*Journal of Teaching and Research in English Literature (JTREL)*
An international open-access journal [ISSN: 0975-8828]
Volume 4 – Number 1 – July 2012

# Reading as Subject Matter in a Literature Survey

**Alison A. Baker, PhD**
Associate Professor of English, Department of English and Foreign Languages,
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
abaker@csupomona.edu

**ABSTRACT**

This study compares two sections of a sophomore level British literature survey, one taught with the traditional aims of covering a body of literature, and one with additional theoretical and metacognitive materials. I set out to discover the value of removing some content from the survey in favour of lasting benefits for the students' confidence and ability reading literary texts. Students' confidence did improve as questionnaires demonstrate, as did the depth of their responses on qualitative measures such as journals and essays. Teaching students to take stock of their own reading practices and focus on the process of reading resulted in higher grades, higher levels of reported confidence in approaching new texts, and more productive engagement with the texts assigned for class.

**KEYWORDS**

Teaching Reading; Student confidence; Meta-cognitive; Literature Survey.

## Introduction

Students enter college with a wide range of abilities and skills, and they often do not arrive prepared to read literature fluently and appreciate it. When I teach the sophomore level literature survey, I meet them all. While some students come, self-proclaimed book lovers all their lives; others claim when asked on the first day of class to name their favourite book, never to have finished an entire book. My purpose, as I see it in this General Education course, is to equip non-majors with the skills they need to read on their own for pleasure and for exploration, reflection, and knowledge, and also to prepare English majors for more analytical reading. Both sets of goals overlap, however, in my desire to help students become more confident readers.

When readers feel confident in approaching a text, their experience is often more fulfilling. It is the same "mind over matter" problem that affects any field of study, and the problem Carol Dweck addresses in her 2006 book, *Mindset: The New Psychology of Success*. If a student thinks of a poem as intimidating, abstruse, impenetrable, then she sets herself up to be confused or disengages from the text. If she goes in without fear of feeling foolish, she has just increased her chance of enjoying herself and opened herself up to learning. The openness to experience that comes with confidence is really what I strive for and it is something not even the English majors have in uniformity. It is possible to be well read and closed to new reading experiences, to have the opinion that you have read so much, nothing new will surprise you—even at nineteen years old (perhaps especially at nineteen).

Dweck's work on mindset argues that individuals either have a "fixed

mindset" where they see intelligence as finite—one is born smart or not—or what she calls a "growth mindset" (12), where one grows from failure and challenge, and intelligence or ability increases over time. In my study, I am concerned with helping all students develop this sort of growth mindset towards reading literature, so that they may do well in my course, but more importantly they may continue to read even "difficult" texts for the rest of their lives. My goal is to create an environment where all students feel comfortable exploring texts that may be challenging for a variety of reasons—because they are unfamiliar genres, such as elegies or dream visions, because they are remote in terms of time and language, or because they are poetic texts with unfamiliar conventions. If I can equip students to feel comfortable reading these texts, or to feel challenged and invigorated by them, and if I can make them aware of the skills and methods they employ when they do, I believe they will develop the mindset that reading is rewarding, and they will continue to read with confidence after they leave my class.

I taught literature surveys on a sixteen-week semester system as a graduate student, and I constantly regretted not being able to teach more texts. When I obtained a tenure-track position at Cal Poly Pomona, a public state school that runs on the quarter system, suddenly the syllabi I had prepared for a sixteen-week schedule had to be adapted to fit a ten-week quarter. Surely this was a real crisis. So when the thought occurred to me to take out even more texts to integrate meta-cognitive exercises and subjects—to explore and study the process of reading at the expense of Paradise Lost, for instance—it took me by surprise.

I had already whittled down my reading list in favour of teaching complete texts, rather than many excerpts. To remove any more seemed dangerously near lopping a limb off what I already thought of as a skeletal survey. I finally decided to cut one text, the equivalent of a week's worth of reading, or 10% of the quarter, and replaced its content with reading theory and my students' own reading practices. They would be asked to read theory instead of literature, and to apply it to their own reflections on their reading history and habits. I wanted to see if making students more aware of their reading process would demystify it, and help them to see connections between texts that stemmed from their own readership.

