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The purpose of this study was to identify a common set of strategies as determined by two panels of experts (practitioners and theorists), which reflected a sociopsycholinguistic teaching model integrating reading and writing processes on the postsecondary level.

At the present time approximately 30% of the students entering college have some type of skill need, and tertiary institutions have been compelled to admit this type of developmental student to survive financially. Higher education has responded to this crisis by providing developmental programs to assist students in improving their basic skills.

Despite the fact that recent educational research on language acquisition and development states that reading, writing, speaking, and listening are best taught simultaneously in a whole language process, these skills are still taught in isolation in developmental programs designed to assist students. Therefore, the need was to come up with more effective alternatives to traditional methods.

In researching these alternatives, this study focused on the need to determine exactly which of these strategies were sociopsycholinguistic in nature and were appropriate and useful in working with developmental postsecondary students.
Using a survey-research design, the investigation was conducted by developing and administering two instruments: A Survey of the Utilization of Sociopsycholinguistic Strategies, and A Survey of Sociopsycholinguistic Strategies and Practices. The sample consisted of 252 specialists: 224 practitioners working with developmental college students selected from 48 Michigan higher education institutions and 28 selected experts in the theory of sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, sociopsycholinguistics, and linguistics from the United States, Canada, and New Zealand.

Five hypotheses were developed for this investigation. A two-thirds criterion was used to provide a ratio of positive to negative responses, which determine agreement on the individual strategies. Findings of this study provided an integrated set of sociopsycholinguistic strategies agreed to be useful and appropriate at the tertiary level. Further research needs to be done on the effectiveness of these strategies with developmental students.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

American schools and universities are in the middle of a literacy crisis. Amidst this crisis is a dissatisfaction with American public education, and the impetus for back-to-the-basics programs, minimal competencies, and general education, especially in the humanities. Secondary schools are faced with numerous public mandates, one of which is to insure that their graduates have minimum writing and reading abilities needed for adult life. Unfortunately the "minimum" writing and reading abilities needed for adult life are not always sufficient for those intending to enter a college or university for further education, especially in this American "information-processing" society.

While focusing on the need to improve students' basic skills at the college level, and the reasons to cure this crisis, it is imperative to discuss the nation's economic and social changes to determine what created this crisis and how it will continue to impact society. During the past three to four decades, the United States has gone through constant economic and social changes while shifting from an industrialized-mechanized society to a "megatrend," space-oriented, computer-operated society. And as such, the United States' transition from an assembly line, factory-oriented, and primarily blue-collar, industrial-based society to a new information/electronic, space-bound economy, was based on the creation and distribution of information.

1
In a long, excellent essay 'The Molting of America' in the November 22, 1982 issue of Forbes [it was] ... argued that the old industrial base was indeed fading away and that in its place a new information--electronics economy was rising up. We have shifted from an industrial society to one based on the creation and distribution of information. (Naisbitt, 1984, pp. xxi-xxii).

Because the former industrial era served Americans so well, its demise has been unthinkable for many. "For years we have denied that our industrial base was eroding steadily, even though it was happening right before our eyes" (Naisbitt, 1984, p. xxi). As a result, developing these new skills for an information-processing society has been resisted, especially by believers in and former supporters of the industrial era philosophy. Along with the creation and distribution of information came the great emphasis on changing our educational systems and programs and the need for people with strong "basic skills" (see Definition of Terms).

According to John Naisbitt (1984), author of Megatrends, the demise of the industrial-oriented society during the Eisenhower administration in 1956 brought about the beginning of the information society, which can be traced to the introduction of the transatlantic cable telephone service, with more white-collar workers than blue-collar employees, and with the globalization of information with the launching of the Sputnik. It was at this point in America's history that educational methods and programs started coming under careful scrutiny (Naisbitt, 1984). Many individuals will protest that the information era began in recent years with the development and utilization of computers and robotics. However, the results of this sophisticated technology merely hastened the plunge into an information-oriented society. "The problem
is that our thinking, our attitudes, and consequently our decision-making have not caught up with the reality of things" (Naisbitt, 1984, p. 3).

In a *Chronicle of Higher Education* article entitled "Change in America," Cheryl M. Fields (1986) stated that the changes in both the work and the work force will certainly transform U.S. higher education. Fields stated that "between 1979 and 1984, an estimated 11.5 million people lost their jobs through plant closings, relocations, or technological innovations" (p. 1). These innovations are the same transformations, Naisbitt (1984) pointed out, that are used in creating an information-processing society. The article continues with a warning that "an estimated 20 percent of these people need to improve their basic skills in reading, writing, mathematics, and communication if they are to find jobs with good chances for advancement" (p. 1). Therefore, one could conclude that higher education graduates would also need even more sophisticated language ability or skills.

In recent history, the reality of the situation is that this is a nation with information workers, where only 5% of the almost 20 million new jobs created in the 1970s were in manufacturing and approximately 90% were in information, knowledge, and/or service jobs (Naisbitt, 1984, p. 13).

These information occupations include "workers who are actually engaged in the creation, processing, and distribution of information" (Naisbitt, 1984, p. 4). Donald J. Foss and David T. Hakes (1978) called this current century the age of communication and pointed out that a substantial portion of the gross national product is generated by individuals who are primarily communicators. These jobs include computer
programmers, teachers, clerks, secretaries, accountants, stockbrokers, insurance people, bureaucrats, lawyers, bankers, and technicians, to name a few, with most positions requiring a college education/training. The new wealth, as Naisbitt put it, is know how, that is, coming to the job with strong basic language ability and perhaps computer skills, instead of having very few skills and being trained on the job as in the past. Daniel Bell, a Harvard sociologist (cited in Naisbitt, 1984), concurred by stating that the current strategic resource is information. No matter how this new information-processing economy is described, the crux of the issue is that creating, developing, and processing information or knowledge is the key to achieving success in the job market and the future. In order to do this successfully, one needs strong languaging abilities. This is where the problem for American youth and for the American educational system becomes grave.

Background of the Problem

It is certain that this information-age society will continue to grow and that, perhaps in the near future, nearly every high school graduate will be required to have a college education or technical training, no matter what career she\(^1\) chooses for the future. Having excellent languaging skills will continue to be vital for the American society. The survival of this country will then be very dependent on how well the educational systems and institutions educate its future leaders and

---

\(^1\)Since English lacks an accepted word to denote the generic third person singular and to encompass both woman and man, this author finds "she/he" or "her/him" awkward and chooses to use "she" or "her" throughout this dissertation.
citizens. Carmen Collins (1985) of Rutgers University supported this point:

The growing use of computers to store, manipulate and retrieve information increases the need for an interactive competency with language. Although information processing is accelerated and enhanced by computers, only those who read and write fluently and can make decisions about appropriate uses of language, are making efficient use of new technology. As a result, the shortage of effective readers and writers, felt deeply in an industrial age, will have an even greater impact in an age of information that demands higher levels of critical reading and writing. (p. 333)

As previously discussed, information-processing skills are manifested in the use of language; that is, ability to use the language well, and to incorporate "people-interactive communication" in the American job market. During the agricultural period people were pitted against nature; in the industrial society people were pitted against fabricated nature; and now, during the information society people are pitted against written and spoken, computer generated communication in what Naisbitt (1984) called a people-interactive communication process.

The American society has changed from one of brawniness during the industrial era to one of cerebralness in this information-processing era, from training on-the-job to prewired languaging skills. However, Naisbitt (1984) contended that "in this literacy-intensive society, when we need basic reading/writing skills more than ever before, our education system is turning out an increasingly inferior product" (p. 11).

Higher Education's Quandary

In the past, students whose academic skills were woefully inadequate and whose intellectual interests were hard to ascertain would not
have been as readily accepted in higher education as they are currently. At the same time, "higher education is losing its ability to compete effectively with more lucrative professions in attracting the ablest young people" (Schuster, 1986, p. 277). This leaves higher education in a bit of a quandary. At the same time that it is concerned with accommodating and serving the needs of large numbers of poorly prepared students, it is confronted with declining enrollments and budget cuts. For instance, the U.S. Department of Education's survey in 1983-84 found that 82% of institutions offered remedial courses in reading, writing, or mathematics, while the 1989-90 number of institutions offering remedial courses decreased to 74% (U.S. Department of Education, 1991). Budget cuts can certainly account for much of this decline. Without this group of potential students the educational institutions may face substantial loss of programs due to lack of students. While decisions regarding this quandary have been debated and made at the administrative level, the faculty members are cognizant of their precarious position.

In addition to the declining enrollment and the budget cuts, the tertiary faculty also face a dilemma. Jack H. Schuster (1986) shared this faculty dilemma:

Meanwhile, critics--including a host of public officials--who deplore the elitist tendencies of higher education are urging faculty members to better accommodate expanded access. In their view, if that means more remedial courses for poorly prepared students, so be it. Simultaneously, however, the faculty is routinely rebuked by other observers for compromising academic skills [which] are woefully inadequate. (p. 277)

It was estimated in 1987 by Spann that approximately 16% to 25% of the freshmen entering higher education institutions need basic
skills or literacy intensive instruction (reading, writing, critical thinking). But, in 1991 it was reported by the U.S. Department of Education that 30% of all entering college students were enrolled in remedial courses. To give an even broader perspective on the problems in the admissions pool to higher education institutions, it has been found that: "In 1975, as many as twenty percent of all American 17-year-olds were functionally illiterate" (Learner, cited in Carbo, 1984, p. 72). "We are appalled by the fact that we are graduating 750,000 to a million kids from high school a year who are functionally illiterate, and an equal number are dropping out or are being pushed out of our school system" (Fields, 1986, p. 39). Fields stated the opinion that "during the next 10 to 15 years, growing numbers of youths and adults will lack the education and skills to obtain even their first entry level job" (p. 39). "It is sobering--if not grim--to think of teenagers as 'has-beens' with no realistic chance of a comeback" (T. Sowell, 1984, p. 28). But this is the evidence, as far as basic skills and the sciences are concerned. Jean Evangelauf (1985) and Spann (1987) stated that enrollment in remedial courses has increased 63% for college students with basic skill deficiencies. In 1987, just the public colleges and universities alone enrolled 85% of all freshmen in the U.S.A., and an even higher overall percentage (90%) of freshmen taking remedial courses, which includes reading, writing, and mathematics. These statistics only present part of the total picture; that is, those poorly prepared students in colleges and universities, and omit the estimated 27 to 72 million illiterate (depending on definition) Americans, that either will not or have not yet finished high school and will not even attempt higher education (McGarvey, 1988). Eventually,
however, these students will also attempt to enter the job market, "skillless," yet more profoundly lacking in reading and writing skill, that is, literacy-intensive skills. "If we don't take some action now, we're going to have a very big pool of unskilled citizens who at best will be underemployed and probably will find it very difficult to get a job because of the rising skill needs" (Fields, 1986, p. 39).

Another problem exacerbating the situation is due to a drop in the birthrate 20 years ago, which caused the current decline in enrollment of traditional-aged college students. Practically every higher education institution is turning to recruiting "disadvantaged" students (see Definitions of Terms). Although the primary mission for these tertiary institutions is to offer an educational opportunity to students who might not otherwise have one, universities and colleges are also attempting to offset the rapid decline in enrollment. According to the report by Hodgkinson (1983), the future history of higher education can be pretty well established through the year 2000. A decade of decline in total numbers of college-eligible youth (1986 to 1996) will be followed by slight increases in the youth pool that will last into the next century. Most of these increases will be among minority groups, especially Blacks and Hispanics. On one hand, the law of supply and demand is causing colleges and universities to admit students who are not academically prepared for college even though many of them graduated in the upper percentage of their high school class and were considered the best in their class. On the other hand, colleges and universities are not truly prepared to assist these students with skill needs. Consequently, the freshman and sophomore years for these students are spent adjusting
and improving their basic skills instead of learning new materials to prepare them for future professional positions.

The Students' Skill Needs

The common bond within all educational endeavors, and now the link to success in a megatrend (information-processing) society, is the use of language. A university student's ability to use and comprehend the language clearly reflects upon her career and in turn has a direct bearing on the growth of American society. In the past, sophisticated skill in the use of language as needed for critical thinking and communicating was limited to a notable select few, that is, mainly college graduates. Now, being able to use these verbal skills proficiently is essential and crucial for all, especially the "educated." In the U.S. Department of Education's study conducted in 1983-84 (Spann, 1987; U. S. Department of Education, 1991), it was found that of all the college freshmen 25% took remedial mathematics, 21% took remedial writing, and 16% took remedial reading. This report also showed that 82% of all institutions offered at least one remedial course in mathematics, reading, or writing. More offered remedial courses in writing (73%) and mathematics (71%) than reading (66%). In comparing public to private schools, 87% of public institutions offered remedial reading, as compared to 44% of the private institutions surveyed. Ironically, it now appears that the elite few that formerly had language skills are now becoming those in need of basic skills.

In J. L. Martin's (1991) article on the learning disabled college writer, she pointed out that "the number of LD college students is esti-
mated to have increased 300 percent in the last decade; currently 1 percent of all college freshmen describe themselves as LD" (p. 284). Formerly, "learning disabilities [were] thought of, by the general public as well as educators, as being a problem concerning only elementary-level students" (p. 284). Even more astonishingly, she stated that "a much larger population is as yet formally undiagnosed, an invisible group whose numbers are estimated to range from as low as 10 percent to as high as one-third of our students" (J. L. Martin, 1991, p. 284).

The Developmental Student

Suddenly, these problems with underprepared college students have become a national crisis. Gerald W. Bracey (1988) pointed out that the "Commission of Excellence in Education reports, [that] American students are becoming less well prepared for college and the years beyond" (p. 378). However, Martha Maxwell (1980) contended that "the need for intensive basic skills services for college students is not a recent phenomenon but has deep historical roots" (p. 6). Because of the rapidly changing society, the profile of the developmental learner (see Definitions of Terms) has been altered. Certainly, college students are faced with problems other than academic skills. For instance, they must make personal as well as social adjustments in a new environment. Problems with health, their families, and certainly finances may also affect the new student. However, as Maxwell (1980) stated, the crucial need is still academic:

The central concern of college students is success in academic work; if faced with academic difficulties, they are overwhelmed. They feel inadequate and fear failure and
these feelings affect all spheres of their lives. Conversely, when students are able to overcome learning problems, they gain confidence in themselves, and this confidence enables them to cope more effectively with other conflicts (pp. 1-2).

Academic difficulties and learning problems (most frequently) stem from poor basic skills. When students acquire strong basic skills, their self-image usually improves simultaneously. It is also necessary to realize that academic skill deficiency is not unique to any specific group; instead it is apparent in all types of students, from the "A" students to the low achievers.

Maxwell (1980) gave a thumbnail sketch of this multifaceted crisis by describing many of the influences or contributors to the problem of the "new" college student.

The permissive environment of today's high schools, lowered standards as reflected in high absentee rates and grade inflation, and their deemphasis of traditional college preparatory courses have produced a generation of students that is weaker in skills than students of the 1950s. Faculty members and administrators in colleges throughout the country are deeply concerned about the continuing decline in college entrance test scores and in measures of proficiency in basic skills. As increasing numbers of students from poverty backgrounds and with weak academic preparation enter college, supported by federal and state financial aid, the pool of highly qualified college applicants seems to grow smaller each year. The problem of underprepared students affects every institution--indeed, it is viewed as a national crisis. Newspapers regularly report on the crisis in the three R's, the illiteracy of today's college students, and the fact that providing the necessary remedial instruction is taxing college budgets and resources. Most colleges are requiring freshmen to take basic reading, writing, and mathematics review courses, while some are still struggling with the question whether credit should be awarded for preparatory work that faculty members (and state legislatures) insist should have been taught in high school. But the problems are growing and an end is not in sight. (p. 2).

Even though Maxwell's (1980) materials appear to be dated, in a section of A Response to a Nation at Risk entitled "The Plague of Ignor-
(Bell & Elmquist, 1991), the authors gave a vivid description of today's semiliterate high school students:

[A] plague is attacking this country’s youth. Schools in this nation are producing hundreds of thousands of semiliterate, undereducated young people each year, even though most of them are potentially productive members of our society. These youths are unprepared to meet the world; and this society, not just the schools, is to blame. (p. 1)

**Teaching Basic Skills in the Higher Education Setting**

Although many institutions of higher education provide facilities to improve the incoming students' chances for survival and to assist in maintaining enrollment, and even though many higher education institutions' intentions are well-meaning, the images of these facilities are poor, and basic language skills are still taught in isolation (Donoghue, 1990). Both the poor image of the centers and the isolation of language skills perpetuate the problem; that is, improving incoming developmental college students' chances for surviving. The atmosphere of the learning centers and the developmental classes must be one of a positive environment. The staff should be trained and informed that students with skill needs are not less intelligent as sometimes thought, but that they have not been taught or have not developed sophisticated language abilities.

As the problems with developmental students began to impact higher education, an attempt was made to establish programs quickly and inexpensively to assist these underprepared students and thereby maintain enrollment. But, many institutions of higher education had made an unfortunate error in their program directions by focusing mainly
on their own students and ignoring the experiences of the black colleges, who have successfully taught educationally disadvantaged students for generations. Gordon (cited in Maxwell, 1980) accused white colleges of repeating the same mistakes that black colleges learned to avoid simply because white colleges failed to consult black colleges when they began their programs. Indeed, they insisted on implementing traditional remedial courses, assuming that this was the way to provide an adequate compensatory program (Maxwell, 1980).

Complicating the issues even more, there appears to be no consensus among the experts as to the most effective method of improving these skills. And, instead of integrating these language skills, reading and writing have been taught in isolation, as separate subjects, which further inhibits the development of strong basic skills (Donoghue, 1990).

In addition to courses in basic skills, 90% of the traditional institutions provide support services such as diagnosis, learning assistance labs, tutoring, and counseling programs. In 33% of the cases, schools have separate departments or divisions devoted entirely to remedial/developmental studies (Spann, 1987). Compounding the problems further are the following points discovered by the Southern Regional Education Board (cited in Spann, 1987) in a survey:

1. On a positive note, in almost all institutions there is recognition (officially) of the remedial/developmental education programs; however, they lack university financial support.

2. Unfortunately, there is no general agreement as to what constitutes "college level" skills.
3. This back-to-the-basics approach and underpreparation on the college level is widespread.

4. A large percentage of the postsecondary institutions do not have a clear picture of whether their programs are effective or not.

On the university level, while most reading and writing improvement teaching takes place in a classroom, or in a reading, writing, or learning center, most of these centers and labs are still in the process of isolating reading and writing skill improvement (Holladay, 1988) by teaching from kits, machines, or from strictly a grammatical or mechanical approach. Consequently, very few language development thinking strategies are taught. Many learning centers deal strictly with reteaching the subject/course, instead of focusing on the underlying skill deficiencies, which are in most cases critical reading and writing skills. Rather than the "kit" approaches or computer activities focusing on subskills of the language process (Holladay, 1988), progress should be toward direct application of the reading and writing process, as a whole language process/total language process, with activities centering on meaning and with "real" materials encountered in the adult world, especially at this level of education (Vacca & Vacca, 1981).

It appears that most of the improvement pedagogy applied to the freshmen's ability to communicate on paper and increase to their level of comprehension has been in the form of the "kit-approach," either in learning centers or in skill textbooks. These kit type materials such as SRA and EDL materials, reading machines, computer "games," or skill development handouts/worksheets or workbooks seem to perpetuate the problems or even produce (or continue to produce) boredom with reading
and writing activities as well as itemize and trivialize concepts and processes, or even eliminate aspects of education that are hard to define or are difficult (Holladay, 1988). For the most part, the skill textbooks still do not assist the student either in directly applying reading and writing skills jointly to her other classes and/or eventually to her other career needs. In other words, these cosmetic approaches to improving reading and writing skills are still an isolated, nonmeaningful approach that will not create independent learners.

Even though, in theory, educators have talked about the need to teach language skills simultaneously, in practice reading and writing development has been taught in isolation in higher education. Until recently, however, very little has been done toward "bridging the gap" between these skills.

Since reading and writing are two of the four language processes, along with speaking and listening, they must be treated linguistically. Readers and writers are users of language. They attempt to get meaning from written language and to create written meaning for others and, thus, are engaged in a psycholinguistic process.

It is unclear as to why many schools have not integrated these basic verbal skills (reading and writing) in the past; however, one can conjecture that some reasons could be: (a) the protection of one's turf, (b) the narrow training of professionals, and (c) the limited knowledge (theory and practice) of the process of learning writing and reading. During the past few years, the literature in these fields has begun to focus on research on integrative approaches to reading and writing (often referred to in the literature as a "whole language" process or
interactive skill process); and in some cases, reading and writing have been combined with other verbal skills such as speaking, listening, and even thinking. However, this progress has been primarily implemented on the lower elementary levels to teach initial skills. Unfortunately, parallel uses of integrated language teaching at the university level have not yet caught on, despite the fact that such approaches are crucial.

**Sociopsycholinguistics**

At the current time, sociopsycholinguistic and psycholinguistic methods are being used primarily in the elementary classrooms to teach introductory reading and writing skills, that is, primarily language acquisition. Although much has been written on the psycholinguistic approaches to teaching reading and writing on the elementary level and some on the secondary level, very little has been explored on the integration of reading and writing sociopsycholinguistically on the postsecondary level. Perhaps this is because it is assumed that by the time the student reaches the postsecondary level all of the problems and skill needs have been corrected or satisfied. However, this has not been true.

Therefore, it is in the researcher's opinion that a sociopsycholinguistic approach to teaching reading and writing could and should be adapted on the secondary and postsecondary levels to assist students with reading, writing, and study problems, since the student's language ability level becomes the foundation from which the edification (process) begins.

C. Collins (1985) also supported the integration process on the
university level:

Complex language manipulation tasks demand interactive strategies which, like the computer itself, engage a person's whole language-processing system. In other words, if students are to learn to use language interactively, they must be addressed and taught as interactive readers and writers; and reading/writing instruction must be holistic and meaning-centered rather than fragmented and skills-oriented. (p. 333)

Isolating aspects of language development has gone on far too long (Holladay, 1988; Huot, 1988), even on the university level. It is time, especially in an information-processing society, that a holistic, integrated, meaning-oriented language instruction be instituted at all levels of education, elementary through postsecondary.

C. Collins (1985) made a vital point in her discussion of the use of computers as a means of integrating and developing verbal skills:

The growing use of computers to store, manipulate and retrieve information increases the need for an interactive competency with language. Although information processing is accelerated and enhanced by computers, only those who read and write fluently and can make decisions about appropriate uses of language are making efficient use of the new technology. As a result, the shortage of effective readers and writers, felt deeply in an industrial age, will have an even greater impact in an age of information that demands higher levels of critical reading and writing. Traditional approaches to teaching reading and writing no longer work, for when information is generated instantly and holistically, computer users must be able to process and interact with language in a similar fashion. (p. 333)

C. Collins's (1985) three main points, although presented in reference to the usage of computers, are also the crux of the issues necessary for this information era, and at the heart of this research. First, she pointed out that "only those who read and write fluently and can make decisions about appropriate uses of the language" (p. 333) will be successful. Second, "the shortage . . . of readers and writers . . . will
have an even greater impact in an age of information that demands higher levels of critical reading and writing" (p. 333). At the same time higher levels of critical thinking are required of these professionals. And third, "traditional approaches to teaching reading and writing no longer work . . . [because] information is generated instantly and holistically [and] users of computers [and sophisticated registers of language] must be able to process and interact with language in a similar fashion" (p. 333). All of these points emphasize the need for looking at the language at its upper level registers and its modes as a whole language process.

Since literacy (the ability to write, read, and think well) will continue to be refined as the foundation of our evergrowing megatrend society, it is essential then that the secondary and postsecondary schools focus more time and attention on teaching these college level basic skills by intertwining them, since they will no longer be a need for a select few but essential tools for all. In addition, as a society, America cannot afford to wait until the literacy problems are solved on the elementary and secondary levels, but rather higher education institutions must be prepared to resolve the literacy problems on the upper levels as well. The problem is no longer restricted to one level, program, or skill; instead it is a multifaceted problem.

Statement of Problem

The purpose of this study was to identify and validate a set of strategies which integrate reading and writing skills that are appropriate for the secondary and postsecondary students. These strategies can be
metacognitive in nature and would eventually be acquired as a part of the students' repertoire of language ability.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study are as follows:

1. Do theorists agree that the set of strategies presented are sociopsycholinguistic in nature?
2. Do theorists agree that the strategies presented integrate reading and writing skills?
3. Do theorists agree that the strategies presented would be useful in working with developmental college students?
4. Do practitioners believe that the strategies presented would be useful in working with beginning college students who are in need of basic skill development?
5. Do practitioners use the strategies presented with developmental college students?

