Analyzing "Inconsistencies" in Practice: Teachers' Continued Use of Round Robin Reading

GWYNNE ELLEN ASH

Texas State University—San Marcos, San Marcos, Texas, USA

MELANIE R. KUHN

Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

SHARON WALPOLE

University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware, USA

This study analyzed in-service teachers' and literacy coaches' perceptions of Round Robin Reading to begin developing an understanding of the persistence of this practice in public schools in the United States. Surveying 80 teachers and 27 literacy coaches using an open-ended instrument, we found that many teachers continued to use Round Robin Reading for a variety of reasons. Teacher-given reasons for using Round Robin Reading included covering content, managing classroom behavior, improving fluency, and assessing students' literacy development. Distinct differences in knowledge of fluency research were identified in teachers who used and did not use Round Robin Reading in their teaching. Based on this research, we consider that professional development aimed at supplanting Round Robin Reading in instruction and focused on meeting teachers' instructional goals is essential; it appears that simply reviewing research that indicates Round Robin Reading is an ineffective practice is insufficient, in and of itself, to change practice.

The purpose of this research is to study in-service teachers' and literacy coaches' perceptions of Round Robin Reading (RRR) in order to better understand the persistence of this practice in public schools in the United States.

Address correspondence to Gwynne Ellen Ash, Texas State University—San Marcos, 601 University Drive, San Marcos, TX 78666, USA. E-mail: gwynne@txstate.edu

Given the common understanding among researchers and teacher educators that RRR is not only an ineffective strategy but also one that actively damages learners' comprehension of text and delays their fluency development, it is important to develop a solid understanding of why it remains so common a practice (Allington, 1980; Optiz & Rasinski, 1998; Stanovich, 1980). Considering the dearth of research that actually looks at why teachers remain wedded to such instruction, we consider the insight provided by these educators to be an important component in understanding not only why such practice continues, but also how it can be replaced by more effective instruction.

RATIONALE

Round Robin Reading

Round Robin Reading, or "the outmoded practice of calling on students to read orally one after the other" (Harris & Hodges, 1995, p. 222), may not be so outmoded in the classroom. Although it is a practice that "no authority recommends, including those who write and promote basal readers" (Cox & Zarrillo, 1993, p. 170), RRR is actively used by even some of the more "savvy" teachers of today (Cunningham & Allington, 1999; Ivey, 1999; Opitz & Rasinski, 1998), not only in elementary schools, but also in the middle and secondary grades. As such, even a teacher who "knows and uses 'best practice' teaching strategies [for his or her reading instruction]. . . . resorts to Round Robin Reading and low-level questions during social studies and science" (Cunningham & Allington, 1999, p. 174). Given the widespread awareness of the ineffectiveness of this practice among educators, we find its continued use disconcerting, yet it is only by asking practitioners why RRR remains part of their literacy curricula that we can develop insight into its continued use in the classroom and begin to create the kinds of professional development that can help teachers better integrate effective alternatives into their reading instruction.

Because many teachers realize that RRR is viewed as ineffective, a group of related practices that incorporate slight modifications to the RRR procedure have developed in its stead. The RRR Family also includes practices referred to as:

- *Popcorn Reading*, in which the order in which the students read is "random";
- *Combat Reading*, in which the students call on each other, attempting to catch each other "off task";
- *Popsicle Reading*, in which the students' names are written on popsicle sticks, and the order in which they read is based upon when their names are drawn; and
- *Round Robin Reading*, in which students are called on in a predetermined order, usually following their current seating arrangement.

In both earlier works (Ash & Kuhn, 2001; Ash, Kuhn, & Walpole, 2003) teachers have differentiated between and among these practices, often claiming to be avoiding RRR by using popcorn or combat reading.

In addition to observational evidence that RRR persists in our schools, studies exist in which teachers actively admit to use of the practice. Acknowledging that RRR as "something we know we're not supposed to do," teachers still use it, albeit under a different name, suggesting that it is less damaging when the students, rather than the teacher, call on their peers or when the order of readers is selected at random (Ash & Kuhn, 2001). Further, teachers often stated that they felt uncomfortable admitting to practices that they felt went against their scholarly knowledge of reading instruction.

