

BROKEN PROMISES

Reading Instruction in
Twentieth-Century America

Patrick Shannon

Introduction by Henry A. Giroux and Paulo Freire

Critical Studies in Education Series

□ **BROKEN PROMISES** □
Reading Instruction in Twentieth-Century
America

Patrick Shannon

Introduction by Henry A. Giroux and Paulo Freire



BERGIN & GARVEY
New York • Westport, Connecticut • London

CRITICAL STUDIES IN EDUCATION SERIES

In Memory of Paul T. Shannon

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Shannon, Patrick, 1951-

Broken promises: reading instruction in twentieth-century
America / Patrick Shannon : introduction by Paulo Freire and Henry A.
Giroux.

p. cm.—(Critical studies in education series)

Bibliography: p.

Includes index.

ISBN 0-89789-161-9 (alk. paper)

ISBN 0-89789-160-0 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Reading (Elementary)—United States—History. 2. Reading
(Elementary)—United States—Textbooks—History. 3. Reading—
United States—Aids and devices—History. 4. Reading teachers—
United States—Effect of technological innovations on. I. Title.

II. Series.

LB1573.S466 1989

372.4'0973—dc19 88-27397

Copyright © 1989 by Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.

All rights reserved. No portion of this book may be
reproduced, by any process or technique, without the
express written consent of the publisher.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 88-27397

ISBN: 0-89789-161-9

0-89789-160-0 (pbk.)

First published in 1989

Bergin & Garvey, One Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10010

An imprint of Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.

Printed in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5

Preface

□ When I first heard the title of this book, *Broken Promises*, I thought it was too sensational—more appropriate for a television mini-series or a romance novel. It was clear, at least to me, that my original title, “Managing Literacy,” was descriptive of twentieth century reading instruction, in which reading experts, textbook publishers, and state officials attempted to manage, and continue to manage with ever increasing levels of sophistication, the instructional practice of teachers. In turn, teachers manage the literacy learning of their students. Moreover, “Managing Literacy” connoted the new skills of teaching reading, which teachers must now demonstrate if they are to be considered “effective” in their work. My title seemed an apt, even compelling, descriptor of what takes place in American classrooms in the name of reading instruction. Yet, Jim Bergin, the publisher, and Henry Giroux, the series editor, suggested *Broken Promises* without explanation. What can such a title mean?

American reading instruction is based on a series of promises concerning its audience, its delivery, and its benefit. Originally, reading instruction was supposed to lead Americans to salvation of the soul from that Old Deluder, Satan, in the Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1647, and of the spirit from political and economic tyranny, in the educational writings of Thomas Jefferson. The ability to read promised salvation by enabling the public to be aware of and to examine critically the religious and political temptations likely to lead a free people astray. Right from the start, however, the promise of reading instruction was broken for women, minorities, and the poor, who for one reason or another were excluded from formal instruction. Sadly, this promise is still often broken today, even though laws require compulsory school attendance. Minorities and the poor continue to lag well behind white middle and upper class students, and although women seem to fare somewhat better over-

all, they find themselves behind in the scientific and technical literacies required to gain power in the world of work.

Promises were also made and broken to those who wished to teach reading. Reading instruction was supposed to make a difference in the lives of their students. It was to enable students to gather and evaluate information necessary for them to live fulfilled lives (however defined), empowering them to have greater control over their lives. Implicit in this belief is the promise made to teachers that they would lead fulfilled lives and control their work at school. After all, teachers were already literate. Yet, I will argue that during the twentieth century teachers lost more and more control over their work, as textbook technology became more sophisticated and was expected to carry what is sometimes considered to be the burden of teaching reading.

The promise of benefit has been broken to all Americans—not just to women, minorities, and the poor. At present, American reading instruction does a good job of teaching students to decode words and to reproduce the meaning of texts. But we were promised much more. Reading as promised is supposed to enable us to read both the word and the world in ways that allow us to see through the mysteries, ambiguities, and deceit of modern living in order to make sense of our lives, to understand the connections among our lives and those of others, and to act on our new knowledge to construct a better, a more just, world.

