THE LEARNING ASSISTANCE REVIEW

THE JOURNAL OF THE MIDWEST COLLEGE LEARNING CENTER ASSOCIATION

ISSN 1087-0059
Volume 1 Number 1
Spring 1996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The *MCLCA Newsletter* and *Journal* are published by the Midwest College Learning Center Association, Inc. MCLCA serves learning assistance faculty, staff and graduate students in the field of learning assistance at two- and four-year colleges, vocational/technical schools and universities in the following states: Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. The library subscription rate is $25.00. Editorial assistance, format, and production by Academic Publications, Permissions and Copyright, National-Louis University.

Editors

MCLCA Officers

PRESIDENT
Anna Hammond
National-Louis University
18 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60603
312/621-9650, ext. 3307
aham@chicago1.nl.edu

PAST PRESIDENT
Rosanne Cook
St. Ambrose University
518 West Locust Street
Davenport, IA 52803
319/333-6334
rcook@saunix.sau.edu

VICE PRESIDENT
Audrey Kirkwood
Ball State University
NQ 321, Learning Center
Muncie, IN 47305
317/285-1008
ackirkwood@bsuvs.bs.edu

RECORDING SECRETARY
Paulette Church
Waldorf College
106 South 6th Street
Forest City, IA 50436
515/582-8208
church@sal311.waldorf.edu

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY
Shevawn Eaton
Northern Illinois University
Educational Services and Programs
DeKalb, IL 60115
815/753-0581
cdosbe1@wpo.cso.niu.edu

MEMBERSHIP SECRETARY
Susan Witkowski
Alverno College
P.O. Box 343922
Milwaukee, WI 53234-3922
414/382-6027

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Suzanne Swiderski
Loras College
1450 Alta Vista, Box 199
Dubuque, IA 52004
319/588-7402
sswiders@lcac1.loras.edu

NEWSLETTER EDITOR
Laura Bauer
National-Louis University
18 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60603
312/621-9650, ext. 3544

TREASURER
Kathy Potter
St. Ambrose University
518 West Locust Street
Davenport, IA 52803
319/333-6333
fkpotter@saunix.sau.edu

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge the following individuals who have helped with the publication of this volume: Barb Adams, Lisa D'Adamo-Weinstein, Shevawn Eaton, Jadwiga Piper, Shelly Samuels, Susan Smith, and Gideon Weinstein.

INTRODUCTION TO THE FIRST ISSUE

Seven years ago, the Board of the Midwest College Learning Center Association established a task force made up of Carol Cashen, Bradley Hughes and Michael Marinetti to study the feasibility of publishing a journal for its members. Like many studies, the subsequent report was shared with members and then filed away. In the interim, however, the idea of an *MCLCA Journal* was never entirely lost. It would be floated out to members at the annual conference where it would be anchored for inspection and then set adrift until the next conference. Then, in 1995, MCLCA President Rosanne Cook decided it was time to determine once and for all if the journal would set sail or be dry docked. She charged Martha Casazza, Chair of the Past Presidents' Council, with the responsibility for making a final recommendation to the Board about an *MCLCA Journal*. Through the Spring and Summer of 1995, Martha, along with Bradley Hughes and Karen Quinn, resurrected the earlier, filed-away report, reexamined as well as updated its findings, and prepared a new proposal. At some point, amid the excitement of this new venture and the heat of Chicago's summer, Karen and Martha agreed to serve as co-editors. In the Fall of 1995, the MCLCA Board approved the proposal for an *MCLCA Journal*. Thus, *The Learning Assistance Review* was launched.

We are honored that MCLCA has selected us as the first team of editors for *The Learning Assistance Review*. We recognize the tremendous responsibility that accompanies this appointment, and we are both committed to creating a publication that will advance the state of knowledge in the field of learning assistance. This is exciting as well as somewhat overwhelming.

We are aware of the excellent work that is going on in the field and look forward to providing a forum for sharing ideas related to effective practice and for encouraging practitioners to engage in the research that is increasingly necessary to strengthen the foundations of learning assistance. Two other goals we hope to achieve as co-editors are to encourage interdisciplinary discussions and international perspectives on learning assistance. To this end, we chose members of the Editorial Board for their national and international reputations as scholars, researchers and teachers representing diverse backgrounds. Finally, we hope to expand awareness of the contribution *The Learning Assistance Review* can make

to a wide audience of learning assistance professionals, as well as to faculty and administrators who work with students in a variety of post secondary settings.

Our tenure as co-editors of a new journal presents us with a unique opportunity to design both format and features of *The Learning Assistance Review*. While we intend to publish reports of research and descriptions of curricular and instructional innovation, we also welcome philosophical and exploratory essays that sustain academic dialog about critical issues in our field. We also encourage and invite book reviews and research updates as well as short opinion pieces for a feature we call "Joining the Conversation" designed to present provocative views to stimulate thinking and responses from our readers.

The success of any journal, but particularly a new one, hinges on the writing and managing experience of its editors. Karen B. Quinn is Assistant Director of the Academic Center for Excellence at the University of Illinois at Chicago. She has a Ph.D. in English from the University of Illinois specializing in language, literacy, and rhetoric, and Masters' degrees in Reading Education and Linguistics from SUNY Buffalo. She has been active in the field of learning assistance and post secondary reading and writing for over 20 years. Her stewardship as co-editor is marked by years of experience as a writer, reviewer, and editor of academic books, textbooks and journals such as *Written Communication, Reading Research and Instruction, Journal of Developmental Education,* and the *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy.*

Martha E. Casazza directs the Developmental Studies graduate program at National-Louis University. She has an Ed.D. from Loyola University Chicago specializing in curriculum and instruction, and a Master's degree in Reading also from Loyola. For the past 15 years, she has been involved in the field of learning assistance and post secondary reading education as a faculty member and administrator. She comes to the co-editorship with experience as an editor and reviewer for numerous textbook publishers as well as for the *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, Review of Research in Developmental Education,* and the *NADE Newsletter.* Her publication record includes journal articles and recently, a co-authored book.