The fact that some teachers' admit guilt when using RRR or its counterparts reflects its broad condemnation as a strategy in reading research and theory. For instance in his studies of disfluent readers in the primary grades, Allington (1977, 1980) found that such students were exposed to minimal practice in the reading of connected text as a result of the turn-taking aspect of RRR; for example, in a class of 24 students, it is likely that each child would spend less than two minutes reading during a typical 40 minute reading period. Stanovich (1986) also argued that a lack of access to connected text leads to increased difficulties in the literacy development of these learners; this, in turn, has been demonstrated to increase the gaps in growth between fluent and disfluent readers.

Allington (1980) also found that the interruptive nature of turn-taking in RRR provided poor models of skilled reading for students, presenting them only disfluent oral reading examples. Further, because peers or the teachers often provide struggling readers with the words before students can decode them independently, such interruptions serve to disrupt the development of accurate and automatic word recognition, preventing students from developing proficiency in their decoding. Developing such independence in word decoding is intricately linked to the automaticity that is a key component of fluent reading (LaBerge & Samuels, 1974; Stanovich, 1980).

Finally, RRR has been demonstrated to be damaging to students' social and emotional growth (Opitz & Rasinski, 1998). In her case study of middle school readers, Ivey (1999) found that the practice of RRR caused great stress for the students who were not reading on grade level (as well boredom for those who were). One student felt embarrassed to read aloud without practice. Another student who appeared to enjoy RRR, often volunteering to read, later confessed, "I raise my hand [to read] 'cause I want to read and get it done with 'cause the slow people read, and it takes them forever to get it done, what we have to read" (p. 186). Students' embarrassment and anxiety, when connected to reading, seems to work against the development of identities as readers.

Teacher Beliefs, Perceptions, and Change

Although teachers may express guilt about RRR, they are still using it. Research suggests that attempts at changing teachers' practices are difficult (Baker & Zigmond, 1990; Schumm & Vaughn, 1991). Perhaps some difficulties with changing long-entrenched practices relate to Moje's (1996) observation that "[i]t may be that inconsistencies lie not between what teachers believe and what they practice, but between what researchers believe and what teachers practice" (p. 191).

Further, few researchers (Santa, Isaacson, & Manning, 1987; Wolf, 1998) have conducted intervention research that actually attempts to change teachers' use of RRR. However, neither of these two studies focused on the teachers' perceptions regarding why they used RRR as part of their instruction. Santa and her colleagues were attempting to change the practice of their peers in the school, but no mention is made of these teachers' perceptions of RRR. Wolf notes that her teacher was eager to find an alternative to RRR, but does not provide a discussion about why she chose to use RRR before the intervention. Although these isolated cases resulted in teachers changing their oral reading practice, the widespread use of RRR continues, even in the face of research that discourages its use and teachers' awareness of that research. Why teachers continue to embrace RRR despite their conflicting knowledge of its ineffectiveness is unclear.

Because teachers still practice RRR, despite the acknowledgment by many of its damaging effects, research that attempts to understand the reasoning behind such persistence is needed. If we are truly to end teachers' reliance on RRR, it is important that its continued use in the classroom begins to be understood. It is only with an understanding of the reasons behind teachers' use of RRR that we will be able to determine how effective alternatives to this approach might begin to be adopted by teachers in its stead.

METHODOLOGY AND DATA SOURCES

Theoretical Framework

This study was framed within the paradigm of everyday constructivism. Everyday constructivism assumes that knowledge is created and recreated based on the life experiences of individuals who are members of a social community, and that knowledge is developed and known through the expressions and actions of those individuals (Schwandt, 1994). For the constructivist, "dialogue within a community engenders further thinking" and thus further construction of meaning, whether within that community or individually (Fosnot, 1996, p. 29). Further, constructivist inquiry aims to create "a set of working hypotheses: interpretive, tentative explanations of meaning" (Manning, 1997, p. 97).

