highly effective”.

Table 1. Demographic Percentages of Sample Population

| Characteristics of Teachers and School | Percent |
|--|---------|
| Current Position | |
| Primary Teachers (K-3) | 64% |
| Intermediate Teachers (4-6) | 36% |
| Classroom Teaching Experience | |
| 5 years or less | 42% |
| More than 5 years | 58% |
| School Setting | |
| Suburban | 68% |
| Urban | 32% |
| Private | 11% |
| Public | 89% |
| Diversity of School | |
| 50% + minority | 48% |
| 30-50% minority | 5% |
| 10-30% minority | 22% |
| Less than 10% minority | 25% |

Data Analysis Procedures. Simple descriptive percentages were used to report the data on the teachers’ perceptions about the effectiveness of reading assessments used in classroom-based reading programs. All data received are displayed in Tables 2-4. Based on the observed clustering of data, only those assessments having a percentage value of 40 percent or higher were discussed in the analysis.

Results

Table 2 presents the data from K-6 teachers, regarding the effectiveness of each reading assessment practice. In the first category labeled “not effective”, there was no reading assessments identified by teachers as being not effective. Assessments viewed as being “somewhat effective” were, attitude surveys (40%) and metacognitive awareness assessments (50%). Overall, teachers perceived most of the assessments as having value and judged them as being “moderately effective” or “highly effective”. The assessments rated to be the most “highly effective” were: *Concepts About Print* (41%), phonemic awareness assessments (51%), phonics assessments (46%), and rubric-based assessments (44%).

Comparisons regarding the perceptions of beginning teachers (5 years or less of experience) and those of experienced teachers (more than 5 years of experience) are reported in Table 3. Neither the beginning teachers nor intermediate teachers judged any of the reading assessments as being “not effective”. In the “somewhat effective” category the beginning teachers identified, literacy portfolio assessments (42%), metacognitive awareness assessments (40%), study skills assessments (43%), and state mandated literacy tests (45%). In this same category, the experienced teachers rated interest surveys (43%), attitude surveys (46%), and metacognitive awareness assessments (60%) as “somewhat effective”. The only assessment to be rated by both beginning and experienced teachers as “somewhat effective” was metacognitive awareness.

Beginning and experienced teachers rated most reading assessments as being “moderately effective” to “highly effective”. The most “highly effective” assessments as perceived by beginning teachers were: phonemic awareness assessments (52%), informal reading inventories (40%), and literature response journals (40%). The most “highly effective” as viewed by the experienced teachers included; *Concepts About Print* (47%), auditory discrimination assessments (43%), phonemic awareness (52%), phonics assessments (59%), running records

(45%), sight word assessments (44%), narrative assessments (48%), conference approaches to assessment (40%), critical thinking

assessments (42%), rubric-based assessments (60%), and essay/short answer assessments (43%).

Table 4 displays the data comparing primary (K-3) and intermediate teachers' (4-6) views regarding the effectiveness of selected reading assessment practices. Primary and intermediate teachers did not identify any reading assessments as being "not effective". There were five assessments that were identified by primary teachers as being "somewhat effective"; auditory discrimination assessments (44%), attitude surveys (43%), metacognitive awareness assessments (47%), study skills assessments (48%), and standardized tests (47%). Similarly, there were five assessments identified in this category by the intermediate teachers; running

records (42%), literacy portfolio assessments (45%), metacognitive awareness assessments (50%), interview assessments (50%), and state mandated literacy tests (46%).

Consistent with the findings from the other teacher groups in this study, primary and the intermediate teachers judged most reading assessments to be "moderately effective" to "highly effective". The most "highly effective" assessments reported by the primary teachers were; *Concepts About Print* (44%), phonemic awareness assessments (59%), phonics assessments (50%), literature response journals (44%), and rubric-based assessments (43%). The most "highly effective" as viewed by the intermediate teachers were; phonics assessments (50%), running records (41%), informal reading inventories (50%), reading miscue analysis (55%), qualitative reading inventories (40%), and rubric-based assessments (59%).

