IMPLEMENTING INSTRUCTIONAL COACHING USING A PARTNERSHIP PHILOSOPHY MODEL TO TRAIN TEACHERS IN READING SKILLS.

Mariuxi Karina Briones Huayamave
Maria Rossana Ramírez Ávila

Profesora Guía: Karen Wigby Nieto

Trabajo Final para la obtención del Título de Magister en Educación Superior, con mención en las nuevas tendencias en la formación de profesores de inglés
Res. CONESUP RCP. S04-N°111.04
Guayaquil, Enero 2011.
Implementing Instructional Coaching

Abstract

This study explores the effect of a five-month instructional coaching program using a partnership philosophy model on English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers’ practices of teaching reading and their beliefs about reading. This action research used an exploratory design with two pre-experimental groups at different locations in two high schools of two coastal cities of Ecuador. The participants are six teachers in each school who have an average of 10 years of experience teaching and an intermediate English level of B1 according to the Common European Framework. Two five-week-cycles take place which include workshops, modeling, observation, and reflection.

To see the effect of implementing instructional coaching in teaching reading and teachers’ beliefs, pre-post class observations and a teachers’ beliefs survey were applied. Results on observations show a positive increase of usage of reading skills on both sites. Results on the pre-post belief survey in site B show a 16% increase change on teachers’ responses in favor of teaching reading different from site A where the results do not change. Though, there is little evidence that teachers have changed their beliefs on teaching reading, data collected from one of the coaching formats applied at the end of each of the two cycles, show that teachers have changed in their discourse by using the new terminology.
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Introduction

Professional development programs in education aim to bring about change in teachers’ practices, in their attitudes and beliefs and in the learning outcomes of students. The necessity of improving education has motivated people in the field to look for ways how to make these programs more effective. In-service teachers, most of the time, are required to be part of professional development programs that consist of short-term workshops about any methodological imperative that later they may have application in their classes.

The U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2000) conducted a survey on teacher professional development and training to provide a national profile of teacher quality in public schools in the 50 states and the District of Columbia in the United States. Five thousand, two hundred fifty-three teachers were part of this survey. The results showed that teachers spent one to eight hours in professional development that focused on state or district curriculum and performance standards among others during the 12 months. Two-thirds of the U.S teachers stated that they have no say in what or how they learn in the professional development opportunities provided to them in schools. Of the public school teachers who participated in any of the professional development activities examined in the survey, 18 percent indicated that their professional development was linked to other program improvement activities at their school to a great extent. About one-fourth of teachers (24 percent) indicated that their professional development was not
followed by school administration support in applying what they had learned. Thirty-two percent reported no follow-up sessions or additional training, and 35 percent indicated that their professional development was not followed by school activities in which they help other teachers put new ideas to use. These characteristics are mentioned by researchers as Guskey (2002) to lack important factors which would have an impact in teachers’ practices.

In Ecuador, according to a brief report on the Ministry of Education website (Ministry of Education 2010) teacher training is not current, but weak, and is lacking in continuity and formalized programming. In 1992, the Ministry of Education started the CRADLE project, a change in the English Curriculum program implemented in public schools. The main objective of this project was to “innovate and strengthen the teaching and learning process of English in order to develop communicative competence in listening, reading, speaking, and writing in the students” (Ministry of Education, 2010). Regarding the teacher training, part of this project was to create and implement training modules for English teachers, to work with universities that train English teachers, and to create a net of trained coordinators who after being trained in Ecuador and abroad, could replicate and train around five thousand Ecuadorian public school teachers. The Ministry of Education also started a ten year project, Plan Decenal, from 2006 to 2015 which intends to guarantee the quality of education in Ecuador with equity, intercultural and inclusive vision.

Part of the policies of this project aim at updating and training teachers. One of the goals of Plan Decenal was to motivate young people to become teachers by having a new system of teacher training and a continuous
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professional development program. This program consisted of training teachers in curriculum design beginning in 2008 and enrolling them in master degree programs and post graduate courses in the field.

The ME (2010) started another project in 2010, called Sistema Integrado de Desarrollo Profesional Educativo SiProfe which proposes to enhance teacher performance in the public school system, through improvements in initial training, continuing education, and continuing support. The objectives of this project include the implementation of software for course registration, training, support and continuous education by the end of 2010, distance courses by the end of 2011, Master degree programs and postgraduate courses in 2011, and a 5% increase in the number of evaluated teachers who reach a level of very good and excellent by 2012. Therefore in Ecuador there is a favorable environment for motivating teacher improvement.

Regarding professional development for English teachers in private schools, based on facilitator-researchers’ experience as teachers and consultants in the field (more than ten years), institutions provide some time for teachers to be trained. This training usually consists of teachers attending workshops prepared by the schools at the beginning of the school year or by requiring teachers to attend workshops offered by book stores and book publishers. This kind of training, through two to three-hour workshops has not been shown through research to lead to a change in Ecuadorian classrooms.

The Facilitator-researchers’ experience of working with teachers through a consultant program developed by an important English academy in Ecuador, that started in 1996, has led us to the conclusion that when training
sessions are imposed with no follow-up to measure their impact and application, do not really work. The academy where the facilitators-researchers (authors of this innovation) have worked since 2003 offers consulting to private schools in Guayas, Manabi, El Oro and Santa Elena provinces for their English programs. Consultants are required to spend one or two days a week in each school according to the agreement between both organizations. During that time consultants have to reorganize the English curriculum design the school has or create one if necessary, based on the institution’s needs. This process includes coordinating with authorities, observing classes, giving feedback, evaluating students with standardized exams, planning remedial classes, organizing events, training English coordinators and teachers by helping them to improve in their methodology.

The authors of this study were assigned as consultants in two new schools in two Ecuadorian coastal cities in 2008, at the beginning of the school year. After observing classes and supervising teachers in these institutions identified as “Site A” and “Site B”, the facilitator-researchers came to the conclusion that there were common problems among English teachers related to their practices.

Teachers taught with a traditional approach to teaching English. We define the traditional approach as the use of translation, and mechanical repetition. The teacher-student interaction in this approach focused on working with best students at the expense of the others, and teacher dominated monologues; lacking some important steps which would enhance students learning in an English as a Foreign Language context.
In EFL, one of the main goals of teaching English is to help students develop communicative competence in the language by managing and integrating the four basic skills which are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Observations done on both sites showed that reading is one of the least exploited skills in the classroom. Harmer (2007) mentioned the following:

Reading is useful for language acquisition. Provided that students more or less understand what they read, the more they read, the better they get at it. Reading also has a positive effect on students’ vocabulary knowledge, on their spelling and on their writing. (p. 99).

Observations of reading classes on both sites, showed that teachers included some characteristics described by Cross (1991) as a traditional reading class. Cross explains that after presentation and practice, a few lines are read aloud by a student. Exploitation is in the form of a question-answer session. The aim is to ensure that the learners get to know every word and the main grammar point. He also concludes that these traditional guidelines for dealing with a text are now discredited but they are still applied.

As result of classroom observations, we deduced that teachers believed the correct process for a reading lesson was to make students read aloud paragraph by paragraph, asking comprehension questions after each paragraph to the whole class orally. Often not one of the students answered the teachers, and worse, the teacher was the one who responded to the questions.

Consequently, it seemed that little learning from any reading text was happening, because students did not interact with it and read each section superficially. During this process, students couldn’t develop their own reading
skills to improve their English proficiency. They were unable to become autonomous readers capable of reading outside the classroom, or staying in touch with English from other sources. Cross (1991) mentions that students who are taught to read a foreign language efficiently and independently can remain in touch with it for the rest of their lives. Reading is useful for language acquisition and the teachers that the facilitator-researchers observed did not seem to be taking advantage of this skill and were underestimating it. Several studies (Harmer, 2007) regarding reading and most foreign language reading specialists view reading as an interactive process that emphasizes developing different skills (such as: previewing, scanning, skimming, summarizing, and contextual guessing) to improve the level of reading comprehension. Good teachers exploit reading texts to the full (Harmer, 2007) for comprehension rather than only by teaching grammar and vocabulary. Evidence for the current recommended practices for teaching reading were not observed in the classes of the schools where this action research was carried out.