Most research on teachers' perceptions has employed forced-choice surveys, with only Ash (2000), Moody et al. (1997), and Wood (1998) using individual and focus group interviews for data collection. It has been suggested that this research needs to be complemented by open-ended expressions of teachers' experiences as an attempt to understand better not only *what* these perceptions are, but also *how* they come about (Fang, 1996; Pajares, 1992).

Survey Design

In order to investigate these experiences and perceptions, data were collected through open-ended questionnaires. The questionnaires, included as Appendices A and B, probed knowledge of research and current practices related to RRR. Specifically, we investigated the use of RRR, knowledge of research related to RRR, goals and purposes for RRR, advantages and disadvantages in using RRR, and students' responses to RRR according to teachers and literacy coaches.

PARTICIPANTS

Potential participants were identified in one of three ways: through district-level representatives who distributed questionnaires to teachers working in their schools, through contact with one of the authors at in-service presentations, or through contact with one of the authors at a literacy coach training. Participants from all three recruitment methods completed the open-ended questionnaire, as well as giving their informed consent for participating.

These procedures identified a diverse set of participants. Nineteen participants were identified through surveys distributed by district personnel (17 elementary teachers, 2 middle school teachers). A total of 61 participants were identified through local (38), regional (10), and national in-service (13) conferences. These participants included 6 middle school teachers (grades 6−8), 20 primary school teachers (grades K−3), 22 elementary school teachers (grades 4−5), 7 multiage teachers (grades K−5), and 25 teachers who did not indicate their grade level. Eighty-two percent of teachers invited to participate chose to complete the survey. Finally, questionnaires were distributed to literacy coaches at a state-wide meeting. Twenty-seven of 35 literacy coaches present at the training chose to participate. All of these participants were in their second year as school-based professional development providers at the time of the study.

DATA ANALYSIS

Because of the nature of the questionnaires, they were analyzed first qualitatively and then quantitatively. Two researchers read through all data points

TABLE 1 Reported Use of RRR by Teachers

Grade level	Number of respondents	Frequency	Percentage
All	80	47	59
K−3	20	9	45
4−5	22	15	68
6−8	6	5	83
Multiage (K−5)	7	5	71
Did not indicate grade	25	13	52

and coded items. To answer our question about knowledge of research, responses were first sorted into two groups: those who used RRR and those who did not. Next, surveys were analyzed qualitatively to identify categories of responses for each of these two groups. At least two researchers analyzed all levels of data. Initial data categories were found to be in 90% agreement in the first level of analysis. Researchers then worked together to resolve any differences in categories. Finally, frequencies and percentages for each category were computed. To answer the questions regarding the use of RRR, we used only those surveys from participants who indicated that they did use RRR or a practice in the RRR family.

Findings

USE OF ORAL READING AND RRR

All 80 teachers indicated that they used some form of oral reading in their instruction. All 27 reading specialists indicated that the teachers they work with use some form of oral reading in their teaching. However, not all of the oral reading practices reported constituted practices in the RRR family.

Of the 80 teachers, 47 indicated that they use at least one member of the RRR family of practices discussed above in their instruction, and 9 of the 27 Literacy Coaches indicated that their teachers used RRR practices in their instruction as well. Table 1 summarizes these data, sorted by grade level when possible.

KNOWLEDGE OF RESEARCH REGARDING RRR

In answer to the question of what these teachers know about the research regarding RRR, our qualitative analysis revealed five different categories of responses for those teachers who used RRR, whereas five slightly different categories emerged among those who did not use these practices.

Responses from teachers who used RRR included the following:

1. acknowledging that research indicated that such reading practices were not recommended for instruction ("I believe that it's not a preferred approach, but it's still used.");

TABLE 2 Category Frequencies and Percentages for Knowledge of Research Regarding RRR Reported by Teachers Who Use It

Grade level (number of teachers)	Acknowledged research, but use RRR anyway or say research is wrong	Misconstrued research to support RRR techniques	Indicated little or no knowledge of research	Discussed research/ ideas unrelated to RRR	Left response area blank
All (47)	14 (30%)	8 (17%)	10 (21%)	8 (17%)	7 (15%)
K−3 (9)	2 (22%)	0	2 (22%)	4 (44%)	1 (11%)
4−5 (15)	1 (7%)	4 (26.5%)	4 (26.5%)	1 (7%)	5 (33%)
6−8 (5)	3 (60%)	1 (20%)	0	1 (20%)	0
Multiage (5)	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	0	0
Did not indicate (13)	6 (46%)	2 (15%)	2 (15%)	2 (15%)	1 (8%)

