1989

The conflict between instruction that characterizes Chapter 1 programs and instruction that results from the whole language philosophy

Barbara J. Sabin
University of Northern Iowa

The conflict between instruction that characterizes Chapter 1 programs and instruction that results from the whole language philosophy

Abstract

There is rising concern among Chapter 1 reading educators that instruction that occurs under Chapter 1 guidelines is often in conflict with what is known to be effective reading instruction. Current research and theory increasingly reveals that an instruction resulting from the whole language philosophy is effective in helping children learn reading and language skills. And yet, currently there are several characteristics of Chapter 1 programs that conflict with instruction based on the whole language philosophy. The purpose of this paper is to explore the conflict between instruction that characterizes Chapter 1 programs and instruction that results from the whole language philosophy. In this analysis, it will be seen that the conflict may be due to a misinterpretation of the Chapter 1 guidelines by state and local agencies. While there is evidence of programs attempting to address this issue, there continue to be inhibitions stemming from this misinterpretation.

THE CONFLICT BETWEEN INSTRUCTION THAT CHARACTERIZES CHAPTER 1 PROGRAMS AND INSTRUCTION THAT RESULTS FROM THE WHOLE LANGUAGE PHILOSOPHY

A Graduate Project

Submitted to the

Department of Curriculum and Instruction

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Education

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

by

Barbara J. Sabin

May 1989

This Research Paper by: Barbara J. Sabin

Entitled: THE CONFLICT BETWEEN INSTRUCTION THAT CHARACTERIZES CHAPTER 1 PROGRAMS AND INSTRUCTION THAT RESULTS FROM THE WHOLE LANGUAGE PHILOSOPHY

has been approved as meeting the research paper requirement for the Degree of Master of Arts in Education.

April 10, 1989
Date Approved

Ned Ratekin
Director of Research Paper

April 10, 1989
Date Approved

Ned Ratekin
Graduate Faculty Adviser

April 11, 1989
Date Approved

Sharon Arthur Moore
Graduate Faculty Reader

April 11, 1989
Date Approved

Roger A. Kueter
Head, Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Table of Contents

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

There is rising concern among Chapter 1 reading educators that instruction that occurs under Chapter 1 guidelines is often in conflict with what is known to be effective reading instruction. Current research and theory increasingly reveals that an instruction resulting from the whole language philosophy is effective in helping children learn reading and language skills. And yet, currently there are several characteristics of Chapter 1 programs that conflict with instruction based on the whole language philosophy. The purpose of this paper is to explore the conflict between instruction that characterizes Chapter 1 programs and instruction that results from the whole language philosophy. In this analysis, it will be seen that the conflict may be due to a misinterpretation of the Chapter 1 guidelines by state and local agencies. While there is evidence of programs attempting to address this issue, there continue to be inhibitions stemming from this misinterpretation.

Current views of effective reading instruction involve the simultaneous integration of reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, and visual expression within a context that is meaningful to the reader (Knapp, 1987). Goodman and Goodman (1981) are frequently cited as presenting the central viewpoint of a whole language philosophy. They support a comprehension-centered program that views reading and writing as reciprocal and as developmental processes.

They feel these processes must be learned together. This research shows that the whole language philosophy is based on the theory of language development, language processes, and language learning, including research on reading and writing.

In contrast, though not explicitly stated, the philosophy of Chapter 1 reading programs seems to advocate separation of language processes. Although there is no single statement of philosophy for Chapter 1 programs, the procedures generated by Chapter 1 guidelines appear to advocate segmentation rather than integration in program elements. This segmentation is seen where the teaching of students is carried out with isolated skills instruction. Other evidence is seen in programs that may be curricularly incongruent with the core reading classroom, shortened instructional time periods, small group sizes, types of materials, and assessment of growth.

Scope of the Review

This paper examines (1) the inadequacies of Chapter 1 reading programs that result from the currently held unstated philosophy created by its guidelines, and (2) the nature of effective reading instruction that could occur in Chapter 1 programs dependent on a reinterpretation of Chapter 1 guidelines.

Importance of the Problem

Today most school districts are eligible for federally funded supplementary reading programs through Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (Allington, 1987). The Chapter 1 program is designed to improve the educational opportunities

of educationally deprived children. This program results in helping these children to succeed in the regular reading program, attain grade-level proficiency, and improve achievement in basic skills (Department of Education, 1988a). However, the current structure for Chapter 1 interferes with what we know today to be effective reading instruction. The goal of Chapter 1 is to help children learn to read, but the style of many Chapter 1 programs seems to inhibit this goal.

As a Chapter 1 reading teacher, this writer sees the effectiveness of whole language philosophy in the teaching of reading. However, due to the constraints imposed by the present Chapter 1 philosophy, this writer deals with inadequate instructional time periods of 21-minute blocks, group sizes of 1-4 students which do not lend themselves well to verbal interaction, and inappropriate reading assessment tools such as standardized tests. These kinds of restrictions, along with the teaching of isolated skills instruction, are evident in other Chapter 1 programs represented across the nation. Examples of other Chapter 1 programs experiencing the same constraints will be cited.