In order to improve the English program and overcome the common problems observed on both Site A and Site B, one of the areas we decided to work on was to implement professional development programs which would help teachers apply strategies proven to be effective in the classroom. Research has identified different factors that affect the quality of these professional development programs. For example, Guskey (2002) suggested that the majority of training programs fail because they do not take into account two important factors, first, what motivates teachers to engage in professional
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development, and second, the process by which change in teachers typically occurs.

The necessity to implement an effective training program for the teachers on Sites A and B with the intention of facilitating change in their common reading practices and beliefs made the facilitator-researchers review several methods of training used in organizations, such as: workshops and instructional coaching. From the on the job training methods, instructional coaching was chosen as the topic of research for this study.

This form of coaching uses a partnership philosophy approach to train teachers because it suits an in-service training program and follows a coherent procedure which starts involving the participants in their training, creating a commitment from the beginning, then modeling, observing and providing feedback.

This research study adapted instructional coaching to train teachers on how to teach reading skills in order to improve the reading teaching practices in their classrooms. Twelve in-service secondary teachers were part of this study. This action research involved training teachers using the steps in instructional coaching which include: enrolling teachers, training sessions, modeling a class, observing teachers, giving support, and reflecting, in order to cause a change in their teaching practices. Facilitator-researchers wanted to know whether through this process teachers changed their teaching practices, as well as their beliefs about teaching reading.
Literature Review

The purpose of this study was to facilitate change in teachers’ practices when teaching reading and to provoke a change in teachers’ beliefs about reading. Based on the facilitators-researchers’ goal, theories on how people learn, teachers’ beliefs about reading, and theories on teaching reading were included in order to support the professional development program this action research intended to implement.

How people learn

Ordóñez (2006) mentions the following characteristics of learning using constructivism:

(a) it is an individual process to construct meaning, (b) it occurs from direct experience, that it shown through performance that activates real comprehension, (c) it occurs differently in each individual because it is significant and related to understanding, experiences and prior knowledge, (d) it becomes more significant, more directed to understanding of reality, when it occurs through authentic performances. (pp.15-16)

Education has changed through all these years demanding that teachers be constantly learning and changing. Malcolm Knowles (1980) brought the concept of adult learning and after years of research on how they learn, he made some conclusions about learning. First, adults have a need to be self directed. Second, adults accumulate experience that is a rich resource of learning. Third,
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people become ready to learn whatever they need to know or be able to do with the purpose of managing changing life tasks and problems more effectively. Fourth, adults learn better when learning experiences are organized around life situations than when they are presented in terms of subject units. Finally, though adults respond to external motivation, they are more motivated to learn when they experience the need to grow and develop towards self-fulfillment.

Teachers learning on the job


Brandsford et al., (2003) point out teachers learn from other teachers during formal and informal mentoring with an experienced teacher helping the new one by providing insight and advice. Another way is by teachers teaching other teachers through formal in-service education. Administrators encourage teachers with expertise to share what they know with their colleagues. Another way that teachers learn is by being in degree programs and in enhancement projects that are provided by consultants. Furthermore teachers learn by enrolling in graduate programs like master’s degree or continuing education in order to keep current with the new knowledge in their fields.

Knight (2007) mentions that years of research have indicated that traditional forms of professional development with poor or improvised training
are not effective, achieving no more than a 10% implementation rate. He also adds that teachers are unanimously critical of one-time programs fail to address practical concerns, lack follow up fail to recognize teacher expertise.

Guided by the statements of such experts as Knowles, Knight, and Brandsford, the facilitator-researchers looked for a model of professional development that considered teachers’ needs, experiences, and intrinsic motivation in order to provoke learning and change in their practices.

There are processes that enable teachers to achieve their full potential. From these processes, mentoring and coaching were analyzed. Randall and Thornton (2001) describe mentoring as a popular method of providing feedback at the pre-service level. The mentor is a classroom teacher who accepts a novice into their classroom for a period of teaching practice. Based on the Guidelines for Mentor Teacher Programs approved by the Virginia State Board of Education (2000) a mentor must be a classroom teacher who has achieved continuing contract status or a retired teacher who meets local mentor selection criteria. On the other hand, coaching, according to Kise (2006), is the art of identifying and developing a person’s strengths, a partnership between the coach and the person being coached. An on-line survey was conducted by the Center For Coaching & Mentoring, Inc. [CEO] to define the attributes of effective mentoring relationships according to partners’ feelings. The results of this survey established more differences between mentoring and coaching, summarized differences table 1 (Starcevich, 1998).
According to Table 1, a mentor is a person who is working in the same school, who has a level of expertise in procedures and methodology, so is able to guide novices. Coaches are external tutors that help teachers on a non-daily but systematic basis having a set agenda to reinforce or change specific skills and behaviors. Based on the established differences between mentoring and coaching and connecting those to the facilitator-researchers’ context, the coaching model is the guidance relationship that is studied in this research.

**Coaching**

There are different descriptions for some common forms of coaching. Based on Knight (2007) executive coaching is used for helping people become more competent in one or more areas of their professional lives. Coactive Coaching is where the client-coach relationship involves the whole of a person’s life; the agenda is based on the client, not the coach. Cognitive
Coaching is used to produce self-directed persons with the cognitive capacity for high performance, both independently and as members of a community. Literacy/reading Coaching is where the coaches perform different activities, working with students, and more with teachers to increase students’ literacy skills. Finally, Knight (2007) mentioned the following:

Instructional coaching focuses on a broader range of instructional issues by sharing a variety of effective practices that might address classroom management, content enhancement, specific teaching practices, or formative assessment. The instructional coach in other words collaborates with teachers so they can choose and implement research-based interventions to help students learn more effectively. (p. 13).

Considering the definitions of the types of coaching and keeping in mind that teachers learn better when their needs and experiences are taken into account, the facilitator-researchers decided to use Instructional coaching. This kind of coaching is based on a philosophy model that includes principles like voice, choice, equity that might influence changes on teachers’ traditional practices when teaching reading.

**Instructional coaching using a partnership philosophy model.**

Instructional coaching is based on a partnership philosophy which is “…a deep belief that we are no more important than those with whom we work and that we should do everything we can to respect that equality”. (Knight, 2007, p. 24)

According to Knight (2007) a Partnership Philosophy is based on seven principles which are: (1) Equality is believing the people we collaborate with
are no less important than us or anyone else, and that consequently their ideas, thoughts, and opinions are no less important than ours. (2) Choice is believing that choices lie at the heart of professional practice, and that when we take away others’ choices, we treat them as if they are not professionals. We have found that when we offer others choices, we actually increase the likelihood that they will embrace what we have to offer. Taking away choice is a bona fide recipe for resistance. (3) Voice is believing that a part of learning is helping people find the words they need to say what matters to them. Another important part of voice is making it possible for others to openly communicate what they think. (4) Dialogue is believing in the importance of conversations that enable people to think together. (5) Reflection is believing that learning can be enhanced when we have numerous opportunities to consider how what we’re learning might impact what we have done in the past, what we are doing now, and what we will be doing in the future. (6) Praxis is believing that learning is most meaningful when we reflect and recreate knowledge so that we can use it in our personal professional lives. (7) Reciprocity is believing that every learning experience we create provides as much of a chance for us to learn as it does for our learning partners. (p. 53-54).

Knight (2007) mentions that the principles numbered above are observed when implementing instructional coaching. First, the coach enrolls the teacher by conducting a one-to-one interview with each teacher prior to his or her experience of professional learning. The purpose of enrolling a teacher is to build rapport, learn about the collaborating teacher’s particular interests and concerns so that professional development can be differentiated, and explain
how the new teaching practice to be learned might address teacher’s concerns. In this step we find principles such as: equality, choice, voice and dialogue.

Second, the coach engages in \textit{collaborative planning} with the teacher; the coach meets with the collaborating teacher to discuss how a new teaching practice can be implemented effectively. Then, working collaboratively the coach and teacher co-construct an observation form to guide teacher observations of the coach, and coach observations of the teacher. At this stage, we practice equality, dialogue, praxis, reflection and reciprocity.

Third, the coach \textit{models the lesson}. The coach models a lesson in the collaborating teacher’s classroom while the teacher observes the lesson, using the co-constructed observation form that was developed during the previous practice.