In his book Teaching Undergraduates, Roger L. Dominowski (2002) discusses meta-cognitive strategies; in a section on "Teaching Thinking," he observes, "Better readers monitor their comprehension more closely, and encouraging students to do so improves comprehension" (62).

In fact, Kathleen T. Mc Whorter (2003) includes an entire chapter in her Guide to College Reading entitled "Reading as Thinking." This chapter arm students with several meta-cognitive strategies to improve their comprehension by mindfully organizing the material they are assigned. Students are advised to pause and recall elements, review after reading, and employ the SQ3R (Survey, Question, Read, Recite, and Review) system (132-33). These approaches help students become aware of how they learn material, in this case the content of a literary text. By becoming more aware of their learning process, students have better success retaining the material

In this spirit I discovered that Jim Burke's (2000) Reading Reminders is a source of many metacognitive techniques. He advocates surveying students about their reading habits, and after considering his materials, I adapted his survey for use in my literature course. Although it represents a good start, I needed to add

questions particular to aesthetic or literary reading for my purposes. I am keenly interested in helping students learn the material I assign; that is, helping them read and comprehend difficult texts like *Beowulf* or *The Faerie Queene*. Comprehension and content mastery are only the first goals of my class, however; I am even more interested in students acquiring an understanding and mastery of a process they can apply to any text. Meta-cognitive aids, therefore, constitute part of my project, but are not sufficient to achieve all my goals as Karen Delbridge asserts in her essay on the teaching of adolescent readers:

> Teachers who are really good at what they do are metacognitive, bringing a spirit of inquiry to their teaching. Not only are they reflective about their teaching, but they are always asking questions while expecting the same from students. (in Kucer 2008: 159)

This approach captures some of what I want to achieve: turning students into self-teachers. If I can bring them to reflect and adapt, perhaps they can teach themselves how to become better readers. Delbridge concludes her review of the research with this very idea, "We want our students to be metacognitive and ultimately be responsible for their own learning" (170).

Terry Doyle (2008) explores students' active role in learning in his recent book, Helping Students Learn in a Learning-Centered Environment. He writes:

> Faculty asks me regularly to talk with their students about brain research and learning. When I discuss the discoveries neuroscientists have made about how humans learn, the students appear interested, but, more important, they seem to understand why their teachers are asking them to engage in certain classroom practices. Understanding the latest research about how the brain learns makes their own learning process more relevant. (52)

By the same token, helping students understand their own reading process should give them more confidence in their abilities and improve their performance. I, therefore, planned a comparative study of two sections of my sophomore literature survey. The control class was run as I have taught it for years—full of books—while the experimental course listed fewer primary texts but included additional meta-cognitive exercises, reading theory, and directed journaling for which students were asked to reflect on reading as a process. My goal was to discover if these kinds of practices help students become more confident and capable readers of literature.

**Methodology**

I have been teaching the early British Literature survey course for over ten years now at a California State university of 21,000 students. This course's maximum enrollment is set at 35, and it generally fills, with a drop rate of one to three students a quarter. It is a successful class both in that the students respond well to midterm and end of term course evaluations, and peers who observe my classes remark that the course engages students, helps them form arguments and think critically, and, more generally, enjoy literature. I did, however, lack evidence that the course helps resistant readers become stronger readers. I believe this is a course that should do just that. It is a lower-division General Education course as well as an elective for our English majors, so it normally fills with roughly half majors and half non-majors. The non-majors (typically engineering, architecture, science, and social science majors) come

in with set disclaimers that betray Dweck's fixed mindset. They claim they do not have the skills or aptitude to do well in the course. They commonly assert that English was never their strong suit, or that they don't like to read, or to write, or to speak in public. The English majors sometimes demonstrate equal resistance to engaging early in the class: they may feel that they have already mastered the arts of reading and writing and arguing their points in class (especially in comparison with the non-majors).

