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ABSTRACT

Evidence exists to indicate that children who have not had a great many home literacy experiences, but have participated in high-quality preschool experiences do better in first grade (Lee, Brooks-Gunn, Schnur, & Liaw, 1990). Project Head Start (Head Start) and Project Reach (REACH), a transition program for students in the primary grades, are two examples of society's attempt to help at-risk children enter first grade ready to acquire needed skills.

The purposes of this research are to provide descriptions of 11 graduates of Head Start and Project Reach as they enter first grade and to describe how factors in the school environment interact with student characteristics, with special attention to the acquisition of literacy. This study was an investigation of the characteristics that contribute to literacy acquisition. Specific questions addressed were: What student, teacher, and classroom characteristics contribute to literacy acquisition in first grade students who completed Head Start preschool and Project Reach kindergarten? A probe of these questions utilized concepts consistent with those of qualitative research because data collection was descriptive, naturalistic, and involved observation, field notes, and transcriptions (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982).

The results of this study suggest that students with solid reading readiness success in kindergarten are more likely to be successful in first grade
reading. Student participants who had partial reading success in kindergarten were more likely to fall behind in reading in first grade.

Additionally, many of the more successful students had high levels of response, rather than initiation, during instructional reading periods. Some students with high levels of initiation received lower grades in reading. While some students were clearly verbal, their use of language did not result in increased reading achievement.

Implications of the study are discussed in terms of small class size and more individualized instruction; teaching for reading strategies; definitions of success and transition to first grade; and teacher knowledge and confidence in teaching reading.
"Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding. In all thy ways acknowledge him and he shall direct thy paths." Proverbs 3:5-6
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Project Head Start had its origins in an optimistic period of American history, a time when many believed that government should take a proactive, extensive role in eradicating the negative effects of poverty on children's development. Moreover, it was an era when it was popularly believed that the developmental course of children, including the growth of intelligence could be vastly altered through timely intervention. (Zigler, Styfco, and Gilman, 1993)

Literacy for all citizens is essential for a strong global economy. While policy makers may agree on the importance of literacy, there appears to be less agreement regarding what constitutes literate behavior and how such behavior is best achieved. Escalating high school drop out rates in the United States, along with such factors as overall increases in service and information occupations and in the population worldwide have renewed interest in issues related to literacy.

Minimal levels of literacy, acceptable in the past, are no longer adequate in meeting current and projected societal demands. Highly
competent readers and writers are necessary for the economic and political survival of America in the 21st century (Chall, 1987; Johnston & Packer, 1987). One major justification for a more literate society is expressed in Workforce 2000: "Between now and the year 2000, for the first time in history, a majority of all new jobs will require postsecondary education. Many professions will require nearly a decade of study following high school, and even the least skilled jobs will require a command of reading, computing, and thinking that was once necessary only for the professions" (Johnston & Packer, p. 116).

Links between literacy and early school success have important ramifications for later accomplishments in life. Long-term beneficial effects of preschool may extend beyond improved scholastic placement and achievement during the school years. In a study of lasting effects of the Perry Preschool program on youth through age nineteen, Berrueta-Clement, Schweinhart, Barnett, Epstein, & Weikart (1984) reported additional benefits of preschool to be: decreased delinquency, crime, use of public assistance, and adolescent pregnancy rates; and increased high school graduation, enrollment in postsecondary programs, and employment.

Children with successful preschool backgrounds have an advantage as they begin first grade. There is much evidence that home literacy experiences count in first grade (Wells, 1986). There is also evidence that even children who have not had a great many home literacy experiences, but have participated in high-quality preschool experiences do better in first grade (Lee, Brooks-Gunn, Schnur, & Liaw, 1990). We need research that reveals the nature of such experiences. Head Start and Project Reach are examples of society's attempt to help at-risk children enter first grade ready to acquire literacy in the subsequent two years.
At-risk children who are successful in Head Start and Project Reach seem more likely to become successful readers and writers in first grade than children who have not had these experiences; yet, we know little about the specific skills acquired in preschools or about the characteristics of later education which help the entering first graders use their strengths.

The purposes of this research are to provide descriptions of eleven preschool students who participated in Head Start and Project Reach as they enter first grade and to describe how factors in the school environment interact with student characteristics, with special attention to the acquisition of literacy.

Specifically, the study is designed to describe characteristics of successful graduates of Head Start and Project Reach as they enter first grade and to relate those student characteristics to contextual factors in students' first educational experiences. Relationships among the variables examined will be probed in order to uncover both student and contextual factors related to success in the acquisition of literacy.

Background for the Study

A great price is paid by children who experience early reading failure and by school systems and society at large. Once students have fallen seriously behind, they are unlikely to ever catch up with their peers "because the experience of failure introduces problems of poor motivation, self-esteem, and behavior that undermine even the best remedial or special-education approaches" (Madden, Slavin, Karweit, Dolan, & Wasik, 1993, p. 125). In areas of widespread poverty, social disorganization, and under-funded schools, school failure is endemic (Natriello, McDill, and Pallas, 1990). Regrettably,
impoverished third graders who fail a grade or read significantly below grade level, are less likely to finish high school and are more likely to experience difficulties throughout their school careers (Shepard & Smith, 1989). Students who enter special education programs are likely to remain in them for many years, often for their entire school careers (Anderson & Pellicer, 1990). Both retention and special-education placement are largely determined on the basis of reading performance (Norman & Zigmond, 1980; Shepard & Smith, 1989).

Uncertain economic and political times have generated a renewed interest in literacy and literate behaviors (Gee, 1988; Graff, 1987; Meek, 1989). Through the years, several programs have been created to increase the number of successful readers at the elementary level (for example, Reading Recovery, Reading is Fundamental (RIF), and Right to Read).

Research on the effects of prevention and early intervention for successful schooling of at-risk students supports a variety of strategies, including provision of high-quality preschool programs (Berrueta-Clement, et al., 1984; Karweit, 1989a), full-day kindergarten (Karweit, 1989b), one-to one tutoring of at-risk first graders (Pinnell, 1989; Slavin, 1990; Silver & Hagin, 1990), improvements in reading curriculum and instructional methods (Adams, 1990), and cooperative learning (Slavin, 1990). The manner in which these approaches are used is critical since, in most cases, effects of one-year interventions fade in later years (see Slavin, Karweit, & Wasik, 1994). When prevention is combined with early, intensive intervention and continuing low-cost maintenance interventions in Grades 2-5, students are more likely to reach the end of their elementary schooling on time with good
reading skills (Madden, et al., 1993). High-quality preschool, kindergarten, and beginning reading instruction are critical components in prevention. Tutoring for at-risk first graders, family support services, and improvements in curriculum and instruction provide needed intervention and maintenance throughout the elementary years.

Literacy acquisition and transition to school are important topics to consider when studying success in school. The transition to literacy spans several years in the life of a child. Literacy is no longer regarded as simply a cognitive skill but as a complex activity with social, linguistic, and psychological aspects (Teale and Sulzby, 1989). Unless we act to educate our children, we are condemning much of a new generation to lives of poverty and despair. Public schools are faced with the ever-increasing challenge of educating a diverse population of students on such topics as racial and cultural heritage, language usage, health care, family situations, and preparation for school.

The need to intervene early with at-risk children is critical. When intervention does not occur, there is a heavy price to pay. Reading and writing failure cost students self-confidence and result in educational lags, as well as habituated ineffective responses to reading and writing (Clay, 1988).

Fewer than half of young adults who come from financially impoverished families acquire literacy skills beyond a basic level (Applebee, Langer, & Mullis, 1988). Children who live in poverty are at a greater risk of failure to learn reading and writing, and for them high quality early childhood education is critical. Early childhood education includes a variety of programs, such as family and group child care, infant-toddler-parent
classes, preschool (including Head Start), kindergarten, and primary education. Providers may range from individuals to public schools, to government, public, and private agencies. Each family is also an integral part of the child's care and education.

Observation and documentation of the behavior of successful students while engaged in reading and writing activities are important components in improving the educational process for all students. Clay's (1982) observations of successful young readers led to the design of Reading Recovery, a program to help low progress students become more like successful readers.

This study will provide information about successful at-risk students, their teachers and the classrooms in which they learn. A number of characteristics are related to literacy acquisition. It is necessary to look at a variety of factors which are related to levels of success within the school environment. By expanding the study to include students, teachers, and classrooms, the information obtained will reveal the extent to which teaching and learning occur in many different ways, from many different sources, and at many different times. When literacy learning is viewed as a social and integrated language process that is student centered, it is necessary to include different components of the environment that influence such learning.

Several of the teaching and learning theories emanating from Clay's work are relevant for struggling literacy students and their teachers and provide further assumptions that guide this study. These assumptions, as summarized by Bradley (1991), are that:

(a) Learning occurs on many different mental and physical fronts;
(b) Reading and writing whole messages are necessary for learners to develop efficient reading and writing strategies;
(c) The student controls the processing of reading and writing;
(d) Every student brings a body of usable literacy knowledge to the instructional setting;
(e) Instructors can often help students do more difficult literacy tasks than students can do alone;
(f) Tapping and using background knowledge is important in the development of independent readers and writers, and;
(g) Teachers must carefully observe the student's literacy behaviors in order to make the most valuable instructional decisions.

These assumptions will be used as a frame for examining contextual and student factors related to school success.

Statement of the Problem

The proposed research project is designed to address the question: What characteristics contribute to literacy acquisition in first grade students who were evaluated as successful completers of Head Start preschool and Project Reach kindergarten? Specific questions to be addressed are:

(1) What student characteristics contribute to literacy acquisition in first grade students who were evaluated as successful completers of Head Start preschool and Project Reach kindergarten?

(2) What teacher characteristics contribute to literacy acquisition in first grade students who were evaluated as successful completers of Head Start preschool and Project Reach kindergarten?
What classroom characteristics contribute to literacy acquisition in first grade students who were evaluated as successful completers of Head Start preschool and Project Reach kindergarten?

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are relevant to this study:

**At-risk**

The term at-risk has a long history in medical and psychiatric literature. Identifiers include poverty, single-parent status, ethnic or linguistic diversity, and mother's education (Pallas, Natriello, and McDill, 1989). For purposes of this study, students at-risk refers to students who, because of factors related to their socioeconomic status, family background, community, or school environment, are less likely to benefit from conventional educational practices. Not every child who has one or more at-risk characteristics is necessarily at-risk since these factors should not be viewed in isolation from other factors that exist in the child's environment. For purposes of this study, at-risk factors are problematic when they minimize the degree of success a student is able to achieve within the school setting. Head Start proponents believe early educational experiences are needed to break the strong connections between particular family characteristics and school failure (Richardson, 1990).

**First Grade Success**

First grade success is defined as performing in reading at or near grade level and avoiding retention or special education (Madden, Slavin et. al., 1993). Success is also defined as being judged competent by the teacher.
Throughout the study, both definitions will be used in relating student, classroom, and teacher characteristics to school success. While the two definitions may differ, an assumption is made that both are necessary in defining success, since student success will include factors that evolve from the student as well as those that stem from the teacher and learning environment. The inclusion of the two definitions allows for a broader study of characteristics by extending factors in student success to include components other than students, namely their teachers and classrooms.

**Literacy**

While a basic definition of literacy is the ability to read and write, Kirsch & Jungeblut (1986) extend the definition of literacy as use of "printed and written information to function in society, to achieve one's goals, and to develop one's knowledge and potential." In addition, literacy is a continuum along which all levels of literates progress and change (Venezky, Wagner, & Ciliberti, 1990), and a socially constructed process (Fingeret, 1988). Within the classroom, observations, assessments, oral reading, student assignments, and teacher judgments will be used in analyzing the literacy levels of participating students.

**Project Head Start** (Head Start)

Begun as a summer pilot in 1965, Head Start has become a well-recognized federal educational preschool program that provides comprehensive services to impoverished preschoolers and their families. In addressing social, health, community support, and other issues, the program seeks to provide services that meet a wide range of individual needs, strengthen parents' roles as first teachers, and offer an array of firsthand
experiences and learning activities either directly to children or through parent education.

**Project Reach (REACH)**

Ohio's transition project is known as REACH, an acronym for the major initiatives of the project: Realizing and helping to actualize the potential of each child and family and Enabling and empowering parents to assume responsibility for making their environment a more manageable environment by, Accepting and expanding the knowledge, strengths, talents and skills of each family through, Challenging opportunities for child and family growth and the building of sound expectations for all and Helping children and families through providing a relevant array of comprehensive services. This collaborative effort involving the Child Development Council of a large county (the grantee), Head Start, the school district, a local college, and the community at large is designed to continue supportive services provided in Head Start to families and children in the primary grades. The program emphasizes developmentally appropriate curricula, health services, parental involvement programs, and social services. One of the goals of the program is to ascertain whether or not children and families who receive Project Reach services after Head Start make a more successful transition to elementary school than Head Start graduates who do not receive additional services. The school district in this study is the second largest in the state and operates 89 elementary schools. Project Reach offers transition services in four of these schools, and seven additional schools participate as comparison schools.
Social competence

A primary goal of Head Start is social competence, defined as "an individual's everyday effectiveness in dealing with his environment" (Zigler, 1973, p. 3). A child's social competence includes, but is not limited to, his or her ability to master appropriate concepts, perform well in school, and relate well to other children.

Limitations of the Study

The generalizability of this study to other populations is limited by selection criteria that included only children who had completed two years of schooling as Head Start preschoolers and Project Reach kindergartners. Kindergarten teachers were asked to identify students from a list that contained only the names of students who had completed two previous years in these programs. Although kindergarten teachers were asked to choose students who had been successful students, teacher attitudes about success may have been influenced by including only the names of a portion of their classes.

Secondly, a limitation is noted in the number of students in the study who also receive reading instruction outside of their assigned classrooms. While this study sought to examine factors that influence literacy within the regular classroom, many of the students in the study also received reading instruction outside of their assigned classroom. These students left their assigned classrooms each day to participate in a 45-minute reading lesson with a Reading Recovery/Early Literacy teacher. Generalizability is difficult since some children received reading instruction from only one teacher while other children received individual or small group instruction in addition to the instruction provided by their regular classroom teachers.
Additionally, it is impossible to identify all the reading experiences of the students prior to first grade. These early reading experiences may have importantly influenced the development of the children's subsequent reading strategies.

Organization of the Dissertation

This chapter has stated the problem under consideration and has provided background information about literacy, Head Start, and Project Reach as an introduction to the remainder of the study. Chapter 2 involves a more detailed review of related literature. The second chapter describes literacy as a social process, highlights historical and current issues within Project Head Start, and addresses social competence and language acquisition as important goals in early childhood education. The procedures and data-collection time frame used in the study are described in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 presents descriptions of students, teachers, and classrooms, as well as results of analysis. Chapter 5 reviews the procedures used throughout the study and provides findings, discussion, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a review of the theory and research which inform this dissertation. Literature related to this study will address language acquisition, literacy acquisition, social competence, and preschool education. Research conducted in these areas is helpful in providing a theoretical framework for observing factors associated with early reading success. A review of the literature involving language acquisition offers several assumptions regarding the manner in which children acquire, speak, and understand language. These assumptions are useful in laying the foundation for the study and will be followed by a description of literacy acquisition as a social process. The significance in addressing the acquisition of language and literacy as social processes is that it will lead to a review of the literature related to social competence, a primary goal of Head Start. The examination of these topics will end with research and current issues within Head Start. This summary of language, literacy, and Head Start guides the inquiry into the identification of characteristics that contribute to literacy acquisition, thereby establishing a theoretical base for this study.
Language Acquisition

Children enter school speaking in a variety of accents and dialects. These variations in speech are often associated with social background and parental occupation (Wood, 1988). Some theorists maintain that academic achievement is greatly affected by variations in language use. Opposing viewpoints suggest that such linguistic variations have no direct effects, positive or negative, on children's ability to learn. Rather, the argument continues, any connection between variations in language usage and school performance relate to differences in the effectiveness of schools and teachers in their ability to reach children from differing social and ethnic backgrounds.

Throughout the 1960's the educational community wrestled with deficit models that assumed factors "within" the child and varying levels of "deprivation" within the home accounted for academic failure in school. Project Head Start was born in a climate in which "poverty, it was claimed, depresses children's health, motivation, intelligence and language (Wood, 1988). Bernstein's theory (1960) relating socioeconomic background with school success, while intended to explain differences in the educational achievement of British children, was also embraced by American educators and politicians to explain variations in the educational attainments of black and white children. Bernstein's views of associating language and social class, coupled with psychological studies on intelligence from Piaget (1967), provided a theoretical rationale, and perhaps a stimulus for political action to wage a "war on poverty" (Wood, 1988).

Historically, Chomsky's views on language (1980) offered insights that challenged adoption of deficit models and encouraged research into language acquisition. His theory discounted suggestions that children "learn" language
by being taught and reinforced. It was replaced with a theory that views children as language "acquirers", who discover and make creative, generative use of rules from the very beginning of language development.