Fourth, the collaborating teacher and coach meet for the purpose of \textit{teacher-directed post conferencing}. The coach and Instructional Coaching teacher meet to discuss what the teacher observed the coach doing while modeling the lesson. In these two steps, we include all principles of the partnership philosophy.

Fifth, the coach \textit{observes the lesson} being taught by the teacher. The coach observes the teacher while teaching a lesson using the new teaching practice. While observing, the coach uses the same co-constructed observation form that the collaborating teacher used while observing the coach modeled the lesson.

Sixth, the coach and teacher \textit{collaboratively explore the data}. The coach and teacher discuss the data gathered during the mutual observations,
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discussing what each observed. Finally, the coach provides continued support through observations and feedback while the teacher implements the new strategies. The coach continues to provide support until the teacher is fluent and habitual in their use of the new teaching practice. Again all the seven principles are observed. These seven components are used by an instructional coach when they are collaborating with teachers. The theoretical framework described next ties the seven components of coaching together. This theoretical framework is also referred to as the partnership approach to professional learning (Knight, 2007).

Because of the scarcity of research studies on the effectiveness of instructional coaching, Jake Cornett and Jim Knight (2008) from the Kansas Coaching Project at the Center for Research on Learning conducted a study to measure the impact of instructional coaching by evaluating whether or not instructional coaches have (a) any impact on whether or not teachers implement proven practices that they learn in professional development workshop and (b) any impact on the quality of teacher implementation of new teaching practices. Cornett and Knight’s study investigated instructional coaching as a means of professional development for teachers. Specifically, the purposes Cornett and Knight’s study were as follows:

1) Investigate the extent to which teachers’ use of new teaching practices could be encouraged through instructional coaching,

2) Determine effects on the quality of use of a new teaching routine when supported by instructional coaching, and
3) Find out if effects of instructional coaching persist following termination of Instructional coaching supports. Cornett and Knight followed the seven practices, components of instructional coaching based on seven principles: equity, choice, voice, dialogue, reflection, praxis, and reciprocity. Fifty-one teachers were part of Cornett and Knight’s study in eight secondary schools. A two way contingency analysis was conducted to evaluate whether teachers were more likely to implement the new teaching routine when 1) supported by an instructional coach after attending an after school workshop or 2) only attending the after-school workshop. Results of Cornett and Knight’s study indicate that teachers who were coached were more likely than teachers who only attended a workshop to use a new teaching practice inside the classroom during the study and after the research aids (RAs) stopped observing. Results also suggest that instructional coaching will increase the likelihood that teachers will use the practices with a higher degree of quality inside the classroom when compared with teachers who do not receive coaching support following professional development.

Based on a study done in the United States about teachers’ views on professional development, “…teachers do not resist changes so much as they resist poorly designed change initiatives.” (Knight, 2007, p.3). He also said that when teachers get an appropriate amount of support for professional learning, “…more than 90% of them embrace and implement programs that improve students’ experiences in the classroom.” (Knight, 2007, p. 4).

To enable teachers to change their customary ways of teaching reading and to provoke a change in their beliefs about reading, instructional coaching
using a partnership philosophy model was used for the professional development program because it immerses teachers in their learning rather than imposing change. The type of change in question, is a negotiating process between the person who leads it and the person who is implementing it. One of the challenges that a coach might face is not the professional development program itself, but the resistance to change of the participants who might also boycott the program. Some conditions that favor change are: interaction, respect, tolerance, feedback, communication, agreement, and interchange of experiences. (Knight, 2007). Most of these conditions are observed in the principles of the professional development program applied.

**Beliefs about teaching reading**

To help teachers’ change their traditional ways of teaching reading, first it is necessary to analyze teachers’ principles and beliefs about teaching reading. Teacher beliefs are defined as a primary source of teachers’ classroom practices including “The information, attitudes, expectations, theories, and assumptions about teaching and learning which they develop over time and bring with them to the classroom” (Richards, 2000, p.66). Richards and Lockhart (2001) explain, “Teachers’ belief systems are founded on the goals, values, and beliefs teachers hold in relation to the content and process of teaching, and their understanding of the systems in which they work and their roles within it” (p.30).

Richards (2000) mentions that previous research on teachers’ beliefs systems are the consequence of different sources like experience as students,
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school practice, personality, educational theory, research-based principles, and other sources.

To see the relationship between teachers’ beliefs and their teaching, Woods (as cited in Richards, 2000, p.69) did a longitudinal study of two teachers with different theoretical orientations, who taught the same ESL course in a Canadian university. One of them had a curriculum-based approach that consisted in what is preplanned according to the curriculum. The other teacher carried out student-based teaching where decisions were primarily based on factors related to the particular group of students in the classroom at that time. The findings showed that the decisions made by both teachers were consistent with deeper underlying assumptions and beliefs about language, learning and teaching since each teacher’s decisions and beliefs were completely different.

Smith (as cited in Richards, 2000, p. 70) in a Canadian study of ESL teachers in postsecondary ESL classes found that teachers’ instructional decisions were highly consistent with their beliefs, and that in terms of their personal beliefs, they establish the objectives of their courses. Some teachers that had a structure-grammar based view of language set up different goals from the ones that had a more functional based view.

Richardson, Anderson, Tidwell and Llyds (1991) conducted a study to determine the relationship between teachers’ beliefs on the teaching of reading comprehension and their classroom practices. They used a beliefs interview technique applied to 39 teachers from 4th to 6th grades. The interview was based on predictions about teaching practices and related to practices observed in their classrooms. This study demonstrates that the beliefs of teachers about
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reading comprehension are related to their classroom practices. They also had
the case of a teacher whose beliefs did not relate to her practice. This study says
that this teacher was in the process of changing beliefs and that these changes in
beliefs were preceding changes in practice.

From the research literature, what teachers do in class is based on what
they believe, and their beliefs influence the decisions they make in their
teaching context. Therefore, teachers’ beliefs affect what happens in the
classroom.

**Reading Strategies**

Reading is one of the four language skills. It is a receptive skill, like
listening. “This means it involves responding to the text or making sense of it,
rather than producing it.” (Spratt, Pulverness & Williams, 2007, p. 21).

Second language researchers have learned how expectations defined by
a reader’s culture influence what the reader understands when reading (Barnett,
1989; Marzano, Pickering & Pollock, 2001; Spratt et al., 2007). This means, if
people know how to read and their professional/educational backgrounds are
vast, their expectations are different from those individuals who don’t read.
Thus, second language researchers and instructors are applying these research
findings in classrooms through a variety of strategy-use activities that may lead
students to read better.

Reading is classified into intensive and extensive. Extensive reading
involves reading for pleasure. According to Harmer (2007), It refers to ….  
“reading which students do often but not exclusively from the classroom. They
may read novels, newspapers, web pages, magazines, or any other reference
material” (p. 99). Spratt et al., (2007) describe intensive reading as a language learning activity where texts are used to examine the language. The aim of the different activities such as classifying words or working out the grammar is to “make learners more aware of how language is used” (pg.22). On the other hand, Harmer (2007) describes intensive reading as …“the detailed focus on the construction of reading texts which takes place usually in the classroom” (pg.99). He suggested that in intensive reading, students should work with the reading texts, the vocabulary and the meaning to later move on to other learning activities.

Finally, Harmer encourages teachers to teach students to reflect on different reading skills. (p.100) According to schema theory…“comprehending a text is an interactive process between the reader’s background knowledge and the text.” (Carrell, Eisterhold 1983, p. 553). One important part of interactive process theory emphasizes the use of effective reading skills. Among these we have schemata…”the reader’s preexisting concepts about the world and about the text to be read.” (Carrell, 1987, p. 556).

Based on Grabe (1988, pg. 383) reading is interactive in the sense that many skills work together simultaneously in the process. Barnett (1989) mentions that second language teachers must consider other reader strategies that are not necessarily related to content schemata. Such reader strategies include previewing, skimming, scanning, contextual guessing, and summarizing.

Previewing is using students’ background knowledge about their culture and context to help them understand and recall information. Previewing is…”an
important activity in the reading classroom, but it is not necessarily a process of simply providing a preliminary outline of what is to be read.” (Carrell 1983, p.568). She mentioned that “Previewing can also include presenting key vocabulary and structures that the teacher predicts will cause difficulties” (Carrell 1983, p.568).

