

Comparison of a more Effective and a Typical Teachers' Lesson Plan Detail in the Psychological Engagement of Students

Fatima Zehra ALLAHVERDİ* Lynn GELZHEISER**

Abstract. The reasons for teacher success variability are not well understood. One possible reason for teacher variance might be their lesson planning. A case study methodology was utilized. The study asked if teacher engaged reader (comprehension) lesson plan explicitness was related to differences in student outcomes by comparing teachers. The data was part of a larger study. One of the factors that differentiated the above-average gain teacher from the typical teacher was the extent to which the teacher planned to address all three of the engaged reader processes. The above-average gain teacher wrote more detailed plans and planned on teaching the engaged reader processes in a way that better aligned with the guidance provided by the intervention.

Keywords: Lesson Plan Analysis, Comprehension, Teacher Comparison, Engaged Reader.

* Orcid ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-2345-6789>, Assist. Prof. Dr., Social Sciences University of Ankara, Turkey, zehra.allahverdi@asbu.edu.tr

** Orcid ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7009-2487>, Assoc. Prof. Dr., University at Albany State University of New York, USA, lgelzheiser@albany.edu

1. INTRODUCTION

In primary school, teachers start with teaching reading strategies such as decoding to teach students how to read the material. The main goal of reading is for students to comprehend the text. In their meta-analysis Kim et al.'s (2012) state that reading comprehension is the highest level of the reading components. 'Development of literacy in children is hinged on reading comprehension' (Migyanka et al., 2005, p.172). Therefore, the teaching of comprehension strategies is especially important for students with poor comprehension skills since the use of comprehension strategies have been shown to increase comprehension scores (Ghorbani et al., 2013).

Ghorbani et al. (2013) discuss the importance of the integration of multiple strategies. Strategies when used together help 'learners construct meaning from text and monitor their reading', thus assisting readers to make sense of their reading instead of 'wander[ing] off' (Ghorbani, et al., 2013, p. 3). Therefore, this study addresses multiple strategies, specifically predicting, purpose setting, questioning.

Predicting, Purpose Setting, and Questioning

Predicting, purpose setting, and questioning were selected for this study because these strategies can be used interchangeably based on personal preference. Moreover, to the best of the researcher's knowledge, this is the first study to examine the lesson planning of all three strategies together. Predicting, purpose setting, and questioning are effective comprehension strategies that assist students and lead to an increase in comprehension scores (Guthrie et al., 2007; Mason, 2004; Ness, 2011). The current study refers to these strategies as engaged reader processes since they are purposeful processes that facilitate interaction with the text, which is a component of reading engagement (Guthrie et al., 2007; Townsend & Boynton, 2013).

Other Comprehension Factors

Alongside the importance of comprehension strategies, comprehension is also facilitated by many other factors. Previous research indicates that comprehension involves a reader's prior knowledge (Duke et al., 2011; Pardo, 2004) and '...is an active, constructive process that occurs before, during, and after reading...[a] particular selection' as defined by Mitchell (2006, p.66). Text comprehension is highly interactive (Kintsch, 2005; Yaqoob, 2020). The current study defined the interactive nature of comprehension utilizing the following variables in Table 1.

All of the selected variables assist students with the use of engaged reader processes and were therefore utilized to examine teacher lesson plans. For instance, if students were to make predictions, they would utilize the author's clues and their previous background knowledge and the title of the story to make a prediction. Throughout, they would remind themselves that reading is thinking to continue to look for clues while reading. They would also share their thinking with their peers to facilitate a discussion. If instead, students were to read a non-fiction text, they would use their knowledge of the genre and determine that the text is non-fiction, and therefore, prefer to ask a question or set a purpose rather than make a prediction.

Teacher Instruction

Students are more likely to acquire comprehension strategies if teachers are explicit in their teaching (Kymes, 2005; Morrow, 2011). Moreover, there is much research about the significance of modeling, and scaffolding in comprehension development (Palinscar & Brown, 1984; Stone, 1998; Watson, et al., 2012). However, research indicates that teachers may take several years before they learn to provide explicit instruction, model, provide guided practice, and create a focused study (Almasi & Fullerton, 2012). The quality of teacher instruction and support can vary by teachers with some progressing quicker than others in developing effective strategy teaching methods (Almasi & Fullerton, 2012; Duffy, 1993).