LETTER FROM THE EDITORS

To our readers:

We are enthusiastic about the quality of manuscripts that we have received for the first issue of *The Learning Assistance Review.* In addition to the excellent, detailed, and timely reviews from our Editorial Board, we have had the privilege of working closely with the authors as they prepared the final manuscripts.

The topics covered in the four articles include a wide range of contemporary issues that have significance for our practice. We begin with an interview conducted by Mary Anderson. She talked with Dr. Ernest Pascarella, researcher and author of *What College Teaches Students,* about his recent work investigating the influence of postsecondary institutions on student learning and development. Bohr presents a research article that has implications for teacher training programs which have traditionally focused only on preparation for precollege teaching. She argues that the needs are different for college instruction, and she proposes an approach modified from current training that includes six areas for consideration.

The subject of professional standards for learning assistance and developmental education has been debated for many years. Thayer and Maxwell review the progress that has been made in this area by the Committee for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) and the Standards and Evaluation Committee of the National Association of Developmental Education. They present the perspective that national standards provide us with a benchmark by which to assess our practice, and they offer suggestions for the application of the standards. The fourth article reports on a study that tracked students' performance in college mathematics courses. Thomas and Higbee followed college students who completed a basic math course where collaborative learning was encouraged to determine if the active learning strategies improved math performance. The results have implications for teaching across a wide variety of settings.

In addition to the core articles described above, we have included a review by Judith Cohen of the book *City on a Hill.* Her review is particularly interesting in light of the recent decision of the City University of New York system to limit its

students to one year of "remediation." In the feature "Join the Conversation," Lisa D'Adamo-Weinstein outlines her perspective of teaching as a political activity.

As you read through this first issue of *The Learning Assistance Review*, we encourage you to send us your reactions to the readings, the journal's format and its features. We want *The Learning Assistance Review* to reflect your interests as well as current thinking and research in our field.

Let us hear from you.

Martha Casazza
National-Louis University
18 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60603
312/621-9650, ext. 3273

Karen Quinn
University of Illinois at Chicago
1200 West Harrison
Suite 2900, M/C 327
Chicago, IL 60607-7164
312/413-2179

ARTICLES

AN INTERVIEW WITH ERNEST PASCARELLA: RESULTS FROM THE NATIONAL STUDY OF STUDENT LEARNING

By Mary Anderson, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory

Introduction

Dr. Ernest Pascarella is a senior professor at the University of Illinois at Chicago where he teaches courses in the Educational Policy program and conducts research in the area of student learning. Pascarella first became interested in student learning and the effects of college on student learning when he was a graduate student at Syracuse University and worked as the Associate Director of Research in the Center for Instructional Development. It was there he met Patrick Terenzini with whom he continues to conduct research and with whom he co-authored a recent book, *How College Affects Students.*

His recent work as Director of the National Study of Student Learning began in 1992 as part of the work of the National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment at Penn State. The Center's purpose is to improve postsecondary education by analyzing those things related to educational success. Dr. Pascarella and his team of researchers gathered longitudinal information from 23 institutions that participated in the investigation. MCLCA interviewed Dr. Pascarella to find out more about the study, its findings, and its implications for policies and practices at the postsecondary level.

Research Sample and Methodology

Dr. Pascarella talked about the research that investigated institutional influences on learning and cognitive development. Of the 23 colleges that participated, 18 were four-year institutions and 5 were two-year institutions which were selected

from the National Center on Education Statistics' Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System. Data included information on student characteristics and background, and their aspirations, expectations, and orientations toward learning as they entered college, taken from a survey developed by the National Center on Teaching, Learning, and Assessment; reading comprehension, mathematics, and critical thinking scores from the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency; the College Student Experiences Questionnaire; and assessment of aspects of students' first-year experiences and learning orientations not covered by the previous questionnaire. Longitudinal data have been collected for three years; the results reported here are based on data collected during the first-year.

Dr. Pascarella and his colleagues broke the data down into a number of different components and looked at various effects revealed by the data. Initially they analyzed:

- the effects of two-year and four-year colleges
- the effects of historically-black and predominantly-white colleges
- the effects of perceived teacher behaviors
- the effects on first-generation students
- the effects of intercollegiate athletic participation
- the influences on and consequences of openness to diversity
- the cognitive effects of Greek affiliation
- the multiple influences on critical thinking.

Data Analysis

Their findings are quite interesting. Dr. Pascarella, in his paper, "What Have We Learned from the First Year of the National Study of Student Learning?" (Pascarella, Whitt, Nora, Edison, Hagedorn, & Terenzini, 1995), provided some insights.

Positive Influences

First, the findings from the National Study of Student Learning's first year indicate that some widely-accepted perceptions of the quality of the academic experiences offered by two-year and historically black institutions should be questioned. Students at two-year institutions showed gains in cognitive areas comparable to those students who entered four-year institutions. Also, we found no differences in gains in critical thinking, reading comprehension, or math skills

between black students who completed their first year of college at historically black institutions and black students who spent their first year at predominantly white institutions. Both findings suggest the need to reexamine current policies and practices affecting the allocation of resources to two- and four-year institutions in the public sector. . . . [Current practice restricts the amount of monies to two-year institutions and historically black institutions based on the presumption that these schools do not provide an academic experience comparable to that of white, four-year institutions.]