2. belief that research demonstrated that Round Robin or Popcorn Reading was a valuable practice, particularly for struggling readers ("I know we should use it because those who struggle can improve their comprehension.");
3. indicating they had "very little knowledge about the pros/cons";
4. discussing general reading research/ideas unrelated to RRR ("From what I've learned, balance is most effective"); or
5. leaving the response area blank.

These response categories, frequencies, and percentages are summarized in Table 2. In addition to those categories defined above, teachers who did not use the RRR practices indicated that research does not recommend these practices. Their responses are summarized in Table 3.

Literacy coaches exhibited similar patterns of understanding as their teachers but, as might be expected, were able to express a more thorough knowledge of research regarding fluency and RRR themselves. Table 4 represents the knowledge of the literacy coaches themselves. In addition, they

TABLE 3 Category Frequencies and Percentages for Knowledge of Research Regarding RRR Reported by Teachers Who Do Not Use It

Grade level (number of teachers)	Knew research	Misconstrued research	Indicated little or no knowledge of research	Discussed research/ideas unrelated to RRR	Left response area blank
All (33)	27 (82%)	1 (3%)	0	0	5 (15%)
K–3 (11)	8 (73%)	0	0	0	3 (27%)
4−5 (7)	7 (100%)	0	0	0	0
6−8 (1)	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)
Multiage (2)	1 (50%)	0	0	0	1 (50%)
Did not indicate (12)	11 (92%)	1 (8%)	0	0	0

TABLE 4 Category Frequencies and Percentages for Knowledge of Research Regarding RRR Reported by Literacy Coaches (n = 27)

Knew research	Demonstrated some knowledge of research	Indicated little or no knowledge of research	Seemed to misunderstand question	Left response area blank
18 (67%)	3 (11%)	1 (4%)	2 (7%)	3 (11%)

provided insights into their teachers' practices. Nine of the literacy coaches reported that their teachers did use some form of RRR, and 18 indicated that they did not. These insights are summarized in Tables 5 and 6.

GOALS/PURPOSES FOR USING RRR

For teachers who did use RRR, we also analyzed the surveys to learn about the teachers' goals when using RRR. Frequencies for each of the responses reported below represent the total number of goals reported, rather than the total number of participants, as some participants reported more than one goal. The teachers' most commonly stated goals for the use of RRR were the evaluation/assessment of students' reading (17) and the improvement of students' fluency (16). Other common responses included:

- providing a common level of knowledge/content (9);
- providing practice (7);
- improving students' comprehension and pleasing the students (e.g., students like it) (5 each);
- engaging the students, improving the students' self-confidence, and improving listening/attention skills (4 each);
- covering material speedily and accurately, allowing for teacher guidance/ feedback, and improving students' word identification accuracy (3 each);
- serving as a springboard for discussion, giving auditory learners what they need, and to improving students' vocabulary (2 each).

TABLE 5 Category Frequencies and Percentages for Knowledge of Research Regarding RRR Reported by Literacy Coaches Whose Teachers Use RRR (n = 9)

Acknowledge research, but use RRR anyway or say research is wrong	Misconstrue research to support RRR techniques	Indicated little or no knowledge of research	Learning new practices to supplement RRR	They have control of their instruction
1 (11%)	2 (22%)	2 (22%)	3 (33%)	1 (11%)

Numbers do not add up to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 6 Category Frequencies and Percentages for Knowledge of Research Regarding RRR Reported by Literacy Coaches Whose Teachers Do Not Use RRR (n = 18)

Know research	Misconstrue research	Indicate some knowledge of research	Indicate little or no knowledge of research	Left response area blank
4 (22%)	2 (11%)	4 (22%)	6 (33%)	2 (11%)

Numbers do not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Literacy coaches indicated that their teachers implemented RRR for similar reasons.