The reasons for teacher variability are not well understood. One possible reason for teacher variance might be their lesson planning. This study asked if teacher engaged reader lesson plan explicitness was related to differences in student outcomes by comparing two teachers, utilizing data from a larger study. One teacher had a greater proportion of her students making gains, while the other teacher's students made gains that were typical in the larger study.

Teacher Preparation

'Lesson planning is a complex and an expected task of teaching' (Parker et al., p.287). Teachers use lesson plans as a guide to structuring their class time. Lesson planning 'exposes teachers' beliefs, understandings, and orientations' about the subject concerned (Baecher et al., 2014, p.120). Planning ahead of the class and preparing detailed lesson plans is important, especially for novice teachers who newly experience explicit instruction, modelling, guided practice, and scaffolding. Researchers found that when pre-service teachers were given opportunities to practice lesson planning and were given a chance to utilize the lesson plans with students, pre-service teachers began to view lesson planning as worthwhile (Parker et al., 2017).

Moreover, expert teachers were found to start their lesson plans with instructional activities, providing detailed planning related to the content (John, 2006, Perterson et al., 1978, Zahorik, 1970). On the other hand, novice teachers were found to write vague and non-specific rehearsal plans compared to more experienced teachers (Lane, 2010). Therefore, novice teachers may need support when creating their lesson plans and providing instruction (Regan et.al. 2016). However, 'Teachers are often not effectively taught about planning' (Korkut, 2017, p.115) and even when they are provided with a methods course, which encompasses planning methods, teachers do not utilize these processes to the full extent during planning procedures (Schmidt, 2005).

Some researchers have evaluated lesson plans created by teachers (see for example Korkut, 2017) to add to the limited research on effective lesson planning. The current study, however, not only examines lesson plans utilizing a checklist but also compares student outcomes in the Qualitative Reading Inventory-5 comprehension measure.

Purpose

Are there differences or similarities in the typical gain and above-average gain teachers' comprehension planning? Does the above-average gain teachers' comprehension lesson plans include more detail? Does the above-average gain teacher prepare more explicit lesson plans on engaged reader processes compared to the typical gain teacher?.

Table 1
Coding of the Variables

Variable	What was Coded	What was not Coded
Complete Scripting/Template	<p>Template was coded if the template was glued on or attached to the lesson plan. The template differed based on whether it was an acquisition or a consolidation session.</p> <p>For an acquisition lesson: naming, explaining when/why a process should be utilized, providing a think-aloud, encouraging use, restating name, and reflecting.</p> <p>For a consolidation lesson: naming, encouraging use, restating name, and returning to the process.</p>	<p>Partial scripting was not coded (referring to only parts of the template)</p>
Model	Reference to 'model'	
Genre	<p>Reference to 'genre'</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>-Non-fiction; text features; contents; character problem; conflict; setting; historical fiction; fiction vs. non-fiction; character feelings; feelings; character traits</p>	<p>If the word 'title' was listed, it was not coded as genre, since it was included as a separate variable. The word 'character' was also not included if it referred to listing the character names or the pages that introduced the characters in the story.</p>

	The word 'information' on the other hand was only coded as genre if the students were reading an informational text.	
Author's clues/clues	-clues we use; clues in the book; author's clues; clues from the author	Evidence, author's evidence, author's surprises
Chapter/book titles	Any instance of 'title'	Chapter, book
Background information	-Readers use what they already know -Background knowledge the reader knows -Background knowledge, we've been reading and now have some knowledge -We can use this knowledge as we are reading and thinking	
Reading is Thinking/Think about what you are reading	-Reading and thinking; Reading being thinking; Reading is thinking; Think about what you are reading	More specific phrases such as: One kind of thinking is asking questions
Share thinking/noticing	-Share your thinking; Share our thinking; Share noticing	

2. METHOD

This section is divided into eight subtitles the first of which is research design.

Research Design

A holistic multiple case study was utilized for the current study, comparing two teachers, resulting in a more 'robust' study as compared to a single-case design (Creswell, 2007; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2009), assisting in understanding similarities and differences among cases.

Context of the Study: ISA-X

This research took place in the context of a larger, four-year research program designed to determine if the Interactive Strategies Approach-Extended (ISA-X) reading

intervention improved achievement scores for students with limited reading comprehension. At the beginning of the larger study, student participants' instructional needs were determined using the Woodcock-Johnson III Basic Reading Skills Cluster (WJ III BRSC; Woodcock, McGrew, & Mather, 2001), which measures both sight vocabulary and decoding skills, and the Qualitative Reading Inventory-5 (QRI-5; Leslie & Caldwell, 2010) measures of accuracy and comprehension.