Second, the evidence indicates that the degree of instructors' organization and preparation for classes may be linked not only to general academic achievement but also to the development of higher order academic and cognitive skills of their students. These instructional skills can be taught to and learned by faculty members through purposeful instructional improvement activities.

Third, the analyses identify student experiences and campus interventions that affect student learning and development in a variety of ways, some beneficial, some deleterious. For example, first-generation college students are more likely to benefit in their critical thinking from attendance at orientation sessions and use of the library. However, these students are less likely than their "traditional" peers to encounter a welcoming campus environment and perceive faculty members as unconcerned with teaching and with students as people. These findings imply that particular attention should be paid to the ways in which first-generation students are brought into the institution, and to efforts to ensure their fair treatment.

In addition, students' participation in cultural awareness workshops and their involvement with diverse peers were positively related to gains in openness to cultural diversity, and suggest that ways must be found to systematically incorporate this source of influence (i.e., peer interaction) in educational programs and policies (Pascarella, et al., pp. 18-20).

Negative Influences

Not all college experiences have positive effects on student learning. First-year participation in sororities or fraternities and participation in intercollegiate athletics had negative influences on students' development of higher order academic and cognitive skills and to a certain extent on changes in openness to cultural diversity. Given that all these negative effects were identifiable after only one year

of college, our findings raise questions about the wisdom of institutional policies that permit first-year students to participate in these activities. This information also emphasized the need for institutional programming and interventions that are sensitive to student differences.

Finally, the findings highlight the interconnected influence of students' college experiences as they shape student learning. They point to a wide variety of curricular, instructional, out-of-class, and organizational climate variables that affect how students learn and grow, and suggest a need for greater cooperation and collaboration among organizational units within and across academic affairs and student affairs (Pascarella, et al., pp. 20-21).

The following issues emerged later after the initial analysis. Dr. Pascarella identified the effect locus of control has on student achievement and success. The data also suggested that there is a "chilly climate" for women at college. Additionally, this later analysis looks more closely than the first year findings at critical thinking, asking "Does it matter where you go to college?" In other words, is there a contextual effect of the college environment and population on critical thinking—does attending Harvard, where there is a large population of high achieving students, generally make a student a higher achiever? Previously, the expected answer to this question was "yes." Data analysis suggests otherwise: Where you go accounts for less than 1% of the variance in critical thinking after the first year, and almost nothing after three years. This study is changing perceptions.

Recommendations

But is this study changing policies? Dr. Pascarella is not sure where administrators will go with the data and in fact isn't sure he is in a position to make recommendations. He can make the analysis available to colleges, but he can't ensure what they will do with the information. As he jokingly remarked, "Administrators don't do my job, and I don't pretend to do theirs." He readily admits that the social findings are complicated by political implications. Will colleges change their athletic recruiting and playing policies because the data suggest lower achievement scores for athletes after the first year? Will colleges change their fraternity and sorority membership policies because the data suggest not only lower academic achievement but also a negative influence on openness to cultural and racial diversity? Dr. Pascarella is skeptical that policy changes along these lines will be made.

Learning Center Applications

While learning center personnel may not be able to affect changes in institutional policies, they can influence their programs with this data in mind. The following suggestions are based on the emerging data.

1. *First-generation students.* Learning centers have long targeted first-generation college students as candidates for academic support and may have programs in place to meet some of the needs of these at-risk students. The National Study of Student Learning results show the benefits of a number of services for this population:

   - providing an orientation program
   - providing a variety of library experiences
   - emphasizing critical, evaluative, and analytical thinking
   - doing more than emphasizing vocational and occupational competencies
   - creating a welcoming campus environment
   - dispelling the perception (or working to change the reality) of racial/ethnic discrimination
   - changing the perception that faculty are unconcerned (this may include student *and* faculty workshops).

2. *Athletic participation.* Again, many learning centers have a special program for athletes. If so, they may look at the data and decide to focus attention on male football and basketball players and women athletes who start out with low comprehension scores. If they don't have a special program, they may want to target these athletes and take the advice of the study authors to take steps early in these students' collegiate careers, because poor academic performance may be a cumulative disadvantage that worsens over time.

3. *Greek affiliation.* Learning center staff would do well to create opportunities for academic achievement for students who are associated with sororities and fraternities, perhaps concentrating on attitude and motivation.

4. *Openness to diversity.* While this category is more of an institution-wide concern, learning centers can do much to create a non-discriminatory

environment and to create opportunities for students to connect with diverse student peers; this is probably the most important component of building cultural awareness and tolerance. Learning centers could sponsor cultural awareness workshops for all students, faculty, and staff, and possibly make it a point to hold workshops at fraternities and sororities.

5. *Critical thinking.* The curriculum in a learning center is a natural place to focus on critical thinking. What the study reveals is that courses in the humanities and fine arts as well as the natural sciences and engineering can best promote critical thinking. What may not be so well-known is that involvement in clubs and organizations and attendance at cultural awareness workshops can also encourage critical thinking. Learning center staff can promote active involvement of a variety of aspects of campus life in order to enhance critical thinking.

   In addition, learning center personnel can push for another type of critical thinking: rethinking the institution's current structural and functional relationships between academic and student affairs divisions in their college or university so the interconnected and holistic set of in-class and out-of-class influences can be maximized. While not a direct service to students, the impact on student achievement may be significant.

6. *Teacher behaviors.* Another area that seems to have potential for learning centers is the professional development of the faculty. The study showed that organized and prepared teachers lead to greater cognitive gains in students. These are skills that can be taught and learned through purposeful professional development efforts, and learning centers could become centers for faculty as well as students to grow. This has political implications and would need to be developed sensitively.