Definition and Discussion of Terms

Basic Skills

The term basic skills can imply different meanings to different groups according to Maxwell (1980). It generally refers to the "reading, writing, computational, speech, and listening skills that should have been mastered in elementary school" (p. 3), while to others, especially uninvolved higher education personnel, this term may be used to "describe skills and knowledge normally acquired in high school" (p. 3). Often
"immaturity and inadequate knowledge of new subjects" (p. 3) is confused with skill deficiencies. Hawes and Hawes (1982) stated that basic skills on the elementary level refers to fundamental skills in learning developed in elementary school, such as reading, spelling, and adding.

To most people **basic skills** means decoding, literal comprehension, using correct writing mechanics, and so on. On the postsecondary level, students' skill needs are more basic to literacy such as "metacomprehension," the ability to monitor their own reading and writing, decide when something is or is not making sense, and if necessary, then adopt an appropriate strategy for making sense of the reading/writing. For purposes of this study, both kinds of skill needs are being addressed when the term basic skills is used.

**Developmental Education Versus Remedial Education**

"Remedial instruction," according to Cloud (1978/79), refers to those instructional offerings carried out to provide the learner with the skills or knowledge required by the institution to undertake course work leading toward a postsecondary degree or certificate. These offerings, supplemental to the normal academic program, typically are designed as preparatory, remedial, developmental, or special education services. They may be taken prior to, or along with, the course work leading toward the degree or certificate. They are generally noncredit offerings, although in some cases credit may be given and the credit requirements for the degree or certificate increased accordingly. (p. 73)

Usually remedial education students fall several grade levels below their present grade, which often requires intensive and extensive remediation for many years. This term is used at all levels of education including the tertiary level.
According to the U.S. Department of Education (1991), the terms remedial and developmental are used interchangeably. It defined remedial studies as "any program, course, or other activity (in the area of reading, writing, or mathematics) for students lacking those skills necessary to perform college-level work at the level required by the institution" (p. 2). The U.S. Department of Education's definition of developmental/remedial was used for this research. Most frequently the term developmental has been used instead of remedial as the former creates an image of a developing process and is more positive in nature.

Developmental Learner/Student

As stated earlier, higher education institutions are being confronted more and more frequently with the high-risk student. This student is defined by K. Patricia Cross (1971) as "students whose scores on traditional tests of academic ability are in the lowest third" (p. 2). Her definition does not give a complete picture of what a skill-deficient student is. According to The Concise Dictionary of Education (Hawes & Hawes, 1982), the "high-risk student" is "a student whose background and previous academic performance cause her or him to be perceived as a potential academic failure. A student referred to as 'educationally disadvantaged' may prove to be a high-risk student" (p. 107).

A number of other terms beside high-risk students are used to depict this learner. Fearn (1981) referred to these students as learning handicapped students and believed that these students need to be taught thinking skills first. Roueche and Snow (1977) referred to these high-risk college students as the nontraditional student, a term that is
ambiguous, since it is also frequently used in reference to the older returning student (25 years and older). Other terms that have also been used are the "new" student and the "disadvantaged" student, and more recently the terms "learning disabled" student and "underachieving learners" have been noted. Interestingly, Fearn's (1981) term learning handicapped students and the term learning disabled attempt to focus on more of a physical handicap. Whatever the deficiencies, they are being treated as if they were real special education cases.

The latter terms present a different picture in terms of student capabilities. The terms underprepared, underachiever, and even misprepared are used somewhat interchangeably throughout the literature. These students are, as Maxwell (1980) described them, those that have "earned high grades in high school, either they did not take college preparatory courses needed for their college programs or their courses were academically weak" (p. 3). The students who fit into these categories have skills, knowledge, and basic academic ability below those who typically enter the college or university curriculum.

Whether a student is underprepared for higher education depends on the particular institution--its entrance standards, the expectations of its faculty, and the characteristics of its average student. The more than 1,000 institutions of higher education in the United States vary tremendously in their goals, their programs, and the students they attract. (Maxwell, 1980, p. 3).

Students who may be underprepared at one university may be adequately prepared to enter a two-year college. This underpreparedness is relative.
Therefore, in line with choosing the term developmental education, the student with this profile will be referred to as the "developmental learner/student."

Interactive Literacy

C. Collins (1985) coined the term "interactive literacy" and defined it as follows:

the effective and interactive use of reading, writing, and the computer. Implicit in the definition is the notion that thinking is the link which makes the interaction of reading and writing possible and that interaction can be accomplished through the integration of instruction in reading and writing. (p. 333)

This definition has been adopted for this study.

Metacomprehension

Sally N. Standiford (1984), at the University of Illinois, defined metacomprehension as "the awareness of and conscious control over one's own understanding or lack of it [while reading]" (p. 1). According to Castleberry (cited in J. D. Long & Long, 1987), metacomprehension "is a term used to describe students' awareness of and control over their understanding of what they read" (p. 2). Brown (cited in J. D. Long & Long, 1987), a leading researcher in the cognitive area, believed that metacomprehension is "knowing what you know and knowing what you can do to enhance comprehension when problems of understanding arise" (p. 2). Metacomprehension as defined by these authors will be employed in this study.
The terms defined here are to provide background and clarification of the materials presented. This chapter has provided background information leading up to the problem and its importance in this information-processing era. That is, it has attempted to explore the reasons why students need better reading and writing skills at all levels and especially at the postsecondary level. This chapter also focuses on the importance of integrating reading and writing skills to assist these students in becoming functioning members of this literacy-intensive society.

Overview of the Study

Presented in Chapter II is a review of literature related to sociopsycholinguistics, the integration of reading and writing, and strategies for the postsecondary level. Also provided in this chapter is a frame of reference for the development of a set of strategies which will be evaluated by a panel of selected experts. Chapter III covers the design and method used in this research, including the criteria for selecting the strategies as well as the demographics of the respondents. A discussion of the findings and results of the research are presented in Chapter IV; presented in Chapter V are the summary, conclusion, and implications of the study. Recommendations and suggestions for further study are also outlined.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Maxwell (1980), founder of the learning services at the University of California, Berkeley, stated, as did Harold L. Hodgkinson (1983), in his government research report entitled Guess Who's Coming to College: Your Students in 1990, that almost all colleges and universities are recruiting the disadvantaged students and will continue to enroll this diverse group--in terms of age, race, sex, economic background, and other characteristics. Hodgkinson also added that it is this diverse group that will be the key to survival for many institutions of higher learning in a time of declining enrollment among the traditional (17-22-year-old) students.

McKeachie (1988) added to this point regarding the tertiary institutions' need for survival:

A more pragmatic reason for the current interest in teaching [the disadvantaged student] more effective learning strategies is demographic. College and university administrators all across the country know about the leveling off of the 18-to-22-year-old population and the expected decrease in this age group during the next few years. If colleges and universities are to survive, most need to be more effective in recruiting and retaining students. Whereas many colleges and universities perceived their function in earlier years as screening out those students who lacked the ability to complete successfully for good grades, they are now sending out recruiters to bring in the very type of applicants they turned away in previous decades. Thus, there is now administrative support for teaching more effective learning
strategies to students who might previously have been re-
jected. (pp. 5-6)

Today, colleges and universities' greater concern is retaining stu-
dents in college because the declining birthrate bodes ill for the institu-
tions competing for the young eligible high school graduates to fill their 
classrooms. Even though college grades are slightly inflated (currently 
higher than they have ever been), many students continue to drop out of 
college, and others take 5 or more years to complete their degrees,
possibly due to their poor basic skills (or the decline in basic skills gener-
ally).

This chapter surveys the literature related to a sociopsycholinguis-
tic integrated process for reading and writing to improve basic skills and 
explore various models of integrating reading and writing. It provides 
the frame of reference for discussing the integration of these language 
skills (reading and writing) and sociopsycholinguistic approaches, and 
serves as the foundation from which strategies were developed for 
evaluation by both a team of experts and a team of practitioners.

Profile of Student in Need of Institutional Support

The last one and a half decades have been marked by in-
creasing public concern about the improvement of education,
and particularly the education of those who, for one reason 
or another, enter the higher levels of education with abilities 
and strategies that handicap them in achieving success. 
(McKeachie, 1988, p. 5)

The common perception is that the underprepared student is the 
minority student, the learning disabled student, or the first-generation 
college student. Unfortunately, the underprepared student is just about 
"every student who enters a community college these days" (Noe,
In general, these students have poor computational skills, limited vocabulary, and short attention spans. They don't know how to take notes or answer essay questions. Some have never read a book. They suffer from what E. D. Hirsch calls "cultural illiteracy." (Noe, 1986, p. 80).

However, the need for remedial/developmental programs is not unique to community colleges. Eventually, because the higher education institutions need to survive financially, these students are accepted at the college and university level, while others matriculate from the community college with only slightly improved basic skills. "In short, these students are emotionally and academically underprepared for college, no matter what level or type of institution. For us to help students develop study skills [and language skills] must become one of the core requirements at community colleges" (Noe, 1986, p. 80). This holds true for four-year colleges and universities.

To the surprise of some educators, "most of the[se] students are the sons and daughters of Caucasian blue-collar parents. A substantial number are . . . members of minority groups" (Cross, 1971, p. 2), and together these students represent approximately 25% of the beginning freshmen class at most four-year institutions (Spann, 1987). And, most of these high school graduates need improvements in at least two of the basic skill areas.

Despite President Reagan's laissez-faire attitude toward disadvantaged groups, schools and colleges have generally retained a commitment toward increased educational opportunities for minorities. Almost all institutions, however, have found that many minority group members are not well prepared for university work. But minority students are not the only ones who need more effective learning strategies. Today, the movement to improve education for "slow learners" has burgeoned. . . . Programs for the "slow learners," or
"learning disabled," include members of minority groups, but the majority are white and come from all reaches of society. (McKeachie, 1988, p. 6)

It should be understood that students with basic skill needs are not new to universities and colleges, but they are now in greater numbers than ever before and of greater importance to universities and colleges' economic survival. "We have always had academically weak, poorly prepared college students. Perhaps we have them in greater numbers today, but then, more students are currently attending college than ever before" (Maxwell, 1980, p. 5).

"The need for intensive basic skills services for college students is not a recent phenomenon but has deep historical roots. To put our present problem in perspective, we should remember that American higher education has historically had an egalitarian thrust" (Maxwell, 1980, p. 6).

In large public institutions, [this] failure [and the need for basic skills] has always been an inherent part of academic life. Even before the days of open admissions, state universities admitted large numbers of freshmen each fall, many of whom failed or dropped out before the end of their first year. College, in those days, were not termed "revolving doors"; a better metaphor might be "stone walls" over which few passed. (Maxwell, 1980, p. 6)

In 1970, Pitcher and Blaushild (cited in Maxwell, 1980) described the traumatic effects of college failure on students and their parents:

Every year, more than 380,000 students fail out of college and looked upon with pity, suspicion, and even anger. Their problems are loudly worried about, but ultimately swept under the academic carpet. No one seems to know what to do with this huge army of human beings. They are stranded in their confusion, guilt, and failure. Colleges dump thousands on the failure pile annually . . . and the young person is often isolated on this island of rejection and left feeling there is no alternative to failure. The college takes little interest or responsibility for him . . . parents are frequently
as overwhelmed with shame, defeat, and worry and fear as he is" (pp. 3 and 7).

It becomes obvious then, that the self-image of developmental learners is unusually low, and that they have learned to avoid that which they need most, that is, basic skill development. As Frank Smith (1989) said, "students who are expected to have difficulty with reading and writing are treated as outcasts, lose self-respect, and are persuaded that they can't be readers and writers--even as we claim to be teaching them literacy" (p. 355). Everyone's prophecy is fulfilled.

[The] current motivation theory also enters the picture. Because students' own theories of intelligence and learning often involved the notion that failure to learn is the result of low innate ability their [students] attribute their failures to stable unchangeable factors which they can do nothing about. Their motivation to learn is low because they feel it is useless to try. Changing attributions and self-concepts to include the idea that needed skills can be developed may have a significant effect upon motivation. (McKeachie, 1988, p. 5)

Regarding the future of higher education institutions and the need for improving basic skills, Fields (1986) pointed out that,

Besides advanced education and technical training, postsecondary institutions probably must continue to play a role in remedial education. Although some states are moving to take remedial education out of collegiate institutions, government experts say that many young adults with poor high-school backgrounds and older unemployed workers will continue to rely on community colleges and technical institutions for help in improving their basic skills--or many will never find jobs. (p. 370)

Another facet of this low self-esteem is related to "the number of freshmen who report they have a disability is growing significantly, according to a study by the American Council on Education" ("Notebook," 1992, p. A27). The article, from The Chronicle of Higher Education, stated that "nearly one in every 11 freshmen report they
have a disability compared with one in 38 in 1978" (p. A27). Apparently, schools are now able to detect these disabilities earlier and therefore able to better prepare these students for postsecondary learning.

The proportion of disabled freshmen with learning problems rose from 14.8 percent in 1985 to 25 percent in 1991. The report said the students' disabilities were more likely to be invisible ones, such as dyslexia or difficulties with conceptualization, rather than physical ones such as deafness or blindness. ("Notebook," 1992, p. A27)

So, in spite of the fact that institutions are being confronted with these students' low self-esteem and basic skill needs, for universities and colleges to survive this economic climate, developmental students must continue to play an important role in their own development.

Current Procedures

Assisting students with these skill deficiencies varies from program to program and from institution to institution; however, most institutions are now taking an interest in their welfare and, in turn, the economic welfare of the institution. Some contemporary programs have avoided using the word "remedial" in describing both the program and the skill-needs of the students involved. "Instead these programs are often called basic studies, developmental studies, or such acronyms as TALENT and HEAP. Students are aware of the purposes of the programs and finding them less repulsive and more supportive" (Cross, 1971, p. 7). Other facilities are learning centers and intellectual skills centers. Most universities/colleges have set in place a testing program to target this group and monitor their progress.
Sociopsycholinguistics

Purvis (1985) described the three subdivisions of linguistics: (1) formal linguistics, (2) psycholinguistics, and (3) sociolinguistics. Formal linguistics is defined as "provid[ing] an adequate formal account--a structural account, so to speak--of language" (p. 144). Noam Chomsky (cited in Purvis, 1985) and his "transformational grammar," as well as many other authors, have developed and influenced formal linguistics. "Chomsky's belief in the possibility of an 'experimental mentalism'" (Purvis, 1985, p. 146) spawned the second subdivision--psycholinguistics. Purvis said that Slobin described the changes in the field as "moving from an original concern with proving the psychological reality of transformational grammar to an increasing attention on the cognitive and social factors involved in language" (p. 146). Important within the history of psycholinguistics, especially the relation between language and thought, is the polemic (argument/controversy) debate between Chomsky and Piaget.

Chomsky has held that language is based on a separate, innate system and that the acquisition of language is governed by specific, biologically determined constraints. The opposing position, roughly Piagetian, tends to see language as developing from more general innate principles as strongly governed by cognitive development. (Purvis, 1985, p. 146)

Frank Smith, according to Purvis, has notably written about the relation to teaching both reading and writing. Purvis (1985) defined the third division of linguistics, sociolinguistics, as "a field inhabited by people who are fond of saying that sociolinguistics is linguistics, given the essentially social nature of language" (p. 147). "Labov, much like Chomsky, is interested primarily in giving a formal account of linguistic
structure but does not believe such a description is possible without examining language in its social setting" (p. 147), that is, the social variability of language. Roger Shuy and William Labov expressed an interest in another aspect of sociolinguistics--"the social dialects in American and their relation to education" (p. 147). Del Hymes, on the other hand, "studies language not only in terms of its grammar but also in terms of its use in communities, its nature as social discourse" (p. 148). And yet another area of sociolinguistics, and one in which Susan Philips (cited in Purvis, 1985) explored, is the cross-cultural aspects. Her book, *The Invisible Culture: Communication, Classroom, and Community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation* is valuable for teaching students on nonmainstream cultures.

All of these fields, but perhaps especially psycholinguistics is a forerunner of sociopsycholinguistics (S-P-L) as is linguistics and sociolinguistics. Some define psycholinguistics as the relationship of language and thought. However, Evelyn H. Hatch (1983) provided a more comprehensive definition:

Psycholinguistics is defined traditionally as the study of human language--language comprehension, language production, and language acquisition. The two disciplines that make up its name, psychology and linguistics, both contribute, but the resulting blend is not always entirely smooth. While psycholinguists from both disciplines have a common goal--understanding how people comprehend and produce language--each pursues it in a somewhat different way. (p. 1)

In addition to being a communicative process, language is a social process, "as Labov points out, all communication is social" (Bloome, 1985, p. 134). All four of the language components "involve social relationships among people: among teachers and students, among
students, among parents and children, and among authors and readers" (Bloome, 1985, p. 134). This relationship with language involves "establishing social groups and ways of interacting with others; gaining or maintaining status and social position; and acquiring culturally appropriate ways of thinking, problem solving, valuing, and feeling" (Bloome, 1985, p. 134). Although Bloome, in his article, examined reading as a social process, his discussion applies to all of the language components. So, his three dimensions of reading as a social process can be adapted to language in general and are as follows:

1. All reading [language] events involve a social context. Social interaction surrounds and influences interaction with a written text.

2. Reading [language] is a cultural activity. That is, reading [language] has social uses which are an extension of people's day-to-day cultural doings.

3. Reading [language] is a socio-cognitive process. Through learning to read [learning to use language whether written, spoken, read, or listened to] and through reading [language] itself, children [students] learn culturally appropriate information, activities, values, and ways of thinking and problem solving. (Bloome, 1985, p. 134)

Since the definition of S-P-L has not been made explicit in the literature and the existence of one has been assumed, this researcher has defined S-P-L as the following: an approach of using a student's own native-speaker knowledge about language and the pragmatic and social linguistic knowledge acquired by being a member of a speech community, as a springboard to integrating or teaching reading and writing as well as the other languaging skills, that is, listening and speaking. Barbara Greene and Marianne Matson (1976) pointed out that "psycholinguists have found that the practice of one aspect of language
is reinforcing to all aspects" (p. 43). That is, listening, speaking, reading, and writing need to be incorporated in student activities, or for that matter, many other social interactions in the workplace. Although Greene and Matson (1976) provided premises that they stated are consistent with a psycholinguistic approach to language instruction and successful teaching of reading and writing, the elements are also consistent with a sociopsycholinguistic approach. No matter how varied the group of students or how varied the content is, the activities contain the following elements:

1. Use of students' oral language as a base for learning.
2. Use of learning activities which incorporate different systems of language.
3. Students' involvement and interest through use of their experiences, ideas, and choices.
4. Communication skills taught in operation.
5. Expansion of vocabulary in context.
6. Attempt to instill pride in the students' own language.
7. Continuous effort to make learning meaningful and fun.
8. Providing a framework which stimulates ideas but leaves room for individuality (Greene & Matson, 1976, p. 43).

The socio aspect of this approach can be seen in the "individuality," "pride in the students' own language," and any attempt to use language in a real live context segments of these elements. And it is these sociolinguistic aspects which refer to one's knowledge of one's culture and the way one's speech community uses language.
Although this field is often referred to as psycho-socio-linguistics (PSL), this researcher will use the term sociopsycholinguistics (S-P-L), emphasizing the internalization of language.

With compound technical terms, it is usual that the prefix closest to the root morpheme which is the one that is taken as primary, and the outer one, secondary. Thus, the use of the terms sociopsycholinguistics, presupposes that this field is a branch of psycholinguistics; i.e., mainly concerned with language acquisition and how language is processed in the brain first of all; and brings to bear the social aspect of this--how this processing and acquisition is affected by social factors, such as ethnomethodology--[cultural most behavior which uses language] how things are done--within a society, people's contextual prior knowledge, etc. Psychosociolinguistics would be presumably a branch of sociolinguistics, more concerned with how the social knowledge is learned and processed in the brain, sort of a developmental psychology of language. (Johnston, 1992)

Since the focus for this research is mainly on practice and approaches and the applicability of theories in educational settings, the correct term would be applied sociopsycholinguistics, "since the field draws upon primarily, cognitive theories of language, and secondarily, ethnomethodological/social ones, to come up with programs to assist the developmental learner of reading and writing" (Johnston, 1992). S-P-L, according to M. Suzanne Hasenstab and Joan Laughton (1982), is a process of learning to read and write, which consists of several language components--syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and graphophonology; all leading to the ultimate goal of reading, that is, comprehension. By this time (age level and language ability), it is a student's development of the cultural influence on her language development which has already been felt/experienced/developed. It is the internalization of language that is crucial. Smith (1973) saw the S-P-L process as one
that emerges from the mutual interaction of language and thought as did Hasenstab and Laughton (1982).

**Developing Language Skills as a Whole Process**

Developing better language skills through reading and writing methods certainly are not novel issues. The literature has explored these areas regularly in terms of defining these processes, finding new methods of instruction, and determining reading and writing ability. Unfortunately, these topics have not been explored separately; that is, reading as a process, a method, a practice, and/or an ability; and, writing as a process, a method, a practice, and/or an ability (Hasenstab & Laughton, 1982). In terms of language skills, listening, speaking, reading, and writing are all based on meaning; that is, ways to record and interpret meaning. Therefore, since language is meaning-based it must evolve as a process—and, the other methods have isolated the meaning in terms of skills development, thus not looking at language as a process as does sociopsycholinguistics (S-P-L).

**Skills Versus Strategies**

In examining reading and writing or sociopsycholinguistics as a process, it becomes necessary to determine the difference between skills and strategies. There seems to be a popular preoccupation with skill teaching, which has its origins in the accountability-behavioral objectives-criterion referenced testing-management system movement.

Downing and Leong (1982), in their review of Holmes's sub-strata-factor theory, argued that this overuse of the work *skill* has debased
its meaning and is causing confusion among educators. It is not only
that the term skill is used where subskill would be more accurate; unfor-
tunately, skill is used even sometimes when writers are referring to activ-
ities that are not even subskills. For example, Gross, Carr, Dornseif, and
Rouse (cited in Downing & Leong, 1982) wrote: "A critical part of any
reading or language arts program is the teaching of the skills underlying
the reading process. Without the basic skills of word discrimination,
 vocabulary development, and comprehension, it is virtually impossible for
a student to read new material with success" (p. 782). They went on to
list a "set of behavioral objectives [that] comprises the skills programs"
(p. 783), such as "given a sentence with a heteronym, the student will
identify correctly, from the context, the syllable that is accented" (p.
784). Gross et al. seemed to use skill to mean something like task.
 "This vague use of the term skill is very common in the reading field"
(Downing & Leong, 1982, pp. 24-25.

McKeachie (1988) also examined the differences between skill
and strategy. His focus was on need to become independent learners
and the direction educators should be taking in their teaching. He stated
that,

We have a strong tendency to bring with us, from the earlier
days of study skill training, the presumption that what we
are teaching are "skills," with the connotation that these
skills are superior to the presumably 'skill-less' condition of
the learner who has not yet been trained [reading, writing,
and] study skills. I like the term "strategy" because it indi-
cates that what we are teaching are alternative modes of
learning, which can be chosen when appropriate for the
task. The term "strategy" implies that we need to learn
more about the condition under which a particular strategy
should be chosen. For example, what strategies are best to
use when one is dealing with difficult or unfamiliar material?
What strategies are most effective for different kinds of
students? To what degree is the students' prior knowledge, verbal ability, mathematical ability, motivation, or other individual characteristics variables important in determining what strategy is most likely to be effective? How do we teach students to diagnose both themselves and the situation in order to make effective choices? (pp. 7-8)

In borrowing from the counseling field, according to William H. Cormier and L. Sherilyn Cormier (1985), the term "strategies" as in "helping strategies are modi operandi, or plans of action, [are] tailored to meet the particular goals of each client" (p. 294). "In a nutshell, helping strategies represent the procedural plan to help the client get from point A to point B" (Cormier & Cormier, 1985, p. 294), and eventually to maintain a set of these strategies to get independently from point A to point B. Therefore, this "procedural plan" would assist the student from point A in her language development to point B, eventually allowing the student to independently recognize and adjust these strategies to the situation and to her own needs. However, developing a set of strategies should not be set firmly because not all students would need all strategies--the plan (set of strategies) would vary from student to student and would depend on their individual needs. For these reasons and because the term skill has been overused both in the fields of reading and writing, the term strategy is more of an encompassing concept and therefore will be used in the following discussion.

Further, McKeachie (1988) discussed the need for study strategy training:

The relationship is one in which effective study strategies usually result in greater learning. [They] . . . have brought success often enough to have become a fairly well established part of the college and university scene. What is different today is that we have a better theoretical understanding of the reasons these study strategies work. (p. 3)
In this researcher's opinion, sociopsycholinguistic strategies for integrating reading and writing should:

1. Assist the student in seeing the language as a whole process; that is, all of the language processes and their interrelatedness.

2. Influence how the learner processes information; that is, "we should help students learn to successfully control cognitive processes, including learning to learn, to remember, and to think" (Mayer, 1988, p. 11).

3. Make the learner independent by making the consistent and central features of the strategies be "learner-initiated actions" (Palmer & Goetz, 1988, p. 41).