Skimming, unlike scanning, involves reading but at a fast speed. It is getting a general idea of what the text is about, reading quickly to find the main ideas. Skimming encourages the reader to find a general sense rather than the meaning of every word in order to distinguish important and unimportant information.

Scanning is finding specific, particular bits of information. Learners don’t need to read the entire text. This strategy concentrates on the skill of looking for the information needed to perform a specific task. The aim is achieved quickly. After one or two scanning tasks have been carried out the text is discarded so that the class can get on with another activity. All of these tasks can be given orally. (Spratt, et al., 2007; Tanner & Green, 1998).

Summarizing belongs to high-level thinking in Bloom’s taxonomy and a lot of practice is required to be good at it. “It requires students to distill information into a parsimonious, synthesized form” (Marzano, et al., 2001, p. 30).

Contextual guessing is making guesses about the meaning of words by looking at the surrounding words or situations. It helps you understand the meaning of the words and paragraphs by reading the context. (Tanner & Green, 1998). According to Krashen (1993)
“Despite the presence of occasionally unhelpful or misdirective contexts, readers eventually arrive at meanings of unknown words. The few that escape readers, that must be looked up or that readers get completely wrong, are a tiny minority compared to the enormous number successfully acquired”. (p. 9).

In order to implement these skills in the classroom, teachers had to develop simple exercises which started by eliciting information, connecting students’ background knowledge to the subject matter of study, hooking them into what they were going to be exposed to and then working with the reading itself, finally, students were presented comprehension activities different from the book for better understanding. Teachers needed to be aware of the age, interests and appropriate methodology for adolescents. These exercises were divided by the stages of reading: pre, during and post reading stages. (Spratt et al., 2007; Harmer, 2007).

**Pre-, during, and post reading**

A way for the teacher to encourage the use of effective reading strategies in the classroom is by developing exercises to elicit information and divide it in stages in the reading lesson (Barnett, 1989).

Pre-reading instruction introduces students to a particular text by eliciting or providing appropriate background knowledge (previewing) in order to activate necessary schemata and hook them into the text by different activities such as predicting, which is a major factor in reading, making it an active process (Bruner, 1960; Harmer, 2007). The pre-reading instruction prepares students to read the text. It is during this stage that the teacher brings
out the students' past experiences and their general knowledge about the type of
text they are going to read. It serves to motivate students and to get them
interested in both the topic and the text they are preparing to read.

While reading exercises, help students develop reading strategies, to
improve their control of the second language, and decode problematic text
passages (Barnett, 1989). In while-reading activities, students check their
comprehension as they read. Teachers can offer concrete exercises in the form
of controlled practice and guided reading activity sheets, which might include
guessing word meanings by using context clues (contextual guessing), word
formation clues, or cognate practice, predicting text content, reading for
specific pieces of information (scanning), reading to grasp the main idea or gist
(skimming). (Barnett, 1989).

Post reading exercises first check students’ comprehension and then lead
students to a deeper analysis of the text (Barnett, 1989). Post reading exercises
involved oral or written activities to develop students’ comprehension of the
text and to apply new information. Teachers may measure these by providing
freer practice such as summarizing.

Having the support of how people learn, how teachers learn on the job,
and how teachers could teach reading effectively, the facilitator-researchers
explored the effect of implementing instructional coaching with teachers’
practices and their beliefs. This study intended to first, explore whether or not
teachers change their practices while teaching reading through the
implementation of reading skills through pre, during, and post reading activities
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and second, to explore whether or not teachers change their beliefs about how teaching reading.

**Description of the Innovation**

This innovation was to train teachers from April to August 2009 with instructional coaching using a partnership philosophy model in order to facilitate changes in teachers’ pedagogical practices in their reading classes and in their beliefs about teaching reading.

The implementation of this innovation was supported by the concepts of instructional coaching using a partnership philosophy model (Knight, 2007), the studies on teachers’ beliefs and how they learn (Richards & Lockhart, 2001), and how reading skills facilitate reading comprehension in students (Grabe, 1988; Barnett, 1989).

**Objectives of the Innovation**

After the implementation of instructional coaching using a partnership philosophy approach, the teachers would be able to:

(a) Include in their reading classes: pre, while and post reading activities using the skills taught: previewing, scanning, skimming, contextual guessing or summarizing to facilitate reading comprehension in their students; and,

(b) Change their beliefs about reading from not implementing reading skills to implementing them to facilitate reading comprehension.
The innovation of this action research based on instructional coaching was adapted from Knight’s partnership philosophy through the components of coaching that was applied from April through August of 2009. Facilitator-researchers had to adapt this professional development program by including workshops and adjusting forms used in instructional coaching. Another change was to work with the teachers as a group, since instructional coaching is oriented to individuals and in these two high schools the English area was the unit of study, two groups of six teachers participated. This innovation was applied from April through August of 2009.

**Implementation stages**

Table 2 shows the process of implementation that facilitator-researchers followed during this investigation to answer the research questions and reach research objectives.

**Table 2**  
*Components of Instructional coaching using a partnership philosophy approach.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enroll:</th>
<th>Getting teachers on board by using one to one interviews, group meetings. Forms were adapted from instructional coaching for this study to give teachers a choice on their training and to identify teachers’ practices. (See appendix 1.1, 1.2, 1.3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cycle 1: May – June 2009</td>
<td>Translating research into practice by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One training session was carried out on Reading as an interactive process: reading skills presented in this first session: previewing, skimming and scanning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>training sessions.</th>
<th>Modeling</th>
<th>Providing a model lesson in the teachers’ classrooms with the teachers’ students. Teachers observed and completed the observation form created for this study. A post-conference meeting was held afterwards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observing</td>
<td>Watching teachers in a lesson and gathering data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflect</td>
<td>Pausing to consider what has been learned during the coaching activity through the use of after-action report forms and post-conference feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cycle 2: July – August, 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translating research into practice by training sessions.</th>
<th>A second training session was carried out on Reading as an interactive process: reading skills presented in this second workshop: contextual guessing and summarizing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>Providing a model lesson in teachers’ classroom with teachers’ students. Teachers observed and completed the observation form created for this study. A post-conference meeting was held afterwards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing</td>
<td>Watching teachers in a lesson and gathering data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect</td>
<td>Pausing to consider what has been learned during the coaching activity through the use of after-action report forms and post-conference feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Objectives**

The objective of this study was to describe the effect of a five-month instructional coaching program using a partnership philosophy model on EFL teachers’ practices on reading skills, and their beliefs about reading. This professional development program was implemented in two high schools of two coastal cities of Ecuador between April and August of 2009.
Research Questions

1. What is the effect of implementing instructional coaching using a partnership philosophy in teaching reading?
2. What is the effect of implementing instructional coaching using a partnership philosophy on teachers’ beliefs about teaching reading using skills?

To answer the first question related to the effect of the coaching program on teaching practices, facilitator-researchers used class observations.

To answer the second question related to changes in teachers’ beliefs about teaching reading, the teachers completed a Teachers’ Beliefs Inventory on reading which was applied at the beginning and end of the process.

Methodology

To answer the research questions the design applied was action research. Action research is used “to improve teachers’ understanding of classroom teaching and learning, and to bring about change in classroom practices.” (Richards & Lockhart, 2001).

This action research used an exploratory design in two identified as Site A and Site B. This research includes qualitative and quantitative data based on the instruments used. Data collected on observations was quantitative and a pre-post survey applied was mainly quantitative with qualitative item analysis of the survey.
Description of the Participants

Authorization to carry out the innovation was given by the institutions involved. After their approval, teachers who belonged to the English department of the two high schools were informed of the implementation.

Site A.

“School A” high school is located on the coast. Its population is about 1,500 students. It’s a co-ed school with a staff of about 120. It is a family-owned private school. The English area of this high school is made up of 6 teachers. Five of them have degrees in teaching with an average of ten years of experience. The coordinator doesn’t have a teaching degree but he is currently enrolled in a distance program to get it. Their English proficiency level goes from intermediate to advance according to the language academy scale where they currently study. According to the Common European Framework (a document created by the Council of Europe as part of its policy to promote foreign language learning), all of the teachers are at a B1 level (threshold- first stage at an independent user level). In reading, this means teachers “can understand texts that consist mainly of high frequency everyday language, understand the description of events, feelings and wishes in personal letters” (taken from the Council of Europe website www.coe.int).