In rejecting the theory that the capacity to learn how to speak and understand speech is in any sense taught, Chomsky leads us to view language acquisition as a mental function in which speech sounds stimulate the auditory nerves and are processed naturally to uncover eventually the rules by which that speech is structured. Although languages differ in the sounds they use and the grammatical rules they employ, Chomsky maintains that they all share certain universal properties, which an innate system, known as Language Acquisition Device (LAD) makes possible. The automatic functionings of the LAD are such that children "know" that speech consists of words, sentences, and other linguistic elements. Thus children do not need to "learn" that speech is formulated from subjects and predicates in order to use speech. The LAD ensures that children perceive speech sounds in this way, although they may need to discover the specific rules underlying the native tongue and learn the relationship between words and that to which they refer.

Oral language systems are generally well developed by age six (DeStefano, 1978). The connections between speaking and writing grow out of the wealth of information a child has at his or her disposal. Numerous opportunities which allow children to see language in natural oral and written contexts are therefore encouraged. Project Head Start promotes the encouragement of language development, in part through social interaction.

Halliday (1975) offers a basis of support for the constructivistic view of language learning: as children learn language, they learn about language, and
they learn through language. This idea is powerful since it argues against the isolation of skills in learning language. Halliday categorizes language usage according to the "context of situation." Children in Head Start learn how language functions within their environment. Strickland (1983) states that "the development of the language arts... represents an interdependent network" (p. 116).

Goodman (1986) acknowledges that children must be given opportunities to see connections between oral and written language. While reading, writing, speaking, and listening each have their own linguistic requirements, they are best learned when used in concert with each other.

Additionally, Bruner (1973) emphasizes social interaction as central to language development in children. He stresses the importance of culture and cultural history in terms of the ability to not only acquire information but also to "go beyond" it by inventing codes and rules; social experience plays a major part in these processes. Since Project Head Start promotes social interaction as a primary goal, it would appear that as children receive opportunities to interact, they develop language at the same time. As language develops, children strengthen the foundation upon which they build later successes.

Language acquisition in children is thought to influence academic success, and teacher reactions may lead to the formation of initial expectations of the students without knowledge of the student's academic development (Stone, 1992). Because some expectations compromise the ability of teachers to offer all students an equally effective education, students and teachers benefit from a knowledge of language functions, particularly within school
settings. Because language learning is not an isolated event, it is important throughout the study to observe the interactions and behavior of the teacher, as well.

Research in the areas of literacy, preschool education, social competence, and language acquisition has proven helpful throughout the formulation and evaluation of Head Start and transition programs, such as Project Reach. These programs are regularly monitored for their overall impact on student achievement. Information that relates to connections between preschool success and literacy acquisition in beginning readers is one way to monitor student success. The knowledge gained by this study will help us to learn more about these connections.

Observation, documentation, and analysis of the interactions of successful at-risk students as they make the transition to first grade literacy acquisition is valuable. One significant benefit of this study is the opportunity to observe multi-faceted teaching and learning that focuses on the student, teacher, and classroom.

Literacy as a Social Process

One of the greatest challenges currently facing schools is that of articulating what literacy is in a socially diverse culture. It is suggested (Dyson, 1992) that even for young children the composition of oral and written texts (i.e. planning, responding, revising) is a distinctly socio-cultural process that involves making decisions, conscious or otherwise, about how one fits into the social world at any one point in time.

There is further support for social and cultural connections to literacy. Acknowledging that the subject of literacy is immense and complex, Graff (1987) contends that literacy can be understood only in its historical and
societal contexts. Luke (1991) argues that it is only with a sense of what literacy as a historic and culture-specific technology has achieved that educators can begin to realize the possibilities for reshaping students' literacies as social practices. One of the issues surrounding literacy is that a common knowledge of literacy does not necessarily lead to common interpretations of literacy as a social tool. Within the classroom, for example, teachers and students have their own reasons and purposes for invoking literacy as a social tool (Kantor, 1992).

Literacy acquisition is encouraged through use of philosophical and curricular approaches to learning that integrate reading, writing, speaking, and listening in meaningful ways and allow children to construct their own meaning. Although the view of language in a child-centered classroom is largely influenced by twentieth century scientific investigations into language learning, even Comenius (1659) maintained that unless learning is meaningful to students and a part of their vernacular, it is superfluous. Appropriate instruction is based on language development theory which places children at the center of learning. It recognizes the ability of children to influence their own learning (Vacca, Vacca, & Gove, 1991) and acknowledges the role of teachers as facilitators and co-learners (Weaver, 1988).

For young children, learning to read and write parallels, but is not identical to the acquisition of oral language (Ferreiro & Teberosky, 1982; Teale & Sulzby, 1986). Learning begins early and is shaped by the experiences within the home. A summary of the work of Teale & Sulzby (1989) indicates that the chronological age range studied has been extended to include children 14 months and younger. Teale & Sulzby views literacy as multidimensional and tied to the child's natural surroundings, so it is
studied in both the home and school environments. The rediscovery of the work of Piaget (1952), Vygotsky (1978) and others provides information for the educational community as it looks at ways to make schools more child-centered. The child is seen as an active knowledge seeker who brings a significant background of personal literacy theories to any formal or informal learning situation (Goodman, 1986; Smith, 1978). Goodman, Smith, and others stress the need for print-rich environments with instruction that acknowledges that whatever knowledge a child brings from home is a starting place for learning in school.

For Vygotsky, the nature of intelligence can only be defined within social constructs. Vygotsky's identification of symbolic and physical "tools" and zone of proximal development (ZPD), depict the extent to which "culturally organized ways of operating on information" influence individual knowledge (Vygotsky, 1978). In Vygotskian theory, complex, abstract learning is an interpersonal and social event.

The research of Smith and others has also focused attention on teaching methodology and literacy development in early childhood. Smith (1978, 1988) calls for educators to re-frame their thinking about children as learners and schools as learning environments. One of the ways this might occur is by way of a "permeable" curriculum (Dyson, 1992) in which the curriculum allows for an interplay between teachers' and children's language experiences. When teachers and children are free to draw upon a wide range of experiences, their worlds can come together in instructionally powerful ways. Such a range of experiences can be found in the variety of social goals that frame Project Head Start programs. One of the merits of social goals is that they allow children's language to be energized (Dyson, 1992).
Project Head Start shares several of the philosophical and pragmatic assumptions that underlie theories of literacy acquisition. For example, when instruction is viewed in an integrated, personalized, and social manner, the role of the learner becomes an integral part of instruction. Learning is therefore recognized as a child-centered and highly social process.

Social Competence

Project Head Start, often perceived as one of the enduring successes of the Johnson administration's "war on poverty" (Conger, 1988), promotes social competence as a primary goal. Head Start studies which examine the longer-termed consequences of "socially relevant" educational outcomes conclude that children who attend Head Start are at a more global advantage in school by virtue of having gained social competence that enables them to progress in school, stay in the mainstream, and satisfy teachers' requirements better than their peers who did not attend (McKey, Condelli, Ganson, Barrett, McConkey & Plantz, 1985). The overall goal of the Head Start program, as stated in the Head Start Program Performance Standards (1992), is "to bring about a greater degree of social competence in children of low income families. Social competence is defined as the child's everyday effectiveness in dealing with both present environment and later responsibilities in school and life" (p. 1).

Head Start was designed to influence a broad array of factors, including children's physical well-being, cognitive development and socio-emotional development. Zigler & Anderson (1979) warned that no single factor should be judged as preeminent; rather, all should be viewed as interacting to enhance social competence.
While Head Start was established to provide the type of social interaction applauded by Vygotsky and Zigler, assessments of the program's effects have been concentrated in the cognitive and academic achievement domains, with particular attention to IQ (Cole & Washington, 1986). One such example is the well-known Westinghouse Report (1969), the first large-scale national study to evaluate the impact of Head Start participation on later school achievement. It recorded a lack of long-term academic impact from Head Start participation. The Westinghouse study concluded that Head Start graduates showed only modest immediate gains on standardized tests of cognitive ability and that these gains disappeared after the first few years of school.

Much of the criticism that followed the Westinghouse Report apply to subsequent impact studies as well. Head Start studies have been challenged for their (1) narrowness of outcome measures; (2) possible selection biases in generating student samples; (3) questions of program continuity; (4) failure to examine the effect of different curricula; and (5) failure to examine the role of family. Ongoing concerns have included the concentration of evaluation efforts that utilize IQ and other standardized tests when assessing the effects of intervention and lack of appropriate definition and assessment of social competencies.

Preschool Education and Project Head Start

For centuries educators including Comenius and Montessori documented the importance of childhood experiences before the age of six. In the 1920's, Rose Alschuler, James Hymes, and Laura Zirbes added to the research in support of guidance and intervention for children at the nursery and preschool level.
In years past, a considerable body of medical and psychological research reveals more evidence that preschool experiences are important. Arnold Gesell and Frances Ilg provided longitudinal child-growth information, while Williard Olson and Robert Havighurst, respectively, have made "organismic age" and "developmental tasks" standard pedagogical phrases. Jean Piaget has long been recognized for his developmental-cognitive studies. Despite enthusiastic supporters and a substantial body of literature prior to 1960, little attention was given to the development of programs for children between the ages of two and five.

The period of the 1960's was characterized by unprecedented growth in the preschool population, including large numbers of children who lived in poverty. Although many children of poverty entered school with a degree of optimism, without educational opportunities, they often lagged behind in the first years of school and found their troubles compounded as they stayed in school. Researchers (Ogbu, 1987b; Delpit, 1988) have stated that it is possible to strengthen the ability of children in poverty to cope with school and its surrounding environments, thereby providing hope for a brighter future. Delpit notes the power of educators, textbook publishers, and state departments of education to control the "normalcy" or intelligence of students.

Throughout the 1960's, growing political support for the concept of prevention and intervention to head off potential learning problems led to the formation of a federally funded program for preschoolers. The Federal Government in 1964 commissioned a panel of child development experts to propose a program to help communities overcome the handicaps of economically impoverished preschoolers. The panel's report became the
foundation for Project Head Start. Head Start offers a variety of supportive services for preschoolers who show a need for early intervention. Historically, the primary goal of preschools has been to serve the social and emotional needs of young children.

Begun as an 8-week summer pilot by the Office of Economic Opportunity in 1965, Head Start was founded to help break the cycle of poverty by providing children with a comprehensive program to meet their emotional, social, health, nutritional and psychological needs. With the entry of 3-year-olds to school, Head Start through the years became an eight-month program that received approval from educators, child development specialists, community leaders, and parents across the nation.

In 1969, Head Start was reassigned from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Child Development in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; it has now become a program within the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families at the Department of Health and Human Services. Hailed as an innovative project, Head Start has made a strong impact on other early childhood programs and in communities at large across the country. More than 450,000 children and their families are served yearly in both urban and rural communities throughout all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. territories, including many Native American and migrant children. Since its beginning, the program has served more than 11 million children and their families.

Today Head Start continues to address the state of poverty, and its effects on those who are born therein and on the society as a whole. The rationale for Head Start follows this line of reasoning: (1) the poor are economically and educationally at-risk; (2) their status is caused by
experiential handicaps imposed by poverty; and (3) compensatory
intervention ought to effect a cure (Westinghouse Report, 1969). Through the
years, Head Start has sought to continue its intervention efforts in order to
maintain growth in children as they enter the primary grades.

To accomplish this task, the Head Start Bureau of the Administration
for Children, Youth and Families announced in July, 1991 the availability of
funds for competing Head Start/Public School Early Childhood Transition
Demonstration Projects. The goals of these projects are: (1) to develop
successful strategies through which Head Start programs, parents, local
education agencies and other community linkages provide services for low-
income kindergarten through third grade children and their families; (2) to
test the hypothesis that the provision of these continuous, comprehensive
services will maintain and enhance the early benefits attained by Head Start
children and their families; and, (3) to determine the impact on children and
families when comprehensive services are delivered over a period of time
after a child enters elementary school.

An ongoing challenge within remedial or intervention programs such
as Head Start is to ensure that the evaluation process reflects the
comprehensive nature of the programs. Judgments regarding overall
effectiveness are frequently based on reported outcomes obtained from the
standardized test scores of participating students. Such scores may be used to
determine the cost-effectiveness of the programs, as well.

While methods of student and programmatic evaluation within Head
Start have been questioned, the program continues to be a success story in
governmental intervention for selected preschoolers (Waxler et al., 1990).
This is due, in part, to a renaissance of interest in young children, stimulated
by several historical events within the broader culture (Anderson, 1971). A review of these events follows.

Policies and politics at the federal level have made a distinct impact on the funding of educational programs begun prior to kindergarten. By the early sixties, it was apparent that there was a considerable degree of social dynamite in the nation's impoverished urban and rural centers. One of the ways of diffusing public outrage was to offer educational programs for the children of the poor.

Increasing social commentaries also catapulted the federal government into looking more closely at the educational services it provides for the young. Throughout the 1960's, broadcast and print media brought the issues surrounding poverty to the population at large. Visual images of economic despair flashed across millions of television screens. A heightened awareness surrounding the conditions of poverty focused attention on the importance of providing early intervention programs for children.

As social commentaries made on the plight of the poor in urban and rural areas quickened interest in the young child, support for cultural diversity also gained attention. Educators began to point out that it is shortsighted and wasteful to have so-called compensatory education in elementary and secondary schools to address developmental and cultural issues which surface before entrance into kindergarten.

Renewed interest in remedial programs for the young has also been influenced by the assumption that wholesome forms of intervention in the early years of a child can help him or her become more effective in later transactions and interactions with others. While a desire to improve the
environment of children has existed for centuries, the concept of deliberate, planned intervention, is for practical purposes, a phenomenon of the sixties.

Research Related to Head Start

The quality of Head Start programs is an important topic throughout the literature related to preschool programs. There is concern that too few Head Start classes offer the quality that is necessary to best promote children’s growth and development. The results of one study (Bryant, Burchinal, Lau, & Sparling, 1994) conclude that children in higher quality Head Start classrooms performed better than children enrolled in poorer quality classrooms on measures of achievement and preacademic skills, regardless of the quality of their home environment.

Bryant, et al. (1994) examined relationships between classroom quality and children outcomes among 145 children who attended Head Start and who came from homes that provided varying degrees of stimulation. Children, families, and teachers who participated in this research were residents of a metropolitan area in the South that included a city, suburbs, and a large rural area. Approximately half of the Head Start classes were located within the city, while the other half were in rural areas.

With the consent of the Head Start Advisory Boards, the researcher explained the purpose of the study to teachers, 22 of whom participated in the first year of the study and 30 participated in the second year. Twenty-two teachers agreed to participate both years and 12 agreed to participate either during the first or second year. Observations were made in the classrooms of 32 different teachers.

During the 1990-91 and 1991-92 school years, parents were notified of the pending study and their consent was sought. Teachers were asked to
assist in the return of the consent forms and to provide phone numbers and current addresses to the researcher. Altogether, approximately 270 letters were sent and 146 parents consented to participate, a rate of 54% participation.

Several measures were used to collect data throughout the study. Data involving students were obtained from the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS) (Harms & Clifford, 1980), the Preschool Inventory (PSI) (Abt Associates, 1991), and the Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children (K-ABC) (Kaufman & Kaufman, 1983).

The ECERS is a rating scale designed to comprehensively assess the day-to-day quality of the education and care provided to children in preschool programs. The scale is a standardized observational instrument that focuses on curriculum, environment, teacher-child interaction and teaching practices within the classroom. The ECERS contains 37 items in 7 subscales: personal care routines, furnishings, language-reasoning experiences, fine and gross motor activities, creative activities, social development, and adult needs. Items were scored during a 3-to-4 hour observation in the classroom in which all items were scored using numbers 1 to 7. Descriptions within the range included 1 (inadequate situation), 3 (minimal), 5 (good) and 7 (excellent).

The second instrument used to collect student data was the Preschool Inventory (PSI), an assessment developed by Bettye Caldwell in 1965. Originally designed to measure the skills viewed as needed for success in school, the inventory has been used in its original or revised form for several Head Start studies. The 32-item instrument is scored for total number of correct responses and used an index of knowledge of traditional school-readiness skills.
Thirdly, the Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children was administered to children in April or May of their Head Start year. This assessment measures the verbal and nonverbal intelligence and achievement of children from ages 2-12. The Mental Processing Component of the K-ABC measures intelligence by yielding information about the child's problem solving and information processing. The K-ABC Achievement scale is more verbally loaded and assesses the child's factual knowledge and skills.

In addition to classroom observations, other measures were used to collect data about the teachers. These measures included a questionnaire and two behavior scales, the Vineland Communication Domain of the Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scale (Sparrow, Balla, & Cicchetti, 1984), and the Adaptive Social Behavior Inventory (ASBI) (Hogan, Scott & Bauer, 1992).