This study utilized data collected about participants with comprehension-only-needs. These were students who had adequate reading accuracy but still showed limited comprehension. (The researchers in the larger study also addressed the instruction and growth of primary accuracy-needs students with limited reading accuracy, which may be a cause of their poor comprehension.)

This study used data from one cohort of the larger study, with each cohort representing a school year. Before the ISA-X intervention, teachers were provided with professional development. The intervention was implemented within a small group instructional context for the length of a semester lasting approximately 50 sessions per student. It was provided to third and fourth-grade students in moderate to high poverty schools from four districts in the state of New York utilizing theme-based texts that supported the social studies and science curriculum. All students were assessed before and after the intervention.

Professional Development

Professional development was provided for the teachers to enable them to learn about the ISA-X instruction since they were newly introduced to it. For lesson planning, the teachers were provided with a format to follow (see Data Source: Lesson Plans below), however, no specific guidance was provided on how specific they needed to be. They were, however, provided with a strategy instruction template (see Supplementary Planning Materials under Data Source: Lesson Plans) to assist with planning the instruction of the engaged reader processes.

Teachers were expected to write each day's plan for each instructional group on the lesson plan template to which they could also add the supplementary material. Copies of the completed lesson plans were then collected by the research project

Sample

Each teacher provided instruction for two semesters giving a good amount of variability for teacher instruction. Two teachers from one cohort of the larger study were examined. One of the teachers was a certified reading teacher while the other one was a certified special education teacher, both with experience teaching.

One teacher's students had change scores from pre-test to post-test on the QRI-5 comprehension measure that were typical of most students in the ISA-X research study, while the other teacher's students had higher positive change scores referred to as the above-average gain teacher and typical gain teacher.

The above-average gain teacher had 92% of her total students make gains while typical gain teacher only had 50% of her total students make gains. A sample of the students for each teacher was selected for the current study. Since QRI-5 scores refer to grade levels, gains (change scores) were defined as gains made in grade level.

The intervention with its focus on intermediate students included both special education students and students who were at risk from third and fourth grade (Table 2). As can be seen in Table 2, twelve students (six pairs who were matched at pre-test) were selected after examining the four cohorts of the students for each teacher (case).

Table 2

Selected Students Pre-Intervention Scores

Pairs	Teacher	BRSC	QRI comprehension
1	Typical	99	3.8
	Above Average	98	2.8
2	Typical	102	1.8
	Above Average	92	1.8
3	Typical	98	3.8
	Above Average	98	3.8
4	Typical	96	3.8
	Above Average	93	3.8
5	Typical	90	3.8
	Above Average	92	3.8
6	Typical	95	3.8
	Above Average	96	3.8

Although the students were matched in pairs for this study based on their pre-test scores on the QRI-5 comprehension and BRSC, the students were not examined in pairs. The pairing was only used to select similar students from both teachers. Since each pair had similar needs (as measured by the BRSC and QRI-5) it was expected that the pairs had similar potential for growth and would benefit from similar instruction and, therefore, would require similar planning.

Once the intervention was completed, some students had large positive change scores in reading comprehension grade level while others had smaller or no change scores. The teacher labeled as above-average gain had 100% of her students make gains, ranging from one to three years, while the teacher labeled as typical gain only had 50% of her students make gains either by one year or three years. Lesson plans were then examined

to determine if the above-average gain teacher planned more detailed lesson plans and was better at incorporating the interactive nature of comprehension in her lesson plans.

Data Source: Lesson Plans

2ISA-X teachers were provided with a lesson plan template on which to record their plans. The lesson plan template has three main parts: teacher-led instruction, reading for meaning, and responding and reflecting.

On the template, 'Teacher-led Instruction' is divided into two parts: strategy or text knowledge and plan for non-target students. Under the 'strategy or text knowledge' heading, the teacher is expected to indicate her focus for the lesson. As part of 'strategy or text knowledge' section of the plan, the words 'acquisition' and 'consolidation-pre-set' are listed on the lesson plan template. 'Plan for non-target student' is where teachers are expected to indicate the activities that students who are not the focus or target student for that session will complete.