Discussion

The following discussion is offered within the context of the following limitations. The sample size was relatively small (163 returned) with a response rate of 53 percent. Although that is not unexpected in a study of this nature, the resultant unknown type and

extent of response bias is still a limitation. Through the employment of a self-report questionnaire with Likert-type items, it is noted that the extent to which the answers are forthright or to which social desirability

occurred is unknown. Furthermore, the *Reading Assessment Survey* instrument was compiled from an extensive process of a review of literature and suggestions and opinions from academics and practitioners. It was not necessarily derived from a robust literature base. Consequently, the 38 items may not represent an exhaustive list of assessments. The results indicate that the instrument has substantial utility, but its exploratory nature invites subsequent revision. Finally, there was no theory selected to undergird the selection of the assessments, rather an eclectic representation of assessments was selected.

Analyses of the data revealed some interesting findings. This study was based on the premise that what is determined about student growth is shaped in large measure by the tools that are used to examine the growth. Selected assessment tools and practices always represent the learner in a particular light: no assessment is neutral in its perspective (Johnston & Allington, 1991). The participating teachers globally perceived value in the majority of the assessment practices that were listed by the author of the study. Of particular note is that four assessment practices were judged as “highly effective” across the majority of categories represented by the teachers. These practices were identified as *Concepts About Print*, phonemic awareness assessments, phonics assessments, and rubric-based assessments.

Concepts About Print (Clay, 1985) Assessment. Assessing early reading literacy skills, serves the critical need of identifying and describing what students possess (or need to develop)

as they begin their school reading practices. The *Concepts About Print* (Clay, 1985) assessment, as explained by Afflerbach (1998), provides information related to “students’ understandings of story structure, print awareness, and sound-symbol correspondences” (p. 244). The K-6, experienced, and primary teachers, who participated in this study, rated the *Concepts about Print* (Clay, 1985) assessment as “highly effective”. These findings support the pioneering work of Marie Clay, as well as other researchers, on the importance of emergent literacy assessment

(Clay, 1985; Ehri & Sweet, 1991; Morris, 1981; Reutzel, Ray, Oda, & Moore, 1989).

Phonemic Awareness Assessments. Assessments of phonemic awareness, as defined by Spector (1995), measure the student's "ability to analyze and synthesize the sound structure of words" (p.8). The findings from this study suggest that beginning, experienced, primary, and the total sample of K-6 teachers judged phonemic awareness assessment as "highly effective". This is consistent with the literature that reports unequivocal support for the critical role of phonemic awareness in learning to read (Adams, 1990; Blachman, 1997; Perfetti, Beck, Bell, & Hughes, 1987; Share, 1995; Spector, 1995; Stanovich, 1992). The research however, does not point the direction towards the best way to assess phonemic awareness. The connection between the development of phonemic awareness skills and how best to assess them in early readers is not evident. Pearson, De Stefano, and Garcia (1998) state that the process of connecting research on instruction with effective assessments is an immensely complex process and one that needs more careful and deliberate consideration.

Phonics Assessments. Phonics assessments require young learners to demonstrate knowledge of print/speech correspondence. The term phonics is defined by Beck (1998) as an "umbrella term for a variety of ways of 'showing' (be it explicit or implicit) young learners how the print-to-speech system works" (p. 21). The print-to-speech mapping system appears to be central to what children need to learn early in their formal school reading programs. This basic premise is supported by empirical research that notes the importance of phonics instruction (especially explicit instruction) as a means of facilitating early reading acquisition (Adams, 1990; Anderson, Hiebert, Scott, & Wilkinson 1985). The teachers in all categories in this study, with the exception of beginning teachers, judged phonics assessments as being "highly effective" for determining the degree to which students have obtained proficiency with phonics skills. Beginning teachers rated these assessments as "moderately effective" (48%). Similar to the research base on phonemic awareness, the literature provides a compelling research base for teaching the orthographic/phonological system to early

readers, however determining the best practices for assessing phonics proficiency needs further exploration.

Rubric-Based Assessments. Rubric-based assessments are intended to be clearly connected to the instructional process, and as Hakel (1998) describes, they are lists of clearly

stated criteria by which student performance will be evaluated. Therefore, the use of rubrics helps to focus the assessment process by informing students about what is expected of them from the onset of their work (Montgomery, 2001). These assessments generally support cognitive learning theory and the constructivist approach to knowledge acquisition, which call for assessment methods that ask students to construct a response instead of recognizing one from a list (Hakel, 1998; Montgomery, 2001). In this study, rubric-based assessments were rated “highly effective” by the K-6 respondents, the experienced, primary, and intermediate teachers. It is interesting to note that beginning teachers did not judge rubric-based assessments to be “highly effective”. Beginning teachers usually have recent and substantial experiences with these concepts during their professional studies. Yet the findings of this study suggest that the degree to which knowledge transfers with beginning teachers to practice is uncertain.