I think these are some of the broken promises to which Bergin and Giroux alluded in their cryptic suggestion for a title change. The new title puts my concerns in a new light, one that might allow more people to see the importance of reconsidering and reconstructing American reading instruction. We have a right to expect reading instruction to fulfill its promises, and I hope my book illuminates some of the reasons why the promises have been broken in the past and illustrates some ways we can work to realize desired changes.

As are all authors, I am indebted to several people who helped me develop the arguments I offer in this book. Robert Smith helped me learn to think critically and historically, showing me that culture and history are human artifacts and that “things don’t have to remain the way they currently appear.” Robert Schreiner, P. David Pearson, John Cogan, Elton Stetson, Dick Abrahamson, Pose Lamb, Ed Kameenui, Peter Winograd, Peter Mosenthal, and Andy Effrat each helped by giving their time to read and comment on my writing or by allowing me time to pursue that writing. Jim Hoffman, Ken Goodman, and Henry Giroux offered opportunities to tie my studies together and to extend my argument. Joan Craig and Susan Sperling helped me prepare the manuscript. I thank them all. Most sincerely, I wish to thank my wife, Kathleen, who remains my most supportive critic.

Editors' Introduction

Reading Instruction and Critical Pedagogy

HENRY A. GIROUX AND PAULO FREIRE

□ Theories of reading and reading instruction have fallen on hard times. Conservatives assert their ideological clout and forcefully embrace the old scientism as a model for reading instruction. Touted as a central element in the back-to-basics movement, reading instruction, as a discipline sorely in need of more stringent regulation and control, becomes a major target in the public schools. Relying upon research paradigms which display a passion for exactness, standardization, and rationalization, the federal government has initiated an educational reform movement that defines reading as a technological rather than a historical and social practice. Invoking a methodology that removes history, politics, and values from its formulaic principles, policy makers at the national and state levels have performed ideological surgery on reading programs across the country. Rejecting the notion that reading is a cultural practice inextricably related to the histories, experiences, and voices of the teachers and students—who engage it as a form of social and cultural production—the new technocrats of reading proceeded to develop and argue for forms of reading instruction that deny the active side of human understanding, social interaction, and human intentionality. Abstracted from history and the realm of public culture and power, reading instruction has been enlisted by the dominant culture as part of a wider political and pedagogical attack on the capacity of teachers and students to engage in critical thought as a meaningful form of teaching and learning. What is at stake in this position is not merely the ability of students to learn

how to read critically, but also the even more radical pedagogical practice of teaching students to take risks and to engage in meaningful social action. In effect, the reading instruction that has dominated schooling is part of a wider thrust to undermine the possibility of public schools developing and educating an autonomous and self-motivated critical citizenry.

Consigned to the margins of the current debate on theories of reading and reading instruction, radical social theory in the United States has not been able to challenge the new conservatism effectively. Of course, the works of the Paulo Freire, Ken and Yetta Goodman, and others offer a progressive alternative as both a theory and a pedagogy of reading, but their influence has been limited to adult literacy programs and a few schools of education. A more serious problem has emerged in the influential discourses of postmodernism and poststructuralism that have begun to exercise considerable influence on the theory and practice of reading and text analysis in higher education in the United States. Celebrating the death of the subject and the infinite play of signification and difference, various theorists in these movements have played down the act of reading as historical, value laden, and political. Rejecting historical, ethical, and political practice as one of the crimes of modernity, the culture of postmodernity has largely refused to engage the act of reading and the construction of text as a pedagogical act that itself can only be seen as part of a wider historical and political project. Freire's notion that human beings read the world before they read the word has no place in a paradigm whereby human agents have been relegated to the ashcan of history.