Summary and Overview

The purpose of this paper is to address the following questions: How does the interpretation of federal guidelines affect the curriculum and instructional procedures of Chapter 1 reading programs? How did the interpretation of Chapter 1 guidelines given by the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act occur? How can the results of the review of literature be applied to a Chapter 1 program?

This will be done through a review of literature and an examination of some innovations of the whole language philosophy which can reshape the reading instruction provided in Chapter 1 reading programs.

Chapter 2 presents a review of literature that examines (1) a philosophy which results from an interpretation of federal guidelines of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, and (2) the philosophy of the whole language reading approach which lends itself to the nature of reading and learning to read.

Chapter 3 presents implications from research for changes in reading instruction in a Chapter 1 program. In this chapter, a special emphasis is given to the curriculum and instructional procedure of a whole language philosophy. Identification of what seems to be most effective for reading success is made.

Chapter 4 summarizes the attempts to rethink the philosophy of Chapter 1 reading programs through the use of whole language. Through the simultaneous integration of reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, and visual expression within a context that is meaningful to the reader, effective reading instruction can occur.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Current research provides information that examines a philosophy that spawns isolated skill instruction in many Chapter 1 reading programs. This type of instruction is often times curricularly incongruent with the core reading classroom. This philosophy results from an interpretation of federal guidelines of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) of 1981 and encourages Chapter 1 reading programs to sacrifice effectiveness for accountability. Current research also provides information that examines the philosophy of the whole language reading approach which lends itself to the nature of reading and learning to read.

A Philosophy Which Results from the Interpretation of Federal Guidelines of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed in 1965 to provide financial assistance to local school districts for planning and operating special programs for educationally disadvantaged children. After 1981, Title I became Chapter 1 under the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (Plunkett, 1985). According to Stonehill and Groves (1983), Title I/Chapter 1 instruction has resulted in supplement not supplant services by local school districts. This supplement rather than supplant philosophy made local educational agencies demonstrate that they used the funds to increase instructional time in reading rather than supplant the classroom instruction (Johnston, Allington, & Afflerbach, 1985).

TitleI/Chapter 1 funds were used in addition to and not in place of state and local funds, and they provided supplementary programs for individually disadvantaged children (National Institute of Education, 1977). Kimbrough and Hill (1981) stated that state and local administrators misinterpreted these supplementary regulations as requiring remedial instruction that was different from the content area reading instruction. These regulations actually had not been a part of the federal framework, but rather resulted from the interpretations by many state and local school districts who implemented the program (National Institute of Education, 1977).

Vanecko, Ames, and Archambault (1989) stated that many districts actually were unaware of the flexibility available to them through Title I/Chapter 1 services. The states and local districts perceived the rules governing Title I/Chapter 1 as extremely strict and limiting, and therefore, in order to be safe, school districts defined their programs very narrowly.

The first result of this interpretation of regulations in Title I/Chapter 1 was a mismatch of remedial and classroom instruction. Many districts interpreted the supplementary requirement of the Title I/Chapter 1 categorical program as meaning that the remedial program had to be different in content from the regular core classroom program, rather than in addition to the core program (Kimbrough & Hill, 1981).

The instruction children receive in Chapter 1 classrooms is unrelated to the instruction they receive in their regular classroom.

This lack of coordination between specialized and regular programs does not correlate with what we know about how reading is learned. Many Chapter 1 programs are characterized by isolated skill teaching in order to be different in content from the core reading classroom. Allington (1987) and Savage (1987) found that many of the students that participated in the Chapter 1 program spent their time doing workbook, ditto pages, skill or drill practice activities. The subject matter that was taught in the remedial setting had little to do with topics in the regular classroom reading curriculum. Conroy (1988) stated that some teachers felt it only emphasized "skills, skills, skills, as opposed to read, read, read" (p. 71).

The problem with isolated skill instruction, according to Brazee (1985), is that isolated teaching of skills from the content area text results in no transfer of knowledge gained in real reading situations. She emphasized abandoning the teaching of isolated skills in pure form and, rather, using content reading such as social studies, science, and literature before, during, and after the skill instruction is presented.

Chew (1987) stated that the teaching of isolated skills unconnected with everyday use of reading, speaking, and writing had been viewed with less favor because researchers saw reading as a whole process and that children's prior knowledge should be built up in order to help them comprehend and use language effectively. He emphasized that the "bits and pieces approach" (p. 2) or skills in isolation could even be harmful to the reader. Bussis (1982)

supported this belief when she emphasized that children can master decoding skills and still fail to read. She explained that the skill of reading actually is at least five skills or types of knowledge combined that are needed in order to construct meaning.

Anderson, Hiebert, Scott, and Wilkenson (1985), in Becoming a Nation of Readers, supported the belief that reading is not a set hierarchy of skills. Rather, it involves the combination of many skills that complement each other simultaneously.