Given these common preconceptions and students' various but often uniformly fixed mindsets, my goals include making literature accessible for the non-majors and helping them learn how they can make themselves stronger readers. I hope to help them enjoy reading literature, so that they will continue to read for pleasure when they land their engineering jobs. For those who enter college thinking that they are already strong readers and writers and that the course will pose no challenge for them, I want to present them the task of identifying what they do that works so well, so that they can understand and capitalize on their strengths, but also to help them identify gaps in their training or experience that they can begin to fill. For some students these gaps may be a body of literature from a period they have not yet studied or a genre they have not read; for others it may be learning more strategies for analysing texts, for organizing their thoughts and reading more efficiently, and for enjoying texts more intensely.

In the process of preparing for this study, I completed two online courses (NIH and CITI) to obtain certification for institutional research and received IRB approval before beginning my study. The approach I decided to take to reach these goals is three-pronged. The pedagogical goals I have enumerated would be more attainable if students thought more about their own strengths and weaknesses—if they examined their process critically and sought to own and improve it. This led to the realization that meta-cognitive exercises and assignments had to become an intrinsic part of my project. As Dominowski (2002) notes, "Performance on tasks of any complexity is better when… meta-cognition guides behavior" (162-63); students who know how they read, what sorts of things frustrate or challenge them, can alter their study habits to improve their experience and abilities. As I set out to redesign the course, I looked for resources I could supply that would support my students' efforts efficiently, without turning a literature survey into a neuropsychology class. I needed exercises we could discuss that would encourage them to think about their process while providing them with the language to think in these new terms. This I accomplished by generating some short handouts, crafting a number of surveys, and formulating journal topics to help them reflect on their development as readers and reflect on the current status of their abilities. In addition to allowing their own reflections to become part of the content they would be studying, I also gave them brief introductions to several theories of reading. Reading itself, thus, became the object and content of the course, both in theory and in practice. Students still needed to know what literary devices characterize Anglo-Saxon poetry. They now also needed to know which theory of reading they found most satisfying and how it applied to their own experience.

The final aspect of my control class has already been intimated: reflective journaling. When students think about levels of sophistication in reading (from Adler and Van Doren's How to Read a Book), they need to be able to absorb and express what they learn. When they examine their own journey as readers, whether rewarding or frustrating, they

need to be able to chronicle it and draw conclusions from patterns they discover. I assign these "process" journals in addition to the standard journals I require of survey students, which are reading journals that centre on the text as the subject; these topics help students explore symbolism or narrative patterns or character development. Students, who could write both kinds of entries, I hypothesized, would make more sense out of what they read and find the reading experience more enjoyable and meaningful. With that lofty goal in mind, I set out to make a good course great.

The Control class was taught the way I have taught it for years: class sessions comprise a mixture of mini-lectures on the cultural and literary history of the text and a discussion of the text in dialogue with the students. The assignments for both classes were composed as follows: Daily reading quizzes are objective and content-based. I ask six questions (five 2-point questions and a 1-point bonus question) orally about the characters and events in the text, and students write responses and turn them in. These ensure that students read the assignments daily and are prepared for discussion.

Students also write an in-class midterm exam worth 25% of their grade. The midterm is 50% objective (identifying quotes from the texts and short answer-questions about the texts and the lecture material) and 50% essay questions, where students are asked to compare texts, think thematically, and explore symbolism and literary devices and conventions. The final exam is a take-home essay exam, where students write two short (three-page) essays in response to a list of five prompts.

Outside of class, students are required to write a formal essay for which I provide prompts from which they can choose a topic. The essay prompts encourage close readings and analysis. Papers run four to six pages in length. Students also produce a reading journal of twenty entries written in response to a list of prompts designed to encourage critical reading. Students are asked to discuss the texts in comparison with other texts they know, to unpack metaphors in the text, to question the text or even the characters, and to argue for and explicate the most important scene or character.