Conclusion

The final question for Dr. Pascarella concerned his view of the future of undergraduate higher education, of the direction universities are going or should go in terms of admissions, preparatory courses, and academic support. His response was simple:

Access needs to be accompanied by support and resources. To do anything less is really unethical. To allow students to enter college knowing they cannot succeed is unfair. We must provide students whose academic backgrounds predict failure with the support they need to at least have a chance to succeed.

Mary Anderson *is a program specialist at the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory where she works in the field of professional development. She is working on her doctorate in the Reading, Writing, and Literacy program at the University of Illinois at Chicago.*

References

Pascarella, E.T.; Whitt, E.J.; Nora, A.; Edison, M.; Hagedorn, L.S.; and Terenzini, P.T. (1995). *What have we learned from the first year of the National Study of Student Learning?* University of Illinois at Chicago.

Note: Interview with Dr. Ernest Pascarella, March 27, 1996, Chicago.

COLLEGE AND PRECOLLEGE READING INSTRUCTION: WHAT ARE THE REAL DIFFERENCES?

By Louise Bohr, Northeastern Illinois University

Abstract

In order to facilitate in-service and preparation for college reading instructors, the shared, exclusive and modified components of college and precollege (elementary and secondary classroom) reading instruction are presented. After a discussion of the shared components (those which precollege and college reading have in common), the reasons for differences and exclusive components are presented. Exclusive components are those which the fields do not share. Finally, components of precollege reading which might be applied in a college setting (if altered) are revealed. The implications of distinctions are then discussed.

Since we have so much more to draw upon in primary and secondary reading instruction, it's tempting to assume that what is right for elementary and high school classrooms is right for college classrooms. However, it is prudent to ask whether college reading instructors are actually in the same practice as elementary and high school teachers. Eighty-two percent of American public postsecondary institutions *offer reading courses,* and further, 13% of all American college students take *at least one reading course.* (National Center for Educational Statistics, 1991). As the number of college students taking reading courses increases, more and more college reading instructors join the profession. With few exceptions, however, there is little difference in the way they and other reading teachers are prepared.

College instructors are generally included among the array of reading professionals (Barclay & Thistlewaite, 1992), and there is a small body of literature on the training of college reading professionals (Austin & Gilford, 1993; Garcia, 1981; Matthews, 1981; Maxwell, 1981). However, it is rare that we delineate for prospective college reading instructors how their practice can be differentiated from the practices of elementary and high school teachers. And there are some crucial questions: Do the same practices work with college students? Are the purposes for instruction the same? Do students have the same needs? If we are to clearly understand the role played by college reading teachers, we should focus

on what we can and can't learn from high school and elementary reading teachers.

Much has been borrowed by precollege reading educators in literacy pedagogy; notions of teaching composition with process rather than product emphasis was generated in college, not precollege, research (Hillocks, 1986). But more has been borrowed by college reading educators from the far larger field of precollege reading; however, specific cautions should be exercised in the process. In this discussion, the phrase "precollege reading" is used to describe the teaching of reading to elementary and high school students.

The following will address the shared, exclusive, and modified components of college and precollege reading instruction. Presented first is a summary of shared components: those which precollege and college reading have in common. After a discussion of the reasons for real differences between college and precollege reading instruction, the exclusive components are presented. Exclusive components are those which the fields do not share. Finally, there are some components of precollege reading which could be applied in a college setting if appropriately altered. These areas of modification and reconsideration are presented. The implications of distinctions are then discussed.

What Do College and Precollege Instruction Have in Common?

Central notions regarding where comprehension takes place have evolved and impacted practice in both college and precollege reading. In early reading theory, the author just threw the ball, and the reader just caught it. But the author wasn't standing anywhere in particular, and the reader was floating in space, could only catch in one manner, and couldn't throw back. The "grand prize" in reading comprehension theory in the past decades once belonged to the author, then moved to the text itself, and now has flown off the page, where the reader and the reader's culture do battle for it.

Our current understanding of the varied contexts, goals and world views which students bring to their reading has led us to a view behind and beyond the text (Rogers-Zegarra & Singer, 1985; Steffensen, et. al., 1979) and has revealed the economic (Ogbu, 1987; Willis, 1977) and social (Cazden, 1986) imperatives guiding the process. In addition, linguistic particularities of the reader and the structures of the text influence comprehension (Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Fasold & Shuy, 1970; Rosenthal, et. al., 1983). Further, the reader has a personal wealth of prior

knowledge and schemata (Anderson & Pearson, 1984) which he brings to the process, as well as certain effective or ineffective strategies (Raphael, 1982) and metacognitive processes (Paris & Winograd, 1991) which he or she uses to interact with text (Rumelhart, 1985) and to monitor the dialogue which ensues. The reading process appears to be quite situation specific (Brown, 1989) and depends upon the goals of the reader and the purposes of the reading material itself (Shanahan, 1988). Furthermore, we now understand that learning to write is an integral part of the reading process (Shanahan, 1984; 1988; 1990). What an individual reader does during and after the comprehension process to construct personal meaning and to change himself and change his world (Friere & Donaldo, 1986; Rosenblatt, 1978) can also be considered part of comprehension itself. These findings have shaped both college and precollege reading instruction.

College and precollege reading pedagogy share the most in recognizing the impact that *culture, socio-economic condition, and schema* have on student's comprehension. It is crucial that the cultural context of the reader be taken into account in college and precollege reading instruction. Children who are privy to certain cultural contexts (either inside or outside the mainstream) will excel if pedagogy is based on knowledge from that culture (Labov, 1972; Hunt, 1975; Au, 1980; Heath, 1983). For college readers living outside the boundaries of academic culture, the acknowledgment of the students' special background abets literacy development (Rose, 1989; Shaughnessy, 1977).