It is to Patrick Shannon's credit that he avoids the ideological tenets and worst simplifications of both of these positions while engaging in a project designed to appropriate critically and advance the most important and empowering insights of the progressive tradition on reading and pedagogy.

For Shannon, the question of reading instruction is deeply implicated in issues of power, domination, and possibility. Rejecting the universalizing discourse of prevailing theories of reading instruction, Shannon attempts to develop a criticism of these positions by situating them in historical and theoretical analyses that combine three important considerations. First, he reasserts the primacy of the theoretical, the social, and the functional as central categories for a critical theory of reading and reading instruction. Specifically, Shannon argues that theory cannot be seen merely as a predictive or descriptive category in establishing a language of reading instruction. Theory is a productive category that is constitutive of the categories educators use to organize their views of pedagogy, texts, and students. As a self-reflective discourse, theory both constitutes and is reconstituted through its engagement with practice.

Similarly, Shannon recognizes that theory is always shot through with values and must be seen as both an ethical and political discourse. In addition, Shannon strongly argues that the social as an analytical unit cannot be replaced through an exclusive focus on the individual as the isolated referent for generating critiques and theories of reading instruction. In fact, the individual must be understood and analyzed in social terms, as these are uniquely constructed within larger historical and structural relations. Put another way, the material and ideological conditions that give meaning to human subjectivity and individual behavior as they unfold within particular social practices and cultural forms can only be understood as part of wider specific social formations that occupy a particular historical conjuncture. Instead of talking about the structure or the how of reading programs, Shannon focuses on their function, as determined by the interest they express and the effects they have on students and teachers, especially in terms of how they work to empower or disempower such groups. The language of technique which guides most reading programs is insufficient as a discourse and practice for referencing the theoretical, ethical, and political interests that structure and mediate the purpose and effects of existing approaches to reading and pedagogy.

Second, Shannon develops his own transformative project by examining existing reading instruction as historical and political practice. He attempts to reveal the ideologies and interest at work in current dominant approaches to reading instruction by first treating them as objects of historical analysis. He then critically examines the effects of these approaches on teachers and students through an analysis of how current reading approaches deskill teachers and disempower students at the same time. In effect, Shannon attempts to link questions of history, power, and knowledge through a critical perspective that brilliantly illuminates the ways in which school texts are produced as part of the wider commercialization of schooling, teachers are deskilled under the imperatives of management, and the voices and experiences of students from subordinate groups are silent or ignored as a result of the growing management pedagogies now proliferating in American schools.

Third, Shannon is not content to stay within the language of critique. He devotes the last section of his book to a project of possibility and hope. In doing so, he both provides a critical discourse for teachers to use to rethink their own theory and practice of reading and exemplifies his position by demonstrating how a number of teachers, researchers, parents, and students actually have struggled to reverse the current language and practice of management as it shapes educational policy in a number of public schools.

Shannon is not a bad utopian. On the contrary, he is an educator who believes that hope matters, that struggle must continue, and that schools

are important sites of contestation and reform. His book combines history, theory, and practice in a manner that is unmatched by any other text on reading instruction in North America. His attempt to retheorize and reconstruct a theory and pedagogy of reading is courageous and much needed. Patrick Shannon provides the most illuminating and instructive critique of the historical development and current ideologies at work in existing dominant approaches to reading instruction to appear in years. More important, he lays the groundwork for educators to develop an approach to reading instruction which embraces the insight that schools should be places where a pedagogy of reading truly teaches students to read the world, and the word, in the interest of creating a more humane and justly democratic society.

Introduction

□ Walk into any American elementary classroom during a reading lesson, and there is a 90 percent chance that you will observe a teacher and students working with **commercially prepared materials**. Most likely, the students in this classroom are divided into groups according to their abilities to read accurately and to complete written assignments successfully. Two of the groups will be sitting at their desks completing pages in appropriate workbooks or filling in the blanks of a worksheet, all practicing a reading skill taught to them earlier. When individual students finish their pages, they check the blackboard to see if all of their seatwork is completed. If so, they hand in their assignments and read a book, visit an activity corner of the classroom, or go to the library, if it's the proper day, while they wait for their turn with the teacher.