Further differences about assessment practices are evident between beginning and experienced teachers. Experienced teachers rated assessments of phonics, word identification, sight-word analysis, self-evaluations, narrative, expository, basal reader, conference, critical thinking, rubric, and essay assessments as being “highly effective” whereas the beginning teachers rated them as “moderately effective”. The significant difference where the rating by beginning teachers was “highly effective” compared to a rating of “moderately effective” by the experienced teachers, was on attitude surveys. It is difficult to establish whether these judgements represent actual differences in theoretical underpinnings of the reading process or have been garnered from experience. Further, the data show that the experienced teachers were the only teacher group to judge critical thinking assessments, conference style assessments, and essay/short answer assessments as “highly effective”.

At a time when there is strong emphasis in the field on reading as a “process”, it was surprising to find that teachers consistently judged metacognitive awareness assessments as “somewhat effective”. Baker

and Brown (1984) define metacognitive awareness as the “knowledge one has over his or her own thinking and learning, including reading” (p. 353). Assessment of metacognitive awareness is generally done through interviews or questionnaires. Since metacognitive awareness is generally viewed as a theoretical term, perhaps teachers were unfamiliar with the term or did not fully understand the underlying concepts. If terms such as *prior knowledge*, *predicting*, *monitoring*, etc. had been substituted for metacognitive awareness, teachers’ perceptions and their judgements may have been different.

On the matter of standardized tests, the data bear out the point that teachers identified standardized testing as being “somewhat effective”. Recognizing that standardized tests are generally insensitive to what is educationally important, the results of this study supports Stake’s (1979) long-standing argument that it is not necessary to rule out standardized tests; rather, seek to find ways to properly evaluate, prioritize, and monitor the roles of standardized testing.

Putting into practice what is learned from the practice of others is not an end in itself, nor does it guarantee effective teaching. However assessments that are identified by practicing teachers and judged to be effective, create a context for the development of a new knowledge base about practice in the field.

Conclusions

This study began with the question, “What do elementary teachers think are the most effective reading assessments to determine reading proficiency and growth, and to guide future instruction?” The results lead to the conclusion that teachers perceived all reading assessments as having some degree of merit. There were no assessments that were identified as being “not effective” and the majority of reading assessment practices were perceived to be “moderately” to “highly” effective.

The challenge of shifting the emphasis and responsibility for assessment towards the teacher, and even more significantly towards the reader, will take courage and imagination to undertake and to argue for. This kind of assessment, in which professional judgement is central, and which is to have public standing, is important because it offers the possibility of making better use of assessment information to guide instruction and assist the development of individuals.

It is imperative that society acknowledges the importance of teachers' perspectives as being central to assessment decisions. It is also important to develop a wide body of knowledge about teachers' choices of assessment practices and to put in place mechanisms for sharing the information. This sharing could lead to groups of teachers agreeing to implement such assessment tasks over a given period as a way of developing consensus in the assessment of students' reading performance. An agreed upon body of knowledge is essential to a profession. Although an enormous literature base exists on various aspects of reading, this is not so for research about curriculum-embedded reading assessment.

Considerable national attention has focused on reading assessment and its many attendant issues. Without an appreciation and understanding of teachers' beliefs and practices regarding literacy assessments, it is difficult to address the questions that are raised. Therefore, developing a knowledge base about effective literacy assessment practices as identified by teachers, is essential in order to improve assessment practices for teachers and students alike.

Implications for Future Research

This study suggests a promising line of conceptual as well as practical research. Successful assessment of learning to read is not only a matter of choosing the appropriate tools or practices, but it also includes teachers' knowledge of the reading process, knowledge of assessment, knowing what to assess, and the importance of insight and consistency in the process. In this study teachers were not asked to articulate a clear conception of what is to be assessed nor were they asked to determine if these aims are the best ones to strive towards. Further studies are needed to examine the conditions that foster effective

assessment and the correlation between reading assessment and reading achievement. These topics are critical to the process of further exploration regarding reading assessment.