Site B.

This coastal city co-ed high school has a student body population of 1200 students, and a staff of 65 teachers. The English area is made up of ten
teachers, three teachers for the primary school, and seven teachers for the high school. The seven secondary teachers were part of this study. They all have degrees in teaching and an average of ten years experience. Their English proficiency level goes from beginning to low advanced according to the language academy scale where they currently study. According to the Common European Framework, teachers are at a B1 level (threshold- first stage at an independent user level).

For the purpose of comparing the results of this study on site A and site B, only six teachers from each school directly participated in the study, in order to keep the same number of participants on both sites. For this reason, the results of one of the seven teachers from site B were eliminated at random.

**Instruments and procedures**

**Observations**

To answer the first research question to observe the effect of instructional coaching using a partnership philosophy approach on the English area, class observations were carried out. Facilitator-researchers adapted the instructional coaching observation form to be used when observing teachers’ reading practices. In order to observe the usage of reading skills, the observation form included the description of the three stages of reading: pre, while and post reading activities with the reading skills taught: previewing, skimming, scanning, contextual guessing and summarizing; divided in the three stages mentioned. The data collection instrument was a checklist. During the time of observation facilitator-researchers ticked the skills teachers applied.
Two important characteristics of these observations were: (a) they were not participative, facilitator-researchers did not interact with the teacher or students, and (2) they were not announced. Teachers did not know when the observer was entering the classroom.

**Pre-innovation observation**

Observations done during the last trimester of 2008 school year, before implementing instructional coaching, used a form provided by the language academy, in order to standardize the information and compare results, data collected at that time was passed to the new form created for this innovation.

**During-innovation observation**

Three observations were done during the five months of the innovation. One after the first workshop, facilitator-researchers observed if there was presence of the first skills presented (previewing, skimming and scanning). A second and third observation were carried out after the second workshop. Then we observed the whole process of a reading class (pre, during, and after reading activities) with the presence of the reading skills, which were part of the workshop. Teachers were observed for 40 to 80 minutes, a class period for each observation. In the third observation, we analyzed the results of teachers’ reading practices after implementing instructional coaching and compared these results with observations done before this professional development program.

**Surveys on Teacher’s beliefs about reading**

In order to address the second research question of this study aimed at measuring the effect of the instructional coaching on teachers’ reading beliefs,
the facilitator-researchers administered a survey on teacher’s beliefs about reading. This survey was taken from a study conducted by Duffy & Methany (1978). They considered this instrument an efficient and reliable means for assessing teachers’ generalized reading beliefs. It demonstrated that the beliefs of teachers about reading comprehension are related to their classroom practices (See Appendix 1.4.).

This instrument was applied at the beginning of the innovation and at the end of the process in order to find out if there was a match between what teachers believe and their performance in the classroom. The instrument was also used in the research in order to observe and compare if teachers changed their beliefs as a result of instructional coaching.

Duffy and Methany’s (1978) survey on teachers’ beliefs inventory about reading was adapted and reduced from 50 to 18 items for the purpose of this investigation. The 18 items were divided into two categories. Items 1,2,3,5,6,8,12,13,14 favor teaching with reading skills. Items 4,7,9,10,11,15,16,17,18 emphasize the opposite which is not teaching reading through developing skills or not devoting enough time to develop them as a need to improve the reading success of students. Teachers had to read the statements and agree or disagree using the following Likert scale: A means strongly agree, B agree, C neutral or undecided, D disagree and E strongly disagree.
Variables

To explore the research questions, the following variables were identified:

**Dependent variables.**

a. Teachers’ practices when teaching reading

*Conceptual Definition.* Teaching reading is an interactive process between the text and the reader, this process emphasizes the usage of reading skills.

*Operational definition.* That is by applying pre, while, and post reading activities using skills as previewing, skimming, scanning, contextual guessing and summarizing.

b. Teachers’ beliefs about reading

*Conceptual Definition.* Teachers favoring reading lessons with the application of reading skills.

*Operational Definition.* That is by the application of reading skills as a result of teacher’s decision-making and action.

**Independent variable.**

Instructional coaching using a partnership philosophy approach.

*Conceptual Definition.* Instructional coaching: enrolling teachers in this training, identifying teachers’ practices, translating research into practice through workshops, facilitator-researchers modeling classes to
teachers, facilitator-researchers observing classes, teachers reflecting about their classes, exploring data obtained and supporting teachers.

This is a coaching technique which is based on a partnership philosophy that emphasizes: (1) Equality: Instructional coaches and teachers are equal partners; (2) Choice: Teachers should have a choice regarding what and how they learn; (3) Voice: professional learning should empower and respect the voice of teachers; (4) Dialogue: professional learning should enable Authentic Dialogue; (5) Reflection: it is an integral part of professional learning; (6) Praxis: Teachers should apply their learning to their real-life practice as they are learning; (7) Reciprocity, instructional coaches should expect to get as much as they give. Instructional coaching immerses teachers in their learning rather than imposing change. (Knight, 2007).

Data Analysis

Class observations

The unit of analysis is two English areas. The usage of skills in the observations of the each group was tallied. The presence of reading skills before and after implementation of instructional coaching in both institutions was contrasted. The percentage of increase was calculated.
Surveys on teachers’ beliefs about reading.

The results for items that favored teaching applying reading skills are reported as totals for each site. (see Appendix 1.4).

Each positive item was given a value: 5 for Strongly agree (A), 4 for Agree (B), 3 for Neutral or undecided (C), 2 for Disagree (D), and 1 for Strongly Disagree (E).

After teachers completed the survey, the results were included in a table according to teachers’ answers. This means, if a teacher in item 1 marked A (strongly agree), this was put under 1A. This treatment was done with all teachers and items. When this data was classified by question, the number of teachers’ responses with the same answer was multiplied by the value assigned. For example, if three teachers marked item 1 as strongly agree (A): three times five equals fifteen. That amount was added horizontally and then vertically to have a total quantity.

A table was created to show the results of beliefs that favor teaching with reading skills before and after instructional coaching for the six teachers of each site. The percentage of change was calculated.

Implementation schedule

Table 3 shows the months when this innovation took place, the activities done and data collected.
Research question 1. What is the effect of implementing instructional coaching using a partnership philosophy in teaching reading skills?

Class observations.

As shown in Table 4, class observations done by facilitator researchers on site A and B reveal there was an overall average increase of 216% of usage of reading skills considering results on both sites.
Table 4

Site A – Site B Reading skills observed
before and after instructional coaching: By English Area
(N = 6 teachers each site)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subskills observed</th>
<th>SITE A</th>
<th></th>
<th>SITE B</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before 2008</td>
<td>After 3-13 Aug 2009</td>
<td>% Increase</td>
<td>Before 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previewing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skimming</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scanning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual guessing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for 6 teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>267%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual results (Figure 1) show that there was an effect of instructional coaching which increased the usage of reading skills during the implementation. Before the instructional coaching program only one or two skills were applied, as shown in Figure 1 which demonstrates that there was a tendency to use at least one reading skill by all teachers.
Research question 2. What is the effect of implementing instructional coaching using a partnership philosophy on teachers’ beliefs?

Survey results reported in Table 5 show that there were no changes in teachers’ beliefs responses to questions related to Positive beliefs about teaching reading in Site A compared to a medium size effect (16%) increase in Site B.

Table 5
Site A & B - Beliefs Inventory Results:
Positive beliefs about using reading skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before coaching score</th>
<th>After coaching score</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site A</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site B</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facilitator-researchers made an item analysis of questions that favored teaching by using reading skills on both sites in order to get more detailed understanding on which item there was more/less impact.

Table 6

*Comparison between before and after results by item.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions related to beliefs favoring teaching with reading skills</th>
<th>Site A</th>
<th>Site B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>After</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0-7% change = negligible effect size
8-19% change = small effect size
20-28% change = medium effect size
29+% change = large effect size (Marzano, et al, 2001).

**Positive beliefs about teaching with skills.**

Of the nine items related to beliefs favoring teaching reading with skills introduced, there was more increase on the following items on both sites:

- 1: I believe that teachers should directly teach the basic skills of reading to those pupils who need them.
13: I believe that reading is composed of a series of hierarchical skills which must be taught sequentially and then used in combination if one is to read successfully.