A second effect of the interpretation of regulations in Title I/Chapter 1 is a philosophy that results in programs that are often curricularly incongruent with the core reading classroom. According to Allington (1987) and Savage (1987), another problem with Chapter 1 is that the curriculum disagrees greatly with that of the core reading classroom and this causes curricular incongruence. Allington and Shake (1986) explained that this curricular incongruence has been seen where the remedial students did not see a relationship between what they learned in the classroom and what had been learned in the remedial setting. Allington and Shake noted that when classroom and remedial instruction were different in method the students demonstrated cognitive confusion. This cognitive confusion increased rather than decreased when the strategies or techniques being taught in one setting are different from those being taught in another setting. These writers continued with the idea that the approach of using separate teacher, curriculum material, and location is widely

practiced and results from the misinterpretation by state and local districts of federal regulations in reference to Chapter 1.

Johnston, Allington, and Afflerback (1985) found a frequent lack of congruence between the remedial setting and the core reading classroom. This, they believed, resulted in part because of the supplement not supplant interpretation of federal regulations for the original Title I guidelines. Allington and Broikou (1988) also supported this belief that a misinterpretation of federal guidelines does not allow instruction in the remedial classroom to be collaborated with the instruction in the core reading classroom.

A final result of the interpretation of regulations in Title I/Chapter 1 is a philosophy that encourages Chapter 1 reading programs to sacrifice effectiveness for accountability. The evaluation procedures for Chapter 1 and its assessment of children learning to read are being misinterpreted in order to satisfy a requirement. Chapter 1 encourages the use of norm-referenced tests to evaluate students' achievement in the program. The collection of achievement data is required in reading in 2nd through 12th grade (Department of Education, 1988a). If a different procedure is requested of a local education agency, then approval must be obtained from the state education agency and the secretary. In order for the state education agency to approve another type of testing, the local education agency must prove that the new testing procedure "yields a valid and reliable measure of Chapter 1 children's performance in language arts or mathematics; and that it yields the children's expected performance"

(Department of Education, 1988b, p. 73). The state education agency must also prove that the results can be "expressed in the common reporting scale established by the secretary for SEA reporting" (p. 74).

It is up to the local educational agency to determine if performance of the children participating in the Chapter 1 program shows growth. This is done by the local education agency measuring the gains in a spring - spring testing cycle (Department of Education, 1988b).

Allington (1987) stated that one of the problems with Chapter 1 is that due to various mandates, regulations, and different procedures such as those mentioned in regard to testing, we are sacrificing the reading needs of children who need help. The purpose, he believed, should be to help children overcome reading needs rather than to meet bureaucratic designs.

Savage (1987) concluded that children in early grades who are tutored under Chapter 1 do better on basic skills tests than those children not instructed in the program. His research indicates this advantage disappears by the middle grades, and each year the deficiency increases.

Langer and Pradle (1984) emphasized that standardized comprehension tests tell us very little about students' ability to read and comprehend. They further stated:

> Test developers, users, and interpreters need to carefully consider tests results from a variety of perspectives. (1) what

has been taught in the curriculum? (2) what has the student learned from the curriculum? (3) what are the reasons for testing? (4) how do the testing conditions for the student vary depending upon the kind of test being used? (5) what differing kinds of thinking, reasoning, knowledge are required to succeed in different kinds of tests? (6) what are the limitations of any single test measure? (7) how do we avoid having tests restrict the range of depth of what is taught in the curriculum? (p. 765).

These writers continue to emphasize that we must be careful not to place too much reliance on standardized test data because these tests do not adequately measure those tasks involved in language use. They believe that frequent test abuses include:

(1) interpretation of scores on a particular test as if the test items invoke comparable understanding and strategies from each member of the population being tested; (2) interpretation of the scores across different kinds of tests as if the test type (multiple-choice, fill-in, cloze) or subtest title (comprehension, vocabulary, language) make similar literacy demands on the test taker; (3) potential limitation of the teacher's curriculum options lead to teaching to the test, not the child; and (4) potential inappropriate decisions regarding class placement, instructional needs, promotion, and the loss of creativity and spontaneity in those classrooms where raising test scores is the dominant curriculum concern. (p. 766)

Mayher and Brause (1986) also stated that standardized tests used to test reading are not valid assessments because "the transaction between reader and text which occurs during the reading process clearly depends in part on such factors as the reader's interest in the material being read, his or her purpose for reading it, and his or her knowledge and background in the material the text contains" (p. 392). These writers also stated that standardized tests claim to be context-free, which means that they can "measure" without regard to any specific curriculum objectives. And yet, according to Mayher and Brause, context-free measures of reading and writing do not tell us anything we need to know about reading or writing ability because "neither writing nor reading ability can be completely defined independent of the context in which they are to be used" (p. 392). This idea is further supported by the authors of Becoming a Nation of Readers when they stated that "performance on standardized tests of reading comprehension depends not only on a child's reading ability but also the child's prior knowledge of the topics addressed in the test passage" (Anderson et al., 1985, p. 99). They believed that background knowledge and experiences are important to understand the passage, and children who live in disadvantaged environments are, therefore, at a disadvantage because they do not have experiences on which to draw.

