

in use in Washington State to assess how well schools satisfy the individual needs of learners.

The instrument may be used by teachers for self-assessment or by outside observers and has also been used to compare classes and schools.

According to Frederick Gies, writing in *Context and Conflict* published by the Washington ASCD, research leading to the development of the Inventory of Individualized Instruction and Learning (IIIL) was grounded in the belief that observable behaviors or practices characterizing individualized instruction occur to varying degrees in instructional settings.

Using a five-point Likert scale ranging from "almost never" to "almost always" observers identify and rank the following 25 items:

1. Measurable objectives for learning experience and instruction are in written form.

2. Objectives are communicated to students.

3. Students engage in learning activities as a result of measurable objectives.

4. Objectives differ among students.

5. Students are involved in the selection and/or specification of objectives.

6. Students are able to explain why they are engaged in their present activities.

7. Students are involved in the selection and/or specification of the materials to be used.

8. Assessment procedures are an integral part of the learning process.

9. Various assessment procedures are used (paper and pencil tests, work samples, demonstrations).

10. The same assessment technique is not used for an entire class simultaneously.

11. Assessment results are interpreted to students on an individual and/or small group basis.

12. A student changes learning activities as a result of assessment.

13. Students are encouraged to request that they be assessed.

14. Students are permitted to move around the classroom freely.

15. Different learning modes are used (large group, small group, independent study and one-to-one).

16. Student composition of the learning modes changes.

17. Cross-age and/or peer group teaching is employed in the instructional area supervised by the teacher.

18. During teacher-directed instruction, different teaching methods are employed.

19. A variety of learning materials are used simultaneously by students in the classroom area.

20. A variety of audiovisual equipment is available for use in the classroom.

21. A variety of audiovisual equipment is used in the classroom.

22. Learning materials encompass the range of achievement levels within the group.

23. Students use the school library or resource center.

24. A management system exists that shows objectives at the different levels or stages within a subject area for each student.

25. The management system affords easy access to information concerning student progress for the teacher, student, and parents.

Copies of the instrument are available from Frederick Gies, Dean, School of Education, Seattle University, Seattle, WA 98122.

Research on Teaching

JANET FLEGG

■ POOR READERS DON'T READ MUCH

Poor readers get to read, on the average, less than half as many words in elementary school as good readers. And they have few opportunities to practice silent reading. "This deficit," says researcher Richard Allington, "may be a contributing factor to the underachievement of poor readers."

Allington reports that in comparison to good readers, poor readers spend less time reading, typically receive fewer opportunities to respond, are more likely to have their oral reading interrupted if they make an error, and are more likely to have their attention directed to phonics and punctuation than meaning and syntax.

The effect of frequent interruptions of oral reading and little time spent on silent reading is that poor readers have less opportunity to derive meaning from what they read than do good readers, less chance to enjoy reading.

Allington stresses the importance of increasing reading experiences for poor readers and suggests strategies for teachers to consider:

First, increase the amount of silent reading instruction and experience for poor readers. Second, consider assigning more independent reading to poor readers. Perhaps an aide could listen to retellings of material read independently by poor readers to help them concentrate on meaning.

"It is important that poor readers be given the opportunity to increase their reading experiences," says Allington. "How one chooses to accomplish this is of less concern."

For more information, send for IRT Occasional Paper No. 31, *Poor Readers Don't Get to Read Much*, by Richard Allington, \$1.75. Send check, money order, or *prepaid* purchase order (payable to Michigan State University) to IRT Publications, 252 Erickson, MSU, East Lansing, MI 48824. (Michigan residents should add a 4 percent state sales tax.)

■ WHAT DO STUDENTS LIKE TO READ?

Are teachers accurate at predicting what their students like to read? Not very, say IRT researchers Joe Byers and Thomas Evans, but they can improve their accuracy. And if teachers are more accurate in their predictions, they can better select books that their students will enjoy.

Byers and Evans asked elementary-school students to select books from Scholastic Press brochures that they would like to read, then asked teachers to predict which books their students had chosen. Researchers then developed a list of 29 book cues, such as sports, poetry, or danger, that children and teachers might use in selecting one book over another.

Using statistical analysis, they found that students chose books in a predictable manner and not randomly. The researchers also reported that teachers found the task of predicting their students' book selections to be one "that they could respond to in a systematic fashion." In making their predictions, teachers used many of

the same cues as their students, but they weighted them differently. This was one reason for their low prediction accuracy.

Feedback about *how* someone uses or weights cues in making a judgment or prediction may, say Byers and Evans, significantly improve cue use which will in turn improve prediction accuracy.