The teacher works with a third group as its members sit at a table somewhat separate from the students' desks. One of three activities is taking place at the table: students are reading and answering questions about a story from the group's anthology; they are listening to the teacher as she presents information on a new reading skill; or the teacher and students are correcting seatwork together as a group. Regardless of the activity in progress, the teacher is in control, or, at least, she appears to be in control: setting the page limit for reading and asking questions to check if students understood the passages if read silently or were paying attention if another group member read aloud; providing explanation and examples of the reading skill to enable students to complete their seatwork; or reading directions and calling on students to state their answers from their seatwork aloud. Close to the teacher's hand is a guidebook which coordinates the day's, week's, and year's events for reading instruction in this classroom. The teacher is patient but moves quickly because she divides her time equally among the three groups which

rotate between seatwork and the reading table at twenty- to thirty-minute intervals during reading lesson.

Seem familiar? It should. Although simplified, this description characterizes American reading instruction for the last sixty years or so (Goodman, Shannon, Freedman, and Murphy 1988). Most of you experienced some or all of these events during your grade school years—reading lessons which revolve around textbooks and workbook assignments. It may be understandable then that these materials are generally seen today as a necessary part of reading instruction in the United States. Few Americans have experienced reading instruction without them. Certainly, the content of the lessons above changed a bit over the years as more and more reading skills have been discovered and the artwork and story characters seem more colorful, but the basic structure of the materials and the lessons which result from them have changed little.¹

Perhaps the most startling difference apparent to anyone who returns to visit an elementary school classroom after an absence of ten years is the increased number and types of materials that are available and in use. Beyond the basal reading series, their graded anthologies, guidebooks, and workbooks pioneered sixty years ago and their more recent components—graded worksheets, charts, and tests—lie more workbooks, worksheets, flash cards, games, puppets, computers, and floppy disks produced by publishing companies in seemingly endless supply. Although there are so many materials available in many classrooms that it is often difficult for teachers and students to keep track of them all, most of the materials will be in use in some way to support students learning to read.

To keep the reading lessons straight, teachers rely on the teacher's guidebook which sets the skill objectives for reading lessons at any grade level, kindergarten through grade eight, offers a sequence schedule for stories and instruction directed toward those objectives allowing a smooth flow within and across lessons, and provides the answers to all seatwork assignments and story questions. Thus, as the number of materials and objectives increases, publishers have supplied the mechanism—the teacher's guidebook—with which teachers can manage their workload of teaching twenty-five to thirty-five students to read. At times, however, the materials seem to be the driving force of reading lessons in American classrooms as teachers and students simply react to their logic as expressed in the teacher's guidebook, with up to 70 percent of classroom time being spent on preparing, completing, and correcting workbooks and worksheets (Durkin 1978–79). That is, the roles of teacher and textbook seem to be reversed in these classrooms wherein teachers become a support system for the textbook rather than the other way round.

How this role reversal came to be in the United States is the subject of this book. This is not a history of basal readers or reading methods

which treats the rise of the materials as a necessary boon for classroom teachers and students' literacy.² Rather, I examine the effect of these materials on teachers and students during reading instruction and try to capture the social, political, and economic circumstances which created and maintain this role reversal in American reading instruction. My intention is to show that the reduction of the teachers' role to manager of commercially produced reading materials not only degrades teachers, but also that it reduces school literacy to the completion of materials—in essence, leaving students to develop literacy on their own.