Table 2. Effectiveness of Reading Assessment Practices

| Reading Assessment Effectiveness | Percent Response of Opinions of | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------|------------|--------|
| | Not | Somewhat | Moderately | Highly |
| Concepts About Print | 8 | 20 | 31 | 41 |
| Auditory Discrimination | 0 | 17 | 49 | 34 |
| Phonemic Awareness | 0 | 06 | 43 | 51 |
| Phonics | 0 | 12 | 42 | 46 |
| Running Records | 0 | 21 | 43 | 36 |
| Language | 2 | 27 | 54 | 17 |
| Cognitive | 2 | 25 | 65 | 08 |
| Word Identification | 6 | 24 | 44 | 26 |
| Sight Word | 4 | 17 | 46 | 33 |
| Interest Surveys | 2 | 34 | 49 | 15 |
| Attitude Surveys | 4 | 40 | 40 | 16 |
| Literacy Portfolio | 2 | 34 | 52 | 12 |
| Performance-Based | 0 | 24 | 62 | 14 |
| Project-Based | 3 | 33 | 54 | 10 |
| Student Self-Evaluations | 9 | 32 | 36 | 23 |
| Narrative Reading | 2 | 26 | 40 | 32 |
| Expository Reading | 2 | 18 | 53 | 27 |
| Metacognitive Awareness | 7 | 50 | 37 | 06 |
| Study Skills | 0 | 33 | 50 | 17 |
| Cloze Procedure | 9 | 30 | 46 | 15 |
| Informal Reading Inventories | 0 | 14 | 47 | 39 |
| Reading Miscue Analysis | 2 | 15 | 50 | 33 |
| Qualitative Reading Inventory | 8 | 20 | 44 | 28 |
| Basal Reader | 6 | 27 | 50 | 17 |
| Literature Response Journals | 2 | 20 | 39 | 39 |
| Literature Group Discussion | 5 | 17 | 45 | 33 |
| Conference-Style | 7 | 27 | 38 | 28 |
| Interview | 6 | 28 | 39 | 27 |
| Standardized Tests | 9 | 32 | 43 | 16 |
| State Mandated Literacy | 10 | 37 | 48 | 05 |
| Critical Thinking | 2 | 24 | 48 | 26 |
| Objective Test | 2 | 30 | 56 | 12 |
| Authentic | 2 | 27 | 41 | 30 |
| Rubric-Based | 0 | 12 | 44 | 44 |
| Essay/Short Answer | 0 | 24 | 51 | 25 |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|----|----|----|
| Emergent Literacy | 2 | 26 | 50 | 22 |
| Listening Comprehension | 0 | 14 | 59 | 27 |
| Fluency | 2 | 20 | 56 | 22 |