4. Be a "sequence of activities rather than a single event. This means, among other things, that learners need to acquire both the component processes and a routine for organizing the process" (Garner, 1988, p. 64).

5. Be a learner process and a strategy that are "largely under the control of the learner. That is to say, though certain subroutines may be learned to a point of automaticity, strategies are generally deliberate, planned, consciously engaged in activities" (Garner, 1988, p. 64).

6. Provide a "need for flexible use. This means that knowing when to use a strategy is as important as knowing how to use it" (Garner, 1988, p. 64).

7. Involve cooperative learning. "By interacting with one another students can improve their acquisition of academic knowledge and skills. Such interaction among students based on equal partnership in the learning experience as opposed to a fixed teacher/learner or tutor/tutee
role" (Dansereau, 1988, p. 103) fosters active learning.

8. "Prepare individuals to perform 'team' activities in the field" (Dansereau, 1988, p. 103).

9. Be functional and meaningful as well as enjoyable.

The key here is to create a match among the learner's task, context, and strategy so that the action fits into the learners' ongoing behavior readily. Instruction should demonstrate what strategies can be used, how they can be applied, and when and why they are helpful. Students should believe that strategies are useful and necessary... aids to problem solving. There must be a match between the instructed strategy and the learners' perception of the importance of the task. (Paris, 1988, pp. 313-314)


Learning as a Process of Interaction With Knowledge

Almost all of the strategies presented in the study have some empirical support. Whether each strategy has been documented was one, but not the only, criterion to consider in deciding whether to use it. The best strategy is not always the one the literature suggests, particularly if it poses operational problems or if the student favors another one instead. Several new strategies, without empirical support, which may help students acquire new skills were used/chosen.

Strategies, according to Cormier and Cormier (1985), share four common elements: (1) the rationale for the strategy, (2) the modeling of goal behaviors, (3) rehearsal for these goal behaviors (homework--often accompanied by coaching and feedback), and (4) transfer of learning. The transfer of learning is the ultimate goal. The strategies used in this research are to create student independence.
Luka (1983/1984) reported in a dissertation entitled "The Conceptualization of Instruction by Nine High-School English Teachers" that, most significantly, the study found that teachers viewed learning as exposure to a piece of knowledge rather than a process of interaction with it. Consequently, information resulting from an analysis process was, in every case, presented to or required from students without a process being identified or examined. Evaluation techniques followed a similar pattern. The most frequently used method in the classroom was the question-and-answer system, which included extended periods of information giving or mini-lectures. Although teachers believe that these methods lead to active student participation, they do not. Luka also found in this study that less than one half of the class participated and that that participation in the classroom amounted to less than 30% of class time on the literature read.

The Relationship Between Reading and Writing

The 20th century is characterized by a verbal society, and the student who fails to become competent in the language processes of speaking, listening, reading, and writing is inadequately prepared to express herself to the world or to interpret the world as expressed by others. The relationship between oracy (oral language skills--speaking and listening) and literacy (written language skills--writing and reading) is crucial. Contemporary research indicates and emphasizes the interdependence. For example, an emphasis on oral language is basic to the acquisition and development of writing and reading competencies.
In 1981, Barker et al. studied the time spent by college students in various communication activities. They discovered postsecondary students spent an average of 14% of their communicating time writing, 16% speaking, 17% reading, and more than half, or 53%, of their time communicating listening (see Figure 1). Listening was broken down further into two groups: 21% of the time listening to mass communication media, such as television and radio, and 32% listening face-to-face with teachers, family, and friends. The study also pointed out that college students spend at least one third, or 31%, of their communication time with the literacy processes (reading and writing).

Language is used to communicate with others. Reading and writing are two of these four language components, while the other two are speaking and listening. All four of these skills make our language meaningful as well as being based on meaning.
Andee Rubin and Jane Hansen (1984) pointed out that even with a written text, where the author and reader may never meet face-to-face, a connection between them is essential for communication to occur (Bruce, 1981; Rubin & Hansen, 1984). They believe, as does this author, that many children grow without understanding that reading and writing are whole and alive. Instead, they see these language components as piecemeal and problematic because language instruction is fragmented and decontextualized. Unfortunately, education and educators have widened the gap implicating the presumed distinction between writing and reading.

In a study conducted by Huot (1988), 83% of the respondents reported that reading and writing were taught separately on their campuses. The individual responses to the surveys showed that "not only is there a discrepancy between research, theory, and practice, but also many college-level English educators seem to know very little about the bond between reading and writing" (Huot, 1988, p. 90).

Artificial customs have separated reading and writing skills. Reading was in the hands of the church and writing was taught by the scriveners. "Reading and writing also enjoyed different social statuses, with reading being associated with the church and writing merely as a tool for record keeping" (Huot, 1988, p. 91). "Even at the university level, reading was associated with higher intellectual processes pertaining to learning and scholarship, and emphasis on writing was seen more as manual labor for the lower classes" (Huot, 1988, p. 91).

In looking at reading and writing theory, it "involves understanding reading as a constructive meaning-making process and understanding
the text as the place where readers and writers meet to create meaning" (Huot, 1988, p. 93). Huot described the psycholinguistic theory regarding relationship between reading and writing. He said that Tierney and Pearson have the most fully developed conception and describe it as follows:

They describe the reading process in terms usually associated with composition: planning, drafting, aligning, and revising. Planning for reading involves two complementary processes: goal setting and knowledge mobilization. Drafting is also part of reading in that writers create a text through the act of writing . . . [and] explain reading as a shifting, guessing grope for meaning that is integral to reading comprehension. Aligning is commonly referred to in writing as tone or voice; it is the viewpoint from which an author addresses the audience. Similarly, readers choose a particular stance from which to read a piece of writing. Revising is a reading component; Tierney and Pearson (1983) contend that a reader should approach text as a writer who crafts an understanding across several drafts—who pauses, rethinks and revises. (Huot, 1988, p. 93)

The Process Approach

The prominent view of the integration of reading and writing, until recently could be described as two processes; that is, reading as a receptive process and writing as an expressive process (Hennings, 1982; 1980; Rubin & Hansen, 1984). Furthermore, these researchers/authors mistakenly believed that reading was a noncreative process, since the meaning of the passage being read existed within the text itself. The reader's task was just simply to discover the meaning through the clues left by the author, forgetting or even ignoring that it is the reader's experiential background and the interaction with the text that creates the meaning. Writing, therefore, was seen as the creative process: the opposite of reading (reading sort of "undoing" what writing had created).
As Shanklin (1981) said, these are one-way transmissions, for reading--meaning from the graphics to the mind of the reader, and for writing--from the writer's mind to the graphic displays. As a result of these polarized language skills stressing differences between reading and writing, some superficial similarities seemed to guide language arts education. Students were required to master mechanical details, with reading resulting in decoding and subskills and writing mastering punctuation, grammar, and spelling, and so forth. Unfortunately, the real similarities were prevented from surfacing.

**Metacomprehension**

The ultimate goal of integrating reading and writing skills is metacomprehension, which according to Sally N. Standiford, Kathleen Jaycox, and Anne Auten (1983), "is the awareness of and conscious control over one's own understanding or lack of it" (p. 1). Therefore, the integrating strategies proposed in this dissertation should lead the students to this metacognitive level.

Therefore, the ultimate goal in reading and writing is to understand what "we know and are aware that we know it" (Standiford et al., 1983, p. 1). Similarly, the goal in writing is to understand what is known and to communicate to readers that the writer is aware and can communicate what she knows.

**Overview of Chapter III**

Chapter III provides a description of the procedures and methods used in this study, which has been divided into seven sections: (1) the
Purpose of the Study, (2), the Design of the Study, (3), Selecting the Panels, (4) the Criteria for Selecting Strategies, (5), the Instrumentation, (6) the Pilot Study, and (7) Data Collection and Processing. The last part of the chapter describes the demographics of the theorists and the practitioners.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter focuses on all aspects of the design and methodology of the study; specifically, on the general relation of the study to its overall purpose: the selection of an expert panel; the creation and selection of the strategies surveyed; the construction of the two survey questionnaires needed for practitioners and theorists; the conducting of a pilot study; and the main survey administration and data collection process. The last section describes the demographics of the respondents, including areas of expertise, training, methods currently used, type of institution, degrees, years in position, and publication arenas.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify a set of effective strategies as determined by two panels of experts (practitioners and theorists), which will reflect a sociopsycholinguistic teaching model integrating reading and writing skills on the postsecondary level. Procedures for developing these strategies consisted of the following: (a) selecting the panels, (b) developing the integrated strategies and questionnaires from the P-S-L model/elements, (c) administering the questionnaires, and (d) collating and compiling the data.
Design of the Study

An empirical research survey was selected as an appropriate means for comparing what the writers of the literature (theorists) on the fields of reading, writing, and/or sociopsycholinguistics believe, to what those actually in the field working with developmental learners (practitioners) see as what works effectively with their students. More specifically, in this study the survey instruments are intended to elicit the judgments and perceptions of the validating panels (theorists and practitioners) on the following matters: (a) whether the strategies proposed were in fact sociopsycholinguistic in nature; (b) whether they integrate reading and writing skills; (c) whether they were appropriate for post-secondary developmental level students, and (d) whether they were used by practitioners, or were seen as useful in their expert judgment.

Selecting the Panel

The panel of 224 practitioners was chosen from the Michigan Developmental Education Consortium (MDEC), a state chapter of the National Association for Developmental Education (NADE), or by contacting key people on the MDEC membership list at the various colleges and universities. MDEC is a state established organization, and most practitioners (i.e., college and university instructors and specialists working with developmental learners) are members of this organization. Since this organization, and therefore its membership list, also includes mathematics instructors, specialists, and counselors, efforts were made to exclude these individuals as the focus of this study was on reading
and writing (verbal skills). To obtain a more accurate mailing list, the key contact people were telephoned to insure only reading and writing practitioners' names were on the mailing list. However, in spite of these efforts, several other types of practitioners were occasionally contacted. In this case the member was asked just to return the survey after completing a portion of the demographic information sheet. After the practitioners other than the reading and writing experts were excluded, the population included in this study consisted of 81 practitioners.

According to Van Dalen and Mayer (1966), the opinions or testimonies of experts are often sought by researchers because experts are intellectually trained, experienced, and better informed than lay people. However, Van Dalen and Mayer warned that total reliance on experts' opinion is "a dubious if not a dangerous practice" (pp. 19-20). To avoid this pitfall, it is recommended that one exercise many precautions when identifying people as experts. One means of avoiding this danger is by establishing a set of selection criteria to be used as a guide in selecting the panel of experts. Therefore, to serve on the panel of theorists, the 28 members were chosen based on the following criteria. The expert must meet four of six criteria of these by:

1. Currently holding a position in the educational profession.
2. Being an "expert" by training/degree in either reading, writing, or both.
3. Being an active and or contributing member in two or more professional organizations focusing on the areas of reading and writing, such as the International Reading Association (IRA) or the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE).
4. Having at least 5 years of experience in the fields of linguistics (L), sociolinguistics (SL), psycholinguistics (PL), or sociopsycholinguistics (S-P-L).

5. Having at least five publications (preferably books) on the theory of L, SL, PL, or S-P-L.

6. Having an awareness of students' reading and writing problems on the postsecondary level.

Criteria for Selecting Strategies

It was necessary that the researcher develop some criteria or guidelines for selecting strategies to be included in this study. The descriptions of these criteria reflect the researcher's preferences; however, these preferences have been aided by the thoughtful work in counseling by Grambrill, Goldfried and Davison, Okun, and Shaffer (all cited in Cormier and Cormier, 1985), Cormier and Cormier (1985), and McKeachie's (1988) discussion on study strategies and study strategy training.

Specifically, the strategies chosen for this study met the following criteria:

1. Are easy to follow/teach.

2. Match the unique characteristics and preferences of the student.

3. Are consistent with the basic premises of the sociopsycholinguistic approach to language development.

4. Match the characteristics of the problem and related factors, that is, reading and writing skill needs.
5. Are positive rather than punitive.
6. Encourage the development of self-management skills.
7. Strengthen the student's expectation of personal effectiveness or self-efficacy.
8. Are supported by the literature.
9. Are feasible and practical to implement.
10. Should not be seen by the student or the teacher as an additional burden.
11. Do not burden the student or significant others with too many things to do.
12. Do not require more of the student than the student is able to give or be responsible for giving.
13. Do not require more of the instructor than the instructor is able to give or be responsible for giving.
14. Do not repeat or build on previous unsuccessful solutions.

The strategies decided upon are listed in Appendices C and D.

Instrumentation

Since the field of sociopsycholinguistics is quite new, there have been no previous studies or surveys conducted in this area that could be used as appropriate models. The integration of reading and writing skills has also not been too commonplace, especially at the postsecondary level. Therefore, it was necessary for the researcher to develop two survey instruments "from scratch" and a description guide of strategies for each, which would yield responses relevant to the material under investigation.
The survey instruments are comprised of a list of strategies followed by questions regarding them, a strategy description guide attached to the questionnaire, demographic information sheets, and a cover letter. The survey for the team of theorists focused primarily on the theoretical nature of the sociopsycholinguistic strategies, the integration of reading and writing skills, and the appropriateness for the post-secondary level developmental student. The practitioner's survey, on the other hand, focuses on the efficacy of the strategies; that is, their usefulness and their appropriateness or inappropriateness for the post-secondary level developmental learner.

Practitioner's Survey

The practitioner's questionnaire, A Survey of the Utilization of Sociopsycholinguistic (S-P-L) Strategies and Practices, includes the set of 20 S-P-L strategies integrating reading and writing skills that were previously determined. The practitioners were asked to check the appropriate items in the six categories indicating utilization, usefulness, and appropriateness in working with developmental students. A definition of sociopsycholinguistics and strategy definitions were provided for the participant's reference. The practitioners rated each of the 20 strategies according to whether it was unknown, useful, inappropriate, occasionally used, used often, or used about every day.

The first part of the survey, the Participant Background sheet, asks for the following demographic information: gender, current position, years in current position, expertise, training, type of institution of employment, publication arenas, and degrees held. Structured questions
regarding working with developmental college students then follow. These include current methods used in working with students, their description of developmental students, their philosophy regarding the teaching of reading and writing, and a comment area.

The question regarding area of expertise was placed in the beginning (Item 3) and set up so that if a participant has only mathematics expertise, along or combined with expertise other than reading, writing, and critical thinking, the practitioner is asked not to complete the rest of the survey and merely to return it in the addressed and stamped envelope provided.

A Strategy Description Guide (see Appendix C) accompanied the practitioner's survey and consisted of a brief description of each of the 20 strategies used in the survey. This was to be used as a reference guide while determining the usefulness and appropriateness of each strategy.

A cover letter providing information on how practitioners were selected for the study, the purpose of the study, and directions for completing the survey accompanied the questionnaire. Also enclosed was an addressed and stamped envelope in which to return the materials.

Theorist's Survey

The theorist's questionnaire, A Survey of Sociopsycholinguistic Strategies and Practices (see Appendix D), also contains two sections: the Background Information Sheet and the survey containing the same set of 20 S-P-L strategies integrating reading and writing. A definition of
S-P-L was provided for their reference.

The theorists were asked the following three questions regarding each of the 20 S-P-L strategies:

1. "Would you consider this strategy S-P-L in nature?"
2. "Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?"
3. "Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?"

"Yes" or "no" responses were required for each question along with any explanations required for the clarification for each response.

The first part of the theorist's questionnaire, the Background Information Sheet, focused on the same demographic information as the practitioner's survey except for the questions on expertise and training. The structured questions were slightly different, in that they were asked to define developmental students and state their philosophy of integrating reading and writing skills. A space was also provided for their comments.

The same Strategy Description Guide was sent to theorists as was sent to practitioners. A cover letter was included providing the purpose of the study and directions for completing it, a list of materials included, and the approximate amount of time needed to complete the survey. As with the practitioner's survey, a stamped and addressed envelope for returning the completed questionnaire was included.

The Pilot Study

A pilot study of the survey instruments was administered to:
(a) ensure clarity and simplicity of the instruments' organization,
content, and concepts; (b) establish the administrative procedures; and (c) determine content validity of the questionnaire. Persons involved in the pilot test were college professors of sociopsycholinguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, linguistics, reading, writing, or both; professors in reading, professors in writing, professors in linguistics/English, and professors or administrators of learning centers. The pilot study advisees were from a variety of universities and professional organizations in the Midwest (Illinois and Michigan).

Practitioners were sent a complete copy of A Survey of the Utilization of Sociopsycholinguistic (S-P-L) Strategies and Practices (see Appendix A). This included a copy of the letter listing their instructions, the purpose, and list of materials enclosed. Similarly, the theorists were sent a copy of the survey, A Survey of Sociopsycholinguistic Strategies and Practices (see Appendix B). Their packet of materials included the same type materials and instructions in their cover letter as the practitioners'. Both groups of participants were instructed to critique the entry for each strategy in the description guide, and to complete the survey as they would be directed to do so if they were being surveyed. In addition, they were to point out needed deletions, additions, and corrections affecting precision, clarity, and conciseness. Comments regarding the content or strategies were to be provided on the enclosed Comment sheet.

Revisions resulting from the pilot study were made and a final draft of the survey was prepared. Considering the changes that were made, the most important changes were in the list of the strategies and the descriptions. One strategy (#12), Quill Computer Program, was
replaced by Interactive Literacy: Reading, Writing, and the Computer, and several minor changes in the descriptions of the strategies were changed for purposes of clarity. One of the difficulties with the Strategy Description Guide lay in the process of trying to keep the description brief to ensure a response; the descriptions were not always as clear as they were thought to be. Also, a question regarding degrees held was added to the demographic information on the background sheet in both surveys.

Another change that occurred was altering the word "psychosociolinguistics" to "sociopsycholinguistics," based on new terminology in the literature. It was determined that the nature and emphasis of this study was not on the theory of how social factors interplay with cognition, but instead on developing practical approaches that draw upon both psycho- and sociolinguistic concepts and theories used in education. Therefore, the appropriate term to be used was sociopsycholinguistics (see Chapter II for further discussion).

After the completion of the pilot study, reliability and validity of the questionnaire were examined and any necessary modifications made. The purpose of establishing validity of the questionnaire was to determine the extent to which the instrument measures what it is intended to measure (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1979). Reliability, as defined by Ary et al., "is the extent to which a measuring device is consistent in measuring whatever it measures" (p. 196). In this study, reliability was determined through the pilot study advisee's consistency and stability of the strategies. The responses for each item were compared to determine consistency and stability.
Data Collection and Processing

The collection of data was conducted in two stages. First, the practitioner's surveys were mailed out on November 2, 1992. The panelists were asked to respond within 11 days of receipt of their questionnaires. Second, the theorists' surveys and materials were sent out on November 3, 1992, with a request for it to be returned within 16 days. Four of these questionnaires were going out of the country, so more time was provided for this group.

Follow-up postcards (see Appendix E) to the practitioners were sent on November 13, 1992, 11 days after the survey-questionnaire mailing. On November 19, 1992, a second follow-up was sent to those who had not responded as yet. This time a letter and complete survey packet was sent again, requesting that the survey be returned as quickly as possible.

The follow-up procedure for the theorists consisted of personal phone calls to each of the panelists on November 23 and November 24, 1992. Messages were left by phone mail or with secretaries when the theorist was not available. The telephone calls proved beneficial, since three surveys were completed over the phone. Even though not all of the 10 theorists completed the survey thoroughly, useful information was provided by all of them.

As the questionnaires were returned to the researcher, all 118 practitioners' and the 10 theorists' responses were coded accordingly on scanning sheets and then transferred to the VAX computer at Western Michigan University. The statistical analyses were conducted by the
Center of Statistical Analysis at Western Michigan University.

Once the data were collected according to the procedures described earlier in this chapter, each of the areas to be studied was analyzed. A 2/3 criterion was used to determine the results of the two surveys; that is, a two-to-one ratio of positive to negative responses was used to determine agreement on the individual strategies.

The demographic data were tallied according to responses indicated on the survey questionnaire. The first part examines the practitioners as a group. This group represents 118 respondents, while the second group represents the 10 theorists.

Survey Respondents

The sample for this study consisted of practitioners from 48 different colleges and universities in the state of Michigan, whose names were obtained through the Michigan Developmental Education Consortium (MDEC); and theorists, experts in the fields of linguistics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, sociopsycholinguistics, reading, and writing: a total of 118 practitioners and 10 theorists from the United States, Canada, and England.

Table 1 depicts the number of questionnaires sent and the number returned. A total of 50.8% was returned or 128 respondents (both theorists and practitioners) surveys.
Table 1
Number of Survey Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Questionnaires sent</th>
<th>Questionnaires returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioners</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theorists</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic Data on Respondents

Practitioners

Out of the 81 participants in the survey, 62 were females and 19 males. Of particular interest is the ratio of female to male practitioners; that is, three females to every male. This appears to be a pattern across the United States in developmental education.

Area of Expertise

In Table 2, the largest group with 38 (32.2%) members in the area of expertise is mathematics and other expertise. This group has been eliminated from the rest of the study, leaving a total of 80 reading and writing practitioners for the study. Forms of other expertise include English as a second language (ESL), counseling, learning disabilities, special education, learning differences, public speaking, psychology and
educational psychology, and several specific content areas. The second largest group, with 27 members, were experts in writing, while the reading expert group had 16 practitioners. The group with expertise in both reading and writing had 14 members. For the results, the experts/practitioners were divided into three major groups: (1) the experts in reading and in reading and critical thinking were combined into a reading group, (2) the experts in writing and in writing and critical thinking were combined into a writing group, and (3) experts in both reading and writing and in reading, writing, and critical thinking were combined into a reading and writing group (see Table 3). The mathematics and other field experts were deleted along with the one practitioner that listed herself as a critical thinking expert only.

Table 2
Area of Expertise: Practitioners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of expertise</th>
<th>No. of practitioners</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and writing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and critical thinking</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing and critical thinking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading, writing, and critical thinking</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and other experts</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Combined Expertise Groups: Practitioners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined group expertise</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
<th>Individual group members</th>
<th>Total members</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading expertise</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading and critical thinking</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing expertise</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing and critical thinking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both reading and writing</td>
<td>Reading and writing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading, writing, and critical thinking</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 80.

Years in Current Position

Fifty, or 61.7%, of the practitioners have been in their current position 6 years or less; indeed, 29, or 35.8%, of these experts have been in their current position 3 years or less (see Table 4). Another interesting group was the six (or 7.4%) practitioners that stated they have been in their current position for 25 years or more. Often practitioners leave the field due "burnout." There were nine members (or
11.1%) that have been in their current position for 7-9 years, while 4, or 4.9%, of the practitioners have been in their current position for 10-12 years. From that point, the numbers between 12 and 24 years are very small.

Table 4

Years in Current Position: Practitioners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in ranges</th>
<th>No. of practitioners</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 81. The critical-thinking only practitioner is included.

Training

Regarding training, it is interesting to note that 33 practitioners have degrees in reading and 30 practitioners have degrees in writing (see
Table 5). Twenty-eight participants hold degrees in elementary education, while 37 members hold degrees in secondary education. Twenty-nine practitioners hold degrees in other fields, as indicated by their belonging to the other education degrees category. This includes degrees such as adult education/adult literacy, English as a second language, philosophy, administration and curriculum/curriculum and instruction, educational psychology, higher education/community college/postsecondary education, and special education. The sample of practitioners, as revealed by responses on the four areas (classes, in-services, materials read, and training), is extensively trained in all areas except sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, classes, in-services, and training in general.

**Methods**

In looking at Table 6, classroom/lecture teaching, 70 of 78 (or 90%), and instructor designed activities, 71 of 78 (or 91%), methods are used most frequently. After deleting other, (14, or 28%), the least used methods of instruction with developmental students are computer aided exercises (38, or 49%) and learning center instruction (41, or 53%).