Culyer (1984) explained that standardized achievement tests in reading should be abandoned because students' instructional reading levels are mismeasured by 1 to 4 years. He believed that the tests

measure only students' frustration level rather than their instructional level. He further stated that students are influenced by guessing on these types of tests. These tests also, according to Culyer, put the educationally deprived children at a disadvantage.

A further issue with testing is the validity of standardized tests. Are standardized tests measuring what we are attempting to teach? This idea has resulted in two separate points of view. The first viewpoint consists of those individuals who believe that if whole language teachers are teaching properly then, no matter what, children should do well on standardized tests. The viewpoint of the second group is that of the whole language theorists. They contend that there exists a discrepancy between the reading instruction children receive in the classroom and the tasks children are asked to perform on standardized reading tests.

Are standardized reading tests really telling us what we want to know about children's reading ability? As evidenced by the research provided, standardized reading tests are not adequate measures of what children know about reading.

A Philosophy Which Lends Itself to the Nature of Reading and Learning to Read

The professional literature is filled with tributes to the value of the whole language philosophy underlying reading instruction. The whole language philosophy stems from the premise that "reading must be seen as part of children's general language development and not as discrete skill isolated from listening, speaking, and writing"

(Anderson et al., 1985, p. 20). Whole language literacy instruction is defined as the integrated teaching of reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, and visual expression within a context that is meaningful to the reader (Knapp, 1987).

Goodman (1986) emphasized that skills programs, workbooks, and other isolated teaching practices should not be used in a whole language program. He believed that what was appropriate for teaching reading was what the children themselves wanted to read or write. Goodman noted that the language processes were integrated processes and the children listened, spoke, read, and wrote as the need arose.

Whole language literacy instruction was based on thematic units which provided a focal point or base for reading. These thematic units were across subject areas or integrated among the areas. This allowed the children to choose their own reading material--material they were capable of reading, and wanted or needed to read (Chew, 1987; Goodman, 1986).

Fillion (1983) stated that language developed through purposeful activities; this existed in many instances across the curriculum. For example, students wrote journal articles about what they were studying in science.

The whole language comprehension based approach to reading instruction, according to Goodman and Goodman (1981) and Goodman (1986), was based on prior knowledge and background information that a reader brought to the reading. They believed that it was the "natural extension of human language development" (Goodman, 1981, p. 1). The

Goodmans explained five key principles of whole language philosophy related to the reading process:

1. Meaning was constructed during listening and reading, drawing on prior knowledge while interacting with the text.

2. The process of reading involved prediction, selection, confirmation, and self-correction.

3. Grapho-phonic, syntactic, and semantic systems interacted in language. They could not be separated for instruction without obscuring relevance.

4. The goal of reading and listening was always to comprehend meaning.

5. The goal of writing and speaking was always the expression of meaning.

Five principles of whole language theory were developed to describe whole language philosophy related to the reading process (Goodman, 1986; Goodman & Goodman, 1981). The first principle of whole language theory, that meaning was constructed during listening and reading, was supported by the work of Rumelhart (1977), who used the reader's prior knowledge and inferencing skills as the core of his interactive reading model.

The second principle was that the process of reading involved prediction, selection, confirmation, and self-correction. An illustration of the second principle is seen in a study conducted by Watson, Crenshaw, and King (1984) which used two approaches to reading, whole language and hierarchy of skills. This study showed

opposite instructional positions. The whole language teacher focused children's attention on the largest unit of language appropriate for the situation. She encouraged the children to construct meaning that was sensible to them. She permitted deviations from the text, prearranged the reading instructional time, but involved the children in both short- and long-range planning. She encouraged the children to think and reflect on what they read whether it was library books, reference books, textbooks, or child-authored stories.

The third principle stated was that three language systems worked in both reading and writing but they could not be isolated for instruction. These systems were grapho-phonic (sound and letter patterns), syntactic (sentence patterns), and semantic (meanings) (Goodman, 1986; Goodman & Goodman, 1981). This was supported by Carbo (1987) when she stated that the "excessive demands" of overformalized, skill-oriented reading had a negative impact upon motivation to read and the amount of voluntary reading. She further stated that the whole language approach to teaching reading had been one of the most successful reading programs for young children because of their global learning style.

The report of the Commission on Reading, Becoming a Nation of Readers (Anderson et al., 1985), acknowledged that children understood stories more readily when they were written in familiar language rather than the stilted language and "non-stories" of the phonics or linguistic approach. The report stated that "it is possible to write interesting, comprehensible, and natural-sounding selections for young

readers while constraining the vocabulary on the basis of letter-sound relationships" (p. 47).