On the template, 'Reading for Meaning' is divided into two parts. The first part includes the following: thematic unit titles, format, strategy pre-set, and vocabulary/concept. Under the 'thematic unit titles' heading of the template, the teacher is expected to list the books that will be read within the session. The 'Format' heading prompts teachers to record whether students will read individually, as a group, or in pairs. Under the 'Strategy pre-set' heading the teacher is expected to write which, if any, engaged reader process he/she will pre-set before reading the book. Finally, the 'Vocabulary/concept' heading prompts the teacher to record any words the teacher will focus on as new vocabulary words found in the book.

On the template, the second part of reading for meaning includes: places where the strategy/text knowledge/ vocabulary goals can be practiced/ applied, anticipated challenge, and planned response. This part of the lesson plan prompts the teacher to record places in the book where students might practice the engaged reader process or text knowledge. Under the heading of 'anticipated challenge' the teacher is expected to note parts of the book that might be challenging for the students and in 'planned response' the teacher is expected to write how he/she will respond to the confusion.

The ISA-X Teacher Handbook (Author et al., 2015) includes examples of acquisition and consolidation lessons and examples of language utilized in the ISA-X intervention. The Handbook also includes templates for explicit instruction and pre-set instructions for planning word identification strategy lessons and questioning (one of the engaged reader processes).

Teachers were expected to write each day's plan for each instructional group on the lesson plan template to which they could also add the supplementary material.

Measures

Woodcock-Johnson III BRSC (WJ III BRSC; Woodcock et al., 2001). The Basic Reading Skills Cluster, which assesses letter-word identification (measures word identification

skills) and word attack (measures phonics skills with pseudo-words), requires the students to read a list of words and pseudo-words respectively.

Reliability. The BRSC is a composite measure derived from Letter-Word Identification and Word Attack subtests. Split-half reliability coefficients for ages 8 to 9 are between .94 and .96 for letter-word identification, and .89 for Word Attack. The median test-retest reliability coefficient is .95.

Validity. The criterion validity is indicated by correlations that range from .44 to .82 when using the Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement (Kaufman & Kaufman, 1985) and the Wechsler Individual Achievement Test (Wechsler, 1992) as the criterion measures.

Scoring. For the larger study, the BRSC was scored based on standardized directions. Computer-generated standard scores were utilized.

Qualitative Reading Inventory-5 (QRI-5; Leslie & Caldwell, 2010). The QRI-5 is generally used to report student growth, estimate reading levels, choose appropriate books, and evaluate the effects of intervention instruction (Leslie & Caldwell, 2010). Three narrative and three expository passages are available for use at each reading level; expository texts were not utilized in the larger study because the topics were similar to some texts read during the ISA-X intervention.

Comprehension measure. The starting passage for comprehension assessment for each student is determined through their performance on leveled word lists; the pre-primer level has 17 words while all other grade levels have 20 words.

To facilitate more standardized administration of the QRI-5, the researchers for the larger ISA-X study made two adjustments. First, students were allowed to look back at the passages to support the formulation of responses at all passage levels, rather than only at some levels as the test manual describes. Further, each passage was piloted to identify comprehension questions that produced student responses that were ambiguous or difficult to score. In these instances, standardized prompts and/or follow-up questions were developed for the examiners to use to elicit additional information used for scoring.

Test Administration. Reading level is categorized as independent, instructional, and frustration, with the QRI-5 expressing student scores as grade level scores. The manual specifies a specific number of questions at each level that determines that the student has performed at the instructional, independent, or frustration level.

Reliability. The authors of the QRI-5 report a 98% agreement between two independent scorers on scoring answers for comprehension questions that assess both explicit and implicit comprehension of the students (Leslie & Caldwell, 2010). In the ISA-X study, two independent raters had 93% agreement in their scoring of the comprehension questions, and 86% agreement for comprehension level.

Validity. The relationship between the QRI-5 and the Terra Nova test (CTB/McGraw-Hill, 2001) is statistically significant (.55 for 3rd graders and .66 for 4th graders; Leslie & Caldwell, 2010, p. 485).

Scoring. For the larger study, QRI-5 scoring was adjusted to meet study analysis criteria by converting the results at the earliest reading levels into numerical rather than descriptive terms. For grade 1 there were three passage levels with each set to a numerical value (pre-primer = 1.2, primer = 1.5, grade 1 = 1.8), while at other grades only one passage level was available and these levels were interpreted and assigned values equivalent to end of the grade-level performance (e.g., grade 2= 2.8, grade 3= 3.8, etc.). Students who did not attain an instructional level on the pre-primer passage received a score of 0.8. The administrations of the assessments were audio-recorded which allowed for double scoring by independent raters.