For a more detailed explanation of the study's results, send for IRT Research Series No. 81, *Children's Reading Interests: A Study of Teacher Judgment*, by Joe L. Byers and Thomas E. Evans, \$2.75. To order, send check, money order, or prepaid purchase order (payable to Michigan State University) to IRT Publications, 252 Erickson Hall, MSU, East Lansing, MI 48824. (Michigan residents should add a 4 percent state sales tax).

Learning Styles

NANCY RECKINGER AND
RITA DUNN

■ PERSONALITY STYLES

Understanding personality styles of teachers and administrators offers insights into why things happen as they do in schools. Jeffrey L. Hoffman and Marianne Betkouski have pulled together 41 pages of data in a "Summary of Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Research Applications in Education."

The predominant personality type found among male administrators, and especially among school principals, is extroverted, sensing, thinking, and judging in MBTI terms. These people are good at organization but may need help with human relations. They are most concerned with preserving the establishment and are practical, realistic, impersonal, swayed only by reasoning.

The majority of 1389 public school teachers in six studies consistently were extroverted, sensing, feeling, and judging. This type is described as responsible, dependable, systematic; supporting and preserving socially recognized institutions and expecting

others to do the same. They are loyal, interested in people, work well within a hierarchy of authority, respect facts, do well with detail and routine, and are generally concerned with practical things that visibly affect people's lives.

■ READING CURRICULUM MISSES MANY STUDENTS

Although three-fourths of students prefer the sensing mode of acquiring knowledge (labeled S in MBTI terms) and one-fourth prefer the intuitive mode (N), reading is largely taught in the intuitive way.

Renee Golanty-Koel found significant differences between S's and N's in terms of their reading. Sensing types prefer television to reading while intuitives prefer to read. Sensing types see no relationship between stories read and life, never think about themselves when reading stories, do not identify with characters in books, and cannot recall characters they read about. Intuitives identify with characters and connect stories with real life. Intuitives like who and why questions, while sensing types prefer what and how questions and are more interested in knowing what "really happened" than in fiction.

Writers are mostly intuitives and that includes writers of textbooks, reading programs, and standardized tests. Without understanding learning styles and personality types, their biases are unintended. Nevertheless, they establish the criteria for success in school and that criteria does not work for extroverted sensing children who think best out loud and learn best by interacting with the real world rather than with words about actions.

Four studies looked at the most effective classroom teacher personality. Ryans (1960) identified the most effective teachers as being friendly, understanding, stimulating, imaginative, responsible, and systematic in their teaching behaviors, which in Jungian theory and MBTI terms would be called extroverted, intuitive, feeling, and judging. VonFange (1962), Wright (1966), and Keirse and Bates (1978) each reached the same conclusion.

Authors Hoffman and Betkouski (1981) point out, however, that, "We do not all define the 'effectiveness' of a teacher in the same way. . . . Those who are intuitive, feeling, and those who are sensing, judging just repre-

sent opposite ends of the continuum in teaching philosophy . . ." (pp. 14-15).

The development of learning and teaching style research may lead us to question the assumption that any good teacher can teach any assigned group of students equally well.

Keirse and Bates (1978) found that sensing, judging teachers outnumber intuitive, feeling teachers 56 to 32 percent, and that these two styles make up 88 percent of K-12 faculties but are only 50 percent of the total population. Such data are of crucial interest when we begin looking for ways of meeting the needs of other styles, particularly the active, sensing, doing, freedom-loving, independent sensing-perceptive type that makes up 38 percent of the population but fails to thrive in most schools and accounts for only 4 percent of teachers.

References:

Golanty-Koel, Renee. "The Relationship of Psychological Types and Mass Media Preferences to the Values of Non-Academic High School Students." Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1977. *Dissertation Abstracts International* 38(1978):4683-A. For additional information: Renee Golanty-Koel, 373 Upper Terrace, San Francisco, CA 94117.

Hoffman, Jeffrey L., and Betkouski, Marianne. "A Summary of Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Research Applications in Education." *Research in Psychological Type* Volume 3, 1981.

Keirse, David, and Bates, Marilyn. *Please Understand Me*. Del Mar, Calif.: Prometheus Books, 1978.

Ryans, D.G. *Characteristics of Teachers*. Mansha, Wis.: George Banta Company, Inc., 1960.

VonFange, E.A. "Implications for School Administration of the Personality Structure of Educational Personnel." Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1961.

Wright, J.A. "The Relationship of Rated Administrator and Teacher Effectiveness to Personality as Measured by the Myers-Briggs Personality Type Indicator." Doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1966.

■ COGNITIVE STYLE MAPPING GROWS

Cognitive Style Mapping developed

Copyright © 1981 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.