Table 7 depicts the methods currently used by reading, writing, and reading/writing experts. The most popular methods for all three groups of experts include: small group activities, instructor designed materials, and classroom lecture. The group's least favorite is computer-assisted exercises.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hold degree in</th>
<th>Taken classes in</th>
<th>Taken in-services in</th>
<th>Read materials in</th>
<th>Have training in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary education</td>
<td>28/46</td>
<td>24/46</td>
<td>20/46</td>
<td>27/46</td>
<td>23/46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>37/54</td>
<td>34/54</td>
<td>25/54</td>
<td>34/54</td>
<td>33/54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other education</td>
<td>29/43</td>
<td>23/43</td>
<td>21/43</td>
<td>22/43</td>
<td>19/43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic approaches (to reading and writing)</td>
<td>1/60</td>
<td>34/60</td>
<td>33/60</td>
<td>48/60</td>
<td>25/60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>3/54</td>
<td>46/54</td>
<td>5/54</td>
<td>29/54</td>
<td>9/54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociolinguistics</td>
<td>1/30</td>
<td>17/30</td>
<td>3/30</td>
<td>22/30</td>
<td>7/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psycholinguistics</td>
<td>0/28</td>
<td>18/28</td>
<td>4/28</td>
<td>23/28</td>
<td>7/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociopsycholinguistics</td>
<td>0/17</td>
<td>5/17</td>
<td>5/17</td>
<td>14/17</td>
<td>3/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted competency approaches</td>
<td>0/27</td>
<td>6/27</td>
<td>14/27</td>
<td>21/27</td>
<td>6/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>1/58</td>
<td>24/58</td>
<td>38/58</td>
<td>52/58</td>
<td>26/58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>33/66</td>
<td>48/66</td>
<td>41/66</td>
<td>48/66</td>
<td>38/66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>30/70</td>
<td>48/70</td>
<td>48/70</td>
<td>56/70</td>
<td>47/70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Based on N = 81. Participants were to indicate "those that apply" regarding training.
Table 6
Methods Currently Used in Working With Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer tutoring</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom/lecture teaching</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning center instruction</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group activities</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workbook exercise</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer aided exercises</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor designed activities</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Participants were to check those methods that apply. Based on N = 78 (2 missing).

Table 8 depicts the most frequently and the least frequently used method by practitioners' expertise. The most frequently used method by all three expertises is small group activities and instructor designed activities. The least frequently used method by the reading expertise group is learning center instruction, while the writing expertise and reading and writing expertise groups chose computer assisted exercises.

Type of Institution

Most of the practitioners are at two-year colleges (50/81) or 61.7%, while 24.7% (20/81) are at universities and 13.6% (11/81) are at four-year colleges (see Table 9). These percentages are fairly typical.
### Table 7
Methods\(^a\) Currently Used by Expertise: Practitioners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Reading and writing</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Row total(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer tutoring</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom lecture/teaching</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning center instruction</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group activities</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workbook exercises</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer assisted exercises</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor designed</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column total(^c)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Percentages and totals based on respondents excluded the respondent that has critical thinking only as expertise. \(N = 77\) valid cases (3 missing cases).

\(^a\)Participants were to check those methods that apply. \(^b\)Total represents number of participants that responded to question by chosen method. \(^c\)Total represents number of participants by expertise that responded to this question.

of the institutions offering developmental programs/courses across the nation.

**Publication Arenas**

Table 10 represents the publication arenas used by the practitioners. Their most frequent vehicle of publication is newsletters as
Table 8
Methods Used by Practitioners by Expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading expertise</th>
<th>Writing expertise</th>
<th>Reading and writing expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Most frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Instructor designed activities ( N = 22 )</td>
<td>1. Classroom/lecture teaching ( N = 27 )</td>
<td>1. Small group activities ( N = 23 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Small group activities and classroom/lecture teaching ( N = 21 )</td>
<td>2. Small group activities ( N = 27 )</td>
<td>2. Classroom lecture/teaching ( N = 21 ) and instructor designed activities ( N = 21 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructor designed activities ( N = 27 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Least frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(&quot;Other&quot; not included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Learning center instruction ( N = 13 )</td>
<td>1. Computer assisted exercises ( N = 13 )</td>
<td>1. Computer assisted exercises ( N = 11 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N = 81 \).
### Table 9
Practitioners by Type of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of institution</th>
<th>Number of practitioners</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total/percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-year college</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>50/61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year college--private</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>11/13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year college--public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University--private</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>20/24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University--public</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>81/100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** $N = 81$.

### Table 10
Practitioners' Publication Arenas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of arena</th>
<th>Number of practitioners</th>
<th>Percent of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monographs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Participants indicated those that applied. $N = 53$ of 81.
indicated by 33 participants. Journals is the next most frequent form of publication according to 25 practitioners, while the least used form of publication is monographs, with only 8 participants indicating this arena. Eleven of the practitioners have written books as a means of publication.

Degree Held

Seventy-nine percent, or 39 of the 50, community college practitioners hold a master's degree (see Table 11). Of the 11 four-year college practitioners, 8 hold master's and one "other" (education specialists, [Ed.S.]). Of the 20 university practitioners, 8 hold doctoral and 12 hold master's degrees.

Theorists

For this group of experts, the demographic profile (see Table 12) represented a total of 10 theorists: 5 females and 5 males who responded to the survey. All of the theorists are currently employed at public universities, and range in years in current position from 7 to 23 years. All of the theorists are professors, either professor of education, professor of English, professor of linguistics, and/or professor of English education. In addition, one theorist holds a position as President of the Institute of Education at her institution and one has a dual appointment of professor and of Director of Teacher's College Writing Project. As one would expect, all theorists hold doctoral degrees. Similarly, all of these experts have books published as well as many journal articles, monographs, and newsletters.
Table 11
Degrees Held by Practitioners by Type of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of institution</th>
<th>Bachelor's</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, 4-year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institution</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Numbers indicate count by row and column. Percentages indicate row and then column by type of degree and institution. N = 80.

Regarding the methods that are appropriate in working with developmental college students, the theorists believe that the following are useful: peer tutoring, learning center instruction, small group activities, and instructor designed activities "if designed with student mind." Classroom lecture/teaching and computer assisted instruction were not
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theorist</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years in Position</th>
<th>Degree/Field</th>
<th>University Type</th>
<th>Professor of</th>
<th>Publication Arenas</th>
<th>Methods-developmental college students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Books</td>
<td>Peer tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>Learning center instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>Small group activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Computer assisted exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor designed activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>(Regents) Professor</td>
<td>Books</td>
<td>Peer tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elem. Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>Classroom lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monographs</td>
<td>Learning center instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newsletters (articles in)</td>
<td>Small group activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Computer assisted exercises (&quot;Depends on quality of exercises&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor designed activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other--&quot;inquiry approaches to learning&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-4</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Dr. Secondary Education</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Books</td>
<td>Peer tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>Classroom lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monographs</td>
<td>Learning center instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>Small group activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Workbook exercises--&quot;depending on quality&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Computer assisted exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor designed activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theorist</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Years in position</td>
<td>Degree/field</td>
<td>University type</td>
<td>Professor of</td>
<td>Publication arenas</td>
<td>Methods-developmental college students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>English Education and Director of Teachers College Writing Project</td>
<td>Books Journals</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-10</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Books Journals Monographs</td>
<td>Peer tutoring Classroom lecture-- &quot;appropriate at times&quot; Learning center instruction Instructor designed activities &quot;if designed with student in mind&quot; Other--&quot;student initiated activities&quot; Panels with students and other resources, send to workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-13</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>Books Journals</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-22</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Books Journals Monographs Other</td>
<td>Peer tutoring Classroom lecture Learning center instruction Small group activities Computer assisted exercises Instructor designed activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theorist</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Years in position</td>
<td>Degree/field</td>
<td>University type</td>
<td>Professor of</td>
<td>Publication arenas</td>
<td>Methods-developmental college students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-24</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Books</td>
<td>Peer tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>Classroom lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monographs</td>
<td>Learning center instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Small group activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-27</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>President,</td>
<td>Books</td>
<td>Instructor designed activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


quite as popular, and in fact, "depends on quality of exercises" was written next to computer assisted instruction. Other was chosen by four of the theorists with these suggestions: "whole discourse writing"; "inquiry approaches to learning"; and "initiated activities, panels with students and other resources, send [students] to workplace."

Research Questions

The following research questions served as a guide for this study:

1. Do the theorists agree that the set of strategies presented are sociopsycholinguistic in nature?
2. Do the theorists agree that the strategies presented integrate reading and writing skills?
3. Do the theorists agree that the strategies presented would be useful in working with developmental college students?
4. Do the practitioners believe that the strategies presented would be useful in working with beginning college students who are in need of basic skill development?
5. Do the practitioners use the strategies presented with developmental college students?

Summary

This chapter presented the research design and method of the study, by presenting the process of selecting the panel; the development and examining of survey-questionnaires and of the S-P-L strategies, and the collection and processing of survey data.
The demographic information profiling the survey respondents' training and expertise, and current position as well as the type of institution employing the respondent, and the type of publication arenas used was also presented. Chapter IV will present the findings of the study. The results of each research question will be discussed separately as well as those for selected strategies and pertinent demographic information.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to identify and validate a set of strategies which integrate reading and writing processes that are appropriate for secondary and postsecondary students. These strategies were of a metacognitive nature and could eventually be acquired as a part of the students' repertoire of professional skills.

Chapter IV analyzes the results of both the practitioners' and theorists' questionnaires, and examines the responses to the research questions. A comparison of these results and a summary of the findings are also included in this chapter.

Results of Analysis

Practitioner's Survey

The practitioner's survey focused on the utilization of socio-psycholinguistic (S-P-L) strategies and practices. They were asked to respond to the 20 strategies or practices listed, by indicating to what extent they used or recommended usage of the individual strategies. Table 13 depicts the frequency of responses for the strategies individually in the six categories (unknown, useful, inappropriate, occasionally, often, and about every day/daily). Those items that are underlined indicate the percentage and the number of the most frequent responses by the practitioners.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Unk(^a)</th>
<th>Usfl</th>
<th>Inapr</th>
<th>Occ</th>
<th>Oft</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SQ3R</td>
<td>4 or 6%</td>
<td>2 or 3%</td>
<td>10 or 14%</td>
<td>34 or 47%</td>
<td>16 or 22%</td>
<td>6 or 8%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SQ4R</td>
<td>6 or 8%</td>
<td>6 or 8%</td>
<td>8 or 11%</td>
<td>27 or 37%</td>
<td>18 or 24%</td>
<td>9 or 12%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cognitive Mapping/Webbing</td>
<td>2 or 3%</td>
<td>4 or 5%</td>
<td>6 or 8%</td>
<td>40 or 53%</td>
<td>16 or 21%</td>
<td>8 or 11%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Group Composition Through Social Interaction Process</td>
<td>6 or 8%</td>
<td>13 or 18%</td>
<td>11 or 15%</td>
<td>25 or 34%</td>
<td>14 or 19%</td>
<td>4 or 5%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Top-Level Structure</td>
<td>19 or 26%</td>
<td>15 or 21%</td>
<td>9 or 12%</td>
<td>20 or 27%</td>
<td>6 or 8%</td>
<td>4 or 6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Story Schema/Story Grammar</td>
<td>13 or 18%</td>
<td>11 or 25%</td>
<td>23 or 32%</td>
<td>15 or 21%</td>
<td>9 or 13%</td>
<td>1 or 1%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Free-Response and Opinion-Proof</td>
<td>13 or 18%</td>
<td>17 or 23%</td>
<td>12 or 16%</td>
<td>13 or 18%</td>
<td>12 or 16%</td>
<td>6 or 8%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Peer Language Experience</td>
<td>13 or 18%</td>
<td>17 or 24%</td>
<td>12 or 17%</td>
<td>22 or 31%</td>
<td>2 or 3%</td>
<td>6 or 8%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>Unk⁺</td>
<td>Usfl</td>
<td>Inapr</td>
<td>Occ</td>
<td>Oft</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Expert Scaffolding</td>
<td>16 or 22%</td>
<td>12 or 16%</td>
<td>8 or 11%</td>
<td>21 or 28%</td>
<td>10 or 14%</td>
<td>7 or 10%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Semantic Mapping</td>
<td>9 or 13%</td>
<td>11 or 16%</td>
<td>7 or 10%</td>
<td>27 or 38%</td>
<td>11 or 16%</td>
<td>6 or 9%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. K-W-L Teaching Model for Active Reading of Expository Text</td>
<td>19 or 27%</td>
<td>20 or 28%</td>
<td>8 or 11%</td>
<td>14 or 20%</td>
<td>8 or 11%</td>
<td>2 or 3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Interactive Literacy: Reading, Writing, and Computer</td>
<td>18 or 25%</td>
<td>18 or 25%</td>
<td>12 or 17%</td>
<td>12 or 17%</td>
<td>5 or 7%</td>
<td>5 or 7%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. First Degree MURDER</td>
<td>32 or 45%</td>
<td>28 or 39%</td>
<td>10 or 14%</td>
<td>2 or 3%</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. InQuest</td>
<td>34 or 47%</td>
<td>20 or 27%</td>
<td>13 or 18%</td>
<td>3 or 4%</td>
<td>3 or 4%</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Graphic Framework and Techniques: Expository Writing and Reading</td>
<td>15 or 21%</td>
<td>14 or 19%</td>
<td>11 or 15%</td>
<td>21 or 29%</td>
<td>9 or 13%</td>
<td>2 or 3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Unk(^a)</th>
<th>Usfl</th>
<th>Inapr</th>
<th>Occ</th>
<th>Oft</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Dialogue Journals and Learning Logs</td>
<td>4 or 6%</td>
<td>8 or 11%</td>
<td>8 or 11%</td>
<td>24 or 33%</td>
<td>15 or 21%</td>
<td>14 or 19%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Cross-Genre Writing</td>
<td>8 or 11%</td>
<td>16 or 22%</td>
<td>13 or 18%</td>
<td>27 or 37%</td>
<td>5 or 7%</td>
<td>3 or 4%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The Quest Design</td>
<td>16 or 22%</td>
<td>20 or 27%</td>
<td>14 or 19%</td>
<td>12 or 16%</td>
<td>7 or 10%</td>
<td>4 or 6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Communication Schema</td>
<td>18 or 25%</td>
<td>23 or 32%</td>
<td>14 or 19%</td>
<td>14 or 19%</td>
<td>3 or 4%</td>
<td>1 or 1%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Integrated Approach:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive, Transitional, and Symbolic Stages</td>
<td>20 or 28%</td>
<td>18 or 25%</td>
<td>11 or 15%</td>
<td>10 or 14%</td>
<td>9 or 13%</td>
<td>3 or 4%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Underlined frequency indicates largest response for strategy. \(N = 81\).

\(^a\)Meanings of categories: Unk = unknown; Usfl = useful; Inapr = inappropriate; Occ = occasional; Oft = often; Daily = about every day.
The majority of responses fell in the column indicating that 11 (#1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #8, #9, #10, #15, #16, and #17) were used occasionally, while four strategies (#7, #11, #18, and #19) were considered useful. Only one strategy was considered inappropriate (#6) by the practitioners, and three (#13, #14, and #20) were unknown by the majority of respondents.

The results for Strategy 13, First Degree MURDER, show that at the same time that this strategy is considered unknown by 45% of the practitioners it is also considered useful by 39% of those who know of it. Strategy 33, K-W-L: Teaching Model for Active Reading of Expository Text, has similar responses in that it is seen as useful by 28%, yet it is unknown by 27%. Strategy 12, Interactive Literacy: Reading, Writing, and the Computer, was equally unknown (25%) and useful (25%).

The responses to the research question, Do the practitioners believe that the strategies would be useful in working with beginning college students who are in need of basic skill development?" can be seen in Table 14. A measure of usefulness was obtained by collapsing the categories of useful, used occasionally, used often, and used about every day into one group entitled useful. These strategies are listed as they appeared in the survey instruments for easier comparison with the theorists' choices.

Table 15 rank orders the 20 strategies according to usefulness as reported by the practitioners. It should be pointed out that the most useful strategies according to the practitioners as a group was Cognitive Mapping/Webbing (88%). The next most useful was Dialogue Journals.
and Learning Logs (79%), closely followed by SQ4R (78%). The least useful was considered to be InQuest (34%), followed by First Degree MURDER (39%).

Table 14
Usefulness of Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>No. of practitioners</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SQ3R</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SQ4R</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cognitive Mapping/Webbing</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Group Composition Through Social Interaction Process</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Top-Level Structure</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Story Schema/Story Grammar</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Free-Response and Opinion-Proof</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Peer Language Experience</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Expert Scaffolding</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Semantic Mapping</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. K-W-L Teaching Model for Active Reading of Expository Text</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Interactive Literacy: Reading, Writing, and the Computer</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. First Degree MURDER</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. InQuest</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Graphic Framework and Techniques: Expository Writing and Reading</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Dialogue Journals and Learning Logs</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>No. of practitioners</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Cross-Genre Writing</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The Quest Design</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Communication Schema</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Integrated Approach: Progressive, Transitional, and Symbolic Stages</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 77 (3 missing).

Table 15
Strategies Ranked in Order of Usefulness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>No. of practitioners</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Cognitive Mapping/Webbing</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Dialogue Journals and Learning Logs</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>SQ4R</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>SQ3R</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Group Composition Through Social Interaction Process</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Semantic Mapping</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Cross-Genre Writing</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Expert Scaffolding</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Peer Language Experience</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>No. of practitioners</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Graphic Framework and Techniques: Expository Writing and Reading</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Top-Level Structure</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>K-W-L Teaching Model for Active Reading of Expository Text</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The Quest Design</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Communication Schema</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Integrated Approach: Progressive, Transitional, and Symbolic Stages</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Interactive Literacy: Reading, Writing, and Computer</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Story Schema/Story Grammar</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>First Degree MURDER</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>InQuest</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 77 (3 missing).

Theorist's Survey

Table 16 depicts the results of the theorists' responses regarding these 20 strategies. Five of the theorists chose not to respond to the three research questions for each of these strategies. Instead, several of them addressed the strategies as a group, answering each of the research questions as a whole. (These responses will be discussed in Chapter V). However, those strategies as seen by all theorists as either sociopsycholinguistic in nature (S-P-L), as integrating reading and writing
skills (R & W), or as appropriate for developmental college students (Dev. Students) were indicated by a "yes" response. Where all those theorists agree that the strategies were not S-P-L, or R & W, or Dev. Students were indicated by the "no" response. That is, the table shows a yes or no response where all the theorists responded the same, while the "no con." indicates no conclusion could be drawn since there were mixed responses. Eleven of the 20 strategies were seen by the theorists as sociopsycholinguistic in nature, as integrating both reading and writing skills, and as appropriate for developmental college students. They are as follows:

Strategy 1: SQ3R.
Strategy 2: SQ4R.
Strategy 8: Peer Language Experience.
Strategy 17: Cross-Genre Writing.
Strategy 18: The Quest Design.

None of the strategies received a no for all three of the research questions; however, four were considered not sociopsycholinguistic in nature from their description. These are as follows:
Strategy 5: Top-Level Structure.
Strategy 12: Interactive Literacy: Reading, Writing and Computer.
Strategy 15: Graphic Framework and Techniques: Expository Writing and Reading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>S-P-L</th>
<th>R &amp; W</th>
<th>Dev. students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SQ3R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SQ4R</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cognitive Mapping/Webbing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Group Composition Through Social Interaction Process</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Top-Level Structure</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No con.</td>
<td>No con.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Story Schema/Story Grammar</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No con.</td>
<td>No con.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Free-Response and Opinion-Proof</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Peer Language Experience</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Expert Scaffolding</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Semantic Mapping</td>
<td>No con.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. K-W-L Teaching Model for Active reading of Expository Text</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No con.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Interactive Literacy: Reading, Writing, and Computer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No con.</td>
<td>No con.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>S-P-L</td>
<td>R &amp; W</td>
<td>Dev. students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. First Degree MURDER</td>
<td>No con.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. InQuest</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Graphic Framework and Techniques: Expository Writing and Reading</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No con.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Dialogue Journals and Learning Logs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Cross-Genre Writing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The Quest Design</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Communication Schema</td>
<td>No con.</td>
<td>No con.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Integrated Approach:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive, Transitional, and Symbolic Stages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 4</td>
<td>N = 5</td>
<td>N = 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. No con. = no conclusion.

The two seen as not integrating reading and writing skills are First Degree MURDER and InQuest. Only one strategy, InQuest, was seen by the theorists as not appropriate for developmental college students. Several of the strategies received a yes in one or two of the categories and a no conclusion in the other area(s).
Comparison of Theorists' and Practitioners' Responses to Survey

Table 17 presents a comparison of the theorists' and practitioners' responses to the 20 items on the survey. The 11 strategies listed are those that the theorists believed were sociopsycholinguistic in nature, integrated reading and writing skills, and appropriate for developmental college students. The list of strategies presented in the practitioners' column have been rank ordered according to their usefulness. Only the first 11 responses were included thereby matching the number indicated by the theorists.

The results of this comparison show that 9 of the 11 strategies compared are the same. That is to say that both the practitioners and the theorists agree that the following are useful in working with developmental college students:

Strategy 1: SQ3R.
Strategy 2: SQ4R.
Strategy 8: Peer Language Experience.
Strategy 17: Cross-Genre Writing.

Two additional strategies, The Quest Design (#18) and Integrated Approach: Progressive, Transitional, and Symbolic Stages (#20), were
Table 17
Comparison of Theorists' and Practitioners' Responses to Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theorists’ strategies&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Practitioners’ strategies&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*1. SQ3R</td>
<td>*1. Cognitive Mapping/Webbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2. SQ4R</td>
<td>*2. Dialogue Journals and Learning Logs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>In order presented on survey—not ranked. Strategies determine as S-P-L, R & W, and developmental students. <sup>b</sup>Ranked in order of usefulness. <sup>*</sup>These strategies chosen by both groups.
seen as appropriate for working with developmental students by the theorists. On the other hand, the practitioners believed that Semantic Mapping (#10) and Graphic Framework and Techniques: Expository Writing and Reading (#15) would be useful in working with developmental college students.

**Analysis of the Research Questions**

The research questions for the study were as follows:

1. Do the theorists agree that the set of strategies presented are sociopsycholinguistic in nature?
2. Do the theorists agree that the strategies presented integrate reading and writing skills?
3. Do the theorists agree that the strategies presented would be useful in working with developmental college students?
4. Do the practitioners believe that the strategies presented would be useful in working with beginning college students who are in need of basic skill development?
5. Do practitioners use the strategies presented with developmental college students?

In examining Research Question 1 (see Table 18), "Do the theorists agree that the set of strategies presented are sociopsycholinguistic in nature?" the theorists agreed that 12 of the 20 are in fact sociopsycholinguistic in nature. They have no conclusion or consensus regarding four of the remaining 8 strategies, and believe that only 4 are not sociopsycholinguistic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No conclusion</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SQ3R</td>
<td>10. Semantic Mapping</td>
<td>5. Top-Level Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Free-Response and Opinion-Proof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Peer Language Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Expert Scaffolding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. K-W-L Teaching Model for Active Reading of Expository Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Dialogue Journals and Learning Logs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Cross-Genre Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The Quest Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 2: "Do the theorists agree that the strategies presented integrate reading and writing skills?" Two of the strategies (#13 and #14) do not integrate reading and writing skills according to the theorists. No conclusion could be drawn regarding 6 of the strategies (see Table 19), while 12 were considered by the theorists to integrate reading and writing.

"Do theorists agree that the strategies presented would be useful in working with developmental college students?" was Research Question 3. The theorists agreed that 13 of the strategies would be useful in working with the developmental college students, and felt that only one (Strategy 14, InQuest) of the strategies would not be useful in working with this type of student (see Table 20). There was no conclusion or agreement as to the usefulness in working with developmental college students regarding 8 of the strategies.

Research Question 4: "Do the practitioners believe that the strategies presented would be useful in working with beginning college students who are in need of basic skill development?" examines the practitioners' responses to these strategies. Seven of the strategies were seen as useful by 66% (2/3) or more of the practitioners. An additional 10 strategies were determined useful by 65 to 50% of the practitioners (see Table 21). Only three strategies were felt useful by less than 50% but more than 34% of the practitioners.

The last research question is "Do practitioners use the strategies presented with developmental college students?" (See Table 22.) All 20 of the strategies were used at least occasionally as reported by the practitioners. All of the strategies are used occasionally and have
Table 19

Do the Theorists Agree That the Strategies Presented Integrate Reading and Writing Skills?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No conclusion</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SQ3R</td>
<td>5. Top-Level Structure</td>
<td>13. First Degree MURDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Free-Response and Opinion-Proof</td>
<td>15. Graphic Framework and Techniques Expository Writing and Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Expert Scaffolding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Semantic Mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Dialogue Journals and Learning Logs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Cross-Genre Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The Quest Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20
Do the Theorists Agree That the Strategies Presented Would Be Useful in Working With Developmental College Students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No conclusion</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. SQ4R</td>
<td>6. Story Schema/Story Grammar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Expert Scaffolding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Semantic Mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Dialogue Journals and Learning Logs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Cross-Genre Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The Quest Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Communication Schema</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do the Practitioners Believe That the Strategies Presented Would Be Useful in Working With Beginning College Students Who Are in Need of Basic Skill Development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies seen as useful by 66% or more of practitioners</th>
<th>Strategies seen as useful by 65% to 50% of practitioners</th>
<th>Strategies seen as useful by less than 50% of practitioners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. SQ4R 78%</td>
<td>8. Peer Language Experience 61%</td>
<td>14. InQuest 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. SQ3R 75%</td>
<td>15. Graphic Framework and Techniques: Expository Writing and Reading 60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Group Composition Through Social Interaction Process 75%</td>
<td>5. Top-Level Structure 58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Semantic Mapping 71%</td>
<td>11. K-W-L Teaching Model for Active Reading of Expository Text 57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Cross-Genre Writing 66%</td>
<td>18. The Quest Design 56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. Communication Schema 53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. Integrated Approach: Progressive, Transitional, and Symbolic Stages 52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Interactive Literacy: Reading, Writing and Computer 52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
frequencies ranging from 39% to 53%. Those strategies most frequently used occasionally are Cognitive Mapping/Webbing (53%) and SQ3R (45%), while the least noted as used occasionally are First Degree MURDER (3%) and InQuest (4%) (see Table 22).