A multiple case study approach was utilized to qualitatively examine teacher planning with regard to the engaged reader processes by looking at the lesson plans.

Selecting Lesson Plans that Addressed Engaged Reader Processes. The first step was to select and code lesson plans that planned engaged reader instruction for each of the twelve students. Sessions were selected and coded if the lesson plan included a reference to purpose setting, questioning/wondering, and/or predicting.

Developing the Lesson Plan Coding System. The first step in developing the coding system was to read the engaged reader lesson plans for each of the selected students. A checklist was generated and a detailed definition was developed for each variable. The coding system includes eight variables (See Table 1).

Lesson Plan Variables. The variable that is called 'complete scripting/template' referred to whether or not the teacher included a detailed description of how she planned to introduce the engaged reader processes or pre-set the engaged reader process during instruction. To be coded as a 'complete script with template' in the researcher's coding system, the teacher needed to record what he/she planned to say during certain parts of the instruction (See Table 1 for a description). Since the utilization of the template ensures that the instruction aligns with the ISA-X, it was hypothesized that if a teacher used the template, she would provide better instruction and/or pre-set of the engaged reader processes.

Moreover, for the variables 'reading is thinking/think about what you are reading', 'author's clues/clues', 'chapter/book titles', and 'share thinking/noticing', the phrases were chosen specifically because 1) These phrases are examples of ISA-X language, and 2) It was hypothesized that consistent teacher language is more effective. The phrases were selected because of their importance with the engaged reader processes. 'Reading is thinking/think about what you are reading' was selected because of its reminder to the student of the importance of thinking while reading, encouraging the students to think about the engaged reader process selected. 'Author's clues/clues' were selected because of the importance of finding clues that relate to answering the engaged reader

process selected. Similarly, 'chapter/book titles' was selected because of its importance in setting purposes, predictions, or questions, and for fiction books, the importance of connecting the title to the problem of the story. Lastly, 'share thinking/noticing' was selected because the phrase encouraged the students to discuss what they were thinking and noticing, including their purpose, prediction, or question.

Additional data from the lesson plans were collected, looking for any indication as to whether the plan was for an acquisition or a consolidation session. On the lesson plan, teachers were expected to indicate whether they planned for an acquisition or a consolidation session on the engaged reader processes.

Coding Procedures. To summarise the lesson plan data for the case studies, a table was created for each student. For each session that was selected, what was written about the engaged reader processes in that specific lesson plan was listed. The data was then coded in Table 1, using the coding system described above.

Reliability and Validity. A second researcher was taught the procedures used to create and code the student tables. The inter-rated agreement was 96% for items in the table, and 98% for the coding of those items. The study examined the relationship between the coding scores and the QRI- reading comprehension change scores, thus making it possible to obtain some evidence of validity. External validity was evaluated through the use of analytic generalization and replicating findings using a multiple case study design.

Student and Teacher Identity

Student and teacher names were not included in the study because of confidentiality concerns. Instead, each student's name was replaced with a code. Students who had the above-average gain teacher were coded as 'A' followed by the pair number. Students who had the typical gain teacher were coded as 'T' followed by the pair number.

Declaration

The current research was conducted in the Capital Region of New York, USA. The State University of New York (SUNY) at Albany, SUNY's Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved the study. The study was conducted according to the principles expressed in the Declaration of Helsinki. Ethical standards were followed, promoting and ensuring respect for all human subjects and protecting their privacy and confidentiality. The data is held by the Child Research and Study Center of the SUNY at Albany.

3. FINDINGS

The findings are separated into the two subtitles of engaged reader processes and lesson plan checklist comparison.

Engaged Reader Processes

The results supported the initial decision to name the teachers as the above-average gain teacher and typical gain teacher. The above average gain teacher's students

performed higher than the average expected score, while the typical gain teacher's students performed according to the expected average. Table 3 lists the number of sessions the two teachers planned to spend on each of the processes along with the total number of sessions for all three processes for each of the twelve students.