Table 3. Responses by Years of Experience

| Reading Assessment | Percent Response of Opinions of Effectiveness | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----|----------|----|------------|----|--------|----|
| | Not | | Somewhat | | Moderately | | Highly | |
| | B | E | B | E | B | E | B | E |
| Concepts About Print | 14 | 0 | 27 | 12 | 23 | 41 | 36 | 47 |
| Auditory Discrimination | 0 | 0 | 22 | 13 | 52 | 44 | 26 | 43 |
| Phonemic Awareness | 0 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 40 | 44 | 52 | 52 |
| Phonics | 0 | 0 | 16 | 8 | 48 | 33 | 36 | 59 |
| Running Records | 0 | 0 | 27 | 13 | 46 | 42 | 27 | 45 |
| Language | 4 | 0 | 28 | 23 | 56 | 55 | 12 | 22 |
| Cognitive | 4 | 0 | 24 | 23 | 64 | 68 | 8 | 9 |
| Word Identification | 11 | 0 | 30 | 19 | 44 | 46 | 15 | 35 |
| Sight Word | 8 | 0 | 15 | 19 | 58 | 37 | 19 | 44 |
| Interest Surveys | 4 | 0 | 25 | 46 | 54 | 44 | 17 | 13 |
| Attitude Surveys | 4 | 4 | 35 | 46 | 35 | 46 | 26 | 4 |
| Literacy Portfolio | 0 | 4 | 42 | 25 | 47 | 58 | 11 | 13 |
| Performance-Based | 0 | 0 | 18 | 27 | 73 | 55 | 9 | 18 |
| Project-Based | 0 | 6 | 27 | 38 | 64 | 44 | 9 | 12 |
| Student Self-Evaluations | 9 | 5 | 27 | 38 | 55 | 19 | 9 | 38 |
| Narrative Reading | 4 | 0 | 33 | 17 | 46 | 35 | 17 | 48 |
| Expository Reading | 4 | 0 | 21 | 14 | 58 | 48 | 17 | 38 |
| Metacognitive Awareness | 13 | 0 | 40 | 60 | 40 | 33 | 7 | 7 |
| Study Skills | 0 | 0 | 43 | 21 | 44 | 58 | 13 | 21 |
| Cloze Procedure | 8 | 9 | 25 | 33 | 54 | 38 | 13 | 20 |
| Informal Reading Inventories | 0 | 0 | 20 | 9 | 40 | 57 | 40 | 34 |
| Reading Miscue Analysis | 4 | 0 | 21 | 9 | 46 | 52 | 29 | 39 |
| Qualitative Reading Inventory | 10 | 6 | 15 | 22 | 45 | 44 | 30 | 28 |
| Basal Reader | 8 | 4 | 24 | 27 | 64 | 39 | 4 | 30 |
| Literature Response Journals | 4 | 0 | 8 | 33 | 48 | 29 | 40 | 38 |
| Literature Group Discussion | 9 | 0 | 9 | 29 | 52 | 35 | 30 | 36 |
| Conference-Style | 15 | 0 | 25 | 30 | 45 | 30 | 15 | 40 |
| Interview | 12 | 0 | 29 | 26 | 35 | 42 | 24 | 32 |
| Standardized Tests | 12 | 7 | 33 | 32 | 38 | 46 | 17 | 15 |
| State Mandated Literacy Tests | 5 | 16 | 45 | 32 | 45 | 47 | 5 | 5 |
| Critical Thinking | 4 | 0 | 18 | 26 | 64 | 32 | 14 | 42 |
| Objective Test | 4 | 0 | 30 | 26 | 57 | 58 | 9 | 16 |
| Authentic | 0 | 5 | 26 | 30 | 48 | 30 | 26 | 35 |
| Rubric-Based | 0 | 0 | 11 | 12 | 58 | 28 | 31 | 60 |
| Essay/Short Answer | 0 | 0 | 13 | 33 | 78 | 24 | 9 | 43 |
| Emergent Literacy | 4 | 0 | 20 | 30 | 60 | 40 | 16 | 30 |
| Listening Comprehension | 0 | 0 | 7 | 17 | 63 | 57 | 30 | 26 |
| Fluency | 0 | 4 | 23 | 13 | 58 | 57 | 19 | 26 |

B = Beginning Teachers (5 years or less); E = Experienced Teachers (More than 5 years)

Table 4. Responses by Teaching Level (i.e. Primary/Intermediate)