Used often are SQ4R (24%) and SQ3R (22%). First Degree MURDER was the only strategy not used often by any practitioners. Those that are used daily by the practitioners include Dialogue Journals and Learning Logs by 19% of the practitioners and SQ4R by 12%, while no practitioner used First Degree MURDER or InQuest daily.

Table 22
Do Practitioners Use the Strategies Presented With Developmental College Students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Used Occasionally</th>
<th>Used Often</th>
<th>Used daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SQ3R</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SQ4R</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cognitive Mapping/Webbing</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Group Composition Through Social Interaction Process</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Top-Level Structure</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Story Schema/Story Grammar</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Free-Response and Opinion-Proof</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Peer Language Experience</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Expert Scaffolding</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Semantic Mapping</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Used Occasionally</th>
<th>Used Often</th>
<th>Used daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. K-W-L Teaching Model for Active Reading of Expository Text</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Interactive Literacy: Reading Writing, and Computer</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. First Degree MURDER</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. InQuest</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Graphic Framework and Techniques: Expository Writing and Reading</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Dialogue Journals and Learning Logs</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Cross-Genre Writing</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The Quest Design</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Communication Schema</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Integrated Approach: Progressive, Transitional, and Symbolic Stages</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 81.

Summary

The results of the five research questions are as follows:

Research Question 1: Do the theorists agree that the set of strategies presented are sociopsycholinguistic in nature? The theorists' responses to this question determined that 12 of the 20 strategies presented were sociopsycholinguistic and no conclusion could be drawn
about 4 of the strategies, while they agreed that the other 4 strategies were not sociopsycholinguistic in nature.

**Research Question 2:** Do the theorists agree that the strategies presented integrate reading and writing skills? Only 2 of the strategies were thought not to integrate reading and writing skills. Six of the 20 strategies could not be decided on in this respect (no conclusion), while it was determined that 12 of the 20 strategies did integrate reading and writing skills.

**Research Question 3:** Do the theorists agree that the strategies presented would be useful in working with developmental college students? Of the 20 strategies, the theorists considered only one not useful, 6 no conclusion could be drawn about, and 13 were considered useful in working with developmental college students.

**Research Question 4:** Do the practitioners believe that the strategies presented would be useful in working with beginning college students who are in need of basic skill development? All of the strategies were considered useful in working with beginning level college students in need of basic skills (developmental) by 34% or more of the practitioners. Fifty-two percent or more of the 81 practitioners responding to the survey believed that 17 of the 20 strategies would be useful in working with developmental students.

**Research Question 5:** Do practitioners use the strategies presented with developmental college students? All 20 strategies were used at least occasionally, all but 1 strategy were used often, and all but 2 strategies were used daily by the 81 practitioners.
Presented in this chapter was an analysis of the results of the theorists' and the practitioners' questionnaires as well as an examination of each research question individually. The focus of Chapter V is on the research conclusions and recommendations for future and follow-up studies.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The practitioners' survey (Survey of the Utilization of Socio-psycholinguistic (S-P-L) Strategies and Practices) and the theorists' survey (A Survey of Sociopsycholinguistic Strategies and Practices) were developed as an initial means of reaching a common ground between theory and practice in integrating reading and writing skills on the post-secondary level. In this study, both the practitioners and the theorists surveyed provided useful data for this goal.

Conclusions Regarding the Findings

Profile of Practitioners

From this study's results, the typical practitioner is a female with a master's degree working at a two-year college. Most likely, she has been at her college less than 6 years (62%), and possibly less than 3 years (36%). She would have published mostly newsletters (36%) and perhaps a journal article (27%).

Her degree was most likely in secondary education, reading, or writing. She took classes during her training in reading, writing, and linguistics. The in-services she has attended and participated in were mostly about teaching writing and reading. Interestingly, the materials
she has read focus on writing and critical thinking, with materials on reading and holistic approaches high on her reading list. The training she has received is probably in writing and possibly reading. Therefore, her expertise could be any one of the three: writing, reading, or reading and writing. As a professional working with developmental college students, she prefers working with students in small group activities (92%), instructor designed activities (91%), or even classroom lecture/teaching (90%).

Profile of the Theorists

The typical theorist that responded to this survey could be either female or male. However, she would have a Ph.D., and work most likely as a professor of education, or possibly a professor of English. She would certainly be at a public university for somewhere between 7 and 23 years in the same field. As far as forms of professional publications, she would have written a book or two, several journal articles, and also monographs. Regarding the methods she felt were appropriate in working with developmental college students, her first choice would be peer tutoring, next classroom lecture/teaching, learning center instruction, and finally small group activities.

In examining these two profiles, the difference of length of time in position is striking. For practitioners, the turnover must be great, since the majority of them have been on the job less than 6 years and one-third of them less than 3 years. Perhaps the "burnout" rate is high. With the theorists, the least number of years in a position is 7, and ranging up to 23 years.
Another interesting statistic is the number and types of publications for the practitioners' group. Even though these are the experts that are working with the developmental students, only one-third of them publish in newsletters and one-fourth of them have published in journals. One might think that since these are the professionals working directly with students that they would be publishing the articles on what works. Perhaps their publication record is as it is because they have only been in the position for a few years.

Survey Results

The results of this study provide a common set of strategies which integrate reading and writing skills, are sociopsycholinguistic in nature, and are appropriate for the developmental student on the post-secondary level. This set of sociopsycholinguistic strategies are as follows:

1. SQ3R
2. SQ4R
3. Cognitive Mapping/Webbing
4. Group Composition Through Social Interaction Process
7. Free-Response and Opinion-Proof
8. Peer Language Experience
9. Expert Scaffolding
16. Dialogue Journals and Learning Logs
17. Cross-Genre Writing
18. The Quest Design

The Identified Set of Reading/Writing Sociopsycholinguistic Strategies

The Common Characteristics of the Strategies as a Group

The nine strategies chosen by the two teams of experts have certain elements in common. First, these strategies focus on small group and even dyadic instruction (either student/student or student/teacher dyads), which falls in line with both groups' choices of method for working with developmental postsecondary students. Second, these nine strategies do integrate reading and writing skills and, in fact, focus on the creative aspects of both skills. Third, the strategies are sociopsycholinguistic in nature; that is, they use or involve the student's own native-speaker knowledge about language and the pragmatic and social linguistic knowledge acquired integrating reading and writing as well as speaking and listening skills. For most of the nine strategies provided, the other language skills (speaking and listening) have become a major focus of the strategy; it is interesting that the approach that these techniques take borders on the whole language process. Fourth, these strategies are student/learner centered, not teacher/centered. That is to say, that with strategies such as this, learning evolves around the learner, not the teacher. The learner needs to be in the center of the learning experience and the teacher the facilitator. This can be done through cooperative learning and interacting with others as well as fostering learner-initiated activities.
One must keep in mind that the context in which these strategies are taught is of the utmost importance to being successful. Any of these 20 strategies could be successful and facilitate learning or could fail depending on the situation and the individuals involved. The student's motivation, the instructor, and even the materials could also influence the situation. Certainly, this is a very complex issue not to be oversimplified, or ignored.

**Individual Strategies Chosen by Theorists and Practitioners**

The individual strategies described here were those chosen by both teams of experts.

**Strategy 1: SQ3R**

(Survey, Question, Read, Recite, Review) SQ3R is a content area reading strategy. **Survey** the reading selection, **Question**—create questions related to the main points, **Read**—the lesson silently, **Recite**—the answers to the questions asked, and **Review**—the complete assignment. (See Appendices C and D)

Originally the researcher included this as a strategy simply because "it's the ole standby." In the researcher's opinion, SQ3R did not integrate reading and writing skills. However, the theorists believe it is in fact S-P-L and that it indeed does integrate reading and writing skills, and the practitioners believe it is useful and appropriate in working with developmental college students, as do the theorists. Perhaps their reasons include the general step-by-step procedures set out in SQ3R as their reason for its inclusion: survey, question, read, recite, and review. And, since this "ole standby" is so well known and been around for so
long, perhaps the strategy has been modified to meet each individual practitioner's needs or method and now SQ3R has a user-designed/determined definition, so that when the term SQ3R is used, her own definition/interpretation of the strategy comes to mind instead of the original description.

Strategy 2: SQ4R

(Survey, Question, Read, wRite, Recite, Review) Survey--the reading selection/notes, Question, create questions related to the main points/plot, Read--the lesson/notes/draft silently to answer the questions posed, Write--margin notes, summary notes, answers to questions draft of passage, Recite--or discuss written portion above, Review/Reconstruct/Rewrite/Recap--the complete assignment. (See Appendices C and D)

This strategy certainly involves reading and writing with the fourth R added: wRite. Since the student is asked to use her own language and experiences in comprehending the passage, it is considered S-P-L as well as being appropriate at the college level. In addition, it is a modification of the "ole favorite SQ3R."

Strategy 3: Cognitive Mapping/Webbing

Via small groups a topic is chosen from the reading selection or a theme is determined for writing. The topic is then explored by the small group using the main topic to create a center, and they then begin the webbing/mapping of supporting ideas and facts (utilizes reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills). (See Appendices C and D)

This strategy as described in the guide provides small group instruction and discussion. It integrates reading and writing as well as being sociopsycholinguistic also. The main thrust of this strategy is to discover the relationship between concepts being presented.
Strategy 4: Group Composition--Social Interaction Process

A small group of students determines the focus/topic/plot of a written selection. As each group reads the selection, the members engage in a prewriting discussion on the focus/topic/plot. When all are satisfied with the structure of the writing, the "story" continues to be developed through the social interaction process. Through this discussion the group members begin to examine such things as grammar, sentence structure, and critical thinking/logic in the passage. (See Appendices C and D)

Again, the process focuses on small group interactions, with this strategy integrating cognitive knowledge and social knowledge with the ability to think critically, creatively, individually, and logically; that is, critically. The strategy certainly integrates reading and writing skills while attempting to create independence and responsibility for learning. Because the students select and the teacher specifies items to be examined, it is sociopsycholinguistic. Without this negotiation between students and teacher the strategy would not be S-P-L.

Strategy 7: Free-Response and Opinion-Proof

The four steps are as follows: 1. Free-response--students are introduced to a selection that will generate diversity of opinion and/or emotional responses. Free-response and divergent opinions are encouraged; 2. Opinion-proof--begin the writing component by introducing the students to a writing guide, looking for common themes or opinions which can be supported by evidence or inferences generated in the selection; 3. Writing--students then generate notes based on their free responses and from their underlined supports; and, 4. Peer editing--developed with the students is a checklist specifying criteria for editing. (See Appendices C and D)

This strategy has all the ingredients sought after by the teams of experts. It is integrative, conducted in small groups or dyads with peers,
not rigidly prescribed with step-by-step procedures, divergent opinions, and notions/creativity are encouraged, besides being S-P-L.

**Strategy 8: Peer Language Experience**

Through a dictation process the students create a passage together, recording ideas for each other. Once the passage(s) has/have been developed and refined, the students then engage in the editing process. (See Appendices C and D)

Here again the focus is on creativity, not structure. The students are placed with their peers to develop the creative process. The strategy integrates reading and writing, and is S-P-L. As do several of these strategies, it significantly involves the other language skills, namely, speaking and listening.

**Strategy 9: Expert Scaffolding**

Several approaches used: 1. "Vertical construction" scaffolding with the college level students includes student/instructor dialog regarding the topic of discussion--students' intellectual development grows out of their social interaction with significant adults in their lives; 2. college-aged students tend to learn from one another when engaged in interaction--taking turns requesting and providing information; 3. Scaffolding conferences with instructor provide essential review-discussions of students' writing, allowing the students to hear their own and other's writing read and questioned, and thus make them familiar with the qualities of good writing and the needs of audiences; and, 4. dialog journal in which the instructor responds to the students' writing, but makes no corrections. (See Appendices C and D)

As with several strategies already mentioned, this one centers around dialogue in the student/teacher dyad. In a sense, this strategy focuses on something similar to "workshopping" in a problem-solving fashion: becoming familiar with the English language functions, hearing
one's own and others' writing read and questioned, focusing on the qualities of good writing. In the dialogue journal, the instructor only responds to the writing, making no corrections. This approach certainly makes the strategy S-P-L because of the independence, the creative use of one's language, and the use of the four language processes.

**Strategy 16: Dialogue Journals and Learning Logs**

These interactive (transactive) devices encourage students to dialogue with themselves. It provides the student (and perhaps the instructor) with a means to clarify what is understood from the readings and lecture. These provide the students a means to assess the thinking process also. The student records a detailed summary of the lecture and then a detailed summary of the readings on the same topic. The thinking processes leading to the two summary structures are then compared. (See Appendices C and D)

With this strategy the focus is on student generated ideas, using all four of the language processes. Opportunity is provided for self-evaluation and dyadic interaction for clarification of ideas and concepts. This strategy is student-centered and teacher-guided.

**Strategy 17: Cross-Genre Writing**

A particularly valuable way of stimulating and assessing students' learning is to provide opportunities for them to convey factual information and understanding in a variety of written genres: stories, plays, poems, letters, advertisements, newspapers and magazines, travel brochures, or any other form that seems to accommodate the particular topic. (See Appendices C and D)

The student has the choice of writing genre in focusing on conveying factual information. Because research is involved, the language processes are developed differently depending on the variety of written genre chosen.
The above were the strategies that both groups chose in common. Each group chose two additional strategies and these will be examined next.

Individual Strategies Chosen by the Theorists Only

The theorists also believed that The Quest Design and An Integrated Approach: Progressive, Transitional, and Symbolic Stages met all three criteria for this study.

Strategy 18: The Quest Design

The Quest design is an approach to stimulate reading, writing, and learning across the content areas. In brief, the students: 1. brainstorm possible topics; 2. choose one for investigation; 3. brainstorm questions they might consider researching, related to the topic; 4. divide into interest groups related to questions; and, 5. after several sessions of question formation and discussion, each student takes a specific question related to the more general subtopic to investigate further. (See Appendices C and D)

The main point regarding this strategy is that the students are doing the brainstorming and that it is not teacher-controlled. The small groups are then divided by interest and take responsibility for the formation of questions and the discussion, and eventually the subtopic for further investigation.


A strategy designed to integrate reading and writing skills for composition and comprehension. The progressive exercises help the student through reading, to begin to construct a whole meaning for a story/passage as soon as she begins to read or to write. The transitional stage activities get the students to see the passage/story from different
perspectives, both within and without. The symbolic stage exercises move the student from the creation of meaning to the recognition of significance. The student makes a coherent statement about the whole story moving from involvement with the story to increasingly abstract conclusions about its meanings. (See Appendices C and D)

All four of the language processes (reading, writing, speaking, and listening are integrated in this strategy, as is true for many of those identified. Again, it is not controlled by the teacher, and the focus of the strategy is to examine the three stages in creatively constructing a story/passage.

**Individual Strategies Chosen by the Practitioners**

The two additional strategies chosen by the practitioners were Story Schema/Story Grammar and K-W-L Teaching Model for Active Reading of Expository Tests.

**Strategy 6: Story Schema/Story Grammar**

Story Schema/Story Grammar is an organizational device for organizing a "typical story." Story grammars have been developed to describe how a story schema is organized into categories of information. It defines a story as a series of problem-solving episodes centering on the main character's efforts to achieve a major goal, and includes setting, theme, plot, resolution, and their interrelationship. Each of these categories has questioning formats to help the students determine the preciseness of the story. (For example, regarding the characters: "Who are the characters? What are they like?) (See Appendices C and D)

The practitioners may have chosen this strategy because of its organizational device for categories of information for a typical story. The strategy provides questioning devices for focusing on a series of
problem-solving episodes. The strategy appears to focus mostly on the writing process.

**Strategy 11: K-W-L Teaching Model for Active Reading of Expository Texts**

This is a three-step procedure for three basic cognitive steps required: *What I Know*, determining what I *Want* to learn, and recalling what I *Did* learn as a result of the reading. A worksheet provides a guide for this thinking-reading process. This procedure is done in an oral discussion with the students' personal reactions placed on the worksheets or it can be done individually. In long articles the teacher may reflect with the students section by section, reviewing what has been learned and directing questions for further reading. (See Appendices C and D)

This strategy provides a framework for examining or creating literature. A worksheet guide provides a guide for the thinking-reading process. Although the strategy may appear to be teacher controlled to the theorist, the activity of reflecting by teacher and student need not be controlling, depending on the teacher. The focus should be on student creativity. Perhaps, for the practitioners, a more structured/prescriptive strategy is welcomed.

**Strategies Considered Inappropriate**

The following is a list of those strategies chosen by neither the theorists nor practitioners:

**Strategy 5: Top-Level Structure**

There are four rules in this strategy which assist a student in finding or creating the main ideas of a selection. These rules/guidelines are as follows: 1. *generalization*—involves reducing a number of specific parts to one category, 2. *deletion*—process whereby the reader/writer deletes irrelevant
information, 3. integration—a means by which new information is related to prior information (this can involve either a condensation or expansion of the gist of the passage at this point), and 4. construction—restating main/ideas/plot activities using new terminology. (See Appendices C and D)

This strategy provides "rules" for finding and creating the main ideas of a selection. Certainly this rigid structure and the teacher/rule control was the reason for its unpopularity and inappropriateness by both teams of experts.

**Strategy 12: Interactive Literacy: Reading, Writing, and the Computer**

This strategy is designed to assist student readers and writers to develop the effective interactive skills of experienced writers and readers. Interactive practice exercises are provided for analytical reading, thinking, and writing with an on-screen text. This process includes three phases which depict what occurs before, during, and after the reading/writing process, that is, preparation, discernment, and evaluation. (See Appendices C and D)

Most professionals in this field are suspicious of computer programs/activities. Often they are just workbook exercises on disc. The theorists would not find the strategy S-P-L because of its prescriptive-ness and practical exercises.

**Strategy 13: First Degree MURDER**

This is a dyadic strategy which requires a pair of students to read approximately 500 words of a 2,500 word passage. One member of the pair then serves as recaller and attempts to orally summarize from memory what has been learned. The other member of the pair serves as the listener/facilitator and attempts to correct errors in the recall and to further facilitate the organization and storage of the materials. The partners alternate roles of recaller, listener, and facilitator. It is broken down into six steps: Mood (establish positive mind-set for reading and studying); Understand (while reading, grasp main ideas and facts); Recall (without looking at
text, summarize what was read); Detect (check for errors
and omissions in recall-metacognitive activity), Elaborate
(facilitate memory by adding mental imagery, prior knowl-
edge, etc.); and Review (go over material to be
remembered). (See Appendices C and D)

This strategy is prescriptive, inflexible, and focuses on primarily
one language process: reading. It appears from the description that
little independence is created within this approach. As a result of its
structural nature and failure to integrate writing in the language process,
it was not included in the experts choices.

**Strategy 14: InQuest**

The Investigative Questioning Procedure is a comprehension
strategy that actively involves the reader or listener with
narrative text through a combination of student questioning
and spontaneous drama techniques. At some critical point in
the selection, the teacher interrupts the reading and mentally
transports the reader/listener to a spontaneous news confer­
ence which is taking place at the scene of the story event.
While one student assumes the role of major character,
others become investigative reporters who probe for inter­
pretation and evaluation of story events as well as predic­
tions of future events in the story resumed. This procedure
may be repeated at several points within the selection. Each
time, students are taking charge of monitoring comprehen­
sion. (See Appendices C and D)

This strategy doesn’t involve writing, or speaking and listening
either. Again, it is teacher-controlled because it is prescriptive and in-
flexible.

**Strategy 19: Communication Schema**

A heuristic device to assist a reader in comprehending a
passage or a writer in creating a literary essay. The student
is asked to concentrate in turn on the six aspects as follows:
subject matter--reader’s interpretations; 3. Addresser =
who’s speaking in story/selection--often leads to a
discussion about the distance between the author and the narrator and then into a discussion of the point of view; 4. Addressee = the notion of direct and indirect audience becomes clear to literary novices as they realize that the cozy one-to-one tone of a character-to-reader creates a sense of direct audience; 5. Contact = refers to the form of the communication--a simplistic rendering would be a genre identification (short story, novel, etc.), and how the structure and message are related; and 6. Code = type of language used. (See Appendices C and D)

Because it is a heuristic device to assist a reader to comprehend a passage or a writer to create a literary essay, one might think that it would meet the qualifications for this study. However, the description made the strategy appear rather complicated, thereby making it seem prescriptive. The analytical schema and the literature could also have deleted it.

In analyzing these strategies and in comparing them with the chosen nine, as a group these strategies (a) are too restrictive/prescriptive; (b) provide little room for student creativity and independence; (c) often have too much teacher control over the activity, instead of the student being largely in control of the learning process and strategy; and (d) they are not interactive or provide student-student dyads or small group activities.

Conclusion

So, what has been learned from this study? First, practitioners in the state of Michigan are employed mainly by two-year community colleges. They stay in this field (college level developmental education) approximately 6 years or less. Usually the practitioner is a woman with a master's degree in secondary education, reading, or writing.
Approximately one-fourth of these Michigan practitioners have published journal articles, while about one-third have published articles in newsletters. Her training and in-services have been in the areas of reading and writing; and her classes in reading, writing, and linguistics.

Theorists, on the other hand, are university professors with Ph.D.'s usually in education, English, or a closely related field. Theorists are either female or male and have been employed at a university from 7 to 23 years. Their contributions in terms of publications is usually one to two books, several journal articles, and monographs.

Third, regarding the methods used and appropriateness in working with developmental students at the college level, in practice most practitioners work with students in small groups with instructor-designed material as well as classroom lecture/teaching. However, the theorists believe that peer tutoring, learning instruction, small group activities, and classroom lecture/teaching were the most appropriate.

Fourth, and most importantly, were the results of the survey. Eleven strategies were chosen by both the practitioners and the theorists and considered to be sociopsycholinguistic strategies integrating reading and writing and appropriate for developmental students on the postsecondary level. They are as follows:

1. SQ3R
2. SQ4R
3. Cognitive Mapping/Webbing
4. Group Composition--Social Interaction Process
5. Free-Response and Opinion-Proof
6. Peer Language Experience
9. Expert Scaffolding
16. Dialogue Journals and Learning Logs
17. Cross-Genre Writing
18. The Quest Design

The fifth finding from this study is that these eleven commonly chosen strategies had several facets in common. These common elements are as follows:

1. The strategies focus on small group or even dyadic instruction.
2. They integrate reading and writing skills.
3. They are sociopsycholinguistic; that is, the strategies use or involve the student's own native-speaker knowledge about language and the pragmatic and sociolinguistic knowledge acquired as well as integrated reading and writing and speaking and listening skills.
4. They are student-centered. That is, with the teacher's guidance, the language development process evolves around the learner.
5. The strategies foster learner-initiated activities and cooperative learning.

In addition, the context in which these strategies are taught is of the utmost importance, as is the quality of the individual guiding the activities.

Recommendations for Future Research

First, this study needs to be replicated on a larger scale; that is, several practitioners from colleges in other regions or states should be
surveyed to assure consistence in the findings. Second, more theorists
should be surveyed to provide more insight on S-P-L, the integration of
reading and writing, and appropriateness for developmental college
students. Third, the study should be expanded at some point to include
the oracy processes since they comprise approximately 75% of our
language communication. Four, the additional information received with
this study needs to be compiled and shared. And fifth, a new but yet
related study needs to be conducted to look at possible reasons why a
mismatch exists between the practitioners and the theorists on various
strategies.

This study has made several contributions to its field. First, it has
begun the process of pooling a list of successful strategies that are
sociopsycholinguistically sound and of proven value with older develop­
mental students. Second, the study suggests characteristics essential,
or at least a prerequisite for such strategies, which may be of use in
proposing lines of future strategies. And third, this research illustrates
the apparent mismatch between what theorists and practitioners believe
is effective and what the latter actually do.

Discussion

The 20 strategies identified for this study were chosen based on
the 14 criteria listed in Chapter III. Several of those criteria are rooted in
sociopsycholinguistics and are the underlying reasons why so many
were chosen by both the practitioners and the theorists. Linguistics
refers to the uses of language. When reading and writing are integrated
as they are in most of these strategies, ideas and language are generated
linguistically from the individual's life experiences, and comprehension is based on the text used in a passage, the individual reader's language ability, and their language experiences. The "psycho" portion takes the language to a new cognitive level. With reading, it is metacognitive, or at the evaluation, analysis, and synthesis levels of comprehension. The new level of writing is moved beyond literal or interpretative level to analysis, evaluation, or synthesis level. That is to say, the students' stage/level of writing includes sentence structure, content, and organization as well as grammatical forms.