The Experimental class followed the same format, but one week's worth of literary texts was removed (out of a ten week quarter) and replaced with reading theory handouts, meta-cognitive exercises and discussion topics, and in-class reading workshops. For the journals, students were asked to write ten entries with the assigned literature as their subject (i.e. traditional reading journals) and ten entries with the process of reading as the subject. For the Process journals, I provided prompts such as the following:

1. What do you think happens when you read?
2. What do you do differently when you read a recipe or DVD player instructions and when you read a poem or a story?
3. On a scale of 1-10, how good a reader are you? What are your strengths and weaknesses?
4. If you are faced with a text you find difficult, what do you do to get through it?
5. What was your best reading experience? This can include a discussion of your favorite book, a time when you "got" something when other people struggled, or something that really struck/changed you—whatever. And please include as many details as you can—whether or not this reading was assigned or you did it on your own, where you were, what you did, whatever details you can muster.
6. What was your worst experience reading? See above prompts, and

add what you know now that would have helped you then, or if you think you'd have the same experience today.

7. What do you remember about learning to read as a child? Details about your physical environment or intellectual processes are welcome. (Baker, English 207 Materials, Spring 2007)..

The methods I used to measure the success of both classes were done through these assigned journals (I use the meta-cognitive entries when they indicate their own growth through this process), the objective midterm scores, and the Reading Confidence Questionnaires I distributed at the beginning and end of each term. These questionnaires asked students to rate their own comfort level in terms of understanding narrative poetry, recognizing literary devices, and reading texts in older forms of English on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being not confident at all, and 5 being very confident. Comparing these data will give a sense of whether or not either course accomplished my pedagogical aims, and whether the students in the experimental class saw a marked improvement in confidence by thinking through their reading process.

**Results**

Students came in to both classes with approximately the same level of confidence about reading and understanding the events in a narrative poem (like *Beowulf* or *Paradise Lost*). The first item to which they responded reads- "How confident do you feel that you are usually able to understand the content of narrative poetry, that is, what happens to whom, and in what order?"

This category is perhaps the most practical one on the questionnaire and can function as an indicator of future reading success. How confident are you that you can pick up a book and start reading, and get enough out of it to enjoy it? How capable are you, in short, of mastering the content assigned for this class? This may be the most important question because it addresses the more common literary reading experiences students are likely to have after completing their degree. By contrast, the other questions focus on more specialized experiences. So if students' confidence level increases once they have become aware of their reading process, even in relatively small sample, then questions of reading awareness and self-reflexivity are worth investigating further.

The control group's mean for this question was 3.48 on a 5 point scale (with 1 being "not at all confident" and 5 being "extremely confident"). Students from the experimental group scored themselves at 3.53. They felt reasonably confident as a group, but not overly confident that they could open *The Faerie Queene*, understand, and enjoy it. Both classes scored themselves higher in this area by the end of the quarter, with the experimental group showing a clear increase in confidence in this area over the control group, which, to me, was a very desirable outcome: it meant students were acquiring the skills I intended as well as comprehending the class materials, but it also meant that the new approach could indeed enhance their learning experience.

Control Question 1: Week 1 = 3.48; Week 10 = 3.81, an increase of .33

Experimental Question 1: Week 1 =3.53; Week 10 = 4.24, an increase of 0.71 (.38 greater than the control)

The second item on the questionnaire dealt with students' confidence with the technical aspects of literature-

"How confident do you feel that you can recognize the literary devices and appreciate the poetic

language in a poem (metaphors, symbols, and allusions, for instance)?"

This question typically separates the English majors from the non-majors. English majors feel they should be able to recognize formal features, so they tend to rate themselves higher than non-majors. Yet results also suggest that they may be rating themselves higher than they should. For this item, both classes gained confidence, but the experimental group, asked to reflect more deeply on their processes, strengths, and weaknesses, did not show as great an increase in this category as the control.