WAYS OF LOOKING AT THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHERS AND MATERIALS

Although teachers' reliance on commercial reading materials has been acknowledged for the last twenty-five years (Austin and Morrison 1963), little research has addressed the reasons for the development and maintenance of this relationship in its present form. More than just another example of educational researchers' reluctance to look at the past in order to understand the present, the neglect of this central topic suggests that reading researchers accept the current reversal of roles as a given fact of elementary reading programs in the United States. In order to understand how most reading researchers came to this conclusion, we must look at the research traditions that reading researchers have used to select questions deserving of their attention and to design studies to answer those questions. These traditions have distinct sets of assumptions about reality, ethical values, and social interests which form researchers' dispositions, guiding their everyday as well as their research practices. Rather than a conscious choice among alternative traditions, more often reading researchers become immersed in a tradition as they participate in an existing research community established in a mentor/scholar relationship during graduate school. Following Thomas Popkewitz's (1984) adaptation of Habermas' categories of social science research, I shall characterize reading research as empirical/analytic, symbolic, or critical.

EMPIRICAL/ANALYTIC READING RESEARCH

By far the most prominent tradition in social, educational, and reading research—the empirical/analytic tradition—is based on five assumptions taken directly from physical and biological sciences. The first assumption is that theory is universal, free from any contextual and situational constraints, and, therefore, research is the search for lawlike generalizations that will hold across time and place. Second, researchers must divest themselves of interests and values when conducting research and relate

only to the facts of the matter in their studies. Third is the belief that the social world is the summation of distinct systems of variables which can be analyzed, understood, and reassembled without injury to our knowledge of the social whole. The fourth assumption suggests that each variable has one precise definition which once discovered will hold across research studies, thus allowing researchers to establish controls within their studies. And finally, the search for context and value-free generalizations finds its most exact expression in mathematical logic and deductive reasoning. Taken together, these assumptions enable reading researchers to treat all questions as if they had single answers and to design true experiments which compare groups according to some measure of increase in a designated variable directly attributable to the variation of another specified treatment variable.

The empirical/analytic tradition is readily apparent in the type of questions most researchers ask: What is reading? What is the most effective means of reading instruction? What is the relationship between teachers and materials that will produce the greatest gains in students' test scores (Mosenthal, in press)? Each of these "What is" questions is assumed to have one absolute answer which, once discovered, will not be subject to interpretation. The empirical/analytic reading researchers' job is to hypothesize an answer or partial answer to the questions based on verifiable evidence from other experimental studies and then to design research that will test their new hypothesis. Of course, these example questions are too complex for one study, and few researchers would attempt to tackle them in a single experiment—there are too many undefined, uncontrolled variables for that. More likely, reading, instruction, and teacher/material relations would be divided into components for study. For example, reading might be divided into attention, decoding, comprehension, and information retrieval, and then each of these subsystems could be divided even further.

Some of the components have long histories as research topics upon which reading researchers would build their case through controlled studies in order to inch us closer to understanding all of reading and how it is learned. Other components require preliminary "fieldwork" before controlled studies can be profitable; here, nonquantitative research methods—interviews, observation, description—find their way into the empirical/analytic tradition because they can provide sufficient data to allow credible hypotheses for testing (Barr 1986a). These early descriptive studies become tied to experimental results through theoretical literature reviews which set the agenda for the next round of experimental studies.

Although empirical/analytic reading research has the advantage of producing theory that is easily translated into instructional practice, it has several shortcomings and it is quite limited in its usefulness in

explaining the reversal of teachers' and materials' roles in elementary school reading instruction. First, the empirical/analytic tradition has generated multiple theories of reading without providing a means to choose among them because each has its own internal validity and system of verification. In fact, you must become unscientific and play your favorite in order to choose at all. Second, empirical/analytic researchers seem relatively unconcerned about the effects of their work on the total social framework of reading instruction; rather they seem most intent on fine-tuning existing systems, investigating individual cognitive processes, developing rational systems for testing, and validating their own hypotheses. Overall, empirical/analytic reading researchers suggest a restricted role for teachers—the follower of someone else's theory and plans—and an impoverished, overly psychological and individualistic definition of literacy. And although they claim neutrality in and for their work, empirical/analytic reading researchers really support the status quo overall because they attempt to shore up the sagging parts of the present conditions of elementary school reading instruction.