| Reading Assessment | Percent Response of Opinions of Effectiveness | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----|----------|----|------------|----|--------|----|
| | Not | | Somewhat | | Moderately | | Highly | |
| | P | I | P | I | P | I | P | I |
| Concepts About Print | 4 | 25 | 17 | 12 | 35 | 50 | 44 | 13 |
| Auditory Discrimination | 15 | 0 | 44 | 30 | 41 | 40 | 0 | 30 |
| Phonemic Awareness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 41 | 42 | 59 | 33 |
| Phonics | 0 | 0 | 7 | 25 | 43 | 25 | 50 | 50 |
| Running Records | 0 | 0 | 11 | 42 | 52 | 17 | 37 | 41 |
| Language | 0 | 8 | 26 | 31 | 59 | 46 | 15 | 15 |
| Cognitive | 4 | 0 | 26 | 17 | 63 | 75 | 7 | 8 |
| Word Identification | 7 | 0 | 28 | 29 | 52 | 36 | 13 | 35 |
| Sight Word | 3 | 0 | 20 | 21 | 53 | 43 | 24 | 36 |
| Interest Surveys | 0 | 0 | 33 | 38 | 50 | 54 | 17 | 8 |
| Attitude Surveys | 0 | 8 | 43 | 38 | 48 | 31 | 9 | 23 |
| Literacy Portfolio | 0 | 9 | 33 | 45 | 54 | 27 | 13 | 19 |
| Performance-Based | 0 | 0 | 22 | 23 | 61 | 61 | 17 | 16 |
| Project-Based | 0 | 8 | 35 | 31 | 59 | 46 | 6 | 15 |
| Student Self-Evaluations | 4 | 8 | 35 | 33 | 39 | 33 | 22 | 26 |
| Narrative Reading | 4 | 0 | 24 | 23 | 44 | 46 | 28 | 31 |
| Expository Reading | 4 | 0 | 17 | 15 | 54 | 62 | 25 | 23 |
| Metacognitive Awareness | 0 | 12 | 47 | 50 | 47 | 25 | 6 | 13 |
| Study Skills | 0 | 0 | 48 | 15 | 43 | 54 | 9 | 31 |
| Cloze Procedure | 0 | 8 | 36 | 25 | 56 | 33 | 8 | 34 |
| Informal Reading Inventories | 0 | 0 | 8 | 28 | 60 | 22 | 32 | 50 |
| Reading Miscue Analysis | 0 | 9 | 15 | 18 | 59 | 18 | 26 | 55 |
| Qualitative Reading Inventory | 0 | 10 | 16 | 30 | 63 | 20 | 21 | 40 |
| Basal Reader | 7 | 7 | 31 | 21 | 45 | 57 | 17 | 15 |
| Literature Response Journals | 0 | 8 | 17 | 31 | 39 | 31 | 44 | 30 |
| Literature Group Discussion | 0 | 8 | 21 | 15 | 47 | 46 | 32 | 31 |
| Conference-Style | 5 | 8 | 25 | 33 | 40 | 42 | 30 | 17 |
| Interview | 0 | 8 | 17 | 50 | 56 | 25 | 27 | 17 |
| Standardized Tests | 10 | 7 | 47 | 14 | 30 | 57 | 13 | 22 |
| State Mandated Literacy Tests | 10 | 0 | 35 | 46 | 55 | 46 | 0 | 8 |
| Critical Thinking | 0 | 8 | 25 | 15 | 55 | 46 | 20 | 31 |
| Objective Test | 0 | 8 | 26 | 8 | 59 | 67 | 5 | 17 |
| Authentic | 0 | 0 | 32 | 23 | 32 | 54 | 36 | 23 |
| Rubric-Based | 0 | 0 | 11 | 7 | 46 | 36 | 43 | 57 |
| Essay/Short Answer | 0 | 0 | 19 | 29 | 57 | 36 | 24 | 35 |
| Emergent Literacy | 0 | 9 | 20 | 36 | 52 | 46 | 28 | 9 |
| Listening Comprehension | 0 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 65 | 57 | 24 | 29 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Fluency | 0 | 0 | 24 | 21 | 64 | 43 | 12 | 36 |
|---------|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|

P=Primary Teacher (K-3); I=Intermediate Teachers (4-6).

REFERENCES

- Adams, M. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Afflerbach, P. (1998). Reading assessment and learning to read. In J. Osborn & F. Lehr (Eds.), *Literacy for all: Issues in teaching and learning*, (pp. 239-263). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Anderson, R., Hiebert, E., Scott, J., & Wilkinson, I. (1985). *Becoming a nation of readers*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.
- Baker, L. & Brown, A. (1984). Metacognitive skills and reading. In P. Pearson, R. Barr, M. Kamil, & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research*, (pp.353-394). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Beck, I. (1998). Understanding beginning reading: A journey through teaching and research. In J. Osborn & F. Lehr (Eds.), *Literacy for all: Issues in teaching and learning*, (pp. 11-31). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Blachman, B. (1997). Early intervention and phonological awareness: A cautionary tale. In B. Blachman (Ed.), *Foundations of reading acquisition and dyslexia: Implications for early intervention* (pp. 409-430). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Calkins, L. (2001). *The art of teaching reading*. San Francisco, CA: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers, Inc.
- Clay, M. (1985). *The early detection of reading difficulties*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Coles, M. (1998). Assessing reading. In M. Coles & R. Jenkins (Eds.), *Assessing reading 2: Changing practice in classrooms*, (pp. 1-8). New York: Routledge.
- Ehri, L. & Sweet, J. (1991). Fingerprint reading of memorized text: What enables beginning readers to process print? *Reading Research Quarterly*, 26, 442-462.
- Hakel, M. (1998). *Beyond multiple choice: Evaluating alternatives to traditional testing for selection*. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Harrison, C. (1994). The assessment of response to reading: Developing a postmodern perspective. In A. Goodwyn (Ed.), *English Ability*, (pp. 66-89). London: David Foulton.