Teachers completed a questionnaire designed to yield information about their knowledge and attitudes regarding developmentally appropriate teacher practices (Bryant, Clifford, & Peisner, 1991). The questionnaire was developed from established guidelines on developmentally appropriate practices from the National Association for the Education of Young Children (Bredekamp, 1987) and a survey used by the Oregon Department of Education. Respondents rated their level of agreement with 28 statements about early childhood teaching that included both appropriate and inappropriate practices. The questionnaire also involved demographic information, such as educational and teaching history.

Two assessments were used to rate teachers' attitudes about children. In one component of the Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scale known as the Vineland Communication Domain, teachers rated the children's language development for receptive, expressive and written skills. The Vineland is
designed for children from birth to age 18 and has been standardized across the ages (M=100; SD=15). Teachers also rated the children using the Adaptive Social Behavior Inventory (ASBI) to measure preschoolers' social development. The ASBI is a 30-item rating scale yielding results in three subscales: Express, Comply, and Disrupt. The items represent developmentally appropriate behaviors for children from 2.5 to 4.5 years of age. The Express subscale contains items that reflect initiating social behaviors and emotionally expressive qualities; the Disrupt subscale includes some behaviors that are slightly negative in emotional tone yet normative for many young children; and the Comply subscale reflects responsive and cooperative behaviors.

Additionally, data were collected from parents via a parent interview and the Home Screening Questionnaire (HSQ) (Frankenburg & Coons, 1986). In the parent interview, the primary caregiver, usually the mother, was interviewed in the spring of the child's Head Start year. Interviews with parents were scheduled on the phone or via notes from the child's center. Interviews were scheduled in homes, at workplaces, or in the Head Start centers. Demographic information related to the family, such as occupation and education of the mother. The Home Screening Questionnaire (HSQ) was completed at the time of the parent interview visit. The HSQ yields a score representing the overall quality of the home environment, such as degree of language-rich activities, schedule and organization, use of punishment, and family activities.

The primary research question posed at the outset of the study involved the association between the quality of the Head Start classroom and the cognitive, language, and social outcomes of participating children. The
results of the study related to classroom and home quality, the relationship of teacher education, attitudes, and classroom quality, and the relationship of home and classroom environments to child outcomes.

Results of the study suggest children from more stimulating home environments seemed to benefit more from classroom quality in the area of problem solving and reasoning than did children from less stimulating environments. This study found no statistically significant differences in child, family, teacher, or classroom characteristics based on location within the city or rural area.

The hypothesis that framed this study was partially supported through findings that indicate children who attend higher quality Head Start classes tended to have better cognitive outcomes as measured on a standardized mental processing measure and a test of school-readiness skills. Results failed to show that students had more positive behavior or social skills as rated by their teachers.

Modest, but nonsignificant, correlations were found among teacher education, teacher attitudes about developmentally appropriate practices, and classroom quality. Teachers with more education tended to have somewhat higher quality classrooms. Years of teacher experience were not related to teacher attitudes about the way in which classes were taught or attitudes about developmental appropriateness. Overall, teachers' characteristics such as education, attitudes, and experience were not associated with classroom characteristics in the group of 32 Head Start classrooms surveyed in this study.

On the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale, no classroom received a rating of inadequate, however only 9% met or exceeded the score that would be considered developmentally appropriate. The term
developmental appropriateness involves the age and individual appropriateness of the types of activities used with young children and the ways in which activities are used. The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) has specified practices that comprise developmental appropriateness across the curriculum, in adult-child interactions, in relations between home and school, and in developmental evaluation of children (Bredekamp, 1987).

In another study, Hofferth (1994) probed several issues that have implications for Head Start expansion. Research inquiries involved (a) examining how characteristics of the child, the family, and the community are associated with the enrollment of impoverished 3-to 5-year old children in Head Start; (b) identifying the types of programs and child-care arrangements in which non-Head Start children were enrolled in 1990; and (c) connecting family and community characteristics that are related to Head Start-eligible parents.

The research sample was taken from the National Child Care Survey 1990 (NCCS) (Abt Associates, 1990). The sample contained 212 children ranging from ages 3 to 5 who, in 1990, were living with their mother, were not enrolled in school, and whose families were poor or received Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). Through random digit-dial techniques, 4,392 households in 144 counties representative of the United States were interviewed by phone using computer-assisted telephone techniques. The objective of the survey was to obtain information about the characteristics of families with children under age 13 and the early education and child care programs attended by their children.
Data used in this study came from the *National Child Care Survey 1990* and *A Profile of Child Care Settings* (Kisker, Hofferth, Phillips, & Farquhar, 1991). The child care survey provided data on the characteristics of children and their families and on enrollment in Head Start and other early education and child care programs. The child care settings study yielded data on the availability of and services provided by the center-based programs and regulated family day care homes in each community in which the participating children lived. A contextual data file provided information on the counties in which the children in the sample lived.

Results of the study suggest that, in 1990, family structure was related to enrollment in Head Start; children in two-parent families with no wage-earners were the most likely to be enrolled in the program. Hofferth found results that were not anticipated when the employment status of the mother was examined: there appeared to be little difference in enrollment by employment status of the mother per se, although having a mother in a job training program was associated with greater student enrollment in Head Start. Black children were more likely to be enrolled than children of other racial/ethnic groups. Of the 3-to 5 year olds not enrolled in Head Start, only about one quarter were enrolled in center-based programs, and only about half of these programs offered comprehensive services. The majority of the children not enrolled in Head Start were in the care of a parent or other relative.

In summary, this study found evidence that programs will need to provide more services to employed parents as Head Start expands. However, even more critical are services to help single parents manage their responsibilities. Such services may include transportation, counseling, and
other types of social services as well as wraparound child care programs that
care for children either before or after Head Start. Since Head Start programs
are half-day programs that do not meet the entire year, the need for extended
child care is a concern for many who work with children. Results of this
research indicate 52% of the children in the study spent time in the care of a
relative before or after their Head Start program; 22% were cared for by a
babysitter in the children's homes; 10% went to another center-based
program; 4% used a family day-care home; and 8% were in some other kind
and child care arrangement.

This study indicates a need for Head Start expansion that provides
increased services to employed parents. Additionally, the study suggests that
white and Hispanic children are sometimes under-enrolled in Head Start
programs compared to black children.

A third study (Smith & Dickinson, 1994), describes the nature of
children's oral language experiences in Head Start and in other preschool
programs serving low-income children, and relates those experiences to
broader features of the classrooms' programs. Data were drawn from
multiple sources and included demographic information, teacher interviews,
and audiotapes of teachers' and children's spontaneous interaction that
occurred throughout one morning in 61 individual classrooms.

Using a socio-cognitive model of literacy development, Smith and
Dickinson hypothesized that particular classroom circumstances (e.g. small
group size), pedagogical orientations (e.g. desire to foster early literacy
development), and activity settings (e.g. small-group activities) would
maximize the facilitation of speech that would later enhance language and
literacy development in the children.
Data used in this study were collected from school visits conducted in the spring when the sample of children were 4 years old. The sample included 41 boys and 43 girls; 65.5% were White, 27.4% were Black, and 7.1% were of Hispanic heritage. Each family reported that English was the primary language spoken in the home. All the children were eligible for Head Start or comparable programs. Half the students were in Head Start and the remaining half of the students were in similar subsidized programs for children from low-income families. Head Start guidelines were used to determine income levels. Education of the mothers varied with a quarter reporting they did not complete high school, about half reporting they graduated from high school, and the remaining quarter reporting they had received some post-secondary education.

Instruments used to collect data included teacher interviews (n=56); classroom observations (n=56); audiotapes of the children (n=50), and teacher audiotapes (n=56). The Early Childhood Rating Scale (ECRS) (Harms & Clifford, 1980) was used to gather information regarding the variations in demographics across the classrooms (such as class size), and differences in the attributes of teachers, including such factors as educational backgrounds and years of teaching experience.

Conclusions of the study indicate there is merit in using a multifactorial approach in gathering data that would increase our understanding of language opportunities and environments. One finding of the study suggests general characteristics of the classroom (such as length of day or number of students) and specific qualities of teachers (such as educational level) influence interaction in both positive and negative ways. Secondly, this research study found that reported and observed teacher
pedagogy, if it is centered either on facilitating children's social and emotional development through interaction or on facilitating literacy development in a broad sense, contributes positively to the overall classroom language environment.

Lastly, a study conducted by Brody, Stoneman, and McCoy (1994) contributes to the present research because it evaluated the associations of hypothesized protection and risk factors of Head Start graduates. The research question posed was "What are the variables that promote or undermine the competence of Head Start graduates during kindergarten?" The inquiry is a critical one, in part because little attention has been given to understanding the ways in which rural poverty affects family functioning and the cognitive and socioemotional competence of Head Start graduates attending kindergarten. The authors of *Head Start Research and Evaluation: A Blueprint for the Future* (Administration for Children, Youth, and Families, 1990) note that little is known about those factors that promote or sustain the benefits of education.

The research was framed from a protective and risk-factor perspective. Because these former Head Start children and their families were at risk for the problems that accompany rural poverty, researchers (Brody, et al.) conceptualized and operationalized factors that protect former Head Start children from experiencing compromised functioning in kindergarten and those that place them at risk for poor kindergarten performance (Garmezy, 1985; Luthar & Zigler, 1991; Rutter, 1990). Although little has been added to the literature that identifies protective factors for former Head Start children as they make the transition to public schooling, the literature on resilience suggests several classes of variables may function protectively. Garmezy
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(1985) has suggested that individual personality traits, social support, and family cohesion can serve as protective factors. Earlier research by Garmezy (1983) indicates that harmonious caregiver-child relationships help provide a buffer against the external sources of stress that accompany poverty.

The research sample included 117 former Head Start children, their primary caregivers, who were assessed during the fall of the children's kindergarten year, and kindergarten teachers. Data involving caregivers, teachers, and children were gathered using a multimethod research design. Caregivers provided information regarding developmental goals, family processes, and their own psychological functioning, and the children and their kindergarten teachers provided socioemotional, literacy, and cognitive-competence information.

During the fall of the children's kindergarten year, two researchers visited the homes of all former Head Start children and their primary caregivers. Parents responded to a series of interview questions regarding their family characteristics, the resources available to the family, and their perceptions of the children's social skills. Two interactions of the child and caregiver as they completed a structured and unstructured activity were videotaped.

Instruments used by Brody and others included assessments of social, literacy, and cognitive competence. Data collected about the children involved a series of standardized assessments that focused on their social, literacy, and vocabulary competencies, including subscales of the Social Skills Rating System (SSRS) (Gresham & Elliot, 1990), a section of the MAPS Observation Guide (Bergan, Feld, Schwarz, Reddy, Li, & Cheng, 1992), and the
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (PPVT-R) (Dunn & Dunn, 1981). Kindergarten teachers assisted in the collection of the student assessment data.

During the spring of the children's kindergarten year, their teachers completed questionnaires about each of the full sample of 117 former Head Start children in their classrooms. Teachers provided information about the children's internal and external behavior and cognitive competence.

Results of the study support the hypothesized relations between the child-competence measures and protective factors, especially caregiver self-esteem, endorsement of independence-promoting developmental goals, co-care-giver support and communication, and engaged, responsive, and cognitively challenging caregiver-child interactions. Another component of the stated hypothesis was also supported: that caregiver distress and conflicted family relationships are associated with negative developmental outcomes for former Head Start children attending kindergarten.

Current Issues in Head Start

Experiments in early learning, although not unique to the 1960's, have fueled discussions and provided relevant data for reformulating governmental policy. Today, discussion continues as to the role of Project Head Start. Moore (1991), in a 20-year study of statistical data on Head Start and other legislative programs that benefit children, concludes that every child should have the right to experience academic achievement and receive a high-quality education in a public school. While such a goal may draw little criticism, issues regarding how to achieve, evaluate, and retain the goal of academic achievement throughout the school years ignite considerable discussion.
For example, the issue of how to best achieve academic success may focus attention on the child, home, school related factors, the community or a combination of variables. Barnett (1992), in a review of 22 studies and a cost-benefit analysis of the Perry Preschool Project in Ypsilanti, Michigan, determined that compensatory preschool education can produce long-term gains in school success and that such success is accompanied by improvements in employment, teen pregnancy, and welfare assistance.

While the Perry Preschool Project has been recognized as a model for Head Start programs, preschool programs have been criticized for providing too few services to children and their families. At the same time, Moore (1991) addressed the limitations of individual programs, including Head Start, noting that achievement must be examined in a more comprehensive manner. Her solution toward ensuring success is to provide children with loving and supportive families, affordable, high quality child care while their parents are at work, national health care coverage, and a high quality public education. Questions regarding how such goals are best achieved remain unanswered and the debate as to whether or not efforts should be limited or comprehensive in nature continues.

Another issue stems from variations in evaluations of Project Head Start programs. Even when there is agreement as to how the goal of academic achievement is best met, there may be considerable variation in the evaluation of the goal. The Management and Planning System (MAPS), a developmental assessment system initiated in Head Start, consists of instruments which assess preschoolers' and kindergartners' development of math, science, literacy, social skills, and motor development (Bergan & Feld, 1993). Assessment instruments designed to serve teaching and learning
initiatives must meet three criteria (Bergan, 1991). The assessments must: (1) assess children's abilities; (2) be capable of reflecting development during the long transition period and, (3) provide information that can be used to plan developmentally appropriate learning opportunities. Bergan maintains that norm-referenced and criterion-referenced achievement tests do not meet these criteria and that MAPS provides developmental information by referencing a child's performance to a position on a path of development.

While some Head Start programs evaluate the progress of children, other Head Start programs are evaluated for the degree of direct instruction that is given (Stallings, 1987). Still others may base evaluation on external factors, such as differences in behavior and attitudes among families (Hebbeler, 1985; Datcher-Loury, 1989; Reynolds, 1990). Gallagher (1991) found a lack of explanation as to how gains are made in intervention programs such as Head Start. When the focus of evaluation varies greatly from the child to the curriculum to the environment, valid collection and interpretation of data becomes more difficult for purposes of discussion or replication.

In addition to implementation and evaluation, efforts must be made to maintain gains throughout the years that children remain in school. In a study of effects of Head Start and other programs for the economically impoverished, Reynolds (1990) found cognitive readiness and parental involvement to be relatively strong variables in the effect of prekindergarten on third-year achievement. As expected, retention and mobility had negative effects on achievement. The importance of continuity between Head Start programs and education in the primary grades is justified (Sandel, 1991). As Head Start graduates move through school, such factors as support and nurturance of children, readiness for school, provision of direct services to
children and families, and parental involvement and empowerment effect social adjustment and academic progress (Oden & Ricks, 1990). Before deciding what kind of support is needed, there is benefit in stating the differing viewpoints of Head Start proponents (Washington & Oyemade Bailey, 1995, p. 8-9):

1. For community activists, Head Start demonstrates the value of local control.

2. For early childhood educators, Head Start develops and nurtures the young.

3. For "family support" and "family values" promoters, Head Start emphasizes parent involvement with their children and with those institutions that affect the children's lives.

4. For health care workers, Head Start offers children nutritious meals, immunizations, and mandates screening/diagnosis/treatment for every child.

5. To the welfare reform strategist, Head Start offers jobs for parents, as well as job training, child care that permits parents to work, and a focus on economic self-sufficiency.

6. To those who seek stronger coordination of social services and "one-stop shopping," Head Start since 1965 has helped social services agencies to be more responsive to the poor, while promoting cooperation among agencies.

7. Head Start was a strong forerunner to "Goal One" of the national education goals: "By the year 2000, every child will enter school ready to learn." Emphasizing preschool education and social competence skills, Head Start has produced gains for children as they enter school.
Efforts to "close the gap" between more and less successful students must include educational services that go beyond short-term interventions. Continuing successful experiences for children of poverty throughout their educational careers are critical. "We simply cannot inoculate children in one year against the ravages of a life of deprivation" (Zigler, 1987, p. 258).

Today, while efforts towards more Project Head Start intervention continue, Washington and Oyemade Bailey (1995, p. 5-6) list the following concerns as a contrasting image of the program:

1. The existing infrastructure of Head Start has weakened over the years at multiple levels, such as managerial and facility capacities.

2. The effectiveness of Head Start services has been impacted by the elimination of, or budget and staff reductions in other federal programs on which Head Start depends.

3. Today, 55 percent of Head Start children live with a single parent, often a very young mother.

4. One out of every five preschool children is affected in some way by substance abuse.

5. Family violence affects positive outcomes. Among 5,000 families in one demonstration preschool program, at least five mothers died violent deaths in less than one year—seventeen times the violent death rate for women fifteen to twenty-four in the population as a whole.

6. Head Start is not immune to the challenges generally faced in the early childhood field—high staff turnovers and low wages.

7. There is some concern that Head Start is a second-class citizen in a field it helped to stimulate: individuals who receive child development training, certification, and even academic degrees through Head Start are
often attracted to better-financed, higher status roles in institutions such as public schools that typically offer better pay, benefits, and working conditions.

Summary

This chapter has reviewed literature associated with Project Head Start and beginning reading. Areas of focus have included language acquisition, literacy acquisition, social competence, and preschool education.