The fourth principle of the whole language theory was that the goal of readers was always comprehension of meaning (Goodman, 1986; Goodman & Goodman, 1981). Carbo (1987) illustrated this principle when she found that "meaning was the key" (p. 199) when teaching reading to remedial readers. Other studies (Cohen, 1968; Cullinan, Jaggar, & Strickland, 1974) showed that children who were exposed to whole language reading activities such as being read to, being involved in stories and poems, and being provided books to explore independently comprehended better than children in the control group not given those opportunities.

A fifth and final principle was that the goal of writing and speaking is always the expression of meaning (Goodman, 1986; Goodman & Goodman, 1981). Fillion (1983) demonstrated that students used informal, personal, expressive language when writing for themselves or close friends. This was in contrast to the formal language of precisely correct answers and finished essays. Whole language provided for this type of informal writing and allowed students to write in their journals and then share the writing orally with others.

Cazden (1977) supported the whole language philosophy when she said that one of the most serious problems facing language arts teachers today in the teaching of literacy was an imbalance between too much attention to skill and drill taught in an isolated manner and not enough attention to language used in an integrated way. She

further stated that these isolated components needed to be taught in text that had personal meaning to the reader.

CHAPTER III

IMPLICATIONS FOR INSTRUCTION

In the review of literature, certain implications for instruction became evident. Prior to the discussion of these implications, current curriculum and instructional procedures in Chapter 1 programs across the nation are reviewed. These activities generated for the current Chapter 1 reading programs seem to conflict with what we find to be effective reading instruction. For the purpose of this research, curriculum in a Chapter 1 program is defined as what is being taught. Instructional procedure in a Chapter 1 program is defined as how the curriculum is being taught.

Instructional Activities Generated by Current Philosophy of the Chapter 1 Reading Programs

Curriculum

In many Chapter 1 programs, curriculum activities center around teaching reading as basic skills instruction. The current philosophy on what should be taught in these programs is translated into a piecemeal approach. This results in an isolation of reading and writing from real text. According to Goodman (1986), we have an abundance of workbooks, ditto masters, and extra practice sheets for learners who get low test scores. All of the time spent with reading instruction, Goodman continues, does not mean, however, that children are actually doing real reading. Goodman states, "Little time is left *after skills drill, exercise, phonics drills, and workbook exercises with nothing longer than a line or two*" (p. 36). A study done by

Savage (1987) compared two schools in a low-income area in Los Angeles, California. One school had Chapter 1 assistance, but the type of curriclum focused solely on basic skills mechanically defined; the exercises were fragmented and seemed to serve no purpose. The children seemed lethargic and uninterested. The other school, where the teacher had no assistance with her large classroom, was teaching reading for meaning. The teacher activated prior knowledge and got children interested in reading real literature.

Allington (1987) included the remarks of a Chapter 1 teacher, Carol Muller, reiterating the frustation she felt in serving 3 years as a Chapter 1 teacher. She found the program was completely separate from the rest of the reading curriculum, reflecting a curriculum of incongruence. There were no set guidelines on what to teach and, she felt, no administrative support. Rather than criticize the lack of cooperation with classroom teachers on continual updates of students' needs, she began just to guess what the children needed. She found her students experienced burnout from continual skill instruction.

Instructional Procedures

Carol Muller, the Chapter 1 teacher previously discussed, saw problems with instructional procedures, another component generated by the current Chapter 1 philosophy. Ms. Muller found that there was little time for actual instruction. The reason for this was because children were alloted 25-30 minute instructional time blocks, and part of this was travel time. Consequently, this resulted in approximately

15 minutes of classroom reading instruction that does not allow meaningful involvement.

In an attempt to give individual instruction in Chapter 1 reading, group sizes are encouraged to be 1-4 students. This results in a lack of cooperative discovery and interaction among students. In one Chapter 1 program in Idaho Falls, Idaho, according to Manning (1986), children in the program are tutored 1-to-1 or in small groups. Students in the program are tutored for 30 minutes daily using materials that are highly structured so that uncertified tutors can be trained to use these materials. It is the thought that by employing three tutors at the cost of one certified teacher, more students can be served in small groups.

In Chapter 1 the curriculum identification is closely tied to an instructional procedure that is mirrored in an isolated skills approach using workbooks, skill and drill cards, and games. An example of this is found in the 1985-86 Chapter 1 reading program in Chillicothe, Ohio. In this program:

> Students are scheduled daily for 30 minutes of instruction. Individual folders for each child provide immediate work activities for those skills deemed necessary for the child's reading progress. Included in the packet are vocabulary and reading paragraphs at the child's instructional level, as well as appropriate phonics workbooks and comprehension skill packets. (Albrecht, 1985, p. 5)

Cook and Hoag (1987) reported a study showing a comparison of Chapter 1 reading instruction in two South Carolina schools. Danville, South Carolina's school population consists of black, urban students. Sumner, South Carolina enrolls students from well-to-do suburbs and a rural poor trailer park community. Both schools emphasize in their program the basal reader series with more time spent on lower-order comprehension than on higher-order thinking. Both schools used extra supplementary materials such as games, word activities, and worksheets in their Chapter 1 programs to teach reading skills.