Interwoven with issues of culture, socio-economic conditions arrange the posture of reader, text, and instructor. On a universal scale, readers with lower economic status don't meet standards on the comprehension assessments created, primarily, by those who have higher economic status (Thorndike, 1973; Coleman, 1966). Developmental, (Chall, et. al., 1990; Covington & Beery, 1976; Deutsch, 1960; Warren-Leubecker & Carter, 1988), deliberate (Ogbu, 1988; Weis, 1985; Willis, 1977) and instructor (Rist, 1970; Haller & Davis, 1981) behaviors are blamed for this discrepancy.

Related to the cultural and socio-economic influences on both college and precollege reading is a reader's immediate psychological predisposition, background knowledge or schema. The schema model (Pichert & Anderson, 1977) allows deeper understanding of a reader's use of metacognition and strategy. In both precollege and college reading, a student is directed toward strategies, for attention, memory, summary, questioning and regulation of his or her own reading. These strategies have long been recommended for elementary school

(Palincsar & Brown, 1984) and for the development of college literacy (Hillocks, 1986; Nist & Kirby, 1991; Stahl, et. al., 1992; Simpson, 1994; 1995).

Four further dimensions of the comprehension process shared by college and precollege readers deserve attention. The first concerns the situation in which the reader comprehends, the second concerns the genre of the text, the third concerns the reader's purpose, and the fourth concerns the use of technology in literacy development.

First, it appears that comprehension processes accomplished in one situation are not always easily transferred to another. This means that if students practice a particular strategy on a particular text in a classroom in September, the experience does not necessarily enable them to do it at home with text homework for another class in December, or even later that day in the library. Some unknown ambience is lost the second time around, which has led researchers to believe learning is "situated" (Brown, 1989). Second, as comprehension is different from one situation to the next, it is different when a text is from another genre. Comprehension instruction in lower and higher education must show the reader different processes for comprehension in the many genres which elementary, secondary and postsecondary readers share. Third, the purpose for reading, or the reason a student sets out to read what he or she has in hand, should make students use different strategies (Janiuk & Shanahan, 1988). A heightened awareness of purpose enhances comprehension for readers of all ages. Finally, as computer competency in reading and writing become necessary for those who will and will not attend college, students and teachers at all levels must work to integrate technological processes with literacy development (Kiefer, 1991).

Why is College Reading Instruction so Different?

A number of reasons account for the very real differences between college and precollege reading instruction: 1) Students in elementary and high schools attend by law; students in college attend by choice. 2) There is a wide range of ages in each setting, but for the most part the age ranges do not overlap. 3) There are differing ability ranges for each of the settings, though here the overlap is pretty large. 4) Grade school pedagogy prepares readers for all reading; college reading pedagogy prepares students for academic reading. College reading instruction is limited to that which helps students to succeed in college; it is not intended to help students with literacy styles outside of academe. Some may disagree, but most practice does, in fact, address primarily college tasks (Fairbanks, 1974). In

some very special cases developmental educators and the administrators of a college or university agree to literacy goals outside academic success, but generally a developmental reading program at a college *earns its keep* by trying to help college students succeed in classes.

What are The Differences Between College and Precollege Reading Classrooms?

Following are six basic differences between college and precollege reading which separate the tasks of educators in those two areas. The ages, abilities, motivations, and goals of "clientele" account for most of these differences. For the purpose of this discussion, college success is assumed to be the primary goal of college reading programs.

1. *Only precollege reading is concerned with reading readiness and emergent reading.* A very rich collection of works helps early childhood educators to prepare children for the new phenomenon of reading (Mason & Au, 1990). This type of activity, of course, appears prior to kindergarten, and has registered successes which may endure even through college age, but few conceivable circumstances would ever involve the college reading educator in this literature.

2. *Only precollege reading is concerned with early, first language development.* Not only is reading new at some age for every child, but so is a sort of integration with one's own language. First language acquisition in children has been characterized by many types of grammars and their resultant "stages," and these concerns may or may not have interplay with the reading a very young child accomplishes (Brown, 1973; Clark, 1973). However, these issues do not concern college reading educators, with the exception of lexical acquisition.

3. *The ability range of college readers excludes some of the range of precollege readers.* While we hope that the top of the achievement range for college students is higher for college readers than for precollege students, we know that the bottom of the range is not generally equal to the bottom of the precollege range. According to recent studies, the number of students with no knowledge of sound-letter relationships is only about 6% of the adolescent population (Davidson & Koppenhaver, 1993). For this reason, college reading is usually not concerned with orthography, phonics, and word recognition.

Some open admissions postsecondary institutions do report reading instruction of this sort. Yet it is unclear that even those college students in the extremely low ability ranges would benefit from instruction of this nature. Curricula designed for reading disabled college applicants might be one exception. However, for the most part college reading instruction does not include instruction in sound-letter association or sight word recognition. For this reason, assessment issues for college readers should also not address word recognition, and should instead address the difficulty, purposes, lengths, and genres of college texts (Quinn, 1992).

4. *Only precollege reading uses early reading materials (e.g., basals, big books).* There is widespread disagreement regarding what materials best facilitate reading at all levels (Heinrichs & La Branche, 1986), but even with extremely low achieving college applicants materials designed for the primary grades are not used. Because basals and early reading materials are engineered to perform functions mentioned in 1-3 above (Mason & Au, 1990), they appeal to the taste of children, and they are psychologically distracting to adults for a number of reasons.