Project Head Start was born into a culture that was uncertain about its direction in educating an ever-increasing group of preschoolers. It was, in part, the growing political support for the concept of prevention and intervention to head off potential learning problems that led to the formation of this federally funded program for preschoolers.

Literature related to Project Head Start lists social competence as a primary goal. Head Start studies that examined the long-termed consequences of "socially relevant" education indicate that children who attend Start are at a more global advantage in school by virtue of having gained social competence that enables them to progress in school, stay in the mainstream, and satisfy teachers' requirements better than their peers that lack preschool experience.

Related literature has also highlighted social and cultural connections to language acquisition. The literature suggests that even for young children, the composition of oral and written texts is a distinctly socio-cultural process that involves making decisions, conscious or otherwise, about how one fits into the social world at any one point in time. As children learn language, they learn about language, and they learn through language. It is therefore important to provide children with opportunities, such as those offered in Head Start, to see connections between oral and written language.
This research will contribute to the literature base through its exploration of the subsequent learning of students who completed Head Start and Project Reach. We need data that follow these students, since there has been a lag in the funding of Head Start and transition programs. Head Start began as a summer pilot in 1965; yet the announcement by the Head Start Bureau of available funds for competing Head Start/Public School Early Childhood Transition Demonstration Projects occurred more than 25 years later in July, 1991. To date, few studies have been completed regarding the effectiveness of transition programs. A paucity of information involving transition programs has contributed to the lack of follow-up study of participating students and their families. Additionally, few studies have been found that follow students who were enrolled in both Head Start and a transition program before entering first grade. This research is unique in that it allows us to follow eleven students, each having two years of earlier school experience, into first grade and to observe them as early readers and as students. Because this research includes students who have completed two years of schooling before making the transition to first grade, it helps to bridge the gap between preschool, kindergarten, and first grade since students were observed as they related their prior learning to first grade reading and other school based activities.

This relation of Head Start and Project Reach to first grade reading success is important in the overall effectiveness of the school program since the goals of these programs are based on the assumption that the skills learned previously by students will positively affect learning in the primary grades. This research observes students at they participate in school activities as Head Start and Project Reach completers. Part of the justification for an
increased level of support for Head Start and transition programs, such as Project Reach, is the belief that these programs make a positive difference in the lives of children and their parents.

This research is also needed because it offers a multi-faceted observation of eleven students, their teachers and their classrooms. Throughout the data collection phase of the study, participating teachers and students completed pre and post interviews and were observed formally and informally. Additionally, a pre and post checklist of available resources was completed in each of the first grade classrooms in the study. This information is significant because it notes changes in behavior and physical environments throughout the six weeks duration of the study. The design of the study also permitted contextual factors to be noted, rather than traditional assessment only. Because social competence was identified as a primary goal of Head Start completers, it is necessary to observe the social context in which first graders participate in reading and other school-based activities. This research is an observation of the social context in which reading instruction occurs.

The evaluation of Head Start and transition programs such as Project Reach needs to include the monitoring of its graduates. The foreword to a government document entitled *The Impact of Head Start on Children, Families and Communities* (1985) states: "In spite of the many successes of Head Start reflected in this report, the report also provides us with insights into areas where further improvements can be made. These must be pursued during the next several years if children and parents are to realize maximum benefits from the program." These include, but are not limited to, "more emphasis on school readiness skills and closer linkages between Head Start
and the elementary school system to assure long-term continuation of the growth that children demonstrate while in Head Start." This research will contribute information in pursuit of these improvements.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

This study was designed to address the question: What factors are related to successful literacy acquisition among eleven Head Start and Project Reach graduates who are making the transition to first grade? Student, teacher, and classroom characteristics were observed in five first grade classrooms during a six week period from mid-winter to early spring of 1995. In addition to the 11 students, five teachers also participated in the study.

In order to examine as closely and unobtrusively as possible those factors related to student success, a naturalistic approach was used for the study. This approach is appropriate since data collection was based upon the observations of participants within the classroom, a natural setting of the students and teachers. Because these observations were critical to the accumulation of data available for analysis, it was necessary to record them in the most naturalistic state possible. As Gay (1987) notes: "in naturalistic observation the observer purposely controls or manipulates nothing, and in fact works hard at not affecting the observed situation in any way" (p. 225).

It is not always possible to detach oneself from the environment. This study also included participant observation. The naturalistic setting of the classroom can be affected by the presence of an observer, who then intentionally or unintentionally becomes part of the setting. In participant
observation, the observer actually becomes a part of, a participant in the situation to be observed with varying degrees of participation and observations that may be overt or covert. Elements of this observational design within a naturalistic setting are common within descriptive research. These components are noted by Gay, (1987, p. 18) who writes: "Descriptive research involves collecting data in order to test hypotheses or answer questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study. Descriptive data are typically collected through a questionnaire survey, an interview, or observation." Therefore, observation and analysis of data were appropriate for a beginning exploration of the process of identifying those factors that relate to student success.

Data collected in the first phase of the study provided a focus for obtaining subsequent information that would be collected during the remaining phase. It was possible to explore characteristics of the students, their teachers, and their classrooms since data collection included a variety of observations and instruments that were specifically designed to gain an insightful glimpse into each area of inquiry. This inquiry was guided by multiple sources of data that included observations of students, teachers, and classrooms, field notes, interviews of both students and teachers, student records, assessment information, a classroom checklist, and student assignments. Participant observation was a major component in data collection.

Patton (1990) notes a strength of observational fieldwork to be that "the evaluator has the opportunity to see things that may routinely escape conscious awareness among participants and staff. In order for someone to provide information in an interview, they must be aware enough to report
the desired information. Because all social systems involve routines, participants in those routines may take them so much for granted that they cease to be aware of important nuances that are apparent only to an observer who has not become fully immersed in those routines" (p. 204).

Gaining Access

The objective of the study was to identify student, teacher, and classroom characteristics related to literacy acquisition among Head Start and Project Reach graduates who were evaluated as good students by their former kindergarten teachers.

The study took place in a large urban school district in the Midwest. School selection was determined by identifying the elementary building in the school district with the greatest number of students who met the criteria of completing both Head Start and Project Reach kindergarten. Discussions with the building administrator, teachers, support staff, parents, and students, were ongoing to ensure their compatibility with the study. Appendix A contains a flow chart of the activities that preceded the study.

My association with the school was not solely as a researcher. I maintained an ongoing professional relationship with the staff by serving as a college readiness/career education resource teacher to the school during the four years that preceded the study. In this role, I have provided supplemental materials to the school and coordinated a number of inservice programs and other activities that allowed me to become more familiar with the staff, students, and community. I continue to work in this position to provide the staff, parents, and students with resources that can assist them in making connections between themselves, school-based learning, and the world of work.
Through the years, one of the activities that I have coordinated for the school is the distribution of our department's resource manual, activity packets, publications, and commercially produced magazines as well as information regarding our inservice and summer employment opportunities for teachers. Other examples of the services that I coordinate for the school include displays of audio-visual materials from our resource center, Make-It Take-It workshops for teachers and parents, and Career Day presentations. These efforts are designed to provide students, teachers, parents, and the community at-large with various opportunities to connect, enhance, and extend the learning that occurs in the school and in the community.

The students in the study attended an urban elementary school and lived in a neighborhood on the near north side of the city. The school had an enrollment of 380 students in grades K-5 with 98.7% of the students eligible for free and reduced price school lunches based on family income. Students selected for Head Start and Project Reach were also identified by family income. The number of students enrolled in full-day kindergarten was 85 while the first grade enrollment was 68. The school had five Multiple Handicapped classes. With the exception of these special needs students who were transported to the school by bus, most students lived in the neighborhood and walked to school.

The teaching staff consisted of 28 teachers and 17 instructional aides. Other support staff included a counselor who was assigned to the school three days a week and art, music, and physical education teachers who instructed classes weekly.

The school is located in a community with one of the highest crime rates in the city and a high incidence of families who live at or below federally
established poverty levels. The school received Disadvantaged Pupils Impact Aid (DPIA) from the state government to fund drop-out prevention programs in grades K-4. DPIA funding allowed the first grade classes at this school to average 12 students.

To increase parent involvement, school personnel also collaborated with family service agencies to make the schools more inviting to parents. In addition to scheduling programs and activities that encouraged parents to attend school events, the staff worked with community agencies who sent personnel to the school to assist teachers in making home visits to talk with parents.

Selection of Participants and Setting

The two Project Reach coordinators assigned to the school were asked to prepare a list that contained the names of every first grade student who had completed Head Start preschool followed by Project Reach services in kindergarten. A list was submitted that contained the names of 28 students who met this criteria as completers of two years of schooling before entering first grade. This group of students became the pool from which participants were selected for the study.

During the fall of 1994, kindergarten teachers were then individually consulted to identify potential candidates from the list of former students who had just recently been promoted to first grade. The criteria used to select students for the study included kindergarten teachers' recommendations, kindergarten teachers' evaluations of successful kindergarten students who were expected to do well as first graders, and kindergarten progress reports of
the students' skills related to language arts, mathematics, readiness, work habits, and personal/social growth. The list of students recommended by kindergarten teachers contained 14 names.

The 14 students were invited to participate in the study. Students became part of the study based on: (1) successful completion of Head Start and Project Reach, (2) kindergarten teacher recommendations, (3) willingness of first grade teachers to participate in the study, and (4) parental consent. The total number of students who met the criteria was 11.

Project Reach coordinators who worked on-site indicated that the pool of students who met the criteria of successful completion of two years of previous school experience was not expected to exceed 14, because each classroom also contained students with less than two years of prior school experience as well as students with less successful backgrounds. Additionally, classroom assignments were organized heterogeneously with consideration to such factors as race, gender, academic achievement of students, and teacher judgments. Therefore, students who had successfully completed Head Start and Project Reach kindergarten were assigned to six different first grade classes. Since participation in the study was also dependent on the return of students to the same school in first grade and consent from parents, 11 students met the criteria and became part of the study. One student in the original group of 14 had recently moved away from the neighborhood and was not involved in this study. A second student was excluded from the study because his teacher did not wish to participate. Five of the six first grade teachers were included in the study. A third student did not return the parental consent form before the study began. Consequently, from the list of
14 eligible students, three students were not included. The remaining 11 students from five first grades at one elementary school participated in the study.

Description of Participants

The 11 students included eight females and three males. Of the eight females, one is biracial, five are black, and two are white. The three males in the study are black. At the beginning of the study, the students ranged in age from 6 years, 4 months, to 7 years, 2 months. The average chronological age of the group at the beginning of the study was 6 years, 10 months.

Eight of the students attended Early Literacy classes. The classes provided additional reading support to students who showed a need as a result of earlier reading test scores. Students who qualified met in a small group with one of the two Reading Recovery teachers who shared a classroom. Typically each group contained five or six students who left their assigned classrooms for a 45-minute group reading lesson. Each group met daily; however the time of day that some of the groups began their classes varied from 1:30 to 2:35 in the afternoon.

The Early Literacy teachers provided additional reading support through instructional strategies that assisted students in the development of letter/sound mastery and reading comprehension. This was accomplished through use of activities that included oral and silent reading, listening to books on tapes, taking books home to read, demonstrating letter/sound associations and writing. The two Early Literacy teachers also diagnosed reading difficulties by administering various assessments including Concepts About Print (Clay, 1985). The two teachers tested each first grader at the
beginning of the year and routinely used running records to document potential problems that were noted as they listened while a student read a passage aloud.

Table 1 contains a summary of demographic information about the students in the study. Throughout the dissertation, actual names of the student participants, staff members, school and room assignments are not used. Instead, pseudonyms have been assigned to increase the level of confidentiality for those involved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Early Literacy Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6-11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7-2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7-0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6-4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Biracial</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenika</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Student demographic information.
The five classroom teachers and two Reading Recovery teachers are white females. For purposes of this study, only classroom teachers with regularly assigned students were included in the data collection. The Reading Recovery teachers, however, are part of this discussion because some student observations were completed during instructional reading periods with these teachers. It was therefore necessary to sometimes observe students outside of their assigned classrooms. Because the natural instructional reading settings for the majority of the students in this study involved two classrooms and two teachers of reading, student observations were conducted in the students' regularly assigned classrooms and in the Early Literacy classroom.

Of the five first grade classroom teachers who were included in the study, three teachers were certified to teach grades K-8 and two teachers were certified to teach grades 1-8. This was the first year that one of the teachers had taught first grade; three teachers had taught first grade 4 years, and one of the teachers had taught first grade 9 years. The total years of teaching experience for the five classroom teachers ranged from 3-23 years. One teacher had 3 years teaching experience while the remaining four teachers each had 10, 12, 15, and 23 years of teaching experience respectively.

Description of the Setting

This study was conducted in five first grades in one elementary building in an urban school district in the Midwest. Five teachers participated in the study. Two teachers shared the same classroom; therefore the number of physical classroom spaces was four rather than five. Three of the classroom spaces appeared to be similar in size and were located inside the school; one classroom seemed slightly smaller and was located in a portable
The two teachers who shared a classroom space wanted to remain inside the building rather than teach in a portable unit. Each of the participating classes contained students who were previously enrolled in both Head Start preschool and kindergartens that received Project Reach services as well as students who had not participated in these programs.

Design of the Study

The design of the study was qualitative in nature and included interpretive and ethnographic components in the data collection and analysis phases. The study included observation of people, incidents, environments, and social conditions. Watching and listening (Schatzman and Strauss, 1973) provided the framework for gathering data. Observations were recorded in field notes; listening was accomplished with the assistance of audio tape recordings of formal observations and interviews that were transcribed and analyzed. Audiotapes were made in order to preserve all verbal interactions that occurred during each taped session. Observation techniques were augmented with interviews, field notes, assessment information, work samples, and teacher judgments to provide the data base for this study.

The study began in mid-February, 1995. The parameters of the study were discussed with participating teachers and the building administrator. Written consent to conduct research was requested from the principal and the five first grade teachers after the proposal was submitted for review to the district's program evaluation committee (see App. B).

In January, 1995, a consent form was forwarded to parents, seeking permission to observe, audiotape, and interview their children in a research project to be conducted during winter. Parents were reminded that student
participation was optional and that every effort would be made to continue the normal classroom schedule while the study was underway. Confidentiality of selected students was maintained throughout the study through use of pseudonyms in lieu of the actual names of participants.

Throughout the two weeks preceding the beginning of the study, I made informal visits to the first grade classrooms. During this time, I became acquainted with the students and their classroom schedule, collected contextual data, and listened to students read. This time afforded me the opportunity to obtain background information about the participants prior to the actual study. While the dates of this activity are noted in the time frame of events (see Table 7), they were not included as part of the six weeks of study within the five classrooms.

During the week preceding the study, I made informal and very brief visits to each of the participating classrooms to provide opportunities for students to become more familiar with my presence in their classroom and to allow me to learn more about the children, teachers, and classroom schedules. To minimize classroom interruptions and to provide for a system of organization, each teacher was given a roster of the mornings that I would visit their rooms. The number of visitations to each room was determined primarily by the number of participating students contained in the class. Each class contained 2-4 student participants.

In order to examine as closely and unobtrusively as possible those factors related to student success, a naturalistic and multi-factoral approach was employed to collect data. Data collection consisted of four audio-tape recordings of each participating student during instructional reading periods; three informal observations of each student, teacher, and classroom; two
audio-taped interviews of each student and teacher; two word tests per student; and two checklists of available resources per classroom. While formal student observation occurred only during instructional reading periods, informal observations of students, teachers, and classrooms took place during periods when reading related and other activities were observable outside of instructional reading lessons. Informal observations frequently occurred when teachers explained the morning schedule of activities, while students and teachers worked individually or in groups, during language arts or writing periods, as students read independently, and during visits from resource and support staff at the school. Table 2 is a summary of the events that occurred throughout the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Formal Obs.</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Informal Obs.</th>
<th>Word Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children (11)</td>
<td>4 each</td>
<td>2 each</td>
<td>3 each</td>
<td>2 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (5)</td>
<td>2 each</td>
<td>3 each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms (4)</td>
<td>2 per class (Checklist)</td>
<td>3 each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Schedule of activities: Weeks 1-6.

Phase 1

The study was conducted in two phases, beginning with Phase 1. Phase 1 was completed during the first two weeks of the study and included observations of children, classrooms, and teachers, initial interviews with
students and teachers, a classroom checklist, and a word test. During Phase 1, I made one formal observation of each student during an audiotaped instructional reading period in which field notes were taken. I completed one 20-minute informal observation with field notes which occurred during other times when students were involved in reading and other activities such as calendar events, art, music, or in-school scouting. These activities provided information regarding the numerous interactions that took place as students related to each other, their teachers and their classrooms. During several of the informal visits, students were observed as they used language within their classrooms and in other settings to interact with various peers, school, and community members. Similarly, one informal observation of each teacher and classroom was made and field notes were taken as reading related and other activities took place.