TEACHER-IDENTIFIED BENEFITS/DISADVANTAGES OF USING RRR

When asked, teachers who used RRR identified many benefits from its implementation. The most commonly identified benefits included increased student engagement as a result of listening to others read and ease of gathering of information for assessment of reading development (5 each); improvement of struggling readers' literacy development and the fact that all students hear all the reading material (4 each); good readers acting as role models, the provision of student support and interaction, and RRR ability to help students read and understand challenging text (3 each).

However, these identified benefits seemed to be in conflict with the issues they identified as disadvantages that emerged as a result of the same practices. For example, commonly identified disadvantages included students getting off task or failing to attend when others (particularly poor readers) are reading (9); RRR practices being time-consuming (5); students who are not reading on grade level experiencing difficulty reading aloud, and pressure being exerted on students who struggle (3 each); and struggling readers providing bad models for fluency, students (especially those who struggle) feeling uncomfortable reading aloud, and a lack of sufficient time to properly assess individual readers (2 each). Responses commonly included both an advantage, such as good readers act as role models, as well as the flip-side disadvantage, for example, struggling readers providing bad models.

TEACHERS PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENTS' RESPONSES TO RRR

Teachers who used RRR practices were asked to identify how students responded to the practice, and then to explain if any students responded differently than most, and if so, how and why. Teachers were not guided in identifying the responses as positive or negative; this designation was added in data analysis. Results are reported first for overall responses, and then for contradictory responses.

Reported positive responses by students overall occurred quite often. More than half of the respondents (31/47) indicated that their students enjoy being asked to read aloud in RRR style. Two additional teachers indicated that it was their readers who struggle who enjoyed it the most. However, teachers did identify overall negative responses as well. Four teachers indicated that although their students now like it, they did not until they got better/more used to it, and two teachers each indicated that listeners lose attention when others are reading and that students prefer to read independently. Finally, a single teacher indicated, in a thought-provoking response, "I can't say that any student of mine really loves oral reading, but they do it anyway."

When asked if some of their students responded differently than others, teachers categorized those who have differing responses in the following ways: struggling readers, high IQ readers, English Language Learners (ELL), LD/BD, ADHD, and students with identified special education needs. Six teachers responded that these students overall responded positively to being asked to read aloud in Round Robin or Popcorn style, with readers who struggle identified as the most eager to participate.

Four categories of negative responses by those students who respond differently from the rest of the class to RRR practices also emerged: avoidance of reading, emotional distress, off-task behavior, and preference for other methods of reading. Under avoidance of reading, there were many different responses, all by students who had difficulties reading, including students refusing to read aloud (6), avoidance behavior, such as avoiding eye contact, asking to go the bathroom, etc. (4), students giving up and asking other students to read for them, asking to be skipped, etc. (3) students "trying to disappear" (2), and students coming to the teacher ahead of time and asking to read shorter pieces of text aloud. The responses in the category of indicated emotional distress were almost all felt by those who experienced difficulty reading as well. Teachers indicated that struggling readers were reluctant to read aloud (5), or experienced embarrassment (5), stress (5), shyness (4), and fear. The only emotional concern identified in more proficient readers was that they became frustrated by slower readers (2). Off-task behaviors were not usually identified within the category of different student responses, but they included students' losing attention/focus/place (5), and students openly refusing to attend to the lesson (e.g., putting their heads down, not making eye contact). In the category of preference for other methods, one teacher indicated that some students prefer to read alone, rather than have to read in front of others.

DISCUSSION

We believe that the information gathered through this survey supports our contention that RRR is still a widely used instructional practice in public schools. Although these teachers were all taking part in non-mandatory

in-service, and would be identified as self-motivated regarding improving their instruction, more than half of them still use RRR in their instruction; further, more than 30% of this group acknowledged that the research said RRR was not best practice but they used it anyway. Finally, of those teachers involved in professional development with their reading specialists, one-third still used RRR. From our data, we have drawn the following conclusions:

- Teaching teachers about fluency research is important, but it probably will not be enough, in and of itself, to change their instructional practices.
- Teachers need to be encouraged to explore and evaluate research. They also need to be encouraged to gather and to evaluate their own data about their students.
- Classroom teachers need to have access to meaningful practices that will allow them to align their professional knowledge with their practical knowledge. It seems likely that this can best be accomplished through ongoing professional development (e.g., Schwanenflugel & Bradley, 2006).