This support of the status quo represents the limited utility of this tradition for my purposes. Because empirical/analytic researchers accept the present conditions as given, immutable facts, they begin their work by assuming that my question is irrelevant to American reading instruction. That is, since empirical/analytic researchers do not consider the goals of reading instruction as scientific topics for research, they are unable to posit alternative situations and relationships among the participants and materials in school reading programs. They work only in the present and accept current circumstances as the parameters of their research. Perhaps that is why Beck and McKeown do not see the irony in asking teachers to be thoughtful and reflective as they follow someone else's theoretical principles while implementing someone else's plan. The blinders imposed by the empirical/analytic research tradition allow empirical/analytic reading researchers only to see the facts of reading instruction not the human action and consequences behind those facts nor the potential for what reading instruction might do for all participants under different conditions.

SYMBOLIC READING RESEARCH

The symbolic tradition shifts the emphasis of research from experimentation in order to verify lawlike generalizations of behavior to observation and interpretation of human interaction and intent. Rather than a search for objective facts which will hold across all contexts, symbolic researchers assume that the social world differs from the physical world in that the human participants determine what is real and valid through negotiations in which they reciprocally define rules of acceptable behavior

within specific social contexts. According to the symbolic tradition, the social world is a constructed and socially maintained phenomenon rather than a naturally given entity as it appears to empirical/analytic researchers. In this way, the context in which symbolic research is conducted becomes very important because different social circumstances will most likely produce different rules for appropriate behavior. The task of symbolic research becomes the observation and interpretation of the symbols people create in order to negotiate these social rules in everyday interactions. And because symbolic researchers seek to understand naturally occurring rule making, they cannot disturb the ordinary social situation under study. That is, they cannot divide the context into parts, set artificial controls, or intervene because each act will necessarily affect the natural negotiations and subvert the external validity of the study.

The symbolic research tradition is just beginning to gain legitimacy within the reading research community (Mosenthal, in press). Although as yet symbolic studies do not comprise a significant percentage of the articles in reading research journals (Shannon 1987), symbolic researchers have found alternative outlets for their research and often present their work at professional conferences. In that work, they attempt to discover how participants in everyday typical reading events negotiate definitions of reading and rules to govern reading instruction in those specific contexts; they want to know how these participants make sense of each others statements and actions sufficiently well to enable children to learn to read and write. To accomplish this task, symbolic reading researchers immerse themselves in classroom or home reading activities, observe the participants' words and actions, record their interactions, and then examine these records to locate patterns of communication and behavior that might provide insight into how participants make sense of such social situations. Bloome's *Literacy and Schooling* (1987), the published proceedings of a University of Michigan multidisciplinary conference on literacy learning, offers several examples of symbolic reading research. Barr's "Classroom Interaction and Curriculum Content" (1987) most closely addresses the teacher/materials relationship during reading instruction from the symbolic perspective. Although depth of description is valued more highly than the ability to make generalizations from the conclusions from one situation to another, the intent of symbolic reading research is to develop theories about rule and sense-making processes (Green 1987). These theories are more sociological or sociopsychological than the purely psychological theories generated by empirical/analytic researchers.