A checklist of classroom resources (Lehman, Freeman, & Allen, 1994), student interviews, teacher interviews (adapted, Pinnell, 1989), and a word test for students were also completed during Phase 1 to provide a baseline for comparing data that would be gathered during Phase 2. The word test used in this study was developed by Clay (1966) who found that administering an instrument in which students could say 15 words systematically sampled from a list of 45 of the most frequently occurring words in the little books in their reading series was a valuable tool for ranking or grouping students during the first grade.

Informal observations of teachers, students, and classrooms were recorded by way of field notes taken in increments of 20 minutes per observation. All observations took place within the school setting.
Students were observed formally during instructional reading periods lasting approximately 20 minutes in length and informally at other times when engaged in a variety of activities. The scope of skills that were observed was compiled from Marie Clay's *Concepts About Print* assessment and the *Houghton Mifflin Literary Readers* adopted by the school district. These skills included those that were student as well as teacher centered. Mastery of the skills assessed in *Concepts About Print* was viewed by school personnel as an important component in laying the foundation for beginning readers and was routinely administered to beginning first graders throughout the district. Many of the skills tested in this assessment were also found throughout the scope and sequence charts of the *Houghton Mifflin Literary Readers*.

Student centered skills in the Houghton Mifflin series and in *Concepts About Print* were those skills that were to be acquired and developed by the student. These skills included book handling techniques, such as indicating where the front of a book is; directionality, in which the student noticed that a book is read in a left to right direction, and letter and word knowledge. Similarly, other skills that were expected to be exhibited by the students included their understanding and use of punctuation marks, beginning and final consonant sounds and word structure as well as their reliance on pictures to tell the story or their memory to recall the text.

Another set of skills was directed or implemented by the teachers. These teacher directed skills included background-building activities in which teachers drew on the prior knowledge of their students in order to make subsequent learning more relevant. Other reading activities that teachers were expected to initiate included comprehension monitoring strategies that provided students with tools that better enabled them to understand print.
Additionally, teachers were expected to provide a variety of cooperative, guided, and independent reading opportunities for students. This allowed students to view teachers in various roles as individuals who read with them, instruct them, and encourage them to become independent readers. It was also the teacher's role to provide numerous opportunities for students to experience and respond to literature. One of the purposes of conducting student observations was to learn more about the ways in which each child experienced and responded to literature. Experiencing literature included drawing upon personal experiences, expanding concepts and vocabulary, reading oral and silent selections, and receiving instructional support from the teacher. Responding to literature involved summarizing and discussing selections, assessing comprehension (students and teachers), writing about various passages, and performing or role playing.

A summary of activities completed in Phase 1 is found in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Informal</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Interview*</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>1 each</td>
<td>1 each</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1 each</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>1 per class (Checklist*)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Schedule of activities: Weeks 1-2.
Phase 2

Phase 2 followed a similar format of observations of students, teachers, and classrooms, post interviews with each student and teacher, a classroom checklist, and a reading assessment. A summary of activities completed during Phase 2 appears in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informal</th>
<th>Formal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Interview*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>3 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>1 per class (Checklist*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Initial Interview/Checklist

Table 4: Schedule of activities: Weeks 3-6.

Two instruments were developed to obtain information about the attitudes of students and teachers toward reading; a checklist of available resources was used to guide classroom observation. Each student and staff member was interviewed twice throughout the study. Each student was observed four times formally; every student, teacher, and classroom in the study was informally observed 3 times.

Instruments Used

Several instruments were used to gather data concerning the students, teachers and their classrooms. All instruments, including a student
interview, word test, teacher interview, classroom checklist and cumulative record information, were used in both phases of the study.

**Student Interview**

The student interview is a 10-item reading survey adapted from one developed by Pinnell, (1989) designed to identify students' attitudes towards reading (see App. H). During the interview, I asked students to name their favorite pastime, rate their current instructional reader as easy, just right, or difficult to read, indicate what they do when they come to words they do not know, and share what they hoped to learn in first grade. To encourage conversation and relaxation throughout the activity, students were asked to bring a copy of the story they were currently reading in their reading group to the interview, which was held in the library learning center at the school. As each student entered the conference room, he or she saw a display of books on a desk. The student was asked to place his or her reader among the other books.

Each student was then asked to look at the books on the table and select three books that would be fun to read. Several weeks earlier I had asked the library aide to provide me with an assortment of books that were popular with first graders at the school. The following books were selected for the interview: *Bear Child's Book of Hours* by Anne Rockwell, *Color Dance* by Ann Jonas, *Feathers for Lunch* by Lois Ehlert, *It Takes a Village* by Jane Cowen-Fletcher, *I Was a Second Grade Werewolf* by Daniel Pinkwater, *The Black Snowman* by Phil Mendez, *The Picture Life of Thurgood Marshall* by Margaret B. Young, *The Three Bears* by Paul Galdone and the student's assigned reader. Students were then asked questions regarding the difficulty level of their reader and their favorite characters, places to read and pastime.
The next questions asked students to share the first things they do when they read and tell what they do when they approach words that are difficult. During the last three questions, I asked students to describe the best part of their visits to the library learning center, advise the Lollipop Dragon puppet, who had been placed on the desk, by offering suggestions for becoming a better reader, and tell what they would like to learn in first grade. Table 5 provides a complete reference of each title included in the student interviews.

---


*The child’s current instructional reading book was also included.

---

Table 5: Titles of books* used during the student interviews
Word Test

To obtain a sample of the child's knowledge of words, I administered a word test (Clay, 1993, p. 55) to each student. This 2-minute test involved the child's knowledge of a list of 15 high frequency words. This test was chosen because the vocabulary includes words students might have been exposed to in their reading. Although the test contains 3 word lists, only one of the lists is to be used during the test. I gave each child a paper strip that contained the words in List A only. After assisting each student with the practice word at the top of the list, I asked the child to say the remaining 15 words. The score was recorded as the number of correct responses from a maximum of 15 words. The additional two lists of words were not used in this study; however they are appropriate for retesting.

In 1968, a sample of 320 urban students ranging in age from 5-0 to 7-0 completed this test and their scores were represented as stanines. Stanines distribute scores according to the normal curve in groups from 1, the lowest band, to 9, the highest band. Students are expected to master the word test by moving through the stanine score range until they reach perfect scoring (Clay, 1993). The "Ready to Read" Word Test, named for the reading series used by Auckland first graders in 1963, does not indicate a reading level for students, but does provide information about the extent to which students may be accumulating a reading vocabulary of high frequency words.

Teacher Interview

The teacher interview was adapted from an interview developed by Pinnell (1989) for Reading Recovery teachers. It represents an abbreviated oral interview in which participating teachers were asked to describe the reading instruction within their classrooms and to identify the most
important factors in helping a child become successful in reading. Teachers were questioned about their attitudes towards professional growth and development, site-based factors that promote and hinder teaching and learning, and the backgrounds of their students.

Classroom Checklist

The instrument used to note the availability of classroom resources was designed by Lehman, Freeman, & Allen (1994). Entitled Classroom Observation Checklist, the instrument provides a means of checking the presence or absence of children's literature displays, children's books, and materials and equipment that support children's interactions with books. It also notes cross-curricular links, teacher and student created literature materials, and resources for literature-based teaching.

Cumulative Record Information

Additionally, the cumulative records of participating students contained information that was included in the data collection and analysis phases of the study. Since each student had completed Concepts About Print tasks before the study began, this instrument was added to the data because it yielded scores that assessed the students as early readers. The final reading grades from the kindergarten report cards were also included since they indicated the kindergarten teachers' perceptions of reading success for students prior to entering first grade.

The instruments described in the preceding paragraphs (see App. C.) were administered throughout a six-week period in which data was collected and preliminary analysis completed. At the end of this period, I left the field to concentrate on further analysis of the data collected. Audio recordings were later transcribed and analyzed using a coding system that was completed
after all transcriptions had been made. Some categories were identified *a priori* (such as those generated by the questions asked) while others emerged as data analysis proceeded (adapted from Toulmin, Rieke, and Janik, 1984). By the beginning of April, a determination was made that sufficient data had been collected for most of the participating students. A follow-up visit to the research site was made to gather portfolio information for two students whose folders needed to be updated.

**Sources of Data**

Data consisted of student, teacher and classroom observations, field notes, audio-tape recordings, and interviews, reading scores and a classroom checklist. A portion of the assessment information (including teacher evaluations and test scores from preschool and kindergarten) was obtained from historical information located in the participants' cumulative records. Cumulative records, located in the school's office, yielded insights into the two years of schooling students engaged in before entering first grade. During these two years of early schooling, student judgments were made by Head Start teachers and Project Reach kindergarten teachers.

Instruments were developed to obtain additional information about the students, teachers, and classrooms throughout the study. These instruments included a student interview, teacher interview, and checklist of available resources.

Table 6 represents the information that formed the baseline for subsequent data that were gathered after the first two weeks of the study. As such, this data was useful in comparing similarities and differences in students, teachers, and classrooms as they were observed during Phase 2.
Children

Head Start Test Scores/Assessments
Head Start Teacher judgments
Kindergarten grades/assessments
Kindergarten teacher judgments
Initial Interview
Word Test

Teacher

Initial Interview

Classroom

Initial Classroom Checklist

Table 6: Baseline data used in the study.

The data collected from students and teachers emanated primarily from listening to, observing and recording their interactions during instructional reading periods and while involved in reading and other school based activities. The data analyzed at the conclusion of the study also included Concepts About Print scores and final reading grades from kindergarten and first grades.

Data was collected as follows:

1. Each student was formally observed and audiotaped during four instructional reading periods, lasting approximately 20 minutes each. Observational field notes were taken to provide a context for audio tape recordings. Observations were conducted in the assigned classrooms of the students and in an Early Literacy classroom shared by two teachers.
of reading. The two teachers of Early Literacy were not a part of the actual study; however observations of students were made in their classroom since this program represented an integral part of the daily reading instruction received by students. Because 8 of the 11 students received Early Literacy services outside their assigned classrooms, some of their formal reading observations were conducted outside of their regular classrooms. The two teachers, who had been trained in Reading Recovery, each provided additional reading instruction for selected first grade students. Their reading groups averaged 5-6 students.

2. Each student and teacher was also observed informally 3 times. Each informal observation lasted 20 minutes, during which time field notes were also taken. During the informal student observations, each student was observed as he or she participated in activities other than instructional reading. These activities included learning centers, independent reading, math lessons, art, and circle time when students were observed as they completed calendar events and language arts. Teachers were observed as they taught or facilitated such activities. While formal student observations occurred only during instructional reading periods, informal observations of students and teachers occurred during periods of activity that were observable outside of instructional reading periods. Field notes were taken during formal and informal observations.

3. A checklist of classroom resources was completed during Phase 1 to establish baseline information and again at the end of Phase 2. Each classroom was also observed informally once during Phase 1 and twice
during Phase 2. Informal classroom observations, like those involving students and teachers, were also made at times outside of the formal reading instruction. During the informal classroom observations, I focused on the interactions of the entire classroom as students and teachers related to each other and to the classroom itself. Unlike the other observations that were recorded, the informal observations of each of the classes were included in the study to take a snapshot of the dynamics of the group as a whole, rather than focus attention primarily on one individual in the classroom.

4. Each student and teacher was interviewed during Phase 1 of the study. I used a structured interview format with both open-ended and close-ended questions. Responses to the first interview provided baseline data for teachers. Responses to the first interview, along with cumulative information and teacher judgments regarding previous success in Head Start and kindergarten provided baseline data for analysis of subsequent student responses. Students and teachers were interviewed again at the end of the study using the same structured interview format (including both open-ended and close-ended questions). Changes in student and teacher perspectives from the initial interview were compared with responses on the final interview. Interviews provided for triangulation of data.

5. Each student was given the same word test to complete during Phase 1 and again in Phase 2. The data collection phase ended after the fourth week in March and is displayed in Table 7.
Table 7: Data collection time frame for Head Start graduates as first grade readers.

Data analysis included:

1. Field notes of informal student, teacher, and classroom observations.
2. Written transcriptions of instructional reading sessions that were coded and analyzed to determine frequency and types of statements.
3. A pre- and post-checklist of classroom factors
4. Comparison between pre- and post-interviews of students and teachers.

5. Comparison of scores from word tests.

6. Reading achievement as represented by scores from the Concepts About Print assessment, students' instructional reading levels at the end of their fifth month in first grade and comparison of final reading grades from kindergarten and second quarter reading grades from the first grade report card.

Evaluations from Head Start and Project Reach teachers, as well as test data, work samples and other pertinent information from student cumulative records provided a historical framework for analysis of the present reading success of the students. While the collection of data occurred at mid-year, there is merit in collecting information at smaller than yearly increments. At the time of this study, students had been in first grade five months. One of the goals of this research is to note patterns which may occur in the behavior or skill level of students and teachers. There is merit in collecting end of the year data as a follow-up study. However, for purposes of this study, it is important to note whether or not students appear successful during the first semester of first grade.

Daily Summary of Activities

Many student, teacher, and classroom observations were completed in the mornings; I conducted student and teacher interviews, administered a student assessment, collected cumulative information regarding students, and completed a daily log of events during the afternoons as well as before and after school. A sample of the events and activities completed during three days of the study as documented in my daily log follows.
Day 1  February 13

Students began the day by engaging in informal reading. The classroom routine involved children reading independently for approximately 1/2 hour upon entering the room. Several students willingly read to me today and the students participating in the study (Amber, William, Carolyn, and Barbara) were introduced to me as they came into the room.

The following activities were completed by the class:

- Independent reading (30 minutes)
- Calendar activities (whole group)
- Reading with entire group (big books on the topics of birthdays and space)
- Center activities (writing, puzzles that were a substitute for the science center, computer, and listening center, which was a book on tape)

The 14 students were then asked to meet their teacher on a large rug in the room. Selected students were rewarded with stickers for working quietly and independently at their centers. Their teacher distributed writing journals to the students and asked them to go to their two tables to complete their daily writing exercise. I exited the room after the journal writing activity was well underway.

After lunch, I returned to Ms. Martin's room to complete one classroom observation (12:55-1:15). Students entered the classroom after leaving the lunchroom. Because of inclement weather, students remained inside during recess. During the observation, I observed the teacher as she demonstrated cutting out hearts by folding red and white construction paper in half and then cutting out half the heart.
Students worked at two tables. Ms. Martin gave each child a bag. She then placed a plastic carrier containing scissors and glue on each of the two tables and gave each child two pieces of construction paper (red and white). A couple of heart patterns were placed on each table. Students began tracing and cutting out hearts.

I left the room after children have begun tracing and cutting out hearts for approximately 10 minutes.

Tasks completed—AM: Informal observations—Amber, William, Carolyn, Barbara, Ms. Martin
Task completed—PM: Informal observation—Room 19

Since students were not in attendance, I spent the day completing tasks that focused on their teachers and classrooms. Teachers met with parents throughout the day. I asked each of the participating teachers to schedule me for a 15-minute conference that allowed me to complete their initial teacher interview. Because the classrooms were not occupied during the entire day, I also used this time to complete the first checklist of available resources in each classroom.

Tasks completed: Interview 1: Ms. Anderson, Banks, Martin, Toliver, and Vaughn

Classroom Checklist #1: Rooms 17, 18, 19, 20

I arrived in Room 20 at 9:20. Students were preparing to line up to go to the restrooms. The class was scheduled for an art lesson from 9:30-10:30. Mr. Wood, the art specialist, arrived in the room during the time the classes were out of the room. One student remained in the room when the teachers
and other children exited the room. When the classes returned, students assembled on the rug to learn about the masks they would make in art. Mr. Wood demonstrated the activity by folding a piece of paper in half and cutting patterns along the unfolded sides. He opened the paper and cut out two eyes. He showed students how to draw a nose by using three strokes and he told them to draw, rather than cut out, a mouth. Mr. Wood displayed two examples of masks he had completed earlier. Several students had difficulty settling down or attending to the project.

Tenika was observed as she sat quietly listening to the directions. After directions were given, students were sent back to their tables to receive the art materials they would use. Tenika worked carefully on her mask and began methodically folding the paper in half and cutting designs on the unfolded edges. She completed the task without much assistance. She did receive help from Mr. Wood as she began to cut out the eyes on her mask.

Deborah was also informally observed during the art lesson. At the beginning of the observation, Deborah sat quietly following the instructions previously given. When the daily news service came across the public address system, most children, along with the instructor, continued to talk or work. Deborah was praised by the art teacher for making faster progress with her mask.

During formal reading, Tenika was observed as she sat with eight other children. Ms. Vaughn held up pictures painted by each of the students the previous day. The pictures were those of a pumpkin. Ms. Vaughn told the group they were to write a story to go with their illustration. After each of the nine students had received an opportunity to tell what they would write in their story, the children went back to their seats with their picture, a sheet of
paper, and a pencil. Creating their own sentences, spelling the words correctly, and writing their thoughts on paper seemed difficult for some of the children. Several became disruptive, moved around the room, or talked with each other. Tenika sat quietly throughout the writing activity. Her story follows:

Tenika James

I went to a Halloween party.