5. *College reading is usually not concerned with functional, survival, vocational, or other extra-academic "utility" reading.* We teach grade schoolers to read in many more ways than we do college students. We prepare them to be citizens, to labor, to pay taxes, to be consumers, to stay healthy, and to understand personal communications. Some pedagogy broaches the question, "What are the natural uses of literacy in the world?" In a sense, language experience approaches in the classroom and whole language approaches in pedagogy give rise to conceptions of literacy's unlimited, personal, and natural uses (Mason & Au, 1990). Some of the whole language and language experience techniques should certainly be applied by college educators, but only if the focus returns to the academic uses of literacy. In short, precollege readers face a different group of literacy experiences.

6. *Instruction for college readers is androgogy, not pedagogy.* Androgogy is instruction for adults, not for children. The teacher of college reading pursues a classroom discourse more suited to adults. Classroom management is a very different proposition for children. Good precollege reading instruction requires a teacher to guide and conduct

groups of children toward comprehension. Conducting this type of "orchestra" requires attention to the management of a group which may still be developing social control and may not know how to keep the learning task a priority (Doyle, 1986). It should be acknowledged that some excellent recent work points to the possibility that developmental college classes are comprised of students who do not share all the characteristics of adult learners (Davis, 1995). In a good *college* class, however, much of the responsibility for the management of productivity is shared with the students (McClusky, 1958; Newton, 1976). The essence of the adult is independence and self-direction (Kidd, 1966; Knowles, 1973).

Is There Overlap Between College and Precollege Instruction?

While many of the features that follow have been mentioned in the last section, the emphasis here is to show how some considerations are *modified* for the college reader. In these six areas, college reading instructors must be careful to adapt pedagogical styles in order to work with postsecondary students.

1. *Developmental college reading, though it addresses a more advanced, sophisticated audience, might not apply some of the more sophisticated advancements in reading theory.* As reading theory shifted focus away from the text and author, it became possible for readers to follow suit. The activities of the reader in reader response, constructivist, post-structural, and in a discourse synthesis approach (Rosenblatt, 1978; Foucault, 1981; Spivey, 1990) are generally not the initial focus of college reading. An immediate focus for a low achieving college reader on personal response and action may confuse this reader who has never entered an academic dialogue in the first place. Delpit goes so far as to indicate that process approaches can confuse or frustrate readers "on the boundary," who want to know common rules for academic interpretation (Delpit, 1988). Applications of newer theories should be made, but constraints of the college's goals (which must usually be addressed in one short academic term) are limiting factors.

2. *Purposes are different for precollege and college readers.* As we have mentioned, college readers face a different group of literacy experiences. These experiences go beyond "catching the ball," from writers of droll introductory texts, and beyond the text itself to include synthesis of

academic texts, understanding underlying grammars of discourse in the disciplines, interpretation, criticism, syntopical synthesis, and the construction of argument (Bartholomae & Petrosky, 1986). Literature dialogue in higher education may also address the outer limits of knowledge and how this knowledge has been created, and the creation of further knowledge.

3. *Genres and expectations are different for precollege and college readers.* College reading programs may exclude "workplace," or "functional" reading strategies and materials. The precollege reader in high school, for example, may learn to distinguish between argument and comparison, or between scientific and non-scientific prose, but probably does not learn to distinguish among historical types of argument, or among varied methods for research in sociology, for example. The high school student may have to read a small amount of text as homework, but probably is not expected to read and integrate extended text with little or no instructional support as are college students (Carson, et. al., 1992). Emphasizing discipline-specific strategies for reading academic genres of considerable expectation separates precollege and college reading instruction.

4. *Motivation is different for precollege and college readers.* We don't sell a new concept of literacy to college readers. They've bought it. We may sell certain types of text, for example, philosophical text or texts explaining quantitative analysis, but few college aged students are without understanding of the importance and uses of literacy in society. The college student's readiness for learning is inherent in his role as a college student, and he or she has already experienced demands for literacy (Kidd, 1966).

5. *Prior lexical, psychological and cultural knowledge are different for precollege and college readers.* The mature individual is a storehouse of language and experiences which can help him to comprehend text. Instructional strategies should attempt to tap this knowledge base, which may be richer than that of a precollege reader (Knowles, 1993).

6. *Family ties are different for precollege and college readers.* Much important recognition and research on family influence for young readers points to the potency of family effects for young readers (Maehr

& Stallings, 1975; Marjoribanks, 1979). Family influence is different for the college reader, and by the time a student is 18, much of what a family has done for a student is indelible. In fact, where precollege reading focuses on the positive contributions of a family for the young reader, the college impact literature which concerns family ties reflects primarily negative family influence—the constraints of living with parents or children, or the great benefits of leaving the family behind to be immersed in college at a dormitory (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). In short, college reading practitioners do not usually look to family learning models to understand reading gains.

What are the Implications for College Reading Instructors?

How does this delineation of the shared, exclusive and adapted help inform new and prospective college reading teachers? Those preparing to teach reading at a postsecondary level do not need to concentrate at all on many areas which are important only for precollege instruction. College reading teachers don't need to study the features of preliteracy, literacy emergence, or initial language learning. They may comfortably expect to go beyond the teaching of sound-letter relationships. Rarely will college readers benefit from instruction of this nature. In particular, postsecondary reading instructors must avoid using basals and other reading materials designed for precollege readers. Neither the genre nor the focus will help the college reader.

College reading teachers also need not focus on functional and "utility" reading. Where a high school teacher could appropriately show students how to read a checkbook, a job application, a tax form, a bus schedule, or a newspaper advertisement, the parameters of academic genre dictate a classroom focus which is separate from these tasks. "Utility" in college reading is the direct academic use of literacy.