It seems that having teachers understand that RRR is a highly ineffective strategy is necessary, but not sufficient. Many teachers (30%) who were aware of the research on RRR still chose to use it as an instructional practice. While we acknowledge that teaching teachers about fluency research and its implications for practice is a noble goal, our research indicates that contrary to extensive research and writing on the negative outcomes of RRR in the classroom, many teachers still believe that there are benefits to the use of RRR with their students. Some of these teachers believe that research indicates the effectiveness of RRR, while others choose to disregard extant research in order to use a practice that is clearly inconsistent with the findings of that research.

The ideas of the former group might be explained by their having simply misconstrued the research, given RRR's prevalence in the schools. For example, perhaps these teachers interpret the report of the National Reading Panel (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000) regarding guided oral reading as an endorsement of RRR. The latter group, however, concerns us more. In their cases, knowledge of research is actively disregarded in the face of more imperative needs. We believe that it is not that the teachers are acting in defiance of their beliefs; it is, as Moje (1996) points out, that their beliefs and ours differ on this point.

Our call (Ash & Kuhn, 2006) for teachers to engage in systematic research with their own students is an attempt to have the teachers contemplate the contradictions within their own observations of their students' responses. Although most teachers suggested that overall RRR was a positive experience for their class, when asked to look at their students as individuals, they often identified many of the same difficulties with RRR that are identified in the research (e.g., interference with comprehension, lack of attentiveness, stress, embarrassment, lack of real-world purpose, etc.). We believe that given the

opportunity to gather and reflect on actual student data in this area, perhaps through sustained professional development, teachers will have the opportunity to reflect on their beliefs and how these may or may not accurately represent student perceptions and responses.

An alternative interpretation of why teachers may be ignoring the research is alluded to in the comment by one teacher: "I know that the research says not to use it, but it works for me." We believe it likely that teachers who feel RRR works are unaware of effective alternatives to this practice, especially when it comes to covering material that is too difficult for many of their students.

Finally, as none of the teachers' goals seem at odds with alternative reading practices such as partner reading or guided reading, we believe that more must be done to create and share practices that could meet these goals without creating negative consequences for their students, either academically or emotionally. According to our data, these practices will need to be easy to manage, easy to implement, provide a way for all students to access difficult materials equally, and provide an opportunity for teachers to assess students' growth. For primary grades, these practices might include the following:

- Fluency-Oriented Reading Instruction (FORI) (Kuhn et al., 2006) involves students repeatedly reading a selected text, usually a story from the classroom's literature anthology or basal reader, several times over the course of a week. The text is first read aloud by the teacher while the students following along in their own copy. A discussion is held in order to direct attention to the importance of comprehension early in the lessons. Over the next few days, the students echo, choral, and partner read the text, and also take it home for additional practice as needed.
- Wide Reading Intervention (Kuhn et al., 2006) is designed to have students read significant amounts of text with teacher support. Over the course of a week, students are engaged in a scaffolded reading of either two trade books along with a selection from a basal or anthology or three trade books, thereby providing students with an alternative to reading a single text repeatedly. The texts are covered through echo or choral reading, with partner reading being implemented when time permits. Students are also encouraged to bring the text home if they need additional practice.
- Peer Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS) (e.g., Fuchs, Fuchs, & Burish, 2000) is a form of partner reading. Teachers assign partners to match higher and lower proficiency students. The partners engage in a series of turns reading, rereading, and retelling.

And for intermediate and middle grades, they might include:

- Jigsaw (Aronson, Blaney, Sikes, Stephan, & Snapp, 1978; Aronson, Blaney, Stephan, Rosenfield, & Sikes, 1977; Gunter, Estes, & Schwab, 1995) is an

adaptation of a basic strategy to increase student interdependence. First, students are assigned to one of several heterogeneously-grouped study teams, or expert groups, each with a text or text segment to read and a set of questions or goals to discuss. Next, the members of each study team join representatives from each of the other teams to form the jigsaw group. Each member of the jigsaw group is then responsible for teaching the other members of the group the text information from his or her study team.