My pumpkin melted.

When Tenika read her story aloud, she read: "I went to a Halloween party. My pumpkin melted."

After students completed their work, they were told to get a book, return to the rug, and begin reading it quietly. Many of the children did not follow directions. Half of the students wanted to wear the portable microphone that was used to tape students individually and some students asked me to read to them or to listen to them as they read to me. At 11:20, the children in Ms. Vaughn's group were told to sit on the rug. They were scolded for their failure to follow directions. Throughout the period, Ms. Toliver was working on a different activity with her group.

Tasks completed: Formal observation: Tenika
Informal observation Tenika, Deborah, Ms. Vaughn, Room 20

The preceding activities were representative of the kinds of events that occurred throughout the study. Included in the summary of activities were descriptions of teacher, student, and classroom observations and other tasks. The events that occurred on the first day were indicative of the types of activities that were observed throughout. During the morning a class was
observed as children completed independent reading, calendar activities, learning center tasks, and journal writing. During the afternoon, the class was observed during an art lesson. Students were not in attendance on Day 6 of the study because the district observed a Parent Conference Day. Therefore, baseline information about the teachers and classrooms was collected instead. The data gathered included an interview with each of the five teachers as well as a classroom checklist of available resources in each of the four classrooms. On Day 15, I formally observed a student during instructional reading and noted a writing sample she had written. A summary of the activities that took place on the remaining days of the study is located in Appendix D.

On the last day of the study, three of the classrooms received an audiotape containing the voices of their children reading a story aloud. I taped three groups of students in a pleasure reading activity on the last two days of the study. A blank audiotape was left with the remaining classroom so that a recording could be made.

A final tally of the activities to be completed during the study was completed. The remaining programmatic and personal information was collected and I officially concluded the data collection phase of the study. A follow-up visit was needed to collect Concept About Print scores and a copy of the report cards for Pamela and Louis in Room 18.

Plan of Analysis

This study is qualitative in nature and provides a description of students, teachers, and classrooms in their natural settings. The context of the natural classroom was expected to offer insights into the teaching and learning that takes place within the school setting.
During the days that preceded the study, I made visitations to the classrooms to become more acquainted with the students, teachers and class routines. As suggested by Bogdan and Biklen (1992), such visits to the classrooms permit preliminary data collection. During this period, I began to collect such information as student progress reports from kindergarten and first grade and reading assessment scores. Contextual information was collected throughout the study and was compared with the data that were collected once the study began.

Transcriptions of audiotaped instructional reading lessons, student and teacher interviews, field notes, and a word test comprised much of the data that were gathered in the classrooms. Data were collected in two phases during six consecutive weeks. Collection of the data typically occurred between 8:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. on each school day that teachers reported to work. Mornings were reserved for student, teacher, and classroom observations; during the afternoon, student interviews and word tests, rescheduled classroom observations and entries into a computerized daily log of events were completed.

Following the data collection phase of the study, the organizing and coding of data were the next steps taken to identify patterns that would prove helpful in addressing one of the questions posed at the outset of this research: What student characteristics contribute to literacy acquisition in first grade students who completed Head Start preschool and Project Reach kindergarten? As a result, transcriptions of the formal reading groups and field notes of the informal sessions were analyzed to determine which coding categories would be representative of the reading behaviors and skills found throughout the data.
The primary a priori assumption held at the outset of the data collection phase of the study was that students and teachers would be engaged in reading and other school-based activities that could be recorded, coded and analyzed for their contribution in answering the questions that guide this research. Formal observations of students were completed during instructional reading periods and informal observations were made as students participated in activities outside of instructional reading. Field notes were taken during all observations and audio tapes of the students' formal observations were recorded and transcribed. Field notes and transcriptions permitted triangulation of the data because both modes proved useful in arriving at an analysis of the events recorded during instructional reading. During informal observations, no audio tapes were produced; however, field notes were made.

Coding categories were established following an intensive analysis of the transcriptions to ascertain the frequency with which reading behaviors, skills and other events occurred. Four coding categories emerged to sort the data contained in the transcriptions of each of the formal reading observations of the 11 participating students in the study. Because the study focused attention on the interactions of students, all data collected from the formal reading groups were initially coded as either an initiation or response from the observed student. This information was helpful in establishing the extent to which each student was more active or passive in his or her behavior within the reading group. All data were then recoded and placed in one of four categories that demonstrated the students' active learning, knowledge and skills, comprehension of the text, or other events.
Once data collected from student and teacher surveys and the classroom checklists were summarized, a systematic analysis that involved the comparison of responses between the first and second settings was begun. Each student, teacher, and classroom instrument was used at the outset of the study and again a few weeks later to establish pre and post responses. At the outset, data analysis focused on the responses of each student and teacher during the initial interview and the availability of classroom resources. This process was repeated a few weeks later and data analysis was extended to include variations in responses and classroom resources noted during the second session.

Summary

This chapter has presented the methodology used to collect, describe, and analyze data related to literacy acquisition in first grade. Data collection was multifactoral in nature as it addressed characteristics of the students, their teachers, and the classrooms in which they learned. Included in this chapter is a description of the participants and their setting, design of the study, instruments used, sources of data, sample of the daily activities completed throughout the classrooms and plan of analysis.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

This study was an investigation of the characteristics that contribute to literacy acquisition. Specific questions addressed were: What student, classroom, and teacher characteristics contribute to literacy acquisition in first grade students who completed Head Start preschool and Project Reach kindergarten? A probe of these questions utilized concepts consistent with those of qualitative research because data collection was descriptive, naturalistic, and involved observation, field notes, and transcriptions (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982).

The actual study was conducted in two phases and involved the completion of the following tasks during both phases: formal and informal observations of each student; a word test for each student; a checklist of available resources in each class; informal observation(s) of each teacher and classroom; and an interview with each student and teacher. Concepts About Print (Clay, 1985) a reading inventory for beginning readers, had been administered to each first grader by the Reading Recovery teachers earlier in the year and scores were collected as baseline information at the outset of this study. The multifactorial nature of the data collection led to an analysis of students, teachers and their classrooms. This chapter presents a discussion of the results of the analysis of all data.
Before the study began, I visited the classrooms to become more familiar with the students and staff and to collect contextual data for the study. These visitations were an important prelude to the study because they afforded me the opportunity to address my own a priori assumptions and personality traits that would be carried into the research environment. It was helpful to make visits to the classrooms before the study began since data collection and analysis were based on the observation of students, teachers, and classrooms. I recognized that my recordings of the classroom interactions would also be influenced by my personal history as a former first grade teacher. In an effort to establish credibility for this research, triangulation was used throughout the data collection and analysis phase of the study.

Triangulation

Triangulation of data is a useful strategy because it involves the use of two or more means of data collection to form analytic interpretations (Denzin, 1978). Triangulation was important because it provided a means of checking data that had been accumulated in multiple layers. For example, formal reading observations yielded transcriptions of audiotaped lessons and field notes. Additionally, all student and teacher interviews were audiotaped and field notes were collected on the instrument that provided the questions for the interview. Triangulation of data became even more valuable because two of the classrooms shared the same physical space and the environment commonly yielded several simultaneous events and conversations.

Coding Categories

The development of coding categories was consistent with the process described by Bogdan & Biklen (1982). As the data were read, certain words, phrases, patterns of behavior, subjects' ways of thinking, and events repeated
and became more visible. Developing a coding system involved the following steps. The data were searched for regularities and patterns as well as for topics covered. Key words and phrases were written down to represent topics and patterns. These words and phrases are coding categories (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). Coding categories are a means of sorting descriptive data so that material on a given topic can be physically separated from other data. Throughout the process, coding categories were adjusted, expanded, and deleted to represent the data collected. Following the establishment of the coding categories, the next step involved a mechanical sort of the data, a critical step in data analysis.

Data were sorted based on a method similar to the index card method noted by Lincoln and Cuba (1985). Transcriptions of the audiotaped instructional reading sessions were separated into datum that was placed on an index card with an assigned heading. The headings changed as new ideas emerged. Categories were reviewed, narrowed and expanded to accommodate every datum. Subcategories were also created to reflect delineations within categories.

Data collected from the formal and informal observations of students were analyzed and coded into four categories based on the extent to which patterns and frequencies emerged as transcriptions and field notes were examined. Each datum was also coded as a student initiation or student response. The following categories were constructed for analysis of the data collected during formal observations: Demonstration of Active Learning (Shows a Willingness to Engage in Literacy Tasks and Asks for Help); Demonstration of Knowledge/Skills (Uses Prior Knowledge and Displays Letter/Sound Knowledge); Goes Beyond the Text (Comprehension) and
Other. Each category will be described in more detail using Natalie as an example to portray the data collected within each of the four categories. Examples of the data collected from the remaining ten students can be found in App. E. App. E provides a snapshot of the students by citing two examples, where possible, of their coded utterances during the four formal observations of reading sessions.

The first category, Demonstration of Active Learning, contains two subcategories: Shows a Willingness to Engage in Literacy Tasks and Asks for Help. This category contains data regarding the frequency of behaviors in which students: (a) showed a willingness to either initiate their own learning or respond willingly when asked to participate in such literacy tasks as oral and silent reading or journal writing, and (b) sought help from the teacher or peers. The need for children to have numerous opportunities to experience language is expressed throughout the literature related to language and learning (Halliday, 1975; Smith, 1978; Chomsky, 1980; Goodman, 1986; and Wood, 1988). One episode in which Natalie showed a willingness to engage in literacy tasks occurred during a meeting of her Early Literacy group. The group began to read independently at a table as Natalie and three other students shared a set of books that were kept in a small plastic pail. A second example of engagement in literacy tasks came later in the session when Natalie read to Ms. Young at a table nearby.

Since student initiations were also viewed as one way to demonstrate engagement in literacy tasks, students were coded when they asked for help. This subcategory yielded the least number of entries from the students. In Natalie's case, no instances were recorded of her asking for help during formal reading sessions.
The second coding category demonstrates the students' literacy knowledge and skills within the reading group. This category also contains two subcategories: Uses Prior Knowledge and Displays Letter/Sound Knowledge. Data collected in this category yielded information about the connections students made in using background knowledge and letter and sound skills in their reading. Clay (1988) acknowledges the power that comes when students are encouraged to learn in different ways and use their backgrounds as powerful tools in learning. The following examples demonstrate two ways in which Natalie used prior knowledge to advance her reading skills. The interactions occurred as Ms. Anderson led Natalie's reading group in a discussion just prior to reading a new little book entitled All By Myself.

Ms. Anderson: Tell us something you like to do all by yourself.

Natalie: Help my sister with her writing.

Ms. Anderson: If I looked under your bed, what might I find?

Natalie: A Barbie car.

Additionally, the contributions of Chall (1989) and Adams (1990) indicate that students need to make appropriate letter/sound associations in order to become successful readers. Natalie demonstrated letter and sound knowledge in different ways. During one episode, when asked why the last word in a sentence is hair, Natalie stated that hair begins with the /h/ sound. In a second example, Natalie walked to the chalkboard and wrote:

Today is Wednesday
It is a sunny day.
We have 5 girls here.
The next category, entitled Going Beyond the Text, identifies the students' initiations and responses to the texts read within their formal reading groups. This category addresses the students' comprehension of the text beyond the story itself to include such tasks as summarizing, discussing, drawing conclusions, predicting and expanding ideas that relate to the text. The theories of Clay as summarized by Bradley (1991) note that all students bring a body of usable literacy knowledge to school and tapping into this knowledge is important in the students' development as independent readers. During one reading lesson, Natalie was observed as she displayed her comprehension skills beyond the text in this exchange:

Ms. Anderson (after naming the author of the book): What does an author do?  
Natalie: Writes the story.

In a second episode, Ms. Anderson asked Natalie's group to look at a picture that accompanied the text in another story the group read. The picture contained a boy whose face seemed to ponder an idea.

Ms. Anderson: What do you think he's thinking about?  
Natalie: Eating.

The final category contains data that were collected but not placed in any of the three preceding categories. The entries in this category reflect other interactions that occurred within the reading groups. Such interactions include informal conversations of students within the group, initiations and responses that did not seem to relate to reading or were not understood, and any data that did not seem appropriately placed in another category. There is merit in including such a category because language occurs on many different fronts (Bradley, 1991) and many of the entries in this category attest to the
social interaction that Bruner noted (1973) to be central to language development in children.

During one lesson, Natalie yielded an example of one such interaction as she spoke with a peer in her reading group:

Student: Why are you talking like that, Natalie?
Natalie: She (researcher) want me to. She wants me to put this (microphone) on. I have to talk in this. Want me to get that for you?

In another example, Natalie spoke to her teacher:

Teacher: We're going to have fun with one of these fun, fun books.
Natalie: Okay. Seven o'clock.

In each of the examples in this category, Natalie added a comment that seemed misplaced at the end of her responses.

The four coding categories were established using the following criteria: (1) frequency of occurrence in the transcriptions of the formal reading groups; (2) indication of reading related behaviors or skills; (3) inclusion of other events that took place during formal reading groups; and (4) representation of each entry of datum as either a student initiation or response.

The three coding categories that include literacy tasks, prior knowledge, letter and sound knowledge, and comprehension skills that extend the text are helpful since these behaviors and skills are also integral components of the Houghton Mifflin Literary Readers, the reading program presently used throughout the elementary grades within the school district.

Student Achievement Data

Student achievement data were collected at the outset of the study to provide a baseline upon which to frame the subsequent observations and
interviews of the students. Examples of the data collected include Concept About Print scores at the beginning of first grade, final reading grades in kindergarten, current reading grades in first grade, and scores from Clay’s (1993) word test administered at the beginning and midpoint of the study.

Teachers began to collect reading information about the students at the beginning of the year. During September, the two Early Literacy teachers administered Concepts About Print to each first grader at the school. Table 8 shows the score obtained by each student in the study, beginning with the highest scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Total CAP score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenika</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum Score: 24  
Expected September Score: 12-15

Table 8: September Concepts About Print (CAP) scores.
Kindergarten reading grades, obtained from the final progress reports to parents, were collected and analyzed at the outset of the study. Students were ranked according to their final reading grades in kindergarten. Their kindergarten grades were then compared to their reading grades at the end of their second quarter of first grade. Table 9 is a comparison of this information that ranks the students beginning with those who obtained the highest reading grades at the end of kindergarten.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Kindergarten reading (Final grade)</th>
<th>First grade reading (Second quarter grade)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenika</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O (above grade level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S (at grade level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S (at grade level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S (at grade level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I (at grade level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S (at grade level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S (at grade level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I (below grade level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I (below grade level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>U (below grade level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>U (below grade level)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Codes:
- Kindergarten: S-Successful, P-Partially successful, N-Not at this time, L-Improvement needed, U-Unsatisfactory
- First Grade: O-Outstanding, S-Satisfactory, I-Improvement needed, U-Unsatisfactory

Table 9: Reading grades in kindergarten and first grade.
Table 9 provides information that shows the five students (Tenika, Louis, Barbara, Sheila, and Deborah) who received Successful reading grades at the end of kindergarten were on or above grade level in reading after six months in first grade. During the second quarter of first grade, three of these students received a reading grade of Satisfactory, one student received a grade of Outstanding, and one student was evaluated as Improvement Needed. The grades were given by different teachers. As indicated in Table 9, Deborah received a less than Satisfactory grade in reading, although her teacher determined she was reading material that was on grade level for first grade at the time the grade was issued. The grades in Table 9 do not necessarily coincide with the reading level of the benchmark books in Table 10. This may be due to a time lapse of several weeks between the time the reading grade appeared on the students' report cards and the identification of the students' reading level using benchmark books. Teachers were asked to supply the benchmark level of the students on a survey distributed at the beginning of the study. The information from Table 9 came directly from the students' report cards; the information supplied in Table 10 came from a survey given to the teachers several weeks after report cards had been issued. Amber and Carolyn represent a middle group in Table 9 because they received Partially successful final reading grades in kindergarten and were evaluated as Satisfactory and on grade level during the second grading period of first grade. Natalie, Michael, William, and Pamela, who also received Partially successful final reading grades in kindergarten represent a third group since they were below grade level in first grade reading and were making less than satisfactory progress.
Further analysis suggests that two of the 11 students were reading slightly above grade level as indicated in Table 10. Five students, (Natalie, Michael, Tenika, Louis, and Barbara) read at the expected level and six students read books that were either borderline or below grade level for readers who had been in first grade six months. Table 10 shows the students' rank from those with the highest to the lowest reading levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Reading level*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenika</td>
<td>12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reading Level Benchmark on 2/19/95: 10-12
Levels 1-17 are appropriate for students in first grade

Table 10: Reading level using benchmark books.

The reading levels provided in Table 10 were obtained from a survey given to each of the participating first grade teachers. In three instances,
teachers gave a range of instruction (such as 7-10) because the reading instruction tended to be more fluid as students sometimes moved from one reading group to another. At the onset of the study, students were expected to read books leveled 10-12. In the case of Tenika, who was the only student who received a grade of outstanding in reading (see Table 9), other factors need to be considered. According to my observations during instructional reading periods, Tenika read books that were more difficult than those read by Natalie and Michael, who received a slightly higher reading level. Tenika also tended to be more consistent in her reading progress. It should also be noted that the books are intended to be benchmarks and there is a range of difficulty between books that are graded at the same reading level.