The "socio" aspect focuses on language used in its context. In writing, the students' use their knowledge and experiences of/with the topic for writing, while reading draws upon the students' repertoire of experiences and knowledge to comprehend what is being read.

There is a tendency in society to think that language learning takes place in elementary school and perhaps junior high school within the language arts curriculum. It is assumed that children magically have completely acquired language once they reach the end of the language arts program. Developing one's language ability, however, is a lifelong effort. It is a process that continues throughout life, and in the case of this research, through college and obtaining a particular profession; and therefore, more attention has to be paid to older students' language elaboration needs and on devising sociopsycholinguistically sound methodologies to serve this clientele, along the lines suggested by the results of this study.
Appendix A
Pilot Study Materials for Practitioner

1Cover letter to Pilot Study Participants and Comment Sheet
Cover Letter to Practitioners
Participant Background Sheet
A Survey of the Utilization of P-S-L Strategies and Practices
Strategy Description Guide
Dear:

The enclosed is a pilot study for my research project on "Psychosociolinguistic Strategies Integrating Writing and Reading on the Postsecondary Level." I have chosen you to be a member of my pilot study team. I have chosen you because of your knowledge and expertise in this area, and am hoping that you will assist me by completing the survey as well as critiquing it.

Each participant in the actual study will receive the same information and survey packet attached. It includes the following:
1) a cover letter
2) a background information sheet
3) a survey
4) a "strategy description guide"

Your directions are as follows:

1) Please complete the survey to the best of your ability.

2) After completing the survey, please indicate any troublesome areas - any aspects that were vague, unclear, or questionable.

3) On the enclosed "Comment Sheet," please list any other pertinent points or helpful suggestions, especially regarding the content or subject matter.

4) I would also appreciate your opinion on the layout/format and organization of the survey and materials as well as readability.

Your completion of this survey, and your comments, corrections, and so on will assist me in conducting this project. I would like these materials returned in the enclosed envelope by October 2, 1992.

I truly appreciate your time and assistance with my research project.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gail L. Landberg
Dear

You have been chosen as a part of a panel of practitioners to participate in this study on the "Utilization of Psychosociolinguistic Strategies and Practices on the Postsecondary Level." You were chosen because of your membership and affiliation with the Michigan National Association of Developmental Educators. Therefore, you are being asked to complete the attached survey instrument.

Your responses will help me determine to what extent you use or recommend usage of the proposed strategies. Included is a "Survey Description Guide" and a survey "Utilization of Psychosociolinguistic Strategies and Practices." Please review the description guide prior to completing the survey. It is extremely important for you to understand that the purpose of this study is to examine the appropriateness and usefulness of the psychosociolinguistic strategies and practices mentioned in this study.

Completion of this survey will take approximately 30 minutes of your time. Your cooperation in spending time to complete this instrument is greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Gail L. Landberg
A SURVEY OF THE UTILIZATION OF PSYCHOSOCIO-LINGUISTIC STRATEGIES

Participant Background

1. Gender: Female ____ Male ____

2. Current position: ___________________________ position ______

3. Area of Expertise: (check those that apply)
   a. ___ Reading
   b. ___ Writing
   c. ___ Critical Thinking
   d. ___ Mathematics
   e. ___ Other (not related to the above) ________________

   If you have checked "d" or "e" only, please do not complete the rest of the survey. Place the survey in the addressed and stamped envelop and return it as soon as possible. Thank you for your assistance.

4. Training: (Please check [✓] those that apply on the matrix below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hold Degree in</th>
<th>Taken Classes in</th>
<th>Taken Inservices in</th>
<th>Read Materials on</th>
<th>Have Training in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Education (What kind?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic Approaches (To reading &amp; Writing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociolinguistic Approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psycholinguistic Approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosociolinguistic Approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Competency Approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
5. Methods currently used in working with students: (check those that apply)
   a. ___ peer tutoring
   b. ___ classroom/lecture teaching
   c. ___ learning center instruction
   d. ___ small group activities
   e. ___ workbook exercises
   f. ___ computer assisted exercises
   g. ___ instructor designed activities
   h. ___ other (please specify ______________________)

6. Please describe the "developmental students" with which you work:
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

7. Please describe your philosophy regarding the teaching of reading and writing:
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

8. Type of institution:
   a. ___ 2-year/community college
   b. ___ 4-year college (private)
   c. ___ 4-year college (public)
   e. ___ university (public)
   g. ___ other
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

9. Publication Arenas:
   a. ___ books
   b. ___ journals
   c. ___ monographs
   d. ___ newsletter
   e. ___ other
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

COMMENTS:
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
## A SURVEY OF THE UTILIZATION OF P-S-L STRATEGIES AND PRACTICES

For the following strategies, indicate to what extent you use or recommend usage. The authors of many of these strategies have been omitted to avoid biased responses. Attached is a "Strategy Description Guide," which can be referred to for clarification.

Please use one of the following categories for each strategy listed:

1. I have never heard of this P-S-L strategy or practice. (Unknown)
2. Even though I have not heard of this strategy, I believe it would be useful in working with developmental students. (Useful)
3. This strategy is inappropriate for my students. (Inappropriate)
4. This is a strategy that I use occasionally. (Occasionally)
5. This is a strategy that I use at least once a week with students. (Often)
6. This is a strategy that I use just about every day. (About every day)

Please check (√) the appropriate column(s) for each strategy or practice listed below.

### STRATEGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SQ3R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SQ4R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cognitive Mapping/Webbing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Group Composition through Social Interaction Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Top-level Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Story Schema/Story Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Free-Response and Opinion-Proof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Peer Language Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Expert Scaffolding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Semantic Mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. K-W-L Teaching Model for Active Reading of Expository Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Quill Computer Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. First Degree MURDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. InQuest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Graphic Framework &amp; Techniques: Expository Writing &amp; Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Dialogue Journals and Learning Logs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Cross-Genre Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The Quest Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Communication Schema</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Integrated Approach: Progressive, Transitional, &amp; Symbolic Stages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRATEGY DESCRIPTION GUIDE

1. **SQ3R:**
   (Survey, Question, Read, Recite, Review) SQ3R is a content area reading strategy. **Survey** - the reading selection, **Question** - create questions related to the main points, **Read** - the lesson silently, **Recite** - the answers to the questions asked, **Review** - the complete assignment.

2. **SQ4R:**
   (Survey, Question, Read, Write, Recite, Review) **Survey** - the reading selection/notes, **Question** - create questions related to the main points/plot, **Read** - the lesson/notes/draft silently to answer the questions posed, **Write** - margin notes, summary notes, answers to questions draft of passage, **Recite** - or discuss written portion above, **Review/Reconstruct/Rewrite/Recap** - the complete assignment.

3. **Cognitive Mapping/Webbing:**
   Via small groups a topic is chosen from the reading selection or a theme is determined for writing. The topic is then explored by the small group using the main topic to create a center, and they then begin the webbing/mapping of supporting ideas and facts (utilizes reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills).

4. **Group composition - Social Interaction Process:**
   A small group of students determine the focus/topic/plot of a written selection. Each group naturally engages in a prewriting discussion on focus/topic/plot, when all are satisfied with the structure of the writing. As the "story" continues to be depicted, the social interaction process continues. Through discussion the group members begin to examine such things as grammar, sentence structure, and critical thinking/logic in the passage.

5. **Top-level Structure:** (Macrostructure of Discourse)
   There are four rules in this strategy which assist a student in finding the main ideas: 1. **generalization** - involves reducing a number of specific parts to one category, 2. **deletion** - process whereby the reader/writer deletes irrelevant information, 3. **integration** - a means by which new information is related to prior information. (This can involve either a condensation or expansion of the gist of the passage at this point), and 4. **construction** - restating main ideas/plot activities using new terminology.

6. **Story Schema/Story Grammar:**
   An organizational tool for organizing a "typical story." Story grammars have been developed to describe how a story schema is organized into categories of information. It defines a story as a series of problem-solving episodes centering on the main character's efforts to achieve a major goal. This organizational device includes setting, theme, plot, resolution, and their interrelationship. Each of these categories have questioning formats to help them determine the preciseness of the story. (For example, regarding the characters "Who are the characters? What are they like?")
7. **Free-response and opinion-proof:**
   The four steps are as follows: 1. **Free-response** - students are introduced to a selection that will generate diversity of opinion and/or emotional responses. Free-response and divergent opinions are encouraged; 2. **Opinion-proof** - begin the writing component by introducing the students to a writing guide, looking for common themes or opinions which can be supported by evidence or inferences generated in the selection; 3. **Writing** - students then generate notes based on their free responses and from their underlined supports; and, 4. **Peer editing** - developed with the students is a checklist specifying criteria for editing.

8. **Peer Language Experience:**
   Through a dictation process students create a passage and then edit it together.

9. **Expert Scaffolding:**
   Several approaches used: 1. "Vertical construction" scaffolding with the college level student includes dialog student/instructor regarding the topic of discussion - students intellectual development grows out of their social interaction with significant adults in their lives; 2. college-aged students tend to learn from one another when engaged in interaction - taking turns requesting and providing information; 3. Scaffolding conferences with instructor provide essential review-discussions of student’s writing, allowing the student to hear her own and other's writing read and questioned, and thus made them familiar with the qualities of good writing and the needs of audiences; and, 4. dialog journal in which the instructor responses to the students' writing, but makes no corrections.

10. **Semantic Mapping:**
    Semantic mapping has been used by teachers at all levels to motivate and actively involve learners in the thinking-reading-writing processes. It is a categorical structuring of information in graphic form. It is an individualized content approach in that students are required to relate new words to their own experiences and prior knowledge. The steps are as follows: Choose a central word, write the word down, brainstorm words related to the selected key word, list as many words by category as possible, have students share lists orally to obtain new words/ideas, label the categories, discuss entries and discover relationships between categories. This procedure of mapping provides students with a means for both activating and enhancing their knowledge bases. Semantic mapping is used as a pre and postreading and a pre and postwriting strategy.

11. **K-W-L Teaching Model for Active Reading of Expository Texts:**
    This is a three-step procedure for three basic cognitive steps required: What I Know, determining what I Want to learn, and recalling what I did Learn as a result of the reading. A worksheet provides a guide for this thinking-reading process. This procedure is done in an oral discussion with the students personal reactions placed on the worksheets or it can be done individually. In long articles the teacher may reflect with the students section by section, reviewing what has been learned and directing questions for further reading.
12. **Quill Computer Program:**
Quill computer program is a program designed to assist the student in developing the stages of the writing process.

13. **First Degree MURDER:**
This is a cooperative learning strategy (dyadic), requiring the pair to read approximately 500 words of a 2,500 word passage. One member of the pair then serves as recaller and attempts to orally summarize from memory what has been learned. The other member of the pair serves as the listener/facilitator and attempts to correct error in the recall and to further facilitate the organization and storage of the materials. The partners alternate roles of recaller and listener/facilitator. To make it easy to follow, it was broken down into six steps: Mood (Establish positive mid-set for reading and studying); Understand (While reading, grasp main ideas and facts); Recall (Without looking at text, summarize what was read); Detect (Check for errors and omissions in recall - metacognitive activity); Elaborate (Facilitate memory by adding mental imagery, prior knowledge, etc.); and, Review (Go over material to be remembered).

14. **InQuest:**
The Investigative Questioning Procedure is a comprehension strategy that actively involves the reader or listener with narrative text through a combination of student questioning and spontaneous drama techniques. At some critical point in the selection, the teacher interrupts the reading and mentally transports the reader/listener to a spontaneous news conference which is taking place at the scene of the story event. While one student assumes the role of major character, others become investigative reporters who probe for interpretation and evaluation of story events as well as predictions of future events in the story resumed. This procedure may be repeated at several points within the selection. Each time, students are taking charge of monitoring comprehension.

15. **Graphic Framework & Techniques for Expository Writing & Reading:**
This strategy provides several methods for recognizing and creating primary methods of development in used in a selection or a paragraph. Seeing the overall framework helps the student to understand the author's ideas and predict the details as well as allowing the student to think along with the author. As a writing technique the framework provides techniques for developing expository selections.

16. **Dialogue Journals & Learning Logs:**
Interactive (transactive) devices to encourage students to dialogue with themselves. It provides the student (and perhaps the instructor) with a means to clarify what is understood from the readings and lecture. These provide the students a means to assess the thinking process also. The student records a detailed summary of the lecture and then a detailed summary of the readings on the same topic. A comparison and integration of the thinking process is compared.
Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Appendix B

Pilot Study Materials: Theorists\(^1\)

\(^1\)Cover Letter to Pilot Study Participants and Comment Sheet
Cover Letter to Theorists
Background Information Sheet
A Survey of Psychosociolinguistic Strategies and Practices
Strategy Description Guide
September 21, 1992

Dear:

The enclosed is a pilot study for my research project on "Psychosociolinguistic Strategies Integrating Writing and Reading on the Postsecondary Level." I have chosen you to be a member of my pilot study team. I have chosen you because of your knowledge and expertise in this area, and am hoping that you will assist me by completing the survey as well as critiquing it.

Each participant in the actual study will receive the same information and survey packet attached. It includes the following:

1) a cover letter
2) a background information sheet
3) a survey
4) a "strategy description guide"

Your directions are as follows:

1) Please complete the survey to the best of your ability.
2) After completing the survey, please indicate any troublesome areas - any aspects that were vague, unclear, or questionable.
3) On the enclosed "Comment Sheet," please list any other pertinent points or helpful suggestions, especially regarding the content or subject matter.
4) I would also appreciate your opinion on the layout/format and organization of the survey and materials as well as readability.

Your completion of this survey, and your comments, corrections, and so on will assist me in conducting this project. I would like these materials returned in the enclosed envelope by October 2, 1992.

I truly appreciate your time and assistance with my research project.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gail L. Landberg
Dear

Your agreement to participate in this study as part of the panel of experts is certainly appreciated. You were chosen because your background and participation in the field of psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics or psychosociolinguistics which makes you eminently qualified to serve as part of this panel of experts. Therefore, you are being asked to complete the attached survey instrument ("A Survey of Psychosociolinguistic Strategies and Practices").

Enclosed is a "Survey Description Guide" and "A Survey of Psychosociolinguistic Strategies and Practices." Please review the description guide prior to completing the survey. Your responses will help me determine whether the strategies proposed are in fact psychosociolinguistic in nature; second, if the strategies integrate both reading and writing skills; and, third, if these strategies would be useful in working with developmental college students. It is extremely important for you to understand that the purpose of this study is to examine the appropriateness and usefulness of the psychosociolinguistic strategies and practices mentioned in the survey.

Completion of this survey will take approximately 30 minutes of your time. Your cooperation in spending time to complete this instrument is greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Gail L. Landberg
A SURVEY OF PSYCHOSOCIO-LINGUISTIC STRATEGIES AND PRACTICES

Background Information Sheet

1. Gender: Female ____ Male ____


3. Area of Expertise and Training: (Please check (✓) those that apply on the matrix below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hold Degree in</th>
<th>Taken Classes in</th>
<th>Taken Inservices in</th>
<th>Read Materials on</th>
<th>Have Training in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Education (What kind?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic Approaches (To reading &amp; Writing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociolinguistic Approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psycholinguistic Approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosociolinguistic Approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Competency Approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Methods appropriate for developmental college students: (check (✓) those that apply)

a. __ peer tutoring
b. __ classroom/lecture teaching
c. __ learning center instruction
d. __ small group activities
e. __ workbook exercises
f. __ computer assisted exercises
g. __ instructor designed activities
h. __ other (please specify) ____________________________

5. Please provide your definition of "developmental students."

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

6. Please describe your philosophy of the integration of reading and writing skills.

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

7. Type of institution:

a. ___ 2-year/community college  b. ___ 4-year college (private)
c. ___ 4-year college (public)  d. ___ university (private)
e. ___ university (public)  f. ___ national organization
g. ___ other ____________________________

8. Publication Arenas: (check (✓) those that apply)

a. ___ books
b. ___ journals
c. ___ monographs
d. ___ newsletter
e. ___ other

COMMENTS:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
A SURVEY OF PSYCHOSOCIOLINGUISTIC STRATEGIES AND PRACTICES

Below is a list of strategies. The authors of these strategies have been omitted to avoid a bias in responses. Attached is a Strategy Description Guide, which can be referred to for clarification.

Please circle the appropriate response for each strategy.

1. SQ3R:
   a. Would you consider this strategy Psychosociolinguistic in nature? Yes No
      If yes, why?____________________________________
      If not, why not?
   b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills? Yes No
      If yes, how?____________________________________
      If no, why not?
   c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students? Yes No

2. SQ4R:
   a. Would you consider this strategy Psychosociolinguistic in nature? Yes No
      If yes, why?____________________________________
      If not, why not?
   b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills? Yes No
      If yes, how?____________________________________
      If no, why not?
   c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students? Yes No

3. Cognitive Mapping/Webbing:
   a. Would you consider this strategy Psychosociolinguistic in nature? Yes No
      If yes, why?____________________________________
      If not, why not?
   b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills? Yes No
      If yes, how?____________________________________
      If no, why not?
   c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students? Yes No
4. Group composition - Social Interaction Process:

a. Would you consider this strategy Psychosociolinguistic in nature?  
   If yes, why?  
   If not, why not?  

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   If yes, how?  
   If no, why not?  

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  
   Yes  No

5. Top-Level Structure:

a. Would you consider this strategy Psychosociolinguistic in nature?  
   If yes, why?  
   If not, why not?  

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   If yes, how?  
   If no, why not?  

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  
   Yes  No

6. Story Schema/Story Grammar:

a. Would you consider this strategy Psychosociolinguistic in nature?  
   If yes, why?  
   If not, why not?  

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   If yes, how?  
   If no, why not?  

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  
   Yes  No
7. Free-Response and Opinion-Proof:
   a. Would you consider this strategy Psychosociolinguistic in nature?
      If yes, why? ____________________________________________________________
      If not, why not?
   b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?
      If yes, how? __________________________________________________________
      If no, why not?
   c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?
      Yes No

8. Peer Language Experience:
   a. Would you consider this strategy Psychosociolinguistic in nature?
      If yes, why? ____________________________________________________________
      If not, why not?
   b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?
      If yes, how? __________________________________________________________
      If no, why not?
   c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?
      Yes No

9. Expert Scaffolding:
   a. Would you consider this strategy Psychosociolinguistic in nature?
      If yes, why? __________________________________________________________
      If not, why not?
   b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?
      If yes, how? __________________________________________________________
      If no, why not?
   c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?
      Yes No
10. Semantic Mapping:

a. Would you consider this strategy Psychosociolinguistic in nature?  
   If yes, why?  
   If not, why not?  

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   If yes, how?  
   If no, why not?  

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  

11. K-W-L Teaching Model for Active Reading of Expository Text:

a. Would you consider this strategy Psychosociolinguistic in nature?  
   If yes, why?  
   If not, why not?  

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   If yes, how?  
   If no, why not?  

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  

12. Quill Computer Program:

a. Would you consider this strategy Psychosociolinguistic in nature?  
   If yes, why?  
   If not, why not?  

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   If yes, how?  
   If no, why not?  

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
13. First Degree MURDER:

a. Would you consider this strategy Psychosociolinguistic in nature? If yes, why? ________________________________
   If not, why not? __________________________________________________________

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills? If yes, how? ________________________________
   If no, why not? __________________________________________________________

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students? Yes No

14. InQuest:

a. Would you consider this strategy Psychosociolinguistic in nature? If yes, why? ________________________________
   If not, why not? __________________________________________________________

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills? If yes, how? ________________________________
   If no, why not? __________________________________________________________

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students? Yes No

15. Graphic Framework & Techniques for Expository Writing & Reading:

a. Would you consider this strategy Psychosociolinguistic in nature? If yes, why? ________________________________
   If not, why not? __________________________________________________________

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills? If yes, how? ________________________________
   If no, why not? __________________________________________________________

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students? Yes No
16. Dialogue Journals and Learning Logs:

a. Would you consider this strategy Psychosociolinguistic in nature?  
   If yes, why?__________________________________________
   If not, why?__________________________________________

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   If yes, how?__________________________________________
   If no, why not?________________________________________

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  
   Yes No

17. Cross-Genre Writing:

a. Would you consider this strategy Psychosociolinguistic in nature?  
   If yes, why?__________________________________________
   If not, why?__________________________________________

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   If yes, how?__________________________________________
   If no, why not?________________________________________

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  
   Yes No

18. The Quest Design:

a. Would you consider this strategy Psychosociolinguistic in nature?  
   If yes, why?__________________________________________
   If not, why?__________________________________________

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   If yes, how?__________________________________________
   If no, why not?________________________________________

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  
   Yes No
19. Communication Schema:

a. Would you consider this strategy Psychosociolinguistic in nature?  
   If yes, why?______________________________________________  
   If not, why not?__________________________________________  

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   If yes, how?______________________________________________  
   If no, why not?___________________________________________  

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  
   Yes  No

20. An Integrated Approach: Progressive, Transitional, & Symbolic Stages:

a. Would you consider this strategy Psychosociolinguistic in nature?  
   If yes, why?______________________________________________  
   If not, why not?__________________________________________  

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   If yes, how?______________________________________________  
   If no, why not?___________________________________________  

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  
   Yes  No
STRATEGY DESCRIPTION GUIDE

1. **SQ3R:**
   (Survey, Question, Read, Recite, Review) SQ3R is a content area reading strategy. **Survey** - the reading selection, **Question** - create questions related to the main points, **Read** - the lesson silently, **Recite** - the answers to the questions asked, **Review** - the complete assignment.

2. **SQ4R:**
   (Survey, Question, Read, Write, Recite, Review) **Survey** - the reading selection/notes, **Question** - create questions related to the main points/plot, **Read** - the lesson/notes/draft silently to answer the questions posed, **Write** - margin notes, summary notes, answers to questions draft of passage, **Recite** - or discuss written portion above, **Review/Reconstruct/Rewrite/Recap** - the complete assignment.

3. **Cognitive Mapping/Webbing:**
   Via small groups a topic is chosen from the reading selection or a theme is determined for writing. The topic is then explored by the small group using the main topic to create a center, and they then begin the webbing/mapping of supporting ideas and facts (utilizes reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills).

4. **Group composition - Social Interaction Process:**
   A small group of students determine the focus/topic/plot of a written selection. Each group naturally engages in a prewriting discussion on focus/topic/plot, when all are satisfied with the structure of the writing. As the "story" continues to be developed, the social interaction process continues. Through discussion the group members begin to examine such things as grammar, sentence structure, and critical thinking/logic in the passage.

5. **Top-level Structure:** (Macrostructure of Discourse)
   There are four rules in this strategy which assist a student in finding the main ideas:
   1. **generalization** - involves reducing a number of specific parts to one category, 2. **deletion** - process whereby the reader/writer deletes irrelevant information, 3. **integration** - a means by which new information is related to prior information. (This can involve either a condensation or expansion of the gist of the passage at this point), and 4. **construction** - restating main ideas/plot activities using new terminology.

6. **Story Schema/Story Grammar:**
   An organizational tool for organizing a "typical story." Story grammars have been developed to describe how a story schema is organized into categories of information. It defines a story as a series of problem-solving episodes centering on the main character's efforts to achieve a major goal. This organizational device includes setting, theme, plot, resolution, and their interrelationship. Each of these categories have questioning formats to help them determine the preciseness of the story. (For example, regarding the characters "Who are the characters? What are they like?")
7. **Free-response and opinion-proof:**
The four steps are as follows: 1. Free-response - students are introduced to a selection that will generate diversity of opinion and/or emotional responses. Free-response and divergent opinions are encouraged; 2. Opinion-proof - begin the writing component by introducing the students to a writing guide, looking for common themes or opinions which can be supported by evidence or inferences generated in the selection; 3. Writing - students then generate notes based on their free responses and from their underlined supports; and, 4. Peer editing - developed with the students is a checklist specifying criteria for editing.

8. **Peer Language Experience:**
Through a dictation process students create a passage and then edit it together.

9. **Expert Scaffolding:**
Several approaches used: 1. "Vertical construction" scaffolding with the college level student includes dialog student/instructor regarding the topic of discussion - students intellectual development grows out of their social interaction with significant adults in their lives; 2. college-aged students tend to learn from one another when engaged in interaction - taking turns requesting and providing information; 3. Scaffolding conferences with instructor provide essential review-discussions of student’s writing, allowing the student to hear her own and other's writing read and questioned, and thus made them familiar with the qualities of good writing and the needs of audiences; and, 4. dialog journal in which the instructor responses to the students' writing, but makes no corrections.