The ultimate goal of many Chapter 1 programs researched emphasized the importance of raising NCE scores (Normal Curve Equivalent Scores) on the required posttesting (Bailey, 1986; Bech & Chamberlain, 1983; Levine, Holdsworth, & Aquila, 1987; Manning, 1986; Wallace, Hardeman, & Rutherford, 1984). This is further emphasized by the Department of Education (1986b) when it plans to measure gains made by individual schools in a spring - spring testing cycle.

Instructional Activities for a Chapter 1 Program Generated by the Philosophy of Whole Language

There is clear direction from current research concerning elements for a Chapter 1 program generated by the philosophy of whole language. Atweger, Edelsky, and Flores (1987) caution us that:

> Whole language is not practice. It is a set of beliefs, a perspective. It must become practice but it is not the practice itself. Journals, book publishing, literature study, thematic

> science units, and so forth do not make a classroom 'whole language.' Rather, these practices become whole language-like because the teacher has particular beliefs and intentions. (p. 145).

The basic premise is that literacy develops from "whole to part, from vague to precise, from gross to fine, from highly concrete and contextualized to more abstract, from familiar contexts to unfamiliar" (Goodman, 1986, p. 39). There are, however, certain curriculum and instructional procedures that help foster a whole language approach.

Curriculum

In Chapter 1 whole language programs, the curriculum centers around putting the theory of whole language into practice. Reading, writing, speaking, and visual expression simultaneously integrated is the core of the whole language curriculum. For the curriculum to be effective, it must be language-oriented and student-centered (Knapp, 1987). The curriculum is unique to each teacher because it is determined by the needs of the students based on their difficulty in oral and written expression (Melton, 1988). The basic premise is that the curriculum should focus on a wide variety of literature rather than isolated skill instruction. In order to do this, Goodman (1986) suggested centering the curriculum around a context of purpose for reading. Organization of the curriculum is around topics, units, or themes that can be integrated into all of the content areas of reading such as science, social studies, or literature. According to Goodman, "a unit provides a focal point for inquiry, for use of language, for

cognitive development. It involves pupils in planning, and gives them choice of authentic, relevant activities within productive studies" (p. 31).

Instructional Procedure

The instructional procedures that characterize a whole language Chapter 1 classroom focus on five key principles (Goodman & Goodman, 1981; Goodman, 1986). These key principles are:

1. Meaningful and relevant whole texts must be the materials used for instruction. These materials must have characteristics of real functional language.

2. There should be no teaching of isolated skills.

3. Time must be provided for writing.

4. Time must be provided for sustained silent reading as well as reading aloud by the teacher.

5. An alternative to standardized testing must be the final evaluation procedure.

The first principle, that meaningful and relevant whole texts must be the materials used for instruction, is supported by Allington (1987). He stated that Chapter 1 programs need to emphasize the research in reading that has been going on for the past 20 years. This research indicates that students should be reading relevant books and materials and understanding them. Ramsey (1985) also emphasized the use of contextual reading as "real reading" with remedial students.

The second principle that Goodman and Goodman (1981) and Goodman (1986) emphasized is that there should be no teaching of isolated skills. Chew (1987) supported this belief when he noted that the "bits and pieces approach" or skills in isolation can be harmful to the reader (p. 2). He also emphasized that this kind of approach did not work. Rather, he felt that the classroom should be a very literate environment, rich with different types of print, many diverse materials, and several different tradebooks. Anderson et al. (1985) emphasized that the use of exercises that drill students on skills have very little value in helping students learn to read. Carbo (1987) also stated that reading should be easy and enjoyable and the skills type of instruction only lessens students' desire to read. Both Goodman (1986) and Chew (1987) emphasized that, rather than isolated skills instruction, teachers should integrate materials and reading skills through a content or around thematic units. An example of this would be using a piece of literature and connecting all reading and language skills around that reading through the use of a thematic approach. This approach can expand to make it interdisciplinary.

Chew (1987) supported the third principle, that time for writing must be provided. He explained that the writer goes through five stages before a final product is completed. These stages are prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing. Chew emphasized that these stages are not learned in linear fashion; rather, they are recursive, where the writer moves back and forth

between stages. He also noted that these stages are much like what the reader encounters as he reads. Bussis (1987) also stated that time must be provided for students to write in the reading classroom. She stated that at least two or three times a week writing should be included in the reading instruction. Anderson et al. (1985) also supported the importance of writing in connection with reading when they stated, "writing promotes ability in reading" (p. 119). Newman (1985) believed that language experience, where children write about experiences they encounter, should be incorporated into a whole language curriculum. She further stated that language experience shows the connection between reading and writing.

Goodman and Goodman (1981) and Goodman (1986) specify that their fourth principle needs to involve periods of sustained silent reading with self-selected books, as well as time where the teacher reads aloud to students. This involves the use of a wide variety of materials such as magazines, newspapers, and content area reading materials. Both Newman (1985) and Bussis (1982) point out the importance of reading aloud to students as well as sustained silent reading. Reading aloud involves well-written, imaginative literature for older children to shared reading using enlarged books for younger students. Both sustained silent reading and reading aloud to students allow students and teacher to experience an intimate atmosphere where everyone is involved in reading.