To obtain data regarding the word recognition skills of the students, each first grader in the study was given a pre and post word test of 15 frequently used words (Clay, 1993). In comparing the first and second scores, four students received the same score both times the test was administered. One student identified 6 words correctly on the pretest and 4 words correctly on the post test, thereby receiving a lower score the second time. The six remaining students improved their score the second time they took the test as shown in Table 11. Students with the highest scores on the post test are listed first.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Score (Pre) (Maximum=15)</th>
<th>Score (Post) (Maximum=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenika</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Pre and post scores from word test.

Data represented in the preceding tables were compiled and presented as a summary in Table 12. Students with the highest reading levels at the end of their second quarter in first grade are ranked first. Table 12 notes differences between the students' reading levels (obtained from a written survey of the first grade teachers) and reading grades (represented on the students' progress reports to parents.) Data are presented in the order in which it was collected, beginning with the final reading grades from kindergarten. In the second column, a score of 24 is the maximum CAP score and a score of 12-15 would be expected at the beginning of first grade. The February reading levels listed in the third column are the reading benchmark levels found in Table 10. The maximum score on the word test described in the last column is 15.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JUNE READING LEVEL (K)</th>
<th>SEPT. CAP SCORE (24)</th>
<th>FEB. READING LEVEL (1) (10-12)</th>
<th>FEB. READING GRADE (1)</th>
<th>FEB. WORD TEST (15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14 (above)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>7-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14 (above)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>9-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenika</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12-13 (on)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>11-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12 (on)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11 (on)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7-10 (below)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7-10 (below)</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>6-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 (below)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>9-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7 (below)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6 (below)</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4 (below)</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Kindergarten Codes: S (Successful); P (Partially Successful); N (Not at this time)

**First Grade Codes: O (Outstanding); S (Satisfactory); I (Improvement needed); U (Unsatisfactory)

Table 12: Summary of student data collection.

Tenika, Louis, and Barbara were viewed as successful in reading readiness skills at the end of kindergarten. These three students also had slightly higher Concepts About Print (CAP) scores at the beginning of first grade, were on grade level with satisfactory or above satisfactory reading grades in February, and received the highest scores on the word test administered during Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the study.
The preceding information provided a framework for the data collection involving formal and informal observations of the students and interviews regarding their attitudes toward reading. Formal observations were completed as students participated in instructional reading activities while informal observations were made as students engaged in reading related and other activities outside of their instructional reading groups.

Description and Results of Analysis

A description and results of analysis of the data follow. It is presented in three parts: students, teachers, and classrooms.

Students

Description of Formal Observations

Four formal observations of each student were completed during instructional reading periods. The following is a description of the formal observations of Natalie as she participated in instructional reading. Some of the reading sessions occurred outside the regular classroom because eight of the students in the study received supplemental reading instruction provided in another classroom by two Early Literacy teachers.

The first formal observation began as Natalie's group entered Ms. Young's room and sat at a table to begin an Early Literacy class. The students began the session by completing a vocabulary drill. The six students in the group each received a word card and were instructed to repeat the word on the card three times. Next, each student took turns repeating the sound and picture on an alphabet card that each child had been given. The group then began to read independently at a table. Natalie and three other students shared a set of books that were kept in a small plastic pail.
Ms. Young (to the group): We're going to read this book that we read yesterday. It's called *Let's Play Basketball*. I want you to read it all by yourself, okay?

Natalie read aloud: *Let's Play Basketball*. I like to play basketball with my friend. My friend can dribble the ball. She can throw the (sigh) ball. She can throw the ball and I can catch the ball. I can shoot the ball. I can make the basket. She can throw the ball. She can make a basket, two points.

Ms. Young (to Natalie): Good for you! I want you to check over here. I want you to check right here on page 12. You said, "She can throw the ball." (The correct response was "dribble"). What letter would you expect to see at the beginning of the word "throw"?

Natalie: F.

Ms. Young: Did that make sense? What do you see in the word that could help you? Run your finger under the word. (Natalie responded by moving her finger under the word.)

The next activity involved writing stories. Ms. Young asked Natalie to walk to the chalkboard and write a story. Natalie walked to the chalkboard. Ms. Young told her to make sure she read the words after she wrote them. Natalie said she would (read the words).

Natalie wrote:

Today is Wednesday

It is a sunny day.

We have 5 girls here.

Ms. Young told the group of students to put their books away. Students returned to the table and were dismissed to their assigned classrooms.
Natalie's second formal observation began as a group of four students met Ms. Anderson on an area rug in the front of the room. The students received a little book entitled *All By Myself*.

Ms. Anderson (to the group): Tell us something you like to do all by yourself.

Natalie: Help my sister with her writing.

Ms. Anderson: What would you like to do when you grow up?

Students: Several responses given, including fly a kite, get a car, and go over my Grandma's.

Ms. Anderson: What do you find interesting about the word *myself*?

Student (after four different responses): It's a compound word.

Ms. Anderson (after naming the author of the book): What does an author do?

Natalie: Writes the story.

Students then read altogether: I can get out of bed all by myself.

Ms. Anderson: If I looked under your bed, what might I find?

Natalie: A Barbie car.

Ms. Anderson (looking at the first illustrations in the book):

What do you see?

Natalie: A little hole (correct response).

Students began to read the story aloud as a group. They responded to Ms. Anderson periodically throughout the reading of the text:

*I can button my overalls.* (A student stated that overalls is a compound word.)
I can brush my fur. (When asked why the last word in the sentence is *fur* and not *hair*, Natalie said that *hair* begins with the /h/ sound.)

I can put on my socks and tie my shoes. (Some students identified the ending /s/ sound in *socks* and *shoes*.)

I can pour some juice for my little sister. (When questioned by Ms. Anderson, Natalie responded that the juice is orange juice.)

Students continued to read:

And help her eat breakfast.

I can pull a duck for her.

I can drive my truck.

I can ride my bike.

I can give a drink to my bear.

I can catch my ball.

I can kick my ball and roll on the ground.

I can count with my fingers.

I can pound with my hammer.

I can sail my boat.

I can look after my little sister.

I can help Dad trim a bush or ice a cake for Mom. (Ms. Anderson asked what it means to "trim a bush" and some students responded.

I can look at a book and find a mouse.

I can color a picture.

I can put my toys away.

I can brush my teeth.

I can put myself to bed.
But I can't go to sleep without a story.

Good night.

Ms. Anderson then assigned the students to write two things they can do by themselves. Students returned to their seats to begin the assignment.

Natalie's third formal observation began as Ms. Anderson distributed a copy of a little book. The first illustration contained a clock. Ms. Anderson told the group of students to look at the picture. She then asked: "What time is it?" Students responded that it was 7:00 in the morning.

Ms. Anderson: What is the boy doing in the picture?

Students: Sleeping.

Ms. Anderson: Can you spell Monday without looking?

Students: M-o-n-d-a-y.

Ms. Anderson: I'm going to see if you can spell a compound word that's one of the days of the week.

Natalie: Tomorrow.

Students had difficulty finding the day of the week that is also a compound word. One student answered correctly just as Ms. Anderson wrote the beginning letter in Sunday on the chalkboard.

Ms. Anderson: Who wakes you in the morning?

Natalie: Sometimes Mom wakes me up. On school days, I get up at 8:00.

Ms. Anderson: How long does it take to walk to school?

Students shared their responses.

Ms. Anderson: At school, we always sing first. Then we have Show and Tell. What day is on the calendar?

Natalie: Thursday. I mean Tuesday (correct response).
Ms. Anderson: What month is it?

A student responded: October.

Ms. Anderson: October, right. It is Tuesday, October, what date?

A student answered: 13th.

Ms. Anderson: When do we have Show and Tell?

Student: At the end of the day.

Ms. Anderson: Look at the clock on the wall. It doesn't have any numbers. What time is it?

A student correctly answered that it was 9:30.

Ms. Anderson: By 9:30, we are hard at work. Are the children in or out (for recess)?

Natalie: Out. At recess, I play with my friends, but the time always seems to go too quick.

Students reread a page in the book.

Ms. Anderson: What do you think he's thinking about?

Natalie: Eating.

Ms. Anderson: What time is it?

Students: 12:00.

Ms. Anderson: What's one thing that happens in your day?

Natalie: Chinese food.

Due to frequent student absence and conflicts in scheduling observations of the reading group, Natalie's fourth observation of her reading group was not completed. Descriptions of the formal observations of the 10 remaining students are located in Appendix E. Each student was scheduled to be observed four times during in-class or out-of-class reading instruction. Of the 44 observations, 42 were completed. Natalie and Amber have three,
rather than four, recorded formal observations due to conflicts in scheduling or student absence.

**Results of Analysis—Formal Observations**

Analysis of the 11 sets of data recorded during instructional reading periods indicates students spent an average of 22.5 minutes in their reading groups as shown in Table 13. Deborah, Sheila, Tenika, and Pamela spent the most time in reading in instructional reading with 138, 138, 130, and 117 minutes, respectively. Three of the four students ranked low in reading levels using benchmark books (see Table 10). Deborah, Sheila, and Pamela read below grade level, although they spent more time in instructional reading groups. Deborah, Sheila, and Pamela also received Early Literacy services to supplement the in-class reading instruction. Tenika was ranked in the middle of the group using the reading benchmark. It should also be noted that Carolyn and Amber, and William, who were among the students with the least number of minutes in instructional reading, also had low reading levels using benchmark books and received Early Literacy services.

Low reading levels were spread across the classrooms that participated in the study. Deborah and Sheila were in Ms. Toliver’s class; Pamela was in Ms. Banks’ class; and Carolyn, Amber, and William were in Ms. Martin’s class.

In Table 13, students were ranked beginning with those students who spent the most time in instructional reading and ending with those who spent the least amount of time in their instructional reading groups. Observations were conducted in the regular classrooms and in the Early Literacy class in which many of the participating students were enrolled.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Minutes per reading group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>30 35 22 51</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>30 30 40 38</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenika</td>
<td>35 30 53 12</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>39 30 30 18</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>35 22 18 20</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>30 18 14 22</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>27 25 15 17</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>17 10 20 30</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>27 17 28 *</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>15 30 11 13</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>25 6 14 *</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Student absent

Total Number of Groups Observed: 42

Maximum Number of Groups Scheduled: 44
Range of Minutes Per Group: 6-53
Minutes per Group Average: 22.5

Table 13: Minutes spent in instructional reading groups.

An analysis of the data from the formal observations indicated the number of times each student initiated and responded during verbal interactions with teachers and peers. Tables 14 and 15 represent the students' rank according to the number of initiations recorded for each.
Students were ranked from those with the least to the greatest number of initiations overall. Table 14 lists the number of initiations and responses within the four coding categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEMONSTRATION OF ACTIVE LEARNING</th>
<th>KNOWLEDGE/SKILLS</th>
<th>GOING BEYOND THE TEXT</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOING BEYOND THE TEXT</td>
<td>Prior Knowledge</td>
<td>Letter/ Sound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWLEDGE/SKILLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I) (R)</td>
<td>(I) (R)</td>
<td>(I) (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I) (R)</td>
<td>(I) (R)</td>
<td>(I) (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASKS FOR HELP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I) (R)</td>
<td>(I) (R)</td>
<td>(I) (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>1 4 1 0</td>
<td>2 6 1 9</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>3 4 0 0</td>
<td>2 15 0 12</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>4 6 3 0</td>
<td>2 17 1 19</td>
<td>2 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>12 1 0 6</td>
<td>5 37 1 7</td>
<td>16 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>8 7 3 0</td>
<td>1 2 0 16</td>
<td>5 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenika</td>
<td>34 9 0 0</td>
<td>0 1 1 5</td>
<td>12 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>27 8 0 1</td>
<td>0 3 4 9</td>
<td>25 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>23 1 1 0</td>
<td>1 3 4 1</td>
<td>0 4 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>20 10 2 0</td>
<td>0 0 3 6</td>
<td>9 8 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>36 4 0 2</td>
<td>2 2 1 2</td>
<td>1 2 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>30 2 1 0</td>
<td>0 2 5 4</td>
<td>17 16 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-Student Initiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Student Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Summary of coding categories—Formal observations.

Table 14 displays information about the frequency with which students were active in their learning as documented within the four categories. Under the
first category, when the subcategory of Literacy Tasks is analyzed, it is apparent that the number of student initiations ranged between 1 to 36 while the number of student responses fell between 1 and 10. The second subcategory under Demonstration of Active Learning shows the paucity of requests for help made by the students. This subcategory notes that several students, including Natalie, did not seek help during the observations and that there were only 12 instances in which students sought help throughout all the formal observations.

Another aspect of the data analysis is displayed in the second category in Table 14, which relates the students' initiations and responses of their knowledge and skills. Table 14 indicates that Natalie and Michael displayed their background knowledge within the reading groups far more often than did the remaining students. Also, there were few initiations overall in this category. When the second subcategory of Demonstration of Knowledge/Skills was analyzed, there were also few initiations overall and Sheila and Natalie had the two highest levels of responses in the Letter/Sound subcategory (37 and 34, respectively).

In the third category, Going Beyond the Text, 8 of the 11 students, including Natalie, had between 0 and 2 initiations that involved comprehension of the text during instructional reading periods. Natalie was in the middle range of the group for total number of responses in the comprehension category.

The final category represents the extent to which students engaged in initiations and responses that were not placed in the three preceding categories. As Table 14, indicates, Natalie had few initiations and responses in this category. Most of Natalie's data entries were placed in a category related
to reading. Deborah, however, with 73 initiations, had the greatest number of initiations in Category #4, a category that represents information not related to reading.

Table 15 is related to Table 14 in that it represents the same rank order of students from those with the greatest to the least number of initiations, but without reference to the categories in which the initiations and responses occurred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Student initiations</th>
<th>Student responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenika</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Totals: Student initiations and responses.

Like Table 14, Table 15 yields insights regarding which students succeeded as initiators and responders in their reading groups. In the case of Natalie, it is apparent that she responded to the instruction provided. Table 15 shows
another difference in the students. The group fell into different sets with one group representing high levels of initiations and low responses in literacy tasks while the second group had markedly lower levels of initiations and high responses. Other individual differences are noted among students. Tenika's number of initiations and responses were evenly distributed (49 initiations and 50 responses) and she represents the middle range of being the sixth out of 11 students in highest number of initiations. Pamela, on the other hand, had the fewest number of initiations and responses of all the students. Deborah, who had the highest level of initiations was below grade level in reading during February and received a reading grade of Improvement Needed. Similarly, William, who had the fifth highest level of initiations, was also below grade level and received a reading grade of Unsatisfactory during the same period.

Data collected in Table 15 are also displayed as a bar graph in Figure 1. The bar graph allows for visual comparison of each student's initiations and responses as well as comparisons in initiations and responses among students. Students are ranked in order from the greatest to the least number of initiations recorded in four coding categories during instructional reading periods.

Analysis of the data displayed in the figure shows that while Deborah, Amber, Barbara, Carolyn, and William had the highest levels of initiation, only Barbara was in the middle range of reading using benchmark books. The three rankings at the bottom of the graph (low, middle, and high) relate to the benchmark reading levels found in Table 10. Figure 1 shows that four of the five highest initiators had low reading levels.
Figure 1: Comparison of student initiations and responses in the four coding categories and reading levels using benchmark books.

Description of Informal Observations

All informal observations of students were coded into the following categories that identified the primary activity that was noted during each observation: Art Lesson, Center Time, Circle Time/Calendar Events, Independent Reading, Library Learning Center, Seatwork, Storytime (teacher-directed), T.V. Viewing, or Other. Table 16 represents the total number of times students were observed as they participated in these activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Calendar</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>TV</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenika</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Activities completed during informal observations.

Results of Analysis—Informal Observations

The plan of analysis for the informal observations of students involved field notes of observations, rather than transcriptions of activities within the classroom. Each participating student was observed informally three times as he or she participated in reading related and other events outside of the formal reading groups. Field notes of each session were analyzed and data were coded using three of the categories constructed for formal observations: Demonstration of Active Learning (Shows a Willingness to Engage in Literacy Tasks and Asks for Help); Demonstration of Knowledge/Skills (Uses Prior Knowledge and Displays Letter/Sound Knowledge); and Goes Beyond the Text. Rather than include a category for Other skills or knowledge, the last column was used instead to identify the Total number of utterances per student.
After the total number of interactions were tallied, students were ranked from the greatest to the least in the number of examples recorded. This information is displayed in Table 17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Literacy Tasks</th>
<th>Asks for Help</th>
<th>Prior Knowledge</th>
<th>Letter/ Sound</th>
<th>THE TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenika</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: Summary of coding categories—informal observations.