- Harrison, C. Bailey, M. & Dewar, A. (1998). Responsive reading assessment. In C. Harrison & T. Salinger (Eds.), *Assessing reading I: Theory and practice*. (pp.1-20). New York: Routledge.
- Hoffman, J., Roser, N., & Worthy, J. (1998). Challenging the assessment context for literacy instruction in first grade. In C. Harrison & T. Salinger (Eds.), *Assessing reading I: Theory and practice*. (pp. 166-181). New York: Routledge.
- Hoffman, J., Worthy, J., Roser, N., & Rutherford, W. (1998). Performance assessment in reading: Implications for teacher education. In J. Osborn & F. Lehr (Eds.), *Literacy for all: Issues in teaching and learning*, (pp. 289-300). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Johnston, P. & Allington, R. (1991). Remediation. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research, Vol. II*, (pp. 984-1012). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Linn, R. (2000). Assessments and accountability. *Educational Researcher*, 29 (2), 4-15.
- Montgomery, K. (2001). *Authentic assessment: A guide for elementary teachers*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Morris, R. (1981). Concept of word: A developmental phenomenon in the beginning reading and writing processes. *Language Arts*, 58, 659-668.
- Neill, D. (2000). Transforming student assessment. In R. Robinson, M. McKenna, & J. Wedman (Eds.), *Issues and trends in literacy education*, (pp. 136-148). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Pearson, P., De Stefano, L., & Garcia, G. (1998). Ten dilemmas of performance assessment. In C. Harrison & T. Salinger (Eds.), *Assessing Reading I: Theory and practice*. (pp. 21-49). New York: Routledge.
- Perfetti, C., Beck, I., Bell, L., & Hughes, C. (1987). Phonemic knowledge and learning to read are reciprocal: A longitudinal study of first grade children. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 33, 283-319.
- Reutzel, D., Ray, D., Oda, L., & Moore, B. (1989). Developing print awareness: The effect of three instructional approaches on kindergartner's print awareness, reading readiness, and word reading. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 21, 197-217.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York: Doubleday.
- Share, D. (1995). Phonological recoding and self-tracking: Sine qua non of reading acquisition. *Cognition*, 55, 151-218.

- Smith, F. (1994). *Understanding reading*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Spector, J. (1995). Phonemic awareness training: Application of principles of direct instruction. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 11, 37-51.
- Stake, R. (1979). Program evaluation, particularly responsive evaluation. In W. Dockrell & D. Hamilton (Eds.), *Rethinking Educational Research*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Stanovich, K. (1992). Speculations on the causes and consequences of individual differences in early reading acquisition. In P. Gough, L. Ehri, & R. Treiman (Eds.), *Reading Acquisition*, pp. 307-342. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stephens, D., Pearson, P., Gilrane, C., Rowe, M., Stallman, A., Shelton, J., Rodriquez, A., & Commeyras, M. (1995). Assessment and decision making in schools: A cross-site analysis. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30, 478-499.
- Stiggins, R. (2001). *Student-involved classroom assessment*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Swope, K. & Miner, B. (2000). *Failing our kids: Why the testing craze won't fix our schools*. Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools, Ltd.
- Tierney, R. (1998). Literacy assessment reform: Shifting beliefs, principled possibilities, and emerging practices. *The Reading Teacher*, 51 (2), 374-390.
- Venezky, R. (1987). Steps toward a modern history of American reading instruction. *Review of Research in Education*, 13, 129-167.
- Wixon, K., Valencia, S., & Lipson, M. (1994). Issues in literacy assessment: Facing the realities of internal and external assessment. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 26, 315-337.

Dr. Mary B. Campbell is a faculty member at Saint Xavier University in Chicago, Illinois.