There are other items that had a high increase change but on one site only:

- 2: I believe that contextual clues are the most important word recognition aids and should receive more instructional emphasis than sight words or phonics. (Site B)

- 12: I believe that reading is a difficult process which must usually be taught in a step-by-step sequence if we are to develop good readers. (Site A)

**After action report**

Even though there was a small change in teachers’ beliefs as shown in Table 5. Analysis of the “After action report” form, which is part of instructional coaching, revealed that there was a change on teachers’ discourse. This form was made up of questions regarding what was done in the classroom, what was not done, what teachers needed to implement in their coming classes. This form was given to the teacher after each observation done for them to fill it out. Facilitator-researchers considered this information when having individual post conference with teachers.
Table 7

Site A & B – After Action Report Analysis by Category:
(N= 6 teachers in each Site)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th># Site A</th>
<th># Site B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1: Teachers’ usage of new terminology regarding reading skills.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2: Teachers’ perception of application of reading skills in their practices.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3: Teachers’ decision on implementing reading skills in future practices.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to category 1 indicate that all teachers used the technical terminology of each skill taught and/or they referred to the reading process introduced (pre, while and post reading activities). Regarding category 2 (teachers’ perception of application of reading skills), most of the teachers identified the ones they used, they explained which one was missing and why they didn’t use it in that reading lesson. It means even if teachers didn’t use any reading skill they were able to explain why they decided not to include it. Lastly, in category 3, there was a positive intention of taking actions to include reading skills in their next lessons.

On site A some of the teachers’ responses in the after action report were:

- “This (filling out this format) helped me out a lot. I saw things I didn’t see before on reading skills”.

- “It is a good strategy to teach and learn English especially for reading class”.
- “I’ve improved on the second stage. I need to work on pre-reading skills”.
- Before my reading classes were boring and couldn’t get my attention but now my sts. are interested about my reading class making possible a complete understanding”.

On Site B some of the teachers’ responses in the after action report were:
- “It was good, Students likes the activity and practice reading”.
- “I think this time my students give ideas if what the story was about by looking at the pictures. They got interested in the reading by looking at the pictures”.
- “It was easy for the students to read understand the story after the first activities”.
- “I want my students to improve their reading. They had to work with pre-reading and while –reading activities like previewing, skimming, and scanning”.

The “After action report” form includes a section for additional comments. Below, there is a list of comments from teachers on site A and B which favor instructional coaching:
- I can say that it (previewing) is a good strategy to reading class. For me, visuals are more important because it gets sts. attention”. (Site A).
- “It’s a good way to make teachers be aware of their teaching practices”.
- “My classes are better”. (Site B).
- “I need to plan my classes more to have more time”. (Site B).
- “I need to prepare more activities and be ready to help my students”. (Site B).

**Discussion**

This action research with its two research questions aimed to measure effect on teacher practices on reading as result of the innovation and change on teachers’ beliefs about reading. The first research question determined if teachers were able to put into action the reading skills as a result of implementing instructional coaching using a partnership philosophy within a five-month innovation.

The results of observations indicate that there was an increase in the presence of skills if we compare observation “0” (pre-innovation) and observation “3” on both sites. Regarding the skills applied, observations demonstrate that there was an increase in the presence of reading skills as an area as shown in table 4 on both sites: 267% increase in Site A and 171% in Site B. It was observed that scanning was the only skill noticed before the innovation. This might be because teachers on both sites use textbooks and they included questions to measure reading comprehension. Nevertheless these questions were answered by the teachers instead of the students. During innovation, teachers applied previewing, contextual guessing and summarizing more than skimming during and after the innovation as shown in Figure 1.
An unexpected result of the innovation was related to a change of discourse when talking about teaching reading. During a review of data collected by other instruments applied during the innovation, observation data was correlated with information provided in another form called “After action report”. This leads to the following insights: (1) at the beginning of the process, the facilitator-researchers observed that teachers were not familiar with terminology of these skills. After Action Reports demonstrated that terminology presented in the workshops was used by the teachers in general when they filled this instrument in; (2) the reading process, as shown in observation three, included: pre, while and post activities. After the innovation teachers applied at least one skill in each stage. Teachers were aware of all skills, as shown in “after action report” form, and if they didn’t apply any they tended to plan to include them in future classes.

Richards and Nunan (2002) mention that part of the professionalization of language teaching involves the codification of the knowledge of the field into explicit goals for teachers’ preparation and effective methods for achieving these goals. The implementation of this professional development program made teachers aware of the terminology regarding reading skills (as evidenced in the after action report), the stages of a reading class, and the application of skills in their reading practices (presence of skills as shown in observation protocols).

Analyzing the reasons that may have caused this effect, teachers being more aware of terminology, facilitator-researchers consider that this change was a result of teachers being involved in a professional development program using
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a partnership philosophy model. On this action research, teachers participated, during the innovation, in a dialogic approach.

From the beginning, teachers were not only involved in one-session workshops (training-as-usual), they were also part of a follow up program that included demonstration reading lessons given by facilitator-researchers, teachers observing a class, applications of new training, and reflection on their common and new practices.

This complete process might lead teachers to consider and make changes in their practices when teaching reading. Before the innovation, the only skill teachers practiced in their classes was scanning because the texts had activities after the readings. It was observed after instructional coaching that most of the teachers applied three or more skills in their classes, only one teacher applied two of them. It is important to say that all of them included pre, while and post reading activities.

Based on their interpretation of the data, facilitator-researchers conclude that instructional coaching using a partnership philosophy approach may result in positive changes in any training, in this specific case teaching practices using reading skills. This professional development program is adaptable to any context and needs of educational institutions, since it starts with observation of what needs to be implemented as well as the professional development interests of the participants and data collection of prior knowledge of participants in order to plan the training sessions with a follow-up support and encouragement to continuity.
The English language academy consultancy program is still on in Site A and the enduring impact of the instructional coaching program validates the results of this action research. One of the facilitator-researchers works with the same teachers and has noticed that there is a difference in teaching reading practices, from the previous years (mechanical exercises, translation activities, little participation of students, reading out loud activities) to what teachers do now: (a) They plan their lessons and ask for feedback before applying, asking for suggestions to apply any skill, (2) there is more teacher-student and student-student interaction, (3) a better-planned reading lesson is observed, (4) a logical, coherent sequence that starts with pre, while and post reading activities is planned.

In site A in 2010, teachers developed reading worksheets with reading of texts used in other school years. Reading texts were selected according to their content, which had to be of interest to teenagers and the social impact that its information have. These activities are done in classes called “reading workshops” which were prepared to reinforce students learning.

Another issue to consider is that instructional coaching was effective with these participants because it observes some characteristics of constructivism which facilitate adult learning, in this specific study, teachers’ learning. As well as some principles of adult learning described by Malcolm Knowles (1980), adults have a need to be self directed and are more motivated to learn when they experience the need to grow and develop towards self-fulfillment. Getting the teachers involved in their own training and experiencing themselves the changes of their lessons and the response of their students might
have been the incentives for them to improve in their reading practices in order to facilitate learning and change their teaching practices.

Regarding the second research question, the data described the effect of the professional development program on change in teacher’s beliefs about reading. As mentioned by Darling-Hammond and Baratz-Snowden (2007), successful professional development programs confront teachers’ initial beliefs about teaching as a springboard for surfacing misconceptions. When analyzing each question on both sites in a combined analysis, facilitator-researchers noticed that even though there was no change in Site A, observations of classes and teachers perceptions of application of skills in their lessons demonstrated that there was a change on what they decided to include in their future plans.

There was a change in the following beliefs emphasizing positive beliefs about teaching with skills: (a) I believe that teachers should directly teach the basic skills of reading to those pupils who need them, (b) I believe that reading is composed of a series of hierarchical skills which must be taught sequentially and then used in combination if one is to read successfully.