Some context may shed light on this particular result. This course begins with Anglo-Saxon poetry. We read elegies, battle poetry, and religious texts from the time when England was newly Christianized. The language, the historical context, and the literary conventions are very foreign to American undergraduates. They learn about alliterative poetry, and about other conventions rarely in use today: apposition--the repetition of an item in different terms (for example, Caedmon using many names for God in a very brief hymn), and kennings—compound metaphoric constructions such as the "whale's road" to indicate the sea. These poetic conventions are typically completely new to students. They quickly become aware that they have acquired new, quantifiable knowledge and derive confidence from this realization. In other words, they realize that they now know more than they did at the beginning of the quarter. New knowledge in hand, students in the control group scored themselves .61 points higher: from 3.13 in the beginning, to 3.78 at the end of term. On the other hand, the students who had been asked to reflect on their reading seemed to become more reflective than I had anticipated. Although they rated themselves higher as well (3.34 to 3.74, respectively), yet they did not report so great an improvement as students from the control class (-.21). It seems likely that these students, newly reflective on the reading process, may have taken stock here. They certainly learned more literary devices, but it seems also to have struck them that if there were so many literary devices that they had never heard of, there may well be many more that the class could not cover. In this instance, the self-reflective process raised the awareness of English majors who perhaps started rating themselves closer to their ability rather than to their desired level of success or skill.

Control Question 2: Week 1 = 3.13; Week 10 = 3.74, an increase of .61

Experimental Question 2: Week 1 =3.34; Week 10 = 3.74, an increase of only 0.4

The final item on the questionnaire deals explicitly with the fact that a survey course on Early Literature such as this one includes texts technically not in English, but in Old or Middle English. Students can typically make their way through some Middle English, especially if working in groups, but Old English is simply impossible—it resembles German more than Present Day English—so I always assign translations after showing students a few small excerpts to demonstrate this. The final question on the questionnaire, then, reads-

"How confident do you feel about reading texts written in early forms of English, where vocabulary, syntax, and spelling are different from modern usage?"

We discuss the idea that "early forms of English" can refer to a Dickens novel (which many of them find quite challenging) as well as Chaucer, and any literary work along the way. Not surprisingly, students rated themselves the lowest in this area: 3.09 in the control, as opposed to 2.78 in the experimental group. Both groups made great strides

nonetheless, with the control group increasing their confidence by .69 (from 3.09 to 3.78) and the experimental by 1.14 (from 2.78 to 3.92).

These results suggest that I succeeded in moving students forward in their comfort with archaic language. One needs to consider, however, that perhaps the experimental group was scoring its ability, too low in the beginning, erring on the side of caution. (This is a category English majors cannot fake—you either know that a cyning is a king, or you don't). But after some instruction, they felt more confident than they thought they were. Or, again, perhaps the experimental group's focus on reflection caused them to think about the language more deeply, maybe to discover patterns or cognates they had not recognized before, thus increasing their linguistic confidence substantially. It is also possible that this course was simply the first one to prompt them to read these very old texts. In this case they would have begun with no experience and felt like they made much progress in the course of a quarter. Whatever the case, the experimental group, asked to engage in reflective and metacognitive practices throughout the quarter, felt their new ability more keenly than did the control group.

> Control Question 3: Week 1 = 3.09; Week 10 = 3.78, an increase of .69
>
> Experimental Question 2: Week 1 =2.78; Week 10 = 3.92, an increase of 1.14 (.45 greater than control)