Table 3

Number of Sessions the Processes were Listed on the Lesson Plan

Student number	Purpose Setting	Questioning	Predicting	Total
Above Average Gain Teacher's Students				
A-Pair 1	6	6	2	14
A-Pair 2	9	12	1	22
A-Pair 3	16	11	7	34
A-Pair 4	24	17	13	56
A-Pair 5	8	6	5	19
A-Pair 6	24	17	13	56
Typical Gain Teacher's Students				
T-Pair 1	39	12	2	48
T-Pair 2	39	12	2	48
T-Pair 3	19	0	0	19
T-Pair 4	18	10	1	29
T-Pair 5	18	10	1	29
T-Pair 6	18	10	1	29

One factor that differentiated the above-average gain teacher from the typical gain teacher was the extent to which she planned to address all three of the engaged reader processes. Both teachers planned to address purpose setting with all students. Both teachers planned to spend some time on instruction and practice of questioning, but the typical gain teacher planned to spend less time on this topic and for one student she did not plan to provide any instruction in questioning. Moreover, the typical gain teacher rarely planned to provide students with instruction in prediction. The above-average gain teacher, on the other hand, did plan to spend some time on prediction with most of her students, although she planned to spend only one session on prediction for two students. To sum up, while the typical gain teacher mostly just planned on focusing on

purpose setting, the above-average gain teacher most often planned to provide instruction on all three processes.

Lesson Plan Checklist Comparison

Eight variables were generated to characterize the teacher's method of planning focused on the engaged reader processes. Table 4 includes the numbers of sessions the variables were mentioned with regard to the engaged reader processes for both the above-average gain teacher's students and the typical gain teacher's students, thus allowing for the comparison of the two teachers in their planning and preparation for the sessions. It is important to note that although the ISA-X intervention expects teachers to individualize instruction, the teachers did not seem to plan to treat Pair 2 differently than the other pairs, even though they had lower pre-test scores than the other pairs.

The above-average gain teacher wrote more detailed plans and planned on teaching the engaged reader processes in a way that aligned with the guidance provided by the ISA-X. The above-average gain teacher planned to utilize complete scripting based on templates' for the engaged reader processes. She often attached the templates with her own script as supplementary materials to her lesson plans while the typical teacher did not. Specifically, the above-average gain teacher recorded what she planned to say during the following parts of an acquisition lesson: naming the engaged reader process, explaining when/why a process should be utilized, providing a think-aloud model, encouraging the use of the process during reading, restating the name of the process, and at the end of the lesson, reflecting with students on the value of the engaged reader process. During consolidation sessions, the teacher recorded on the plan how she would name the engaged reader process, encourage its use, restate its name, and return to the process during reading. Thus, utilizing complete scripting using templates ensured that the teacher provided a thorough introduction as supported by research on the gradual release of responsibility and explicit instruction. The typical gain teacher only referred to 'modeling' in her lesson plans, without scripting or emphasizing other parts of the introduction.

The two teachers also differed in the extent to which they planned to link the engaged reader processes to other aspects of comprehension that were a part of the ISA-X professional development. The typical gain teacher referred to helpful ideas in her lesson plan like looking for 'author's clues' and 'reading is thinking' with one group only, while the above-average gain teacher included both ideas in her plans for all of her students. The typical gain teacher did not plan to refer to 'share your thinking and/or noticing' with any of her students while the above-average gain teacher included it with all of her students. Furthermore, the typical gain teacher did not include the idea that readers use their 'background knowledge' in her lesson plans. The above-average gain teacher listed background knowledge with all of her students except for the two students in groups with primary-accuracy-needs students. Moreover, even though both teachers referred to the importance of using the 'title' and the connection of 'genre' and

the engaged reader processes, the typical gain teacher provided much less information about these ideas in her lesson plans.

Table 4

Elements in Teachers' Lesson Plans

	Total Engaged Reader Sessions	Complete Scripting and/or Template	Model	Genre	Author's Clues and/or Clues	Chapter or Book Titles	Background Information	Reading is Thinking	Share thinking and/or noticing
Students	Above Average Gain Teacher								
A-Pair 1	6	1	0	4	2	1	0	2	1
A-Pair 2	9	2	0	12	4	7	4	6	6
A-Pair 3	16	2	0	8	4	9	2	2	4
A-Pair 4	24	5	1	21	10	3	7	10	10
A-Pair 5	8	2	0	5	4	5	0	1	2
A-Pair 6	24	5	1	21	10	3	7	10	10
Average	14.5	2.8	0.3	11.8	5.7	4.7	3.3	5.2	5.5
	Typical Gain Teacher								
T-Pair 1	39	0	5	27	7	0	0	1	0
T-Pair 2	39	0	5	27	7	0	0	1	0
T-Pair 3	19	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0
T-Pair 4	18	0	2	10	0	2	0	0	0
T-Pair 5	18	0	2	10	0	2	0	0	0
T-Pair 6	18	0	2	10	0	2	0	0	0
Average	25.2	0	2.7	14.3	2.3	1.3	0	0.3	0