One of the barriers to whole language is the adherence to inflexible schedules, particularly in short time blocks. Longer

instructional times need to be allowed in Chapter 1 reading programs if elements such as writing, sustained silent reading, and teachers reading aloud to students are introduced into a Chapter 1 program. Chew (1987) stressed that part of the writing process involves time for sharing. This can range from displays on a bulletin board to published books. Calkins (1986) stated:

> If students are going to become deeply invested in their writing, and if they are going to draft and revise, sharing their texts with each as they write, they need the luxury of time. If they are going to have the chance to do their best, and then to make their best better, they need long blocks of time. (p. 23)

The last principle, that of evaluating students by alternatives to standardized tests, is critical in a whole language Chapter 1 program. The authors of Becoming a Nation of Readers (1985) believed that these kinds of tests do not assess the reading process. Rather, they believed that their use only is a partial and inexpensive means of assessing reading proficiency. Both Goodman and Goodman (1981) and Bussis (1982) believed that the teacher needs to work individually with students to listen to them read and discuss with them what they are reading. Moore (1983) argued the case for natural assessment, which is based on observing students using a variety of reading materials throughout the school day. Teachers notice children who discuss about stories; teachers notice miscues of students during oral reading; teachers keep records of what and how much reading students

are doing. Records are kept on students and then these, together with cumulative writing folders, show long-term growth.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

One of the rising concerns among Chapter 1 reading teachers today is the most appropriate delivery of reading instruction to low-achieving and educationally disadvantaged students. Two reading philosophies were addressed in this paper which emphasized the delivery of reading instruction: (1) Chapter 1 philosophy and (2) whole language philosophy. A review of literature revealed that the present Chapter 1 philosophy resulted from an interpretation by state education agencies of the federal guidelines of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (Kimbrough & Hill, 1981; Stonehill & Groves, 1983; Vanecko, Ames, & Archambault, 1980). The present Chapter 1 philosophy has resulted in a curriculum and instructional procedure that has lent itself to isolated skills instruction, curricular incongruence, and an emphasis on standardized testing (Allington, 1987; Allington & Shake, 1986; Department of Education, 1988a, 1988b; Savage, 1987).

Whole language literacy instruction is the simultaneous integration of reading, writing, speaking, listening, and visual expression in a context that is meaningful to the reader (Knapp, 1987). By incorporating the five key principles of the whole language philosophy discussed in the review of literature into a curriculum and instructional setting of a Chapter 1 program, the best instruction for low-achieving students can occur. Through the use of relevant whole texts and an abandonment of isolated skills teaching, through the use

of writing, sustained silent reading, reading aloud to students, and through the use of natural assessment, the Chapter 1 program can be effective (Allington, 1987; Anderson et al., 1985; Bussis, 1982; Calkins, 1986; Carbo, 1987; Goodman, 1986; Goodman & Goodman, 1981; Moore, 1983; Newman, 1985).

Lytle (1988) stated encouragingly that with the coming of the most recent Chapter 1 reauthorizations, effective July 1, 1988, more flexibility with new Chapter 1 guidelines is apparent. These new guidelines will allow Chapter 1 teachers to work in regular classrooms; they will allow more team teaching in pullout programs; they will allow more flexibility in working with special education students; and they will allow all faculty to participate in Chapter 1 inservices. It is hoped that the state education agencies will allow this type of flexibility into district Chapter 1 programs. Goodman (1986) very accurately stated, "If young humans haven't succeeded in becoming literate in school, something must be wrong with the program: it needs remediation, not they" (p. 55).

REFERENCES

Albrecht, A. M. (1985). Chapter 1 project identification program. Chillocothe, OH: Report of Chilocothe Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 276 791)

Allington, R. L. (1987). Shattered hopes: Why two federal reading programs have failed to correct reading failure. Learning, 16, 60-64.

Allington, R. L., & Broikou, K. A. (1988). Development of shared knowledge: A new role for classroom and specialist teachers. The Reading Teacher, 41, 806-811.

Allington, R. L., & Shake, M. C. (1986). Remedial reading: Achieving curricular congruence in classroom and clinic. The Reading Teacher, 39, 648-654.

Altweger, B., Edelsky, C., & Flores, B. M. (1987). Whole language: What's new? The Reading Teacher, 41, 144-154.

Anderson, R. C., Hiebert, E. H., Scott, J. A., & Wilkinson, I. (1985). Becoming a nation of readers: The report of the commission on reading. Urbana: University of Illinois, Center for the Study of Reading.