These results from the survey also demonstrate that there was a change in teachers’ beliefs being that: (a) they now consider the skills as basic skills to teach reading, (b) they need to teach reading in a sequential order to be successful at this skill. (pre, while and post reading activities), (c) Teachers don’t only use comprehension questions in their reading classes as they did before, (d) they don’t assign texts as homework, (e) they consider it takes a lot of instructional time to try to have students decode the message, (f) they also believe that contextual guessing and summarizing help comprehension.
Results of the survey about teachers’ beliefs on reading lead to the following reflection: (a) teachers might have not been aware of the terminology and filled out the survey at the beginning just to complete the form as required by the facilitator-researchers but not done with conscious awareness. They gained understanding of the terms during the professional development program and by the end filled out the questionnaire with a better understanding of the concepts. If that were the case, teachers might have changed their beliefs about reading instruction as a result of the implementation of this professional development program; and, (b) in the pre-survey applied, there could have been the presence of the Hawthorne effect: participants may include false answers in order to seem positive or convenient simply because they are being a part of a study. (McMillan & Schumacher, 2007), (c) no changes on the results of teachers’ beliefs survey on site A might have been the same that occurred in the study conducted by Richardson, Anderson, Tidwell and Llyds (1991) to determine the relationship between teachers’ beliefs on the teaching of reading comprehension and their classroom practices. They had the case of a teacher whose beliefs did not relate to her practice. This study says that this teacher was in the process of changing beliefs and that these changes in beliefs preceded changes in practice. This might be the case of the group of teachers in Site A. Even though their pre-post teachers’ beliefs survey did not change, their class observations and “After action reports” evidenced a change in their reading lessons.

It would have been helpful if facilitator-researchers had gone over the questionnaire with the participants after the first application with the group, or
somewhere during the process, to discuss items and check understanding of each item in the questionnaire.

When data was being analyzed the “After Action Report” form provided information that was correlated with the results of the survey. The results favored the second research question. Teachers had to answer four questions related to the observation done about presence/absence of skills in their class. Results from this form demonstrated that teachers were aware of the skills they missed. They compared previous classes and wrote down what counted as difference. They also were committed to planning classes that would include pre, while and post reading activities.

Teachers’ beliefs about learning may be based on their training, their teaching experience, or may go back to their own experience as language learners (Freeman, 1992a cited in Richards & Lockhart, 2001) and different studies confirm that teachers’ beliefs affect classroom practices (Richards, 2000, Richards and Lockhart, 2001, Richardson, Anderson, Tidwell and Llyds, 1991). The data from the After Report Sheets demonstrated that teachers changed their reading practices from only checking the understanding of text by questions that were answered by the best students or the teachers ended up answering (practices observed before the innovation) to knowing and planning reading skills (new practices as result of innovation).

It is important to say that these teachers experienced instruction on the skills during the workshops presented by the facilitator-researchers. Teachers also observed a demonstration class planned by the facilitator-researchers. Professional development workshops and observed demonstration strategies are
characteristics that should be present in successful coaching experiences. (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2007).

Even though the results from this innovation were positive, there were some limitations that are important to mention. The fact that this action research was conducted in two sites with similar characteristics improved the validity of this study and if replicated on other sites with similar results the usefulness of instructional coaching could be used and further studied in Ecuador. Nevertheless, there were some inconveniences with the reliability of the instruments used. The difference of results in the observations carried out in both sites might be due to the usage of an instrument that required inferences by the raters and facilitator-researchers might have been using different conceptual frameworks when rating presence of reading skills. Class observations should have been done and rated by the two facilitator-researchers together in order to improve rater reliability. A recommendation for future research would be to make a rubric for the classroom observations and if two raters are involved to rate and re-rate the same observation together to improve reliability of the instrument.

Another limitation that this study had was the two short cycles applied that did not let the two facilitator-researchers provide long-term evidence of the change on teachers’ beliefs.

Based on the conclusions of this study and analysis of the limitations it had, there are some recommendations for future studies: (a) The teacher-participants should, in future studies, keep written or recorded reflections on the instructional coaching process and the perceptions of their students reading
skills, from time to time. They should also reflect on their complete class observation forms and develop other skills in their classes. The teachers should also continue their training by themselves or ask the school to provide or give the facilities for that purpose. (b) The authorities of the school should keep monitoring teachers in their classrooms in order to consolidate and assure that teachers are applying what they were taught. Administrators should also support teachers’ intentions or requests to be kept current on topics which would help them improve their teaching practices. This kind of coaching facilitates the learning-teaching process benefiting students through enhancing the quality of education.

The facilitator-researchers also recommend that other researchers experiment with this training method with their teachers or other areas with different topics in order to describe the effect of using instructional coaching based on a partnership philosophy approach in their context since it facilitates change that it is not imposed (with no resistance from participants) but that the participant reflect on his/her own professional development with assistance of the coach and confirm the validity and reliability of the instruments, especially if future studies involves two raters.
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APPENDIX 1: Instruments applied.

1. Questions during the interview.
2. The Big Four Questions.
4. Teachers’ beliefs inventory: Beliefs about Reading.
5. Workshop No. 1: Previewing, Scanning and Skimming.
7. Workshop No. 2: Contextual guessing and Summarizing.
9. Observation form.
10. After-action report.
APPENDIX 2: Raw data.
SITE A

1. Questions during the interview
2. The Big Four Questions
4. Teachers’ beliefs inventory: Beliefs about Reading
5. Workshop No. 1: Previewing, Scanning and Skimming.
7. Workshop No. 2: Contextual guessing and Summarizing.
9. Observation form.
10. Summary of observations.
11. After-action report.

Proyecto

MAESTRIA EN EDUCACION SUPERIOR

Universidad Casa Grande
SITE B

1. Questions during the interview
2. The Big Four Questions
4. Teachers’ beliefs inventory: Beliefs about Reading
5. Workshop No. 1: Previewing, Scanning and Skimming.
7. Workshop No. 2: Contextual guessing and Summarizing.
9. Observation form.
10. Summary of observations.
11. After-action report.
QUESTIONS DURING THE INTERVIEWS

**Questions about teachers’ current realities.**

1. How long have you been an English teacher?
2. Describe a typical day on the job.
3. What do you really like about your job?
4. What kinds of pressures are you facing?
5. What challenges are you facing?
6. What kinds of changes are you experiencing?
7. Are you teaching reading at this point? If yes, describe your reading class.
8. What modifications, if any, have you made in your teaching of reading?

**Questions about Students’ current reality.**

9. How many students are you teaching each day?

10. What are your students’ strengths and weaknesses in general? Provide examples and explain why?

11. What are your students’ strengths and weaknesses on reading? Provide examples and explain why?

12. What would most help your students on developing reading skills?

**Questions about professional development**

13. Talk about the kinds of professional development you’ve attended in the past few years.

14. What have you liked about professional development?

15. What have you not liked about professional development?

16. How can the coming session be structured to best meet your needs?

17. How do you learn best?
The Big Four Question

Behavior:
Is classroom management under control?
Are students on task in class?
Does the teacher make significantly more positive comments than negative comments (at least a three-to-one ratio)?
Has the teacher develop clear expectations for all activities and transitions during the class?
Has the teacher clearly communicated those expectations, and do the students understand them?
Do students have frequent opportunities to respond during the class?
Does the teacher care about the students’ welfare?
Does the teacher respect students?
Does the teacher communicate high expectations?
Does the teacher believe his or her students can achieve those expectations?

Content:
Does the teacher understand the content, have a plan, and understand which information is most important?
Does the teacher have a complete, detailed plan for teaching the course?
Has the teacher developed essential question for all units?
Do those questions align with the state standards?
Can the teacher identify the 10 to 15 core questions that are answered by the course?
Can the teacher identify the top 10 concepts in the course?
Can the teacher clearly and simply explain the meaning of each of the top 10 concepts?

Instruction:
Does the teacher properly prepare students at the start of the class?
Does the teacher effectively model thinking and other processes for students?
Does the teacher ask questions at an appropriate variety of levels?
Does the teacher provide constructive feedback that enables students to improve?
Does the teacher use language, analogies, examples, and stories that make it easier for students to learn and remember content?
Does the teacher effectively sum up lessons at the end of the class?

Formative Assessment:
Do the teacher and students know if students are mastering content?
Does the teacher know the target the students are aiming for in the class?
Does the teacher use formative assessment effectively to measure how well students are learning?
Are students involved in the development and use of formative assessments?
Can a teacher look out into the classroom and know with some degree of accuracy how well each students is doing?
ARE YOU INTERESTED?