Tables 16 and 17 show that many of the informal observations involved literacy tasks such as circle time/calendar, independent reading, visits to the library, seatwork, and storytime. Since the informal observations were scheduled during periods outside of instructional reading, the data in Tables 16 and 17 suggest students either selected or were assigned literacy related tasks at times other than during instructional reading periods. Typically,
students were observed reading independently, reading in groups, or writing an assignment. The subcategory of Asks for Help and the category entitled Going Beyond the Text had only five entries each. There were no examples recorded in which students used prior knowledge during the informal observations. Natalie and Carolyn displayed the greatest number of coded examples of utterances coded during informal observations with 8 and 7 respectively. William, Deborah, Sheila, and Tenika had a total of three or less examples throughout the three coding categories.

Pre-Post Student Interviews

Each student was interviewed twice using the same ten questions. The following table represents Natalie’s responses during the pre and post interviews. The interviews contained questions that surveyed the student's attitudes about reading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview #1</th>
<th>Interview #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Look at the books on this table. Which three books would be fun to read?</td>
<td>Student selected <em>I Was a Second Grade Werewolf</em>, <em>The Black Snowman</em>, and her Houghton Mifflin Reader (Preprimer C): <em>Boo Bear Takes a Rest.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That would be fun. (Student chose <em>I Was a Second Grade Werewolf.</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh! <em>The Three Bears.</em> And that one, too. Student selected her assigned reader: <em>Once Upon a Time.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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2.) When you read the stories in your reader, are they easy, hard, or just right?

Interview #1
Uh, I like them. I like to read them and they're great. They're easy.

Interview #2
It's hard.

3.) When you read, what are your favorite characters?

Interview #1
Let's see. Goldilocks and the Three Bears. And have you heard of Dr. Suess? I have a whole lot of books. I like them. And I like Green Eggs and Ham by Dr. Suess. It's really funny.

Interview #2
Green Eggs and Ham. Dangerous animals, sharks, bears.

4.) Where do you like to read your books?

Interview #1
Outside, under a tree. With my teacher on the carpet. In my bedroom.

Interview #2
On the carpet.

5.) When you have free time, what do you like to do?

Interview #1
Clay and geoboards, and I like to read books to my teacher.

Interview #2
Clay, make shapes, draw. I like to make something.

6.) When you read a story, what is the first thing you do? Then what do you do?

Interview #1
I use my pointer (index finger) to look at the words and read 'em. I can look at it (word) without my finger, too.

Interview #2
Point with my finger under the words. Read.

7.) When you come to a word you do not know, what do you do?
Interview #1
I use my pointer and I think.

Interview #2
Figure it out. Think. Look at the words, letters.

8.) What is the best part of your trip to the library?
Interview #1
I like to read all the books. I like 'em.

Interview #2
Check out books.

9.) Tell Lollipop Dragon (puppet) how to become a better reader.
Interview #1
Oh. I think we have this book. He (Lollipop Dragon) should go to school and he should go in the classroom and read books he 'posed to. Think of what the word (says). That's it.

Interview #2
You need to go to school; your mom needs to teach you.

10.) What would you like to learn while you are in first grade?
Interview #1
Write in cursive. Think.

Interview #2
Write in cursive. Learn how to spell Lollipop's name.

Table 18: Natalie's responses to the pre-post interviews.

Results of the analysis of the student interviews show students often varied in their responses between the first and second interviews. For example, the first question in the interview asked students to select their favorite books from a small assortment placed before them. Michael and Amber chose three different books during both interviews; Deborah chose the
same three books during both interviews; and the remaining students made one or two changes in their selection of favorite books between the first and second interviews.

In the second question, students were asked whether they found their readers to be easy, hard, or just right to read. The responses given to this question were the most consistent and similar of any of the questions answered by the students. Only Natalie, Michael and Amber gave different responses during each interview; the remaining eight students gave the same response during both interviews. In the case of the students whose answers remained unchanged, Pamela, Louis, Carolyn, William, Barbara, and Sheila said their readers were easy to read, while Deborah and Tenika said their readers were hard to read. Only two instances were recorded in which a student said their reader was just right.

The third question asked students to identify their favorite characters. Eight students, including Natalie, gave responses that included both the same and different characters (see Table 18). Carolyn and Sheila chose different characters during the interviews and Deborah chose the same three characters each time.

When asked for their favorite place in which to read, two students gave mixed responses while the remaining nine students gave different answers at each interview. Favorite reading places included on the carpet, in the bedroom, on the floor at school, in a corner, and at a picnic.

The fifth question asked students to name their favorite free time activity. Natalie, William, and Tenika gave mixed responses during the interviews. Michael, Pamela, Amber, Carolyn, Barbara, Deborah and Sheila
gave different responses to the question. Louis’ responses to the question did not change. Favorite student activities included clay modeling, books, computers, writing and (learning) centers.

Next, students were asked what they do first when they read a book. Two students, Amber and Tenika, gave mixed responses. Five students (Louis, Carolyn, William, Barbara, and Sheila) gave different responses and Natalie, Michael, and Pamela gave the same responses during both interviews. Student responses included reading the title, using your finger, asking the teacher, looking at the pictures and looking at a capital letter.

When asked what they do when they come to a word in their reading that they do not know, four students gave mixed responses from the first to the second interview and five students gave different responses. Natalie and Pamela gave the same response each time they were interviewed. Responses included several of those given in the preceding questions. Some students said it is important to sound out the word and to use your brain.

The eighth question asked students to share a favorite part of their visits to the library learning center. (As indicated earlier, the library learning center at the school served as a temporary classroom for several months while painters worked at the building. Therefore, students were unable to visit the library or check out books throughout most of the study). Three students gave mixed responses, five students gave different responses, and three students gave the same responses during the interview. Many students said they liked to check out books, read books, watch tapes, and get a bookmark at the library. During the first interview, Pamela said she liked the library because "It looks pretty and it's fun!"
Students were asked to talk to Lollipop Dragon, (a puppet that had been placed on a desk nearby), and tell him how he could become a better reader. Six students gave mixed responses, two students gave a different response during the interviews, and three students gave the same response each time they were interviewed. Answers included: Go to school, ask his sister to read to him, ask the teacher, and sound it out.

The last question in the interview asked students to share what they would like to learn in first grade. Of the 11 students, one student gave mixed responses when interviewed and eight students gave different answers each time they were interviewed. Two students gave responses that were unchanged. Popular responses included learning to write in cursive, do math, read books, do homework, play, and behave.

To summarize, students were given a pre and post interview to gather information about their attitudes towards reading. Students willingly responded to the questions that were asked of them. The interviews took place in a small, semi-private conference located in the library learning center. Results of the student interviews suggest that students like reading and other school based activities. Data collected from the second question in the interview indicate six students believe their readers are easy and two students believe their reader is too hard to read. It is worth noting that only twice did students state they believe their reader was just right. Students indicated a variety of places in which they like to read, and reading was also a popular free time activity for the students.

Students were able to indicate some strategies that are helpful in becoming a better reader. As the study progressed, it became apparent that some students could articulate a particular strategy yet have difficulty in
applying the strategy when they read text. For example, during the student interview, some students indicated that sounding out words is helpful when you read. A few days later, however, when the students were given a word test to quiz their reading recall, some were hesitant about using the strategy to learn unknown words.

It does appear the students liked such activities as reading, writing and learning centers. Acquiring basic skills seemed to be the goal of the students who were interviewed.

**Teachers**

**Informal Observations**

Three informal observations of each teacher were completed as she taught reading and other school based activities. Each teacher was observed three times and each session lasted 20 minutes. The purpose of these observations was to gain information about the teachers when they taught curriculum (including instructional reading) and interacted with students. Typically, such activities as reading groups, calendar activities, seatwork, art class, and pleasure reading occurred during these observations. Informal teacher observations, unlike those of the students, did sometimes take place during instructional reading periods. As shown in Table 19, the average number of minutes spent by each teacher in instructional reading groups varied from 18 to 34 minutes. Teachers with the highest averages are listed first.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Average time per group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Toliver</td>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>34.5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>34.5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Vaughn</td>
<td>Tenika</td>
<td>32.5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Banks</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>29.25 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>23.75 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Anderson</td>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>24 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>21 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Martin</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>21 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William</td>
<td>19.25 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>17.25 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Average time spent by teachers in instructional reading groups.

The amount of time students averaged in instructional reading groups ranged from 34.5 to 15 minutes. Ms. Toliver and Ms. Vaughn, who shared the same classroom, spent approximately the same amount of time with their respective reading group. Each class met as a reading group in a different area of the room at the same time each day. Ms. Banks and Ms. Martin averaged a difference of 5.5-6 minutes between the students who received the greatest and the least amount of instruction within their classrooms.

Pre-Post Teacher Interviews

The five teachers completed pre and post interviews that provided information about their teaching backgrounds and attitudes towards reading.
Table 20 lists the teaching credentials and classroom experience of each teacher. Teachers with the most teaching experience are listed first.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Teaching experience in first grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Anderson</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Martin</td>
<td>K-8; Master's Degree Early Childhood Ed.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Toliver</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Banks</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Vaughn</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: Teacher certification and years of teaching experience.

As indicated in Table 20, four of the teachers held Bachelor's Degrees while the remaining teacher had a Master's Degree. The years of first grade teaching experience ranged from 1 to 9 years; three of the teachers had taught first grade four years. The total number of years of teaching experience ranged from 3 to 23 years.

The teacher interview consisted of 15 questions. Results from the interviews follow. In the first four questions of the interview, teachers were asked to name important factors in helping children succeed in reading, share the kinds of reading that take place in their classrooms outside of formal reading instruction, indicate the frequency in which they read to their students and describe other activities they do with books in addition to reading them. Teachers stated that nurturing children, teaching strategies, praising students, allowing opportunities to practice, and providing a variety
of reading experiences are important factors in reading success. The kinds of reading activities that took place outside of formal reading included calendar reading, writing, poetry, independent/recreational reading, reading in content areas, listening centers, acting out stories, and stories read by the teachers. All five of the teachers said they read to their students at least once, if not twice, a day. When asked what activities are done with books other than reading, each teacher said they used a variety of techniques including graphs, acting, murals, art, writing, play, and letter books to extend reading within their classes. During five of the ten interviews, teachers gave a specific book and the related activity.

During the fifth question in the interview, teachers were asked to share how they can tell if a child is going to be a successful reader and indicate the behaviors they might see in a child who could eventually have difficulty with reading. Teachers cited indicators of success occurred when the child showed interest, asked and answered questions, smiled, took risks, paid attention, followed along with his or her finger, used pictures as clues, displayed good letter/sound knowledge, and had good work habits. Responses that denoted potential reading difficulty ranged from "It's hard to say without labeling" to ADHD (Attention Deficit with Hyperactivity Disorder), inattention, copying other children, sitting beside a good reader, problems with CAP (Concepts About Print) and increased frustration levels.

Teachers were then asked to indicate, after the opening of school, when is it apparent that a student will succeed or fail at reading and name the factors that might discourage a student from being able to read. Responses from teachers related to targeting success ranged from "It's hard to say" and "I'm not sure" to "when the child shows progress" and "by mid-year".
Similar responses were given for identifying the point at which a child will fail at reading. Several factors that might discourage students from being able to learn to read were offered: emotional problems, hunger, fear (of teachers, school, other children, making mistakes), embarrassment, home problems, over-correction, too-high expectations, and frustration.

When asked how their teaching methods had changed over the years, teachers stated several changes had come because there is less reliance on basal reading series. Related changes included fewer reading groups, more writing, fewer reading worksheets, and less emphasis on isolated skills. Teachers also shared they provide more child-based reading, use more little books, emphasize reading context more, connect "real" reading to writing, and use more guided/shared reading in their classroom. One teacher said she used more methods, ways, and strategies to teach reading now. Another teacher stated her methods of teaching had changed because she changed from an intermediate to a first grade teacher.

The next question asked teachers to describe the children in their classroom. They were asked to describe the students' background, social groups, culture, and ability. A few responses related to physical traits or ability: "typical 5/6 year olds," "13 children (5 boys, 8 girls), 2 retentions," and "mostly average ability". Two responses related to social group or culture: "hard to get along" and "lots of background and culture". The overwhelming number of responses to this question related to parents and socioeconomic level. Descriptions included: "poor, high crime, government assistance, families that don't read everyday, working/non-working parents, lower SES, free lunch, and mid to low economic neighborhood."
The next question related to the former one. Teachers were asked to describe how the backgrounds of their students contribute to or impede their progress in reading. Background factors that contribute to reading success included supportive parents, trips to the library, enthusiasm, availability of materials, talking, thinking, obedience, and cooperation. Background characteristics that hinder progress were: lack of exposure to books, uncaring or negative attitudes towards reading, hunger, fighting at home, failure to read or talk to children, and parents who do not read.

The 11th question asked teachers to name the most helpful resources to teach reading. Responses included: finding exciting materials, looks of enjoyment in their (students') faces, sense of humor, experience, help from colleagues, workshops/inservices, professional readings, observing Reading Recovery teachers, taking college courses, watching children, and taking running records (reading assessments of children).

The next two questions asked teachers to name the kinds of things that make it difficult to teach reading well and to state what a child needs to learn in order to read well. Barriers to teaching included: finding enough time in the day to independently work with small groups, pull-out (supplemental) programs, student interruptions, background/knowledge, schedules, school wide events, inattentive students, discipline problems, lack of training, and high frustration levels. Teachers suggested students need the following to learn to read well: motivation, willingness to try, attention to meaning and pictures, verbal clues, language, meaning and story, skills, phonics, grammar, conventions of print, and reading for everyday purposes.

The final two questions asked teachers to list the most important qualities of a good teacher of reading and name behaviors that a good teacher
of reading would avoid. Teachers responded that good teachers of reading:
enjoy reading, take risks, understand individual differences in children,
individualize instruction, are organized, have materials available, and are
knowledgeable in the areas of phonics, whole language, writing, and language
development. Good teachers would avoid the following: being critical, using
"canned" approaches, having students take turns reading aloud in reading
groups, using packets of worksheets, teaching reading to the whole group
when such instruction doesn't allow for individual differences, isolating
reading as a subject, and failing to become well read.

Data gathered that relate to teachers included three informal
observations of each teacher and a pre and post interview of teachers'
attitudes about reading. Analysis of the data suggests:

(1) The average number of minutes spent by teachers as they taught
instructional reading periods varied from 15 to 34 minutes. While the two
teachers whose reading groups averaged 32 and 34 minutes indicated their
respective reading groups usually lasted one hour, for purposes of this study,
minutes were counted when students received direct instruction in a group
setting. While some classes did spend an hour completing reading related
activities, some of the time was spent as students worked independently at
their desk or some other location in the room and without direct, ongoing
instruction by the teacher.

(2) Analysis of the teaching credentials of the staff reveals that four
of the five teachers completed Bachelor's Degree programs and one teacher
completed a Master's Degree. None had been trained in programs that focus
on diagnosing and correcting reading difficulties. When asked to identify
their most valuable resource in helping students with reading difficulties, the teachers often cited the Reading Recovery teachers at their school.

**Classrooms**

Data that supplied information about the classrooms included informal observations and a checklist of classroom resources. Five classes were observed throughout the study. Two classes shared one classroom space; therefore the actual number of classroom spaces observed was four, rather than five. Classrooms were observed in order to gain information about the interactions of the children and their teachers as they participated in activities outside the formal reading groups. These interactions were expected to provide data about students' and teachers' use of language, daily schedules within the classrooms, and connections with other staff members, such as the art teacher or library learning center assistant. One of the main purposes of the classroom observations was to focus attention on interactions within the classrooms and the classroom environments overall, rather than directing attention specifically to individual students and teachers.

The informal observations were also designed to provide insights into the ways in which students and teachers use language and engage in social interactions with each other. Many of the activities recorded were initiated by teachers; however students were observed as they informally constructed events that involved social interactions and language. The following is a description of the classroom observations followed by a description and analysis of the presence or absence of classroom resources.

**Description of Classroom Observations**

Each of the four classrooms was observed three times. Although many of the informal observations were completed in the morning, some visits
were made to the classrooms during the afternoon. The following types and number of activities were completed when the classes were informally observed: Art class (2); Calendar events (2); Individualized instruction (1); Instructional reading (1); Language (1); Learning centers (1); Library (1); Music (1); Early Literacy students leave the room (3); Reading stories: teacher and student initiated (6); Restroom Break (2); and Seatwork (7).

**Results of Analysis—Classroom Observations**

An analysis of the classroom observations indicates the most frequently documented activities were those in which students participated in independent reading and seatwork. It is apparent that students engaged in many reading and literacy based activities outside their formal reading groups.

**Description of Classroom Resources**

A pre and post checklist of each of the classrooms was completed to ascertain the presence or absence of available resources that contribute to literacy in each room. The two inventories were completed approximately three weeks apart and there was little change noted in the number of classroom resources during the interim. The checklist yielded data in seven areas as follows:

**Displays about children's literature.** Each of the four classrooms contained