4. RESULTS, DISCUSSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

As a result of the complexity of comprehension and the difficulty of extracting meaning, multiple strategies are often taught to struggling readers (Watson et al., 2012). Results of multiple strategy instruction in previous research were large on experimenter-written tests that specifically assessed the strategies taught (effect size of .88, National Reading Panel, 2000) and smaller for standardized tests that assessed reading comprehension more generally (effect size of .32, National Reading Panel, 2000). This study obtained results to support these findings by examining a specific set of comprehension strategies that were implemented with third and fourth grade students. The results of the lesson plan analysis support the initial naming of the teachers (above-average gain vs. typical gain) utilizing the gain scores.

Comprehension involves a reader's prior knowledge and is interactive in nature (Duke et al., 2011; Pardo, 2004; Kintsch, 2005). Therefore, including the variables (Table 1) in the lesson plans, if implemented, ensured that the teacher clarified to the students the interactive nature of comprehension. As predicted, the above-average gain teacher included this language in her lesson plans more often than did the typical gain teacher.

'Knowledge-centeredness occurs as teachers acquire additional knowledge of content and pedagogy through iterative cycles of the process of lesson planning and implementation' (Regan et.al., 2016,114). A limitation of this study is that it did not follow teachers for an extended period. Since it can take teachers up to 2-3 years to be able to teach strategies effectively (Almasi & Fullerton, 2012) and create effective lesson plans, more longitudinal studies are warranted to closely examine the development of the teachers in their instruction preparation and planning. Moreover, the results of this study should be replicated utilizing a multiple case study, thus adding to the robustness of the findings.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank three anonymous referees for their comments which significantly improved the paper.

References

- Almasi, J.F., & Fullerton, S.K. (2012). *The strategic processes in reading*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Baecher, L., Farnsworth, T., & Ediger, A. (2014). The challenges of planning language objectives in content-based ESL instruction. *Language Teaching Research*, 18(1), 118-136.
- Duffy, G.G. (1993). Teachers' progress toward becoming expert strategy teachers. *Elementary School Journal*, 94(2), 109-120. doi: 10.1086/461754
- Duke, N., Pearson, D., Strachan, S., & Billman, S. (2011). Essential elements of fostering and teaching reading comprehension. In S. Samuels & A. Farstrup (eds.), *What Research Has to Say About Reading Instruction* (4th ed.,pp. 51-93). Newark: DE: International Reading Association.
- Flurkey, A., & Xu, J., (Eds.) (2003). *On the revolution of reading: The selected writings of Kenneth S. Goodman*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Ghorbani, M.R., Gangeraj, A.A., & Alavi, S.Z. (2013). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension strategies improves EFL learners' writing ability. *Current Issues in Education*, 16(1), 1-11.
- Guthrie, J. T., McRae, A., & Klauda, S. L. (2007). Contributions of concept-oriented reading instruction to knowledge about interventions for motivations in reading. *Educational Psychology*, 42(4),237-250.