10. **Semantic Mapping:**
Semantic mapping has been used by teachers at all levels to motivate and actively involve learners in the thinking-reading-writing processes. It is a categorical structuring of information in graphic form. It is an individualized content approach in that students are required to relate new words to their own experiences and prior knowledge. The steps are as follows: Choose a central word, write the word down, brainstorm words related to the selected key word, list as many words by category as possible, have students share lists orally to obtain new words/ideas, label the categories, discuss entries and discover relationships between categories. This procedure of mapping provides students with a means for both activating and enhancing their knowledge bases. Semantic mapping is used as a pre and postreading and a pre and postwriting strategy.

11. **K-W-L Teaching Model for Active Reading of Expository Texts:**
This is a three-step procedure for three basic cognitive steps required: What I Know, determining what I Want to learn, and recalling what I did Learn as a result of the reading. A worksheet provides a guide for this thinking-reading process. This procedure is done in an oral discussion with the students personal reactions placed on the worksheets or it can be done individually. In long articles the teacher may reflect with the students section by section, reviewing what has been learned and directing questions for further reading.
12. **Quill Computer Program:**
Quill computer program is a program designed to assist the student in developing the stages of the writing process.

13. **First Degree MURDER:**
This is a cooperative learning strategy (dyadic), requiring the pair to read approximately 500 words of a 2,500 word passage. One member of the pair then serves as recaller and attempts to orally summarize from memory what has been learned. The other member of the pair serves as the listener/facilitator and attempts to correct errors in the recall and to further facilitate the organization and storage of the materials. The partners alternate roles of recaller and listener/facilitator. To make it easy to follow, it was broken down into six steps: Mood (Establish positive mid-set for reading and studying); Understand (While reading, grasp main ideas and facts); Recall (Without looking at text, summarize what was read); Detect (Check for errors and omissions in recall - metacognitive activity); Elaborate (Facilitate memory by adding mental imagery, prior knowledge, etc.); and, Review (Go over material to be remembered).

14. **InQuest:**
The Investigative Questioning Procedure is a comprehension strategy that actively involves the reader or listener with narrative text through a combination of student questioning and spontaneous drama techniques. At some critical point in the selection, the teacher interrupts the reading and mentally transports the reader/listener to a spontaneous news conference which is taking place at the scene of the story event. While one student assumes the role of major character, others become investigative reporters who probe for interpretation and evaluation of story events as well as predictions of future events in the story resumed. This procedure may be repeated at several points within the selection. Each time, students are taking charge of monitoring comprehension.

15. **Graphic Framework & Techniques for Expository Writing & Reading:**
This strategy provides several methods for recognizing and creating primary methods of development in used in a selection or a paragraph. Seeing the overall framework helps the student to understand the author's ideas and predict the details as well as allowing the student to think along with the author. As a writing technique the framework provides techniques for developing expository selections.

16. **Dialogue Journals & Learning Logs:**
Interactive (transactive) devices to encourage students to dialogue with themselves. It provides the student (and perhaps the instructor) with a means to clarify what is understood from the readings and lecture. These provide the students a means to assess the thinking process also. The student records a detailed summary of the lecture and then a detailed summary of the readings on the same topic. A comparison and integration of the thinking process is compared.
17. Cross-Genre Writing:
A particularly valuable way of stimulating and assessing students' learning is to provide opportunities for them to convey factual information and understanding in a variety of written genres: stories, plays, poems, letters, advertisements, newspapers and magazines, travel brochures, or any other form that seems to accommodate the particular topic.

18. The Quest Design:
The Quest design is an approach which can stimulate reading, writing, and learning across the content areas. In brief, the students: 1. brainstorm possible topics; 2. choose one for investigation; 3. brainstorm questions they might consider researching, related to the topic; 4. divide into interest groups related to questions; and, 5. after several sessions of question formation and discussion, each student takes a specific question related to the more general subtopic to investigate further.

19. Communication Schema:
A heuristic device to assist a reader comprehend a passage or a writer create a literary essay. The six steps are as follows: 1. context = subject/plot; 2. Message = what's it about/subject matter - reader's interpretations; 3. Addresser = who's speaking in story/selection - often leads to a discussion about the distance between the author and the narrator and then into a discussion of the point of view; 4. Addressee = The notion of direct and indirect audience becomes clear to literary novices as they realize that the cozy one-to-one tone of a character-to-reader create a sense of direct audience; 5. Contact = "refers to the form of the communication - a simplistic rendering would be a genre identification (short story, novel, etc.), and how the structure & message are related; and, 6. Code = type of language used.

20. An Integrated Approach: Progressive, Transitional, and Symbolic stages:
A strategy designed to integrate reading and writing skills for composition and comprehension. The progressive exercises are intended to help the students as reader begin to construct a whole meaning for a story/passage as soon as she begins to read. The transitional stage activities are designed to get the students to see the passage/story from different perspectives, both within and without. Symbolic stage exercises are supposed to move the student from the creation of meaning to the recognition of significance. The student must make a coherent statement about the whole story moving from involvement with the story to increasingly abstract conclusion about its meaning.
Appendix C

Practitioners Survey

1Cover Letter
Participant Background
A Survey of the Utilization of Sociopsycholinguistic (S-P-L) Strategies and Practices
Strategy Description Guide
November 2, 1992

Dear:

You have been chosen as a part of a panel of practitioners to participate in this study on the "Utilization of Sociopsycholinguistic Strategies and Practices on the Postsecondary Level." You were chosen because of your membership and/or your college or university's affiliation with the Michigan Developmental Education Consortium (a state chapter of the National Association for Developmental Education). Therefore, we are asking you to complete the attached survey instrument.

Your responses will help me determine to what extent you use or recommend usage of the proposed strategies. Included is a "Strategy Description Guide" and "A Survey "Utilization of Sociopsycholinguistic Strategies and Practices." Please review the description guide prior to completing the survey. It is extremely important for you to understand that the purpose of this study is to examine the appropriateness and usefulness of the sociopsycholinguistic strategies and practices mentioned in this study.

Completion of this survey will take approximately 30 minutes of your time. Please return the survey in the enclosed envelope by November 13, 1992. Your cooperation in spending time to complete this instrument is greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Gail L. Landberg
Doctoral Candidate

Patrick M. Jenlink
Chair of Doctoral Committee
A SURVEY OF THE UTILIZATION OF SOCIOPSYCHOLINGUISTIC STRATEGIES

Participant Background

1. Gender: Female ____ Male ____

2. Current position: _______________________________________________ position ________

3. Area of Expertise: (check (✓) those that apply)
   a. ____ Reading
   b. ____ Writing
   c. ____ Critical Thinking
   d. ____ Mathematics
   e. ____ Other (not related to the above) _______________________________

If you have checked "d" or "e" only, please do not complete the rest of the survey. Place the survey in the addressed and stamped envelop and return it as soon as possible. Thank you for your assistance.

4. Training: (Please check (✓) those that apply in the matrix below.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hold Degree</th>
<th>Taken Classes</th>
<th>Taken Inservices</th>
<th>Read Materials</th>
<th>Have Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elementary Education
Secondary Education
Other Education
(What kind?) __________________
______________

Holistic Approaches
(to reading & writing)
Linguistics
Sociolinguistics
Psycholinguistics
Sociopsycholinguistics
Targeted Competency Approaches
Critical Thinking
Reading
Writing
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5. Methods currently used in working with students: (check (√) those that apply)

a. ___ peer tutoring  
b. ___ classroom/lecture teaching  
c. ___ learning center instruction  
d. ___ small group activities  
e. ___ workbook exercises  
f. ___ computer assisted exercises  
g. ___ instructor designed activities  
h. ___ other (please specify ________________)

6. Please describe the "developmental students" with whom you work:
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

7. Please describe your philosophy regarding the teaching of reading and writing:
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

8. Type of institution:

   a. ___ 2-year/community college  
b. ___ 4-year college (private)  
c. ___ 4-year college (public)  
d. ___ university (private)  
e. ___ university (public)  
f. ___ national organization  
g. ___ other ___________

9. Publication Arenas: check (√) those that apply  

   a. ___ books  
b. ___ journals  
c. ___ monographs  
d. ___ newsletter  
e. ___ other

10. Degrees held:

   a. ___ Associates Degree  
b. ___ Bachelors Degree  
c. ___ Masters Degree  
d. ___ Doctoral Degree (Ph.D. or Ed.D.)  
e. ___ Other

COMMENTS:
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
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A SURVEY OF THE UTILIZATION OF SOCIOPSYCHOLINGUISTIC (S·P·L) STRATEGIES AND PRACTICES

For the purposes of this study, "sociopsycholinguistics" is defined as the following: "an approach of using a student's own native-speaker knowledge about language and the pragmatic and social linguistic knowledge acquired by being a member of a speech community, as a springboard to integrating (or teaching) reading and writing as well as the other language skills, i.e. listening and speaking."

For the following strategies, indicate to what extent you use them or recommend usage of them. The authors of many of these strategies have been omitted to avoid biased responses. Attached is a "Strategy Description Guide," which can be referred to for clarification.

Please use one of the following categories for each strategy listed:

1. I have never heard of this S·P·L strategy or practice. (Unknown)
2. Even though I have not heard of this strategy, I believe it would be useful in working with developmental students. (Useful)
3. This strategy is inappropriate for my students. (Inappropriate)
4. This is a strategy that I use occasionally. (Occasionally)
5. This is a strategy that I use at least once a week with students. (Often)
6. This is a strategy that I use just about every day. (About every day)

Please check (√) the appropriate column(s) for each strategy or practice listed below.

STRATEGIES

1. SQ3R
2. SQ4R
3. Cognitive Mapping/Webbing
4. Group Composition through Social Interaction Process
5. Top-level Structure
6. Story Schema/Story Grammar
7. Free-Response and Opinion-Proof
8. Peer Language Experience
9. Expert Scaffolding
10. Semantic Mapping
11. K-W-L Teaching Model for Active Reading of Expository Text
12. Interactive Literacy: Reading, Writing and the Computer
13. First Degree MURDER
14. InQuest
15. Graphic Framework & Techniques: Expository Writing & Reading
16. Dialogue Journals and Learning Logs
17. Cross-Genre Writing
18. The Quest Design
19. Communication Schema
20. Integrated Approach: Progressive, Transitional, & Symbolic Stages
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STRATEGY DESCRIPTION GUIDE

1. SQ3R:
(Survey, Question, Read, Recite, Review) SQ3R is a content area reading strategy. Survey the reading selection, Question - create questions related to the main points, Read - the lesson silently, Recite - the answers to the questions asked, Review - the complete assignment.

2. SQ4R:
(Survey, Question, Read, Write, Recite, Review) Survey - the reading selection/notes, Question, create questions related to the main points/plot, Read - the lesson/notes/draft silently to answer the questions posed, Write - margin notes, summary notes, answers to questions draft of passage, Recite - or discuss written portion above, Review/Reconstruct/Rewrite/Recap - the complete assignment.

3. Cognitive Mapping/Webbing:
Via small groups a topic is chosen from the reading selection or a theme is determined for writing. The topic is then explored by the small group using the main topic to create a center, and they then begin the webbing/mapping of supporting ideas and facts (utilizes reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills).

4. Group Composition - Social Interaction Process:
A small group of students determine the focus/topic/plot of a written selection. As each group reads the selection, the members engage in a prewriting discussion on the focus/topic/plot. When all are satisfied with the structure of the writing, the "story" continues to be developed through the social interaction process. Through this discussion the group members begin to examine such things as grammar, sentence structure, and critical thinking/logic in the passage.

5. Top-level Structure:
There are four rules in this strategy which assist a student in finding or creating the main ideas of a selection. These rules/guidelines are as follows: 1. generalization - involves reducing a number of specific parts to one category, 2. deletion - process whereby the reader/writer deletes irrelevant information, 3. integration - a means by which new information is related to prior information. (This can involve either a condensation or expansion of the gist of the passage at this point), and 4. construction - restating main ideas/plot activities using new terminology.

6. Story Schema/Story Grammar:
Story schema/story grammar is an organizational device for organizing a "typical story." Story grammars have been developed to describe how a story schema is organized into categories of information. It defines a story as a series of problem-solving episodes centering on the main character's efforts to achieve a major goal, and includes setting, theme, plot, resolution, and their interrelationship. Each of these categories has questioning formats to help the students determine the preciseness of the story. (For example, regarding the characters "Who are the characters? What are they like?")
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7. **Free-response and opinion-proof:**
The four steps are as follows: 1. Free-response - students are introduced to a selection that will generate diversity of opinion and/or emotional responses. Free-response and divergent opinions are encouraged; 2. Opinion-proof - begin the writing component by introducing the students to a writing guide, looking for common themes or opinions which can be supported by evidence or inferences generated in the selection; 3. Writing - students then generate notes based on their free responses and from their underlined supports; and, 4. Peer editing - developed with the students is a checklist specifying criteria for editing.

8. **Peer Language Experience:**
Through a dictation process the students create a passage together, recording ideas for each other. Once the passage(s) has/have been developed and refined, the students then engage in the editing process.

9. **Expert Scaffolding:**
Several approaches used: 1. "Vertical construction" scaffolding with the college level students includes student/instructor dialog regarding the topic of discussion - students' intellectual development grows out of their social interaction with significant adults in their lives; 2. college-aged students tend to learn from one another when engaged in interaction - taking turns requesting and providing information; 3. Scaffolding conferences with instructor provide essential review-discussions of students' writing, allowing the students to hear their own and other's writing read and questioned, and thus make them familiar with the qualities of good writing and the needs of audiences; and, 4. dialog journal in which the instructor responds to the students' writing, but makes no corrections.

10. **Semantic Mapping:**
This is a categorical structuring of information in graphic form. It is an individualized content approach in that students are required to relate new words to their own experiences and prior knowledge. The steps are as follows: Choose a central word, write the word down, brainstorm words related to the selected key word, list as many words by category as possible, have students share lists orally to obtain new words/ideas, label the categories, discuss entries and discover relationships between categories. This procedure of mapping provides students with a means for both activating and enhancing their knowledge bases. Semantic mapping is used as a pre and postreading and a pre and postwriting strategy.

11. **K-W-L Teaching Model for Active Reading of Expository Texts:**
This is a three-step procedure for three basic cognitive steps required: What I Know, determining what I Want to learn, and recalling what I did Learn as a result of the reading. A worksheet provides a guide for this thinking-reading process. This procedure is done in an oral discussion with the students personal reactions placed on the worksheets or it can be done individually. In long articles the teacher may reflect with the students section by section, reviewing what has been learned and directing questions for further reading.
12. **Interactive Literacy: Reading, Writing, and the Computer:**
This strategy is designed to assist student readers and writers develop the effective interactive skills of experienced writers and readers. Interactive practice exercises are provided for analytical reading, thinking, and writing with an on screen text. This process includes three phases which depict what occurs before, during and after the reading/writing process, i.e., preparation, discernment and evaluation.

13. **First Degree MURDER:**
This is a dyadic strategy, which requires a pair of students to read approximately 500 words of a 2,500 word passage. One member of the pair then serves as recaller and attempts to orally summarize from memory what has been learned. The other member of the pair serves as the listener/facilitator and attempts to correct error in the recall and to further facilitate the organization and storage of the materials. The partners alternate roles of recaller, listener and facilitator. It is broken down into six steps: Mood (Establish positive mind-set for reading and studying); Understand (While reading, grasp main ideas and facts); Recall (Without looking at text, summarize what was read); Detect (Check for errors and omissions in recall - metacognitive activity); Elaborate (Facilitate memory by adding mental imagery, prior knowledge, etc.); and, Review (Go over material to be remembered).

14. **InQuest:**
The Investigative Questioning Procedure is a comprehension strategy that actively involves the reader or listener with narrative text through a combination of student questioning and spontaneous drama techniques. At some critical point in the selection, the teacher interrupts the reading and mentally transports the reader/listener to a spontaneous news conference which is taking place at the scene of the story event. While one student assumes the role of major character, others become investigative reporters who 'probe for interpretation and evaluation of story events as well as predictions of future events in the story resumed. This procedure may be repeated at several points within the selection. Each time, students are taking charge of monitoring comprehension.

15. **Graphic Framework & Techniques for Expository Writing & Reading:**
This visual diagraming and outlining strategy provides several methods for recognizing and creating primary methods of development used in a selection or a paragraph. Seeing the overall framework helps the student to understand the author’s idea structure and predict the details as well as allowing the student to think along with the author. As a writing technique the framework provides a visual diagram for structuring and developing expository texts.

16. **Dialogue Journals & Learning Logs:**
These interactive (transactive) devices encourage students to dialogue with themselves. It provides the student (and perhaps the instructor) with a means to clarify what is understood from the readings and lecture. These provide the students a means to assess the thinking process also. The student records a detailed summary of the lecture and then a detailed summary of the readings on the same topic. The thinking processes leading to the two summary structures are then compared.
17. **Cross-Genre Writing:**
A particularly valuable way of stimulating and assessing students' learning is to provide opportunities for them to convey factual information and understanding in a variety of written genres: stories, plays, poems, letters, advertisements, newspapers and magazines, travel brochures, or any other form that seems to accommodate the particular topic.

18. **The Quest Design:**
The Quest design is an approach to stimulate reading, writing, and learning across the content areas. In brief, the students: 1. brainstorm possible topics; 2. choose one for investigation; 3. brainstorm questions they might consider researching, related to the topic; 4. divide into interest groups related to questions; and, 5. after several sessions of question formation and discussion, each student takes a specific question related to the more general subtopic to investigate further.

19. **Communication Schema:**
A heuristic device to assist a reader to comprehend a passage or a writer to create a literary essay. The student is asked to concentrate in turn on the six aspects as follows: 1. context = subject/plot; 2. Message = what's it about/subject matter - reader's interpretations; 3. Addresser = who's speaking in story/selection - often leads to a discussion about the distance between the author and the narrator and then into a discussion of the point of view; 4. Addressee = the notion of direct and indirect audience becomes clear to literary novices as they realize that the cozy one-to-one tone of a character-to-reader create a sense of direct audience; 5. Contact = refers to the form of the communication -a simplistic rendering would be a genre identification (short story, novel, etc.), and how the structure & message are related; and, 6. Code = type of language used.

20. **An Integrated Approach: Progressive, Transitional, and Symbolic stages:**
A strategy designed to integrate reading and writing skills for composition and comprehension. The progressive exercises help the student through reading, to begin to construct a whole meaning for a story/passage as soon as she begins to read or to write. The transitional stage activities get the students to see the passage/story from different perspectives, both within and without. The symbolic stage exercises move the student from the creation of meaning to the recognition of significance. The student makes a coherent statement about the whole story moving from involvement with the story to increasingly abstract conclusions about its meaning.
Appendix D
Theorists Survey

1Cover Letter
Background Information Sheet
A Survey of Sociopsycholinguistic Strategies and Practices
Strategy Description Guide
November 3, 1992

Dear:

Dr. Jenlink and I have embarked on what we believe is a significant study in the field of sociopsycholinguistics. Your name naturally arose because your background and participation in the field(s) of sociopsycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics or the study of reading and/or writing. Since you are eminently qualified to serve as an expert, we would greatly appreciate you being one of the chosen member of this panel. Therefore, you are being asked to complete the attached survey instrument: "A Survey of Sociopsycholinguistic Strategies and Practices."

Enclosed is a "Strategy Description Guide" and "A Survey of Sociopsycholinguistic Strategies and Practices." Please review the description guide prior to completing the survey. Your responses will help us determine whether the strategies proposed are in fact sociopsycholinguistic in nature; second, if the strategies integrate both reading and writing skills; and, third, if these strategies would be useful in working with developmental college students. It is extremely important for you to understand that the purpose of this study is to examine the appropriateness and usefulness of these sociopsycholinguistic strategies and practices mentioned in this survey.

Completion of this survey will take approximately 30 minutes of your time. Please return the survey and background sheet in the enclosed envelope by November 19, 1992. Your cooperation in spending time to complete this instrument is greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Gail L. Landberg
Doctoral Candidate

Patrick M. Jenlink
Chair of Doctoral Committee
A SURVEY OF SOCIOPSYCHOLINGUISTIC STRATEGIES AND PRACTICES

Background Information Sheet

1. Gender: Female ____  Male ____  Years in current Position ____

2. Current Position: __________________________________________

3. Area of Expertise and Training: (Please check (√) those that apply on the matrix below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hold Degree in</th>
<th>Taken Classes in</th>
<th>Taken Inservices in</th>
<th>Read Materials on</th>
<th>Have Training in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(What kind?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Holistic Approaches (to reading & writing)

Linguistics
Sociolinguistics
Psycholinguistics
Sociopsycholinguistics
Targeted Competency Approaches
Critical Thinking
Reading
Writing
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4. Methods appropriate for developmental college students: (check (✓) those that apply)
   a. ___ peer tutoring
   b. ___ classroom/lecture teaching
   c. ___ learning center instruction
   d. ___ small group activities
   e. ___ workbook exercises
   f. ___ computer assisted exercises
   g. ___ instructor designed activities
   h. ___ other (please specify) ________________________________

5. Please provide your definition of "developmental students."
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

6. Please describe your philosophy of the integration of reading and writing skills.
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

7. Type of institution:
   a. ___ 2-year/community college
   b. ___ 4-year college (private)
   c. ___ 4-year college (public)
   d. ___ university (private)
   e. ___ university (public)
   f. ___ national organization
   g. ___ other ________________________________

8. Publication Arenas: (check (✓) those that apply)
   a. ___ books
   b. ___ journals
   c. ___ monographs
   d. ___ newsletter
   e. ___ other

9. Degrees held:
   a. ___ Associates Degree
   b. ___ Bachelors Degree
   c. ___ Masters Degree
   d. ___ Doctoral Degree (Ed.D.or Ph.D.)
   e. ___ Other ________________________________

COMMENTS:
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
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A SURVEY OF SOCIOPSYCHOLINGUISTIC STRATEGIES AND PRACTICES

For the purposes of this study, "sociopsycholinguistics" is defined as the following: "an approach of using a student's own native-speaker knowledge about language and the pragmatic and social linguistic knowledge acquired by being a member of a speech community, as a springboard to integrating (or teaching) reading and writing as well as the other language skills, i.e., listening and speaking."

Below is a list of strategies. The authors of these strategies have been omitted to avoid a bias in responses. Attached is a Strategy Description Guide, which can be referred to for clarification.

Please circle the appropriate response for each strategy.

1. SQ3R:
   a. Would you consider this strategy sociopsycholinguistic in nature? Yes No
      If yes, why? ____________________________
      If not, why not? ____________________________
   b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills? Yes No
      If yes, how? ____________________________
      If no, why not? ____________________________
   c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students? Yes No

2. SQ4R:
   a. Would you consider this strategy sociopsycholinguistic in nature? Yes No
      If yes, why? ____________________________
      If not, why not? ____________________________
   b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills? Yes No
      If yes, how? ____________________________
      If no, why not? ____________________________
   c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students? Yes No
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3. Cognitive Mapping/Webbing:

a. Would you consider this strategy sociopsycholinguistic in nature?  
   If yes, why?__________________________________________
   If not, why not?__________________________________________

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   If yes, how?__________________________________________
   If no, why not?__________________________________________

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  
   Yes No

4. Group composition - Social Interaction Process:

a. Would you consider this strategy sociopsycholinguistic in nature?  
   If yes, why?__________________________________________
   If not, why not?__________________________________________

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   If yes, how?__________________________________________
   If no, why not?__________________________________________

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  
   Yes No

5. Top-Level Structure:

a. Would you consider this strategy sociopsycholinguistic in nature?  
   If yes, why?__________________________________________
   If not, why not?__________________________________________

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   If yes, how?__________________________________________
   If no, why not?__________________________________________

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  
   Yes No
6. Story Schema/Story Grammar:

a. Would you consider this strategy sociopsycholinguistic in nature?  
   If yes, why?  
   If not, why not?

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   If yes, how?  
   If no, why not?

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  
   Yes  No

7. Free-Response and Opinion-Proof:

a. Would you consider this strategy sociopsycholinguistic in nature?  
   If yes, why?  
   If not, why not?

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   If yes, how?  
   If no, why not?

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  
   Yes  No

8. Peer Language Experience:

a. Would you consider this strategy sociopsycholinguistic in nature?  
   If yes, why?  
   If not, why not?

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   If yes, how?  
   If no, why not?