Name: ______________________________
Date: _______________________________

I am most interested in:

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

Times good for me

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

Maybe some other time

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
Teachers’ Beliefs Inventory – Beliefs about Reading

Directions: For each of the following 18 items, please indicate your level of agreement (or disagreement) by writing A, B, C, D, or E. 
A means strongly agree, 
B agree, 
C neutral or undecided, 
D disagree 
E strongly disagree.

Important: If you cannot decide upon a response to a particular item after 30 seconds, you should circle C for undecided and go on to the next item.

1. ___ I believe that teachers should directly teach the basic skills of reading to those pupils who need them.
2. ___ I believe that contextual clues are the most important word recognition aids and should receive more instructional emphasis than sight words or phonics.
3. ___ I believe that reading instruction should focus heavily on comprehension, even at the beginning stages of reading.
4. ___ I believe that a reasonable amount of time of a reading lesson should be devoted to have students understand the new vocabulary of the text.
5. ___ I believe that a carefully structured skills guide should be used when teaching reading to insure that each separate skill is mastered.
6. ___ I believe that a significant part of a teacher’s time should be spent in teaching basic reading skills.
7. ___ I believe that teachers should always use comprehension questions as a reading strategy in the after reading.
8. ___ I believe that one effective way to determine pupil reading success is to note how many skills he has learned.
9. ___ I believe that the reading texts in the course book should be sent as homework occasionally as it takes lots of instructional time in trying to have SS decode the message.
10. ___ I believe EFL students find reading difficult even if they have been taught reading skills.
11. ___ I believe that the teachers’ role is to emphasize the communication aspects of reading more than the skills.
12. ___ I believe that reading is a difficult process which must usually be taught in a step-by-step sequence if we are to develop good readers.
13. ___ I believe that reading is composed of a series of hierarchical skills which must be taught sequentially and then used in combination if one is to read successfully.
14. ___ I believe that reading instruction should be taught so that pupils can use reading successfully in all curricular areas.
15. ___ I believe that too much emphasis is being placed on skills (especially decoding skills) in reading program today.
16. ___ I believe that sometimes there is not enough time for pre-reading activities/strategies. (e.g. discussion of titles, subheadings, eliciting photographs, identifying text structure, previewing, etc.
17. ___ I believe that Ss can always understand the reading text even if teachers do not apply while-reading strategies as summarizing and contextual guessing.
18. ___ I believe that it’s difficult for SS to understand a text by using contextual guessing, especially if the SS are at a beginning level.
Name: ____________________________________________

Training Session Surveys

Workshop on Reading Skills: Previewing - Skimming – Scanning

Answer the questions:

Did you find interesting the workshop?
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

Will you apply any activity in your class?
____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

Do you have doubts in any strategy? Which?
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________

Which activity did you find new?
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________

Is it necessary to apply exercises different from the book in your class? Why?
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
_______
Name: ____________________________________________

Training Session Surveys

Workshop on Reading Skills: Summarizing and Contextual Guessing

Answer the questions:

Did you find interesting the workshop?
________________________________________________________________________
____

Will you apply any activity in your class?
________________________________________________________________________
____

Do you have doubts in any strategy? Which?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
____

Which activity did you find new?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
____
## Instructional Coaching Observation Form

### Instructional coaching

**Progress Through Partnership**

**READING OBSERVATION FORM**

**Teacher:** _________________________  **School:** ________________

**Unit/ Content:** ________________  **Module:** ________________

**Date:** ______________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Practice</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Reading Stage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher applies pre-viewing activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Works with pictures and graphics, works with headings, makes prediction activities, gives an introduction of the text).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>While-Reading Stage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher applies scanning activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(States the specific information to look for, finds synonyms, antonyms, locates grammar features, reorders sentences, matches beginnings and endings)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher applies contextual guessing activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Identifies the meanings of words according to the context, identifies parts of speech)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-reading stage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher applies summarizing activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pulls out main ideas, focuses on key details, key words, and phrases, breaks down larger ideas, takes brief but complete notes).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AFTER –ACTION REPORT

School: ________________  Strategy/ Routine: ______________
Teacher: ________________  Unit/ Content: ______________

What was supposed to happen?
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

What happened?
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

What accounts for the difference?
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

What should be done differently next time?
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

Additional Comments?
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
### Presence of skills by teacher. (Site A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SKILLS</th>
<th>ML</th>
<th>VP</th>
<th>DA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O0</td>
<td>O1</td>
<td>O2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previewing</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skimming</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scanning</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Guess.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summ.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Presence of skills</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SKILLS</th>
<th>TI</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>BM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O0</td>
<td>O1</td>
<td>O2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previewing</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skimming</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scanning</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Guess.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summ.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Presence of skills</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Presence of skills by teacher. (Site B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SKILLS</th>
<th>T1 (Before Innovation)</th>
<th>O1</th>
<th>O2</th>
<th>O3</th>
<th>T2 (Before Innovation)</th>
<th>O1</th>
<th>O2</th>
<th>O3</th>
<th>T3 (Before Innovation)</th>
<th>O1</th>
<th>O2</th>
<th>O3</th>
<th>T4 (Before Innovation)</th>
<th>O1</th>
<th>O2</th>
<th>O3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previewing</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skimming</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scanning</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Guess.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (presence of skills during observations by teacher)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SKILLS</th>
<th>T5 (Before Innovation)</th>
<th>O1</th>
<th>O2</th>
<th>O3</th>
<th>T6 (Before Innovation)</th>
<th>O1</th>
<th>O2</th>
<th>O3</th>
<th>T7 (Before Innovation)</th>
<th>O1</th>
<th>O2</th>
<th>O3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previewing</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skimming</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scanning</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Guess.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (presence of skills during observations by teacher)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site A: After Action Report. Skills each teacher referred to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>After action report 1</th>
<th>After action report 2</th>
<th>After action report 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Skimming, scanning, previewing, pre-reading, explained summarizing, scanning.</td>
<td>explained previewing.</td>
<td>explained previewing, pre-reading activities, skimming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>previewing, scanning, summarizing, pre, while, post reading activities.</td>
<td>knows that applied all skills but summarizing.</td>
<td>knows that needs to improve constantly in all skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>skimming, while reading, scanning, summarizing, contextual guessing.</td>
<td>previewing, skimming, scanning, contextual guessing, summarizing.</td>
<td>previewing, skimming, scanning, contextual guessing, summarizing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>skimming, contextual guessing.</td>
<td>skimming, contextual guessing, summarizing.</td>
<td>pre, while reading activities, summarizing, knows that most skills were applied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>explaining previewing, scanning, contextual guessing, summarizing, skimming.</td>
<td>previewing, post-reading activities, skimming.</td>
<td>previewing, skimming, scanning, contextual guessing, summarizing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>pre, while and post reading activities.</td>
<td>pre, while, and post reading activities.</td>
<td>previewing, skimming, explained scanning, summarizing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site B: After Action Report Counting the skills each teacher referred to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher (T1)</th>
<th>After action report 1</th>
<th>After action report 2</th>
<th>After action report 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Skimming, scanning, previewing</td>
<td>pre-viewing while reading and post reading; explained a scanning and contextual guessing activity</td>
<td>pre, while, and post reading activities. Explained activities planned previewing, scanning and summarizing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>explained the activities planned, a previewing, a scanning activity</td>
<td>contextual guessing and summarizing explained the activities planned, a previewing, skimming and a scanning activity</td>
<td>pre, while, and post reading activities. Explained activities planned previewing, scanning and contextual guessing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>previewing and skimming</td>
<td>pre, while, and post reading activities; explained a previewing, a skimming, and a scanning activity</td>
<td>explained the activities planned skimming scanning and summarizing activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>explained the activities planned, a previewing and a skimming activity</td>
<td>explained the activities planned, a previewing, skimming a scanning, and a contextual guessing activity</td>
<td>before reading, while reading, and after reading. explained the activities planned previewing, scanning contextual guessing and summarizing activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>pre-reading activities</td>
<td>explained the activities planned, previewing skimming, scanning, and summarizing</td>
<td>explained the activities planned previewing, scanning, and contextual guessing activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>pre-reading and while reading activities previewing, skimming and scanning</td>
<td>pre, while, and post reading activities, explained the activities planned, previewing skimming, scanning, and summarizing</td>
<td>pre, while, and post reading activities, previewing, predicting, skimming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>