The teacher of college reading must pursue a classroom discourse to which adults respond. Since college students attend by choice and not by law, the post-secondary instructor can count on a more motivated group, yet a group which may demand quality and challenge. A college instructor may indeed be teaching students about the discipline and rules of college classes, but unlike the precollege teacher, generally works with students who are eager to participate if the game is clearly described and the content is substantive. Again, few college

aged-students are without understanding of the importance and uses of literacy in society.

The college instructor has an obligation to make clear exactly which types of interpretations of text and which written assertions are acceptable in the academy. The college reading instructor clearly teaches for a distinct purpose: to foster comprehension of texts that fulfills academic expectations. College texts themselves are unlike those taught in precollege classrooms (i.e., social science texts, texts about scientific method, literacy criticism, written in formats particular to each of the fields in a liberal arts core curriculum). College reading requires more indepth processing and analysis.

These differences in the nature of the student, the context, and the genres of college literacy should guide college reading instruction as a field distinct from precollege fields in knowledge and style. While it is clear that precollege and college reading practice share similar features, the distinctions must be addressed.

Dr. Louise Bohr, *Assistant Professor, Literacy Program, Northeastern Illinois University, specializes in adolescent and adult literacy.* *She wishes to thank Drs. Timothy Shanahan and Margaret Richek for their support of this work.*

References

Anderson, R. C., & Pearson, P. D. (1984). A schema-theoretic view of basic processes in reading comprehension. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), Handbook of reading research (pp. 255-291). New York: Longman.

Au, K. (1980). Participation structures in a reading lesson with Hawaiian children. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 11, 91-115.

Austin, R., & Gilford. M. (1993). Implementing a teaching excellence program for developmental educators. Journal of College Reading and Learning, 26(1), 11-15.

Barclay, K. D., & Thistlewaite, L. (1992). Reading specialists of the 90's: Who are they and what do they want? Reading Research and Instruction, 31(4), 87-96.

Bartholomae, D., & Petrosky, A. (1986). Facts, artifacts and counterfacts. New Jersey: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Brown, J. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. Educational Researcher, 18, 32-42.

Brown, R. (1973). A first language: The early stages. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Carson, J., Chase, N., Gibson, S., & Hargrove, M. (1992). Literacy demands of the undergraduate curriculum. Reading Research and Instruction, 31(4), 25-50.

Cazden, C. (1986). Classroom discourse. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Chall, J. S., Jacobs, D. A., & Baldwin, L. E. (1990). The reading crisis: Why poor children fall behind. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Clark, E. (1973). How children describe time and order. In C. A. Ferguson & D. I. Slobin (Eds.), Studies of child language development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Coleman, J. S. (1966). Equality of educational opportunity survey. Washington, D.C.: National Center of Educational Statistics, United States Office of Education.

Covington, M., & Beery, R. (1976). Self-worth and school learning. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Davidson, J., & Koppenhaver, D. (1993). Adolescent literacy: What works and why. New York: Garland Publishing.

Davis, D. (1995). Self-direction and adults in college reading and learning programs: An exploratory study of personal autonomy. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University.

Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. Harvard Educational Review, 58(3), 280-298.

Deutsch, M. (1960). Minority group and class status as related to social and personality factors in scholastic achievement (Applied Anthropology, Monograph #2).

Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom organization and management. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 392-431). New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Fairbanks, M. (1974). The effect of college reading improvement programs on academic achievement. In P. L. Nacke (Ed.), Twenty-third yearbook of the national reading conference (pp. 105-114). Washington, D.C.: The National Reading Conference.

Fasold, R., & Shuy, R. (1970). Teaching standard English in the inner city. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Foucault, M. (
discourse.
Untying
England: P
Paul.

Friere, P., &
Literacy: R
the world.
Bergin and

Garcia, S. (19
learning as
In F. Chris
(Eds.), Sta
learning s
directions
assistanc
Washingto
Inc., Publis

Haller, E., & Da
perceptions
and grou
instructio
Education,

Halliday, M. A.
Cohesion
Longman.

Heath, S. (1983
Cambridge
University

Heinrichs, A. S.
(1986). Co
college lea
Reading
Instruction

Hillocks, G.
written
(NCRE/ERI

Hunt, B. C. (19
third an

Foucault, M. (1981). The order of discourse. In R. Young (Ed.), Untying the text. London, England: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Friere, P., & Donaldo, M. (1986). Literacy: Reading the word and the world. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.

Garcia, S. (1981). The training of learning assistance practitioners. In F. Christ & M. Coda-Messerle (Eds.), Staff development for learning support systems: New directions for college learning assistance, (Volume 4). Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Haller, E., & Davis, S. (1981). Teacher perceptions, parental social status, and grouping for reading instruction. Sociology of Education, 54, 162-174.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. London: Longman.

Heath, S. (1983). Ways with words. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Heinrichs, A. S., & La Branche, S. P. (1986). Content analysis of 47 college learning skills textbooks. Reading Research and Instruction, 25(4), 277-287.

Hillocks, G. (1986). Research on written composition (NCRE/ERIC). Urbana, IL.

Hunt, B. C. (1975). Black dialect and third and fourth graders' performance on the Gray Oral Reading Test. Reading Research Quarterly, 10, 103-123.

Janiuk, D., & Shanahan, T. (1988). Applying adult literacy practices in primary grade instruction. The Reading Teacher, 880-886.

Kidd, J. (1966). Implications of continuous learning. Toronto, Canada: W.J. Gage.

Kiefer, K. (1991). Computers and teacher education in the 1990's and beyond. In G. Hawisher & C. Self (Eds.), Evolving perspectives on computer and composition studies. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Knowles, M. (1973). The adult learner: A neglected species (2nd ed). Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company.