Symbolic research satisfies some of the shortcomings of the empirical/analytic tradition for an investigation of reasons for the development and maintenance of the role reversal between teachers and materials in elementary school reading programs, but it also shares some of the limi-

tations of the empirical/analytic tradition, and it has some limitations of its own. Certainly, symbolic research begins from an assumption that the present circumstances of reading instruction are socially determined, and this assumption would allow my question to be entertained as a legitimate topic for research. And symbolic research rests on interpretation of symbols and signs rather than on mathematic logic. However, the symbolic tradition still separates theory from practice, and it may even make theory more contemplative than empirical/analytic research because, in the symbolic tradition, theory is to describe and clarify rather than to affect practice directly. Moreover, symbolic research is frozen in the present because it must focus on the present rules as they are being negotiated for reading and instruction.³ Along these lines, symbolic science requires a moral neutrality and a restraint from intervention—the interpretative theories of symbolic science are rarely seen as catalysts for change. Thus, like empirical/analytic reading research, the symbolic tradition can really only address “What is” questions concerning current reading instruction, never considering “Why it is” or “What it might become.”

CRITICAL READING RESEARCH

The critical research tradition begins with the premise that the social negotiations concerning definitions of reality and validity are not conducted among equals because social, economic, and political circumstances have given certain groups license to assert undue influence over the outcomes. Consequently, these outcomes benefit the negotiators unequally, and the less dominant groups become dependent on the dominant group's definitions. Because these present conditions are rooted in the social relations of the past, they often seem opaque and immutable to present day negotiators, and the inequality of participation and benefit appears benign, appropriate, and “the way it is.” The task of the critical researcher is to illuminate these past and current relations, to document their consequences, and to identify inconsistencies in the relations as opportunities for change toward more just relations. Critical research must be normative, substantive, as well as formal, because the critical researcher becomes an advocate in the political struggle over rules, definitions, and meaning in everyday life.

Theory and practice have a different relationship in the critical tradition than they had in empirical/analytic or symbolic research. Theory becomes individual self-reflection conducted during and in response to dialogues with other social negotiators concerning everyday events and how these events are connected to larger social issues. Self-reflection in this social context allows individuals to come to understand themselves and their situation more thoroughly, and thus, bringing this reality to

consciousness, sets the stage for prudent practice in which individuals and researchers work together to combine ethics, morality, politics, and science to orient groups toward what is right and just in their social circumstances. Theory, then, provides an orientation for practice, not a prescription or description as in the other research traditions. In effect, theory and practice are united as the social negotiators make strategic, informed choices in the political negotiations which direct anew their daily lives.

The unit of analysis for critical research also differs from the other traditions. Empirical/analytic research assumes the social components of interest can be studied in isolation because they simply add up to reality regardless of their treatment. Symbolic research suggests that the social situation must be studied in its totality. Critical researchers reject these narrow focuses and assume that the isolated social situation forms a dynamic relationship to the whole of social existence. That is, the situation influences the whole as well as being influenced by the whole. This relationship is not linear or entirely rationally aligned as the empirical/analytic researchers insist, nor is it of secondary importance to the immediate observable context as implied in the symbolic tradition. Rather, according to critical researchers, social relationships are often fraught with contradictions which allow and at times invite change. To understand isolated events, then, critical researchers must consider the past, the present, and the possible future of the situation including its relationships to the large social context.

Causality in critical research becomes “the intersection of history, social structure, and biography” (Popkewitz 1984: 47)—that is, the regularities of present social action that result from past social relations, objective factors that are beyond the current negotiators’ control, and subjective factors that individuals use to make sense and to modify their immediate situations. To investigate causality, critical researchers must combine research methods from historiography to access the past, survey and statistical analyses to gather information on social structure, and qualitative analyses to understand how individuals cope with their negotiations and situations. Because the critical tradition values an advocate’s role for the researcher, who is expected to work toward identifying and overcoming constraints on negotiators’ freedom, critical researchers can treat research methods as merely means to this moral goal, rather than as ends in themselves as the other research traditions must.

To date, the critical tradition has had little impact on the reading research community (Mosenthal, in press). Rarely does critical reading research appear in leading reading research journals, and there are few critical papers presented at professional meetings (Shannon 1987). This may be because of the strength of the empirical/analytic tradition in graduate schools of education and its assumption that open advocacy