**[Refer Table 1 in the appendix at the bottom]**

The midterm examinations ask students to identify significant passages from the texts they have read (by author, title, and speaker), in addition to producing short identifications of concepts and characters, and paragraph length essays. Students must demonstrate objective knowledge of the texts and the literary devices employed in them, as well as the cultural and literary contexts relevant to the texts. Exam grades were very similar between the two classes, with an average of 87.2% in the control class and 89.3% in the experimental class, with standard deviations of 9.5 and 9.8, respectively. The essays, though, which were completed out of class and which were graded not only on accurate knowledge of the chosen text, but also on analytical ability and the ability to muster relevant evidence from the text, in short, tasks that required higher level reading skills, show an improvement in the experimental group worth noticing. I began by familiarizing myself to the control essays, having kept copies from the control class that I had taught previously, before I graded the experimental group's papers. The scores went up from an average of 85.4 to 89.1, and the standard deviation decreased as well. The control group's mid-range B had a standard deviation of 8.2, but the experimental group's higher grades were more consistent, with a standard deviation of only 6.3. This indicates a measure of success: students' deep reading skills had improved—skills that are most visibly documented in full-length essays where students trace their reasoning and explain their observations. These essays improved in the experimental class where students were exposed to meta-cognitive strategies and reading theory.

When assigning reading journals, my next assessment tool, one must bear in mind that their effectiveness often depends on the students' degree of commitment to the exercise. Some students will rush through their journal entries, writing many (dare I say all) at once, without too much preparation or thought. There are at least as many students, however, and usually more in my experience (thus the assignment

remains a worthy one), who invest much effort and thought in their journals and reap obvious rewards from the process. I am pleased to report that in the experimental group, many more students fell in to the latter category.

In the control class, I judge fourteen of thirty-three sets of journals to have been completed in an almost purely perfunctory fashion. These are often characterized by purely emotional reactions without depth of analysis, or by a dependence on extensive summary. In discussing the scavenging animals that often circle battlefields in Anglo-Saxon poetry, one student comments, "I felt the Beasts of Battle were kind of the most morbid literary element we've run across. It's a gory idea." Those statements are certainly true, but do not demonstrate any critical awareness or analysis. The student is merely expressing an emotional reaction. Another student, writing about the poem "The Dream of the Rood" a vision of the Passion of Christ told from the perspective of the cross, concludes an entry almost entirely composed of summary with a one-sentence paragraph that looks like a conclusion, "This was a very religious poem."

Journal entries do not all look like this; as I said, students come from many levels of experience and ability to a General Education course and with varying levels of engagement. Interestingly, entries became increasingly stronger for the later works, as if students were warming to the task over the weeks. The texts themselves were certainly not easier, as they included Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*, Milton's Paradise Lost, and Pope's The Rape of the Lock, which all pose a challenge even to the most experienced readers. By the end of the quarter, students are generally able to analyze symbols and scenes, especially in contrast with similar elements in other texts.

In the experimental group, I found only two of thirty-one sets of journals to be superficial to the degree of those seen in the control group. By and large, students engaged more deeply with the texts they were assigned, and wrote more on fewer topics. Perhaps the most striking case of this is a response to the journal topic "unpack a metaphor or symbol and explain how it works" dealing with the Garden of Adonis in Book Three of *The Faerie Queene*. The student wrote a journal entry on this image and then found he had more to say and wrote a second entry. He went on to develop some ideas raised in the journals and to write a final essay on Spenser's depiction of reincarnation in the Garden of Adonis.

More generally, though, the students who wrote on the topics relating to reading in general and their own reading habits in particular seem to have had epiphanies that helped them gain a deeper appreciation for the books. When responding to the prompt one student claims that the one thing that is helping him get more out of his reading is that reading quickly for plot before rereading more carefully helps him read with "greater understanding." The same student, when responding to a later text (not a "reading process" prompt, but a journal that starts out discussing heroism in *The Faerie Queene*) applies this strategy and frames his discussion of the text around it, noting that there are some cases where it does not serve to skim: archaic poetic texts, for instance. In this case, the student's theme is approached via the technical elements of 16th century allegorical verse, but by means of his own reading practices. For this text, the student decides reading aloud affords quicker and better comprehension, and notes at the end that next time he will try focusing on the action scenes and return to the description. This amounts to a revision of the strategy he first tried, with the result that the student employed three

critical strategies in approaching a difficult text, and self-monitored throughout the reading process