- Peer Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS) (Fuchs, Fuchs, & Bursih, 2000) is described above.
- Reciprocal Teaching (Palincsar & Brown, 1984) is a form of cooperative learning. In reciprocal teaching, students read sections of the text silently, and then take turns leading a discussion of their material that includes questioning, summarizing, clarifying, and predicting.

Further, we believe that professional development that focuses on teachers' goals for instruction might help translate this research into practice. Much of the professional development literature indicates that in-services that focus on teacher-identified needs are more likely to provoke instructional change (e.g., Fang, 1996; Schwanenflugel & Bradley, 2006). We believe that when teachers are provided with high-quality professional development that introduces them to practices that meet *their* needs for improving students' literacy achievement, they are more likely to incorporate those practices into their instructional repertoire. We believe that this research gives us a beginning understanding of what some of those needs are.

CONCLUSION

Despite developing significant insight into the teachers continued use of RRR, what is still unclear is extensive: Why *has* the research regarding RRR not connected with practicing teachers? Why *are* teachers able to ignore the negative consequences that they, themselves, identify as unintended outcomes of RRR's use and continue with this practice? Why *are* established effective practices ignored and RRR chosen instead? What *process* gives rise to such inconsistencies between research and practice concerning RRR? We hope that future research will be able to provide us with insight into these questions as well.

REFERENCES

Allington, R. L. (1977). If they don't read much, how are they ever going to get good? *Journal of Reading, 21,* 57–61.

Allington, R. L. (1980). Teacher interruption behaviors during primary grade oral reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 72,* 371–377.

Aronson, E., Blaney, N., Sikes, J., Stephan, C., & Snapp, M. (1978). *The jigsaw class-room*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

Aronson, E., Blaney, N. T., Stephan, C., Rosen Field, R., & Sikes, J. (1977). Interdependence in the classroom: A field study. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *69*, 121−128.

Ash, G. E. (2000). *Middle school literacy teachers' ethical stances and role perceptions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Georgia.

Ash, G. E., & Kuhn, M. R. (2001, December). *Round Robin Reading Anonymous (RRRA): Investigating inservice and preservice teachers' continued pursuit of round robin reading*. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, San Antonio, TX.

Ash, G. E., Kuhn, M. R., & Walpole, S. (2003, December). *Flying in the face of research: Inservice teachers and their use of round robin reading research in progress*. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Scottsdale, Ariz.

Ash, G. E., & Kuhn, M. R.(2006). Meaningful oral and silent reading in the elementary and middle school classroom: Breaking the round robin reading addiction. In T. Rasinski, C. Blachowicz, & R. Lems (Eds.), *Fluency instruction: Research-based best practices* (pp. 155−172). New York: Guilford.

Baker, J. M., & Zigmond, N. (1990). Are regular education classes equipped to accommodate students with learning disabilities? *Exceptional Children*, *56*(6), 515−526.

Cox, C., & Zarrillo, J. (1993). *Teaching reading with children's literature*. New York: MacMillan.

Cunningham, P. M., & Allington, R. L. (1999). *Classrooms that work. They can all read and write* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

Fang, Z. (1996). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices. *Educational Research*, *38*, 47−65.

Fosnot, C. T. (1996). Constructivism: A psychological theory of learning. In C. T. Fosnot (Ed.), *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice* (pp. 8−33). New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., & Burish, P. (2002). Peer-assisted learning strategies: An evidence-based practice to promote reading achievement. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *15*, 85−91.

Gunter, M., Estes, T., & Schwab, J. (1995). *Instruction: A models approach*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Harris, T. L., & Hodges, R. R. (Eds.). (1995). *The literacy dictionary: The vocabulary of reading and writing*. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association.

Ivey, G. (1999). A multicase study in the middle school: Complexities among young adolescent readers. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *34*(2), 172−192.