Labov, W. (1972). Academic ignorance and black intelligence. In M. L. Maehr & W. M. Stallings (Eds.), Culture, child, and school (pp. 63-81). Monterey: Brooks/Cole Publishing.

Maehr, M. L., & Stallings, W. M. (1975). Culture, child, and school. Monterey: Brooks/Cole Publishing.

Marjoribanks, K. (1979). Families and their learning environments. London, England: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Mason, J., & Au, K. (1990). Reading instruction for today. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Matthews, J. (1981). Becoming professional in college level learning assistance. In F. Christ & M. Coda-Messerle, (Eds.), Staff development for learning support systems: New directions for college learning assistance, 4 (pp. 1-18). Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Maxwell, M. (1981). An annual institute for directors and staff of college learning centers. In F. Christ & M. Coda-Messerle (Eds.), Staff development for learning support systems. New directions for college learning assistance, 4 (pp. 39-45). Washington, D.C.: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

McClusky, H. (1958). Central hypotheses about adult learning. Report of the Commission of the Professors of Adult Education. Washington, D.C.: Adult Education Association of the United States of America.

National Center for Educational Statistics. (1991, May). College-level remedial education in the fall of 1989. Macknight Black, O.E.R.I., Washington, D.C.

Newton, E. (1976). Andragogy: Understanding the adult as a learner. The Reading Teacher, 30(3), 361-363.

Nist, S., & Kirby, K. (1986). Teaching comprehension and study strategies through modeling and thinking aloud. Reading Research and Instruction, 25, 254-264.

Ogbu, J. (1987). Variability in minority school performance: A problem in search of an explanation. Anthropology and Education Quarterly 18(4), 312-334.

Ogbu, J. (1988). Literacy and schooling in subordinate cultures. In E. R. Kintgen, B. Kroil, & M. Rose (Eds.), Perspectives on literacy (pp. 227-242). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Palincsar, A., & Brown, A. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension monitoring activities. Cognition and instruction, 1, 117-175.

Paris, S., & Winograd, P. (1991). How metacognition can promote academic learning and motivation. In B. F. Jones & L. Idol (Eds.), Dimensions of thinking and cognitive instruction, 1. Hillsdale, NJ: Earlbaum.

Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). The impact of college on students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Pichert, J. W., & Anderson, R. C. (1977). Taking different perspective on a story. Journal of Educational Psychology, 69, 309-315.

Quinn, K. (1992). Developing a college level reading/writing placement test. IAPLP Newsletter. Chicago, IL: IAPLP.

Raphael, T. (1982). Question-answering strategies for children. The Reading Teacher, 36, 186-190.

Rist, R. (1970). Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. Harvard Educational Review, 40(3), 411-451.

Rogers-Zegarra, N., & Singer, H. (1985). Anglo and Chicano comprehension of ethnic stories. In H. Singer & A. B. Ruddell (Eds.), Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading (pp. 611-617). Newark, NJ: IRA.

Rose, M. (1989). Lives on the boundary. New York: Penguin.

Rosenblatt, L. (1978). The reader, the text, the poem: Transactional theory of the written word. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Rosenthal, A. S., Baker, K., & Ginsburg, A. (1983). The effect of language background on achievement level and learning among elementary school students. Sociology of Education, 56, 157-169.

Rumelhart, D. (1985). Toward an interactive model of reading. In H. Singer & A. B. Ruddell (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading (pp. 722-750). Newark, NJ: IRA.

Shanahan, T. (1984). The nature of the reading-writing relationship: An exploratory multivariate analysis. The Journal of Educational Psychology.

Shanahan, T. (1988, March). The reading-writing relationship: Seven instructional principles. The Reading Teacher, 41(7), 637-647.

Shanahan, T. (1990). Reading and writing together: New perspectives for the classroom. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Shaughnessy, M. (1977). Errors and expectations: A guide for the teacher of basic writing. New York: Oxford University Press.

Simpson, M. (1995). Talk throughs: A strategy for encouraging active learning across the content areas. Journal of Reading, 38(4), 296-304.

Simpson, M., & Nist, S. (1990). Textbook annotation: An effective and efficient student strategy for college students. Journal of Reading, 34(2), 122-131.

Spivey, N. (1990). Transforming texts: Constructive processes in reading and writing. Written Communication, 7(2), 256-287.

Stahl, N. A., Simpson, M. L., & Hayes, C. G. (1992). Ten recommendations from research for teaching high-risk college students. Journal of Developmental Education, 16(1), 2-10.

Steffensen, M. S., Joag-Dev, C., & Anderson, R. C. (1979). A cross-cultural perspective on

reading comprehension. Reading Research Quarterly, 15, 10-29.

Stein, N. L., & Glenn, C. (1979). An analysis of story comprehension in elementary school children. In Freedle (Ed.), New directions in discourse processing. Norwood, Ablex.

Thorndike, R. L. (1973). Reading comprehension education in fifteen countries. New York: Wiley and Sons.

Warren-Leubecker, A., & Carter, B. W. (1988). Reading and growth in metalinguistic awareness: Relations to socioeconomic status and reading readiness skills. Child Development, 59, 728-742.

Weis, L. (1985). Between two worlds: Black students in an urban community college. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Willis, P. (1977). Learning to labor. Westmead, England: Saxon House.

THE C

By Susan C

Professiona
learning as
the standa
(Committe
program
Education)
existing se

Most colleg
years that
accreditatic
responding
goals, and
communica
being met.
connection
support, re
assessment
documents
students, a
developme
indeed, th
departmen
of maintain
However,
they have
greater co
increasing