Bailey, B. (1986). Chapter 1: Impacting excellence in basic skills since 1965. Initiative to improve the quality of Chapter 1 projects. Princeton, WV: Mercer County Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 277 700)

Beck, D., & Chamberlain, E. (1983). Langauge development component, secondary developmental reading program: Final evaluation report. Columbus, OH: Columbus Public Schools, Department of Evaluation Services. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 249 252)

Brazee, P. E. (1985). Traditional skill instruction does not transfer to subject area texts. The New England Reading Association Journal, 20, 27-32.

Bussis, A. M. (1982). "Burn it at the casket": Research, reading instruction, and children's learning of the first r. Phi Delta Kappan, 64, 237-241.

Calkins, L. (1986). The art of teaching writing. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Carbo, M. (1987). Deprogramming reading failure: Giving unequal learners an equal chance. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 197-202.

Cazden, C. B. (1977). Language, literacy, and literature: Putting it all together. National Elementary Principal, 57, 40-42.

Chew, C. R. (1987, August). Whole language: Not the sum of its parts. Paper presented at the Meeting of Catskill Whole Language Conference, Oneonta, NY.

Cohen, D. (1968). The aspect of literature on vocabulary development and reading achievement. Elementary English, 45, 209-213, 217.

Conroy, M. (1988). Pass or fail: How teachers rate pullout reading programs. Learning, 16, 70-74.

Cook, N. R., & Hoag, C. C. (1987, April). On the front lines: A comparison of reading instruction programs in two South Carolina Schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 286-155).

Cullinan, B., Jaggar, A., & Strickland, D. (1974). Language expansion for black children in the primary grades: A research report. Young Children, 29, 98-112.

Culyer, R. (1984). Chapter 1 programs: Problems and promising solutions. Clearing House, 57, 231-238.

Department of Education. (1988a). Chapter 1 programs in local educational agencies: Notice of proposed rulemaking. Federal Register, 53, 41466-41492.

Department of Education. (1988b). Memorandum to chapter 1 state coordinators. Washington, DC: Department of Education, 1-83.

Fillion, B. (1983). Let me see you learn. Language Arts, 60, 702-710.

Goodman, K. (1986). What's whole in whole language? Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Goodman, K., & Goodman, Y. M. (1981). A whole-language, comprehension-centered reading program. Tucson: University of Arizona, Arizona Center for Research and Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 210 630)

Johnston, P., Allington, R., & Afflerback, P. (1985). The congruence of classroom and remedial reading instruction. The Elementary School Journal, 85, 463-477.

Kimbrough, J., & Hill, P. (1981). The aggregate effects of federal education programs. (R-2638ED). Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Knapp, J. C. (1987, Fall). The diary of a teacher starting down the road to whole language, literature-based reading. Iowa Reading, p. 14.

Langer, J. A., & Pradl, G. M. (1984). Standardized testing: A call for action. Language Arts, 61, 764-767.

Levine, D. U., Holdsworth, S., & Aquila, F. D. (1987). Achievement gains in self-contained Chapter 1 classes in Kansas City. Educational Leadership, 44, 22-23.

Lytle, J. (1988, December 14). Revised chapter 1 opens options for school-wide plans. Education Week, p. 32.

Manning, W. S. (1986). Idaho Falls school district no. 91: Chapter 1--Education Consolidation and Improvement Act. Idaho Falls, ID: Idaho Falls School District No. 91. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 275 796)

Mayher, J. S., & Brause, R. S. (1986). Learning through teaching: Is testing crippling integrated language education? Language Arts, 63, 390-396.

Melton, M. (1988). Whole language: A philosophy about how children learn. Iowa Reading, 1, p. 1-3.

Moore, D. W. (1983). A case for natural assessment of reading comprehension. Language Arts, 60, 957-969.

National Institute of Education. (1977). Administration of compensatory education. (Report No. HE 19:202:C73/3). Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Newman, J. (1985). Whole language: Theory in use. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Plunkett, V. R. L. (1985). From Title I to Chapter 1: The evolution of compensatory education. Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 533-537.

Ramsey, W., (1985, September). Infusing clinical reading instruction with whole language. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading and Language Arts Educators Conference, Kansas City, MO. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 266-411)

Rumelhart, D. E. (1977). Toward an interactive model fo reading. In S. Dornic (Ed.), Attention and performance VI, (pp. 573-603). Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum.

Savage, D. G. (1987). Why Chapter 1 hasn't made much difference. Phi Delta Kappan, 68, 581-584.

Stonehill, R. M., & Groves, C. L. (1983). U.S. Department of Education policies and ESEA Title I evaluation utility: Changes in attitudes, changes in platitudes. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 5, 65-73.

Vanecko, J., Ames, N., & Archambault, F. (1980). Who benefits from federal education dollars? The development of ESEA Title I allocation policy. Cambridge, MA: Abt.

Wallace, S., Hardeman, S., & Rutherford, B. (1984). Chapter 1, Chapter II and state compensatory education program evaluations, 1983-1984. Fort Worth, TX: Fort Worth Independent School District, Department of Research of Evaluation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 257 848)

Watson, D. J. (1984, May). Two approaches to reading: Whole language and skills. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association, Atlanta, GA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 247-546)