Kuhn, M. R., Schwanenflugel, P. J., Morris, R. D., Morrow, L. M., Woo, D. G., Meisinger, E. B., et al. (2006). Teaching children to become fluent and automatic readers. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *38*(4), 357−387.

LaBerge, D., & Samuels, S. J. (1974). Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading. *Cognitive Psychology*, *6*, 293−323.

Manning, K. (1997). Authenticity in constructivist inquiry: Methodological considerations without prescription. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *3*(1), 93−115.

Moje, E. B. (1996). "I teach students, not subjects": Teacher-students relationships as contexts for secondary literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *31*(2), 172−195.

Moody, S. W., Vaughn, S., & Schumm, J. S. (1997). Instructional grouping for reading: Teachers' views. *Remedial and Special Education*, *18*, 347−356.

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel. Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction: Reports of the subgroups* (NIH Publication No. 00-4754). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Opitz, M. F., & Rasinski, T. V. (1998). *Good-bye Round Robin*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, *62*(3), 307−332.

Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction*, *2*, 117−175.

Santa, C. M., Isaacson, L., & Manning, G. (1987). Changing content instruction through action research. *The Reading Teacher*, *40*(4), 434−438.

Schumm, J. S., & Vaughn, S. (1991). Making adaptations for mainstreamed students: General classroom teachers' perspectives. *Remedial and Special Education*, *12*, 18−27.

Schwandt, T. A. (1994). Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 118−137). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

Schwanenflugel, P., & Bradley, B. (2006, December). *Teaching children to become fluent readers: An analysis of a multi-site study*. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Los Angeles, California.

Stanovich, K. E. (1980). Toward an interactive compensatory model of individual differences in the development of reading fluency. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *16*, 32−71.

Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *21*, 360−407.

Wolf, S. A. (1998). The flight of reading: Shifts in instruction, orchestration, and attitudes through classroom theatre. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *33*(4), 382−415.

Wood, M. (1998). Whose job is it anyway? Educational roles in inclusion. *Exceptional Children*, *64*(2), 181−195.

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire: Teachers[*]

Directions: Please answer the following questions as completely as possible. Please feel free to include additional comments at the end of the questionnaire.

Do you use oral reading in your classroom?

In what subjects?

How would you describe the way(s) you use oral reading in your classroom (popcorn, round robin reading, partner reading, teacher read aloud, etc.)?

What are your goals when using different oral reading practices in your classroom?

Do you feel you achieve these goals?

Are there any obvious benefits or disadvantages of the approach(es) you use?

How do your students respond to oral reading approaches?

Are there any students who react differently than most of their classmates?

What is your understanding of the educational research regarding oral reading as you use it in your classroom?

General Information

Grade level currently teaching_____ Teaching experience_____(yrs)

Currently teaching (Circle one): Self-contained Departmentalized Other_____
If departmentalized, subject(s) currently taught_____

Comments:

     Thank you for your participation in this research.

Note: on the actual questionnaire, extensive space was given for the responses.

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire: Literacy coaches*

Directions: Please answer the following questions as completely as possible. Please feel free to include additional comments at the end of the questionnaire.

Do your teachers use oral reading in their classrooms?

In what subjects?

How would you describe the way(s) they use oral reading in their classroom (popcorn, round robin reading, partner reading, teacher read aloud, etc.)? Please list all approaches, ad approximately how often they might use each approach.

What are their goals when using oral reading in their classrooms?

Do you feel they achieve these goals?

Are there any obvious benefits or disadvantages of the approach(es) they use?

How do their students respond to oral reading?

Are there any students who react differently than most of their classmates? What are their characteristics?

What is your understanding of the educational research regarding oral reading as your teachers use it in their classrooms?

What is your teachers' understanding of the educational research regarding oral reading as they use it in their classrooms?

General Information

Grade level currently teaching_____Teaching experience_____(yrs)
Currently teaching (Circle one): Self-contained Departmentalized Other_____
If departmentalized, subject(s) currently taught_____

Comments:

Thank you for your participation in this research.

Note: on the actual questionnaire, extensive space was given for the responses.