Other students showed high involvement with the theoretical journal topics, such as critiquing the theories they studied, and offering their own. One student found an unbridgeable gap between what Adler and Van Doren claimed were two consecutive steps of developing reading skill. Very likely on her way to a teaching career, this particular student seemed already keenly aware of stages of developing skills in children, and wrote extensively about the separate phenomena of childhood and adult reading. Another adapted Adler and Van Doren's baseball analogy (author as pitcher, reader as batter/catcher) to account for some of her reading experiences, and explained how well she responded to authors who seemed to pitch right to her (resulting in a homerun experience) and others who missed the plate or hit her in the shoulder with the ball, whom she wanted to put on the disabled list. In short, students overall met the challenges of these topics remarkably well while engaging them in deeply personal ways.

**Conclusions**

This comparative study demonstrates that students do indeed benefit from learning about how they read. The gains in numbers (in terms of questionnaires and grades) were significant, indicating patterns of deeper Appendix understanding, greater confidence, and more sophisticated, more engaged, and more productive reading. It is my hope that these skills will transfer to other classes. The students who were asked to dissect their reading process began to think metacognitively; they learned ways to analyze their own learning, and particularly their own reading. They reflected on their success and struggles, and found methods to improve their learning and their reading enjoyment. Certainly it is the function of a literature survey to expose students to a variety of periods and genres, but surveys always reveal more gaps than they cover. If we can equip students with the skills they need to read on their own and with the confidence to do it fruitfully, it will matter less if the survey fails to cover literary periods comprehensively. As confident, critical readers, students will continue to read long after the final essay is turned in

It seems equally likely to me that equipping students with meta-cognitive strategies will help them in other subjects. While I focused on improving critical and aesthetic reading, I can see biology or mathematics students who learn meta-cognitive strategies also learning more efficiently and with greater retention. The more students understand how they learn, the more control they gain over their progress. But in order to give them those tools, we have to be willing to sacrifice some of our course content to make room in the syllabus.

| | Control | | | Experimental | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Question** | **Initial** | **Final** | **Change** | **Initial** | **Final** | **Change** | **Overall** |
| 1 | 3.48 | 3.81 | 0.33 | 3.53 | 4.24 | 0.71 | 0.38 |
| 2 | 3.13 | 3.74 | 0.61 | 3.34 | 3.74 | 0.40 | -0.21 |
| 3 | 3.09 | 3.78 | 0.69 | 2.78 | 3.92 | 1.14 | 0.45 |

**WORKS CITED**

Adler, M. and Van Doren, C. *How to Read a Book*, revised Ed. New York: Touchstone for Simon and Schuster, 1972.
Bain, K. *What the Best College Teachers Do*. Cambridge, MS: Harvard UP, 2004.
Burke, J. Reading Reminders. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 2000.
Delbridge, K. "What We Know about the Teaching of Adolescent Reading." *What Research REALLY Says about Teaching and Learning to Read*. Ed. S. B. Kucer. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2008. 158-75.
Dwerk, C. S. Mindset: *The New Psychology of Success*. New York: Random House, 2006.
Dominowski, R. L. *Teaching Undergraduates*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2002.
Doyle. T. *Helping Students Learn in a Learning-Centered Environment*. Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2008.
Foster, T. C. *How to Read Literature Like a Professor*. New York: Harper Collins, 2003.
Kucer, S.B. "What We Know About the Nature of Reading." *What Research REALLY Says about Teaching and Learning to Read.* Ed. S. B. Kucer. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2008. 29-61.
Littau, K. *Theories of Reading*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006.
Manguel, A. *A History of Reading*. London: Penguin, 1997.
McWhorter, K. T. *Guide to College Reading*. 6th ed. New York: Longman.
National Research Council. *How People Learn*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 2000.
Ramsden, P. *Learning to Teach in Higher Education*. 2nd Ed. London: RoutledgeFalmer, 2003.
Snow, C.E., Griffin, P. and Burns, M.S. *Knowledge to Support the Teaching of Reading*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.
Wolf, M. Proust and the Squid: *The Story and Science of the Reading Brain*. New York: Harper Perennial, 2007.