- John, P.D. (2006). Lesson planning and the student teacher: Re-thinking the dominant model. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 38(4), 483-498.
- Kim, W., Linan-Thompson, S., & Misquitta, R. (2012). Critical factors in reading comprehension instruction for students with learning disabilities: A research synthesis. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practise*, 27(2), 66-78.
- Kintsch, W. (2005). An Overview of Top-Down and Bottom-Up Effects in Comprehension: The CI Perspective. *Discourse Processes: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 39(2&3), 125-128. doi: 10.1207/s15326950dp3902&3_2
- Korkut, P. (2018). The construction and pilot application of a scoring rubric for creative drama lesson planning. *The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 23(1), 114-125. doi: 10.1080/13569783.2017.1396211
- Kymes, A. (2005). Teaching online comprehension strategies using think-alouds. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 48(6), 492-500. doi: 10.1598/JAAL.48.6.4
- Lane, J. S. (2010). An analysis of relationships between lesson planning training and rehearsal. *Journal of Band Research*, 46(1), 52-65.
- Leslie, L., & Caldwell, J. S. (2010). *Qualitative Reading Inventory – 5*. Boston: Pearson.
- Mason, L.H. (2004). Explicit self-regulated strategy development versus reciprocal questioning: Effects on expository reading comprehension among struggling readers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96(2), 283-296. doi: 10.1037/0022-0663.96.2.283
- Migyanka, J. M., Policastro, C., & Guiqiu, L. (2005). Using a think-aloud with diverse students: Three primary grade students experience chrysanthemum. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 33(3), 171-177. doi: 10.1007/s10643-005-0045-z
- Mitchell, K. E. (2006). Getting to the Heart of a Story. *Teaching Pre K-8*, 37(1), 66-67.
- Morrow, L. M. (2011). Developing effective reading curricula for beginning readers and the primary grades. In T. V. Rasinski (Ed.), *Rebuilding the foundation: Effective reading instruction for 21st century literacy* (pp. 89–112). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- National Reading Panel (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.
- Ness, M. (2011). Explicit reading comprehension instruction in elementary classrooms: Teacher use of reading comprehension strategies. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 25(1), 98-117. doi: 10.1080/02568543.2010.531076
- Palincsar, A.S., & Brown, A.L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction*, 1(2), 117-175. doi: 10.1207/s1532690xci0102_1
- Pardo, L. S. (2004). What every teacher needs to know about comprehension. *The Reading Teacher*, 58(3), 272-280. doi: 10.1598/RT.58.3.5
- Parker, E. C., Bond, V. L., & Powell, B. S. (2017). A grounded theory of preservice music educators' lesson planning processes within field experiences methods courses. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 65(3), 287-308. doi: 10.1177/0022429417730035
- Peterson, P.L., Marx, R.W., Clark, C.M. (1978). Teacher planning, teacher behavior, and student achievement. *American Educational Journal*, 15(3), 417-432.

- Regan, K. S., Evmenova, A. S., Kurz, L. A., Hughes, M. D., Sacco, D., Ahn, S. Y., MacVittie, N., Good, K., Boykin, A., Schwartzter, J., Chirinos, D. S. (2016). Researchers apply lesson study: A cycle of lesson planning, implementation, and revision. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practise*, 31(2), 113-122. doi: 10.1111/ldrp.12101
- Schmidt, M. (2005). Preservice string teachers' lesson-planning processes: An exploratory study. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 53, 6-25. doi: 10.1177/002242940505300102
- Stone, A. (1998). The metaphor of scaffolding: Its utility for the field of learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 31(4), 344-364. doi: 10.1177/002221949803100404
- Townsend, D., & Boynton, M.J. (2013). Mediating the effects of reading engagement on reading comprehension of early adolescent English language learners. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 29, 309-332.
- Watson, S. R., Gable, R. A., Gear, S. B., & Hughes, K. C. (2012). Evidence-based strategies for improving the reading comprehension of secondary students: Implications for students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practise*, 27(2), 79-89. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-5826.2012.00353.
- Woodcock, R.W., McGrew, K. S., & Mather, N. (2001). *Woodcock-Johnson III*. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Services.
- Yaqoob, L.H. (2020). *Mim Harfi uzerinden bir dil felsefesi denemesi [An essay on a philosophy of language on the Letter Mim]*. Muarrib yayinlari.
- Zahorik, J.A. (1970). The effect of planning on teaching. *The Elementary School Journal*, 71(3), 143-151.

In the writing process of the study titled “Comparison of a more Effective and a Typical Teachers’ Lesson Plan Detail in the Psychological Engagement of Students”, the rules of scientific, ethical and citation were followed; it was undertaken by the authors of this study that no falsification was made on the collected data. “Sakarya University Journal of Education Journal and Editor” had no responsibility for all ethical violations to be encountered, and all responsibility belongs to the authors and that the study was not submitted for evaluation to any other academic publishing environment.

Statement of Contribution of Researchers to the Article:

1st author contribution rate: 50%

2nd author contribution rate: 50%

Conflict of Interest Statement:

There is no conflict of interest.

Statement of Financial Support or Acknowledgment:

No financial support was received from any institution for this study. We would like to thank reviewers who contributed to this paper.