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  
   Yes  No
9. Expert Scaffolding:
   a. Would you consider this strategy sociopsycholinguistic in nature? 
      Yes No
      If yes, why?
      If not, why not?
   b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills? 
      Yes No
      If yes, how?
      If no, why not?
   c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students? 
      Yes No

10. Semantic Mapping:
   a. Would you consider this strategy sociopsycholinguistic in nature? 
      Yes No
      If yes, why?
      If not, why not?
   b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills? 
      Yes No
      If yes, how?
      If no, why not?
   c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students? 
      Yes No

11. K-W-L Teaching Model for Active Reading of Expository Text:
   a. Would you consider this strategy sociopsycholinguistic in nature? 
      Yes No
      If yes, why?
      If not, why not?
   b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills? 
      Yes No
      If yes, how?
      If no, why not?
   c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students? 
      Yes No
12. Interactive Literacy: Reading, Writing & the Computer:

a. Would you consider this strategy sociopsycholinguistic in nature? Yes No
   If yes, why? ________________________________
   If not, why not? ________________________________

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills? Yes No
   If yes, how? ________________________________
   If no, why not? ________________________________

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students? Yes No

13. First Degree MURDER:

a. Would you consider this strategy sociopsycholinguistic in nature? Yes No
   If yes, why? ________________________________
   If not, why not? ________________________________

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills? Yes No
   If yes, how? ________________________________
   If no, why not? ________________________________

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students? Yes No

14. InQuest:

a. Would you consider this strategy sociopsycholinguistic in nature? Yes No
   If yes, why? ________________________________
   If not, why not? ________________________________

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills? Yes No
   If yes, how? ________________________________
   If no, why not? ________________________________

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students? Yes No
15. Graphic Framework & Techniques for Expository Writing & Reading:

a. Would you consider this strategy sociopsycholinguistic in nature?  
   If yes, why? ____________________________________________  
   If not, why not?__________________________________________  

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   If yes, how? ____________________________________________  
   If no, why not?__________________________________________  

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  
   Yes  No

16. Dialogue Journals and Learning Logs:

a. Would you consider this strategy sociopsycholinguistic in nature?  
   If yes, why? ____________________________________________  
   If not, why not?__________________________________________  

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   If yes, how? ____________________________________________  
   If no, why not?__________________________________________  

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  
   Yes  No

17. Cross-Genre Writing:

a. Would you consider this strategy sociopsycholinguistic in nature?  
   If yes, why? ____________________________________________  
   If not, why not?__________________________________________  

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   If yes, how? ____________________________________________  
   If no, why not?__________________________________________  

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  
   Yes  No
18. The Quest Design:

a. Would you consider this strategy sociopsycholinguistic in nature?  
   Yes No
   If yes, why?__________________________________________
   If not, why not?

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   Yes No
   If yes, how?__________________________________________
   If no, why not?

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  
   Yes No

19. Communication Schema:

a. Would you consider this strategy sociopsycholinguistic in nature?  
   Yes No
   If yes, why?__________________________________________
   If not, why not?

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   Yes No
   If yes, how?__________________________________________
   If no, why not?

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  
   Yes No

20. An Integrated Approach: Progressive, Transitional, & Symbolic Stages:

a. Would you consider this strategy sociopsycholinguistic in nature?  
   Yes No
   If yes, why?__________________________________________
   If not, why not?

b. Does this strategy integrate both reading and writing skills?  
   Yes No
   If yes, how?__________________________________________
   If no, why not?

c. Would this strategy be useful in working with developmental/beginning level college students?  
   Yes No
STRATEGY DESCRIPTION GUIDE

1. **SQ3R:**
   (Survey, Question, Read, Recite, Review) SQ3R is a content area reading strategy. Survey the reading selection, Question - create questions related to the main points, Read - the lesson silently, Recite - the answers to the questions asked, Review - the complete assignment.

2. **SQ4R:**
   (Survey, Question, Read, Write, Recite, Review) Survey - the reading selection/ notes, Question, create questions related to the main points/plot, Read - the lesson/notes/draft silently to answer the questions posed, Write - margin notes, summary notes, answers to questions draft of passage, Recite - or discuss written portion above, Review/Reconstruct/Rewrite/Recap - the complete assignment.

3. **Cognitive Mapping/Webbing:**
   Via small groups a topic is chosen from the reading selection or a theme is determined for writing. The topic is then explored by the small group using the main topic to create a center, and they then begin the webbing/mapping of supporting ideas and facts (utilizes reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills).

4. **Group composition - Social Interaction Process:**
   A small group of students determine the focus/topic/plot of a written selection. As each group reads the selection, the members engage in a prewriting discussion on the focus/topic/plot. When all are satisfied with the structure of the writing, the "story" continues to be developed through the social interaction process. Through this discussion the group members begin to examine such things as grammar, sentence structure, and critical thinking/logic in the passage.

5. **Top-level Structure:**
   There are four rules in this strategy which assist a student in finding or creating the main ideas of a selection. These rules/guidelines are as follows: 1. generalization - involves reducing a number of specific parts to one category, 2. deletion - process whereby the reader/writer deletes irrelevant information, 3. integration - a means by which new information is related to prior information. (This can involve either a condensation or expansion of the gist of the passage at this point), and 4. construction - restating main ideas/plot activities using new terminology.

6. **Story Schema/Story Grammar:**
   Story schema/story grammar is an organizational device for organizing a "typical story." Story grammars have been developed to describe how a story schema is organized into categories of information. It defines a story as a series of problem-solving episodes centering on the main character's efforts to achieve a major goal, and includes setting, theme, plot, resolution, and their interrelationship. Each of these categories has questioning formats to help the students determine the preciseness of the story. (For example, regarding the characters "Who are the characters? What are they like?")
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7. **Free-response and opinion-proof:**
The four steps are as follows: 1. **Free-response** - students are introduced to a selection that will generate diversity of opinion and/or emotional responses. Free-response and divergent opinions are encouraged; 2. **Opinion-proof** - begin the writing component by introducing the students to a writing guide, looking for common themes or opinions which can be supported by evidence or inferences generated in the selection; 3. **Writing** - students then generate notes based on their free responses and from their underlined supports; and, 4. **Peer editing** - developed with the students is a checklist specifying criteria for editing.

8. **Peer Language Experience:**
Through a dictation process the students create a passage together, recording ideas for each other. Once the passage(s) has/have been developed and refined, the students then engage in the editing process.

9. **Expert Scaffolding:**
Several approaches used: 1. "Vertical construction" scaffolding with the college level students includes student/instructor dialog regarding the topic of discussion - students' intellectual development grows out of their social interaction with significant adults in their lives; 2. college-aged students tend to learn from one another when engaged in interaction - taking turns requesting and providing information; 3. Scaffolding conferences with instructor provide essential review-discussions of students' writing, allowing the students to hear their own and other's writing read and questioned, and thus make them familiar with the qualities of good writing and the needs of audiences; and, 4. dialog journal in which the instructor responds to the students' writing, but makes no corrections.

10. **Semantic Mapping:**
This is a categorical structuring of information in graphic form. It is an individualized content approach in that students are required to relate new words to their own experiences and prior knowledge. The steps are as follows: Choose a central word, write the word down, brainstorm words related to the selected key word, list as many words by category as possible, have students share lists orally to obtain new words/ideas, label the categories, discuss entries and discover relationships between categories. This procedure of mapping provides students with a means for both activating and enhancing their knowledge bases. Semantic mapping is used as a pre and postreading and a pre and postwriting strategy.

11. **K-W-L Teaching Model for Active Reading of Expository Texts:**
This is a three-step procedure for three basic cognitive steps required: What I Know, determining what I Want to learn, and recalling what I did Learn as a result of the reading. A worksheet provides a guide for this thinking-reading process. This procedure is done in an oral discussion with the students personal reactions placed on the worksheets or it can be done individually. In long articles the teacher may reflect with the students section by section, reviewing what has been learned and directing questions for further reading.
12. **Interactive Literacy: Reading, Writing, and the Computer:**
This strategy is designed to assist student readers and writers develop the effective interactive skills of experienced writers and readers. Interactive practice exercises are provided for analytical reading, thinking, and writing with an on screen text. This process includes three phases which depict what occurs before, during and after the reading/writing process, i.e., preparation, discernment and evaluation.

13. **First Degree MURDER:**
This is a dyadic strategy, which requires a pair of students to read approximately 500 words of a 2,500 word passage. One member of the pair then serves as recaller and attempts to orally summarize from memory what has been learned. The other member of the pair serves as the listener/facilitator and attempts to correct error in the recall and to further facilitate the organization and storage of the materials. The partners alternate roles of recaller, listener and facilitator. It is broken down into six steps: Mood (Establish positive mind-set for reading and studying); Understand (While reading, grasp main ideas and facts); Recall (Without looking at text, summarize what was read); Detect (Check for errors and omissions in recall - metacognitive activity); Elaborate (Facilitate memory by adding mental imagery, prior knowledge, etc.); and, Review (Go over material to be remembered).

14. **InQuest:**
The Investigative Questioning Procedure is a comprehension strategy that actively involves the reader or listener with narrative text through a combination of student questioning and spontaneous drama techniques. At some critical point in the selection, the teacher interrupts the reading and mentally transports the reader/listener to a spontaneous news conference which is taking place at the scene of the story event. While one student assumes the role of major character, others become investigative reporters who probe for interpretation and evaluation of story events as well as predictions of future events in the story resumed. This procedure may be repeated at several points within the selection. Each time, students are taking charge of monitoring comprehension.

15. **Graphic Framework & Techniques for Expository Writing & Reading:**
This visual diagraming and outlining strategy provides several methods for recognizing and creating primary methods of development used in a selection or a paragraph. Seeing the overall framework helps the student to understand the author's idea structure and predict the details as well as allowing the student to think along with the author. As a writing technique the framework provides a visual diagram for structuring and developing expository texts.

16. **Dialogue Journals & Learning Logs:**
These interactive (transactive) devices encourage students to dialogue with themselves. It provides the student (and perhaps the instructor) with a means to clarify what is understood from the readings and lecture. These provide the students a means to assess the thinking process also. The student records a detailed summary of the lecture and then a detailed summary of the readings on the same topic. The thinking processes leading to the two summary structures are then compared.
17. **Cross-Genre Writing:**
A particularly valuable way of stimulating and assessing students' learning is to provide opportunities for them to convey factual information and understanding in a variety of written genres: stories, plays, poems, letters, advertisements, newspapers and magazines, travel brochures, or any other form that seems to accommodate the particular topic.

18. **The Quest Design:**
The Quest design is an approach to stimulate reading, writing, and learning across the content areas. In brief, the students: 1. brainstorm possible topics; 2. choose one for investigation; 3. brainstorm questions they might consider researching, related to the topic; 4. divide into interest groups related to questions; and, 5. after several sessions of question formation and discussion, each student takes a specific question related to the more general subtopic to investigate further.

19. **Communication Schema:**
A heuristic device to assist a reader to comprehend a passage or a writer to create a literary essay. The student is asked to concentrate in turn on the six aspects as follows: 1. context = subject/plot; 2. Message = what's it about/subject matter - reader's interpretations; 3. Addresser = who's speaking in story/selection - often leads to a discussion about the distance between the author and the narrator and then into a discussion of the point of view; 4. Addressee = the notion of direct and indirect audience becomes clear to literary novices as they realize that the cozy one-to-one tone of a character-to-reader create a sense of direct audience; 5. Contact = refers to the form of the communication --a simplistic rendering would be a genre identification (short story, novel, etc.), and how the structure & message are related; and, 6. Code = type of language used.

20. **An Integrated Approach: Progressive, Transitional, and Symbolic stages:**
A strategy designed to integrate reading and writing skills for composition and comprehension. The progressive exercises help the student through reading, to begin to construct a whole meaning for a story/passage as soon as she begins to read or to write. The transitional stage activities get the students to see the passage/story from different perspectives, both within and without. The symbolic stage exercises move the student from the creation of meaning to the recognition of significance. The student makes a coherent statement about the whole story moving from involvement with the story to increasingly abstract conclusions about its meaning.
Appendix E
Follow-up Postcard Reminder for Practitioner
November 13, 1992

The College and university environment is a busy one, and we know that your schedule is too. We certainly appreciate you taking the time to complete our survey instrument and helping us to receive the necessary responses to complete this research project.

A couple of weeks ago we sent you our survey on the Utilization of Sociopsycholinguistic Strategies. This is a brief reminder to complete the survey. If you have already done so, we thank you.

If you have not already completed the survey, please respond as quickly as possible, since your response is very important to us.

Thank you very much,

Gail L. Landberg  
Doctoral Candidate

Patrick M. Jenlink, Chair  
Doctoral Committee
Appendix F

Follow-up Letter for Practitioners

1 Cover Letter
Participant Background
A Survey of the Utilization of Sociopsycholinguistic (S-P-L) Strategies and Practices
Strategy Description Guide
November 19, 1992

This is a brief reminder to complete the attached survey. If you have already done so, please disregard it.

If you have not completed this survey, please respond as quickly as possible, since your response is very important to us.

The college and university environment is a busy one, and we know that your schedule is too. We certainly appreciate you taking the time to complete this survey instrument and helping us to complete this research project.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Gail Landberg
Doctoral Candidate

Patrick M. Jenlink, Chair
Doctoral Committee
A SURVEY OF THE UTILIZATION OF SOCIOPSYCHOLINGUISTIC STRATEGIES

Participant Background

1. Gender: Female ___ Male ___

2. Current position: ________________________________ position ________

3. Area of Expertise: (check (√) those that apply)
   a. ___ Reading
   b. ___ Writing
   c. ___ Critical Thinking
   d. ___ Mathematics
   e. ___ Other (not related to the above) ________________

If you have checked "d" or "e" only, please do not complete the rest of the survey. Place the survey in the addressed and stamped envelop and return it as soon as possible. Thank you for your assistance.

4. Training: (Please check (√) those that apply in the matrix below.)

| Elementary Education |  |  |  |  |  |
|----------------------|  |  |  |  |  |
| Secondary Education  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Education      |  |  |  |  |  |
| (What kind?) ________ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Holistic Approaches  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (to reading & writing) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Linguistics          |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sociolinguistics     |  |  |  |  |  |
| Psycholinguistics    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sociopsycholinguistics |  |  |  |  |  |
| Targeted Competency Approaches |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical Thinking    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reading              |  |  |  |  |  |
| Writing              |  |  |  |  |  |
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5. Methods currently used in working with students: (check (√) those that apply)

a. peer tutoring
b. classroom/lecture teaching
c. learning center instruction
d. small group activities
e. workbook exercises
f. computer assisted exercises
g. instructor designed activities
h. other (please specify ____________________)

6. Please describe the "developmental students" with whom you work:


7. Please describe your philosophy regarding the teaching of reading and writing:


8. Type of institution:

a. 2-year/community college
b. 4-year college (private)
c. university (private)
d. university (public)
e. national organization
f. other

9. Publication Arenas: check (√) those that apply

a. books
b. journals
c. monographs
d. newsletter
e. other

10. Degrees held:

a. Associates Degree
b. Bachelors Degree
c. Masters Degree
d. Doctoral Degree (Ph.D. or Ed.D.)
e. Other

COMMENTS:
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A SURVEY OF THE UTILIZATION OF SOCIOPSYCHOLINGUISTIC (S-P-L) STRATEGIES AND PRACTICES

For the purposes of this study, "sociopsycholinguistics" is defined as the following: "an approach of using a student's own native-speaker knowledge about language and the pragmatic and social linguistic knowledge acquired by being a member of a speech community, as a springboard to integrating (or teaching) reading and writing as well as the other language skills, i.e. listening and speaking."

For the following strategies, indicate to what extent you use them or recommend usage of them. The authors of many of these strategies have been omitted to avoid biased responses. Attached is a "Strategy Description Guide," which can be referred to for clarification.

Please use one of the following categories for each strategy listed:

1. I have never heard of this S-P-L strategy or practice. (Unknown)
2. Even though I have not heard of this strategy, I believe it would be useful in working with developmental students. (Useful)
3. This strategy is inappropriate for my students. (Inappropriate)
4. This is a strategy that I use occasionally. (Occasionally)
5. This is a strategy that I use at least once a week with students. (Often)
6. This is a strategy that I use just about every day. (About every day)

Please check (✓) the appropriate column(s) for each strategy or practice listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SQ3R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SQ4R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cognitive Mapping/Webbing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Group Composition through Social Interaction Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Top-level Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Story Schema/Story Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Free-Response and Opinion-Proof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Peer Language Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Expert Scaffolding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Semantic Mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. K-W-L Teaching Model for Active Reading of Expository Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Interactive Literacy: Reading, Writing and the Computer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. First Degree MURDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. InQuest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Graphic Framework &amp; Techniques: Expository Writing &amp; Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Dialogue Journals and Learning Logs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Cross-Genre Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The Quest Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Communication Schema</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Integrated Approach: Progressive, Transitional, &amp; Symbolic Stages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRATEGY DESCRIPTION GUIDE

1. **SQ3R:**
(Survey, Question, Read, Recite, Review) SQ3R is a content area reading strategy. **Survey** the reading selection, **Question** - create questions related to the main points, **Read** - the lesson silently, **Recite** - the answers to the questions asked, **Review** - the complete assignment.

2. **SQ4R:**
(Survey, Question, Read, Write, Recite, Review) **Survey** - the reading selection/notes, **Question** - create questions related to the main points/plot, **Read** - the lesson/notes/draft silently to answer the questions posed, **Write** - margin notes, summary notes, answers to questions draft of passage, **Recite** - or discuss written portion above, **Review/Reconstruct/Rewrite/Recap** - the complete assignment.

3. **Cognitive Mapping/Webbing:**
Via small groups a topic is chosen from the reading selection or a theme is determined for writing. The topic is then explored by the small group using the main topic to create a center, and they then begin the webbing/mapping of supporting ideas and facts (utilizes reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills).

4. **Group composition - Social Interaction Process:**
A small group of students determine the focus/topic/plot of a written selection. As each group reads the selection, the members engage in a prewriting discussion on the focus/topic/plot. When all are satisfied with the structure of the writing, the "story" continues to be developed through the social interaction process. Through this discussion the group members begin to examine such things as grammar, sentence structure, and critical thinking/logic in the passage.

5. **Top-level Structure:**
There are four rules in this strategy which assist a student in finding or creating the main ideas of a selection. These rules/guidelines are as follows: 1. **generalization** - involves reducing a number of specific parts to one category, 2. **deletion** - process whereby the reader/writer deletes irrelevant information, 3. **integration** - a means by which new information is related to prior information. (This can involve either a condensation or expansion of the gist of the passage at this point), and 4. **construction** - restating main ideas/plot activities using new terminology.

6. **Story Schema/Story Grammar:**
Story schema/story grammar is an organizational device for organizing a "typical story." Story grammars have been developed to describe how a story schema is organized into categories of information. It defines a story as a series of problemsolving episodes centering on the main character's efforts to achieve a major goal, and includes setting, theme, plot, resolution, and their interrelationship. Each of these categories has questioning formats to help the students determine the preciseness of the story. (For example, regarding the characters "Who are the characters? What are they like?")
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7. Free-response and opinion-proof:
The four steps are as follows: 1. Free-response - students are introduced to a selection that will generate diversity of opinion and/or emotional responses. Free-response and divergent opinions are encouraged; 2. Opinion-proof - begin the writing component by introducing the students to a writing guide, looking for common themes or opinions which can be supported by evidence or inferences generated in the selection; 3. Writing - students then generate notes based on their free responses and from their underlined supports; and, 4. Peer editing - developed with the students is a checklist specifying criteria for editing.

8. Peer Language Experience:
Through a dictation process the students create a passage together, recording ideas for each other. Once the passage(s) has/have been developed and refined, the students then engage in the editing process.

9. Expert Scaffolding:
Several approaches used: 1. "Vertical construction" scaffolding with the college level students includes student/instructor dialog regarding the topic of discussion - students' intellectual development grows out of their social interaction with significant adults in their lives; 2. college-aged students tend to learn from one another when engaged in interaction - taking turns requesting and providing information; 3. Scaffolding conferences with instructor provide essential review-discussions of students' writing, allowing the students to hear their own and other's writing read and questioned, and thus make them familiar with the qualities of good writing and the needs of audiences; and, 4. dialog journal in which the instructor responses to the students' writing, but makes no corrections.

10. Semantic Mapping:
This is a categorical structuring of information in graphic form. It is an individualized content approach in that students are required to relate new words to their own experiences and prior knowledge. The steps are as follows: Choose a central word, write the word down, brainstorm words related to the selected key word, list as many words by category as possible, have students share lists orally to obtain new words/ideas, label the categories, discuss entries and discover relationships between categories. This procedure of mapping provides students with a means for both activating and enhancing their knowledge bases. Semantic mapping is used as a pre and postreading and a pre and postwriting strategy.

11. K-W-L Teaching Model for Active Reading of Expository Texts:
This is a three-step procedure for three basic cognitive steps required: What I Know, determining what I Want to learn, and recalling what I did Learn as a result of the reading. A worksheet provides a guide for this thinking-reading process. This procedure is done in an oral discussion with the students personal reactions placed on the worksheets or it can be done individually. In long articles the teacher may reflect with the students section by section, reviewing what has been learned and directing questions for further reading.
12. Interactive Literacy: Reading, Writing, and the Computer:
This strategy is designed to assist student readers and writers develop the effective interactive skills of experienced writers and readers. Interactive practice exercises are provided for analytical reading, thinking, and writing with an on-screen text. This process includes three phases which depict what occurs before, during and after the reading/writing process, i.e., preparation, discernment and evaluation.

13. First Degree MURDER:
This is a dyadic strategy, which requires a pair of students to read approximately 500 words of a 2,500 word passage. One member of the pair then serves as recaller and attempts to orally summarize from memory what has been learned. The other member of the pair serves as the listener/facilitator and attempts to correct error in the recall and to further facilitate the organization and storage of the materials. The partners alternate roles of recaller, listener and facilitator. It is broken down into six steps: Mood (Establish positive mind-set for reading and studying); Understand (While reading, grasp main ideas and facts); Recall (Without looking at text, summarize what was read); Detect (Check for errors and omissions in recall - metacognitive activity); Elaborate (Facilitate memory by adding mental imagery, prior knowledge, etc.); and, Review (Go over material to be remembered).

14. InQuest:
The Investigative Questioning Procedure is a comprehension strategy that actively involves the reader or listener with narrative text through a combination of student questioning and spontaneous drama techniques. At some critical point in the selection, the teacher interrupts the reading and mentally transports the reader/listener to a spontaneous news conference which is taking place at the scene of the story event. While one student assumes the role of major character, others become investigative reporters who probe for interpretation and evaluation of story events as well as predictions of future events in the story resumed. This procedure may be repeated at several points within the selection. Each time, students are taking charge of monitoring comprehension.

15. Graphic Framework & Techniques for Expository Writing & Reading:
This visual diagraming and outlining strategy provides several methods for recognizing and creating primary methods of development used in a selection or a paragraph. Seeing the overall framework helps the student to understand the author’s idea structure and predict the details as well as allowing the student to think along with the author. As a writing technique the framework provides a visual diagram for structuring and developing expository texts.

16. Dialogue Journals & Learning Logs:
These interactive (transactive) devices encourage students to dialogue with themselves. It provides the student (and perhaps the instructor) with a means to clarify what is understood from the readings and lecture. These provide the students a means to assess the thinking process also. The student records a detailed summary of the lecture and then a detailed summary of the readings on the same topic. The thinking processes leading to the two summary structures are then compared.
17. **Cross-Genre Writing:**
A particularly valuable way of stimulating and assessing students' learning is to provide opportunities for them to convey factual information and understanding in a variety of written genres: stories, plays, poems, letters, advertisements, newspapers and magazines, travel brochures, or any other form that seems to accommodate the particular topic.

18. **The Quest Design:**
The Quest design is an approach to stimulate reading, writing, and learning across the content areas. In brief, the students: 1. brainstorm possible topics; 2. choose one for investigation; 3. brainstorm questions they might consider researching, related to the topic; 4. divide into interest groups related to questions; and, 5. after several sessions of question formation and discussion, each student takes a specific question related to the more general subtopic to investigate further.

19. **Communication Schema:**
A heuristic device to assist a reader to comprehend a passage or a writer to create a literary essay. The student is asked to concentrate in turn on the six aspects as follows: 1. context = subject/plot; 2. Message = what's it about/subject matter - reader's interpretations; 3. Addressee = who's speaking in story/selection - often leads to a discussion about the distance between the author and the narrator and then into a discussion of the point of view; 4. Addressee = the notion of direct and indirect audience becomes clear to literary novices as they realize that the cozy one-to-one tone of a character-to-reader create a sense of direct audience; 5. Contact = refers to the form of the communication—a simplistic rendering would be a genre identification (short story, novel, etc.), and how the structure & message are related; and, 6. Code = type of language used.

20. **An Integrated Approach: Progressive, Transitional, and Symbolic stages:**
A strategy designed to integrate reading and writing skills for composition and comprehension. The progressive exercises help the student through reading, to begin to construct a whole meaning for a story/passage as soon as she begins to read or to write. The transitional stage activities get the students to see the passage/story from different perspectives, both within and without. The symbolic stage exercises move the student from the creation of meaning to the recognition of significance. The student makes a coherent statement about the whole story moving from involvement with the story to increasingly abstract conclusions about its meaning.
Appendix G

Human Subjects Institutional Review
Board Approval Letter
TO: Gail Landberg
   Charles C. Warfield

FROM: Ellen Page-Robin, Chair

DATE: May 14, 1987

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research protocol has been approved as exempt by the HSIRB providing that no "sensitive" personal information is sought in the questionnaire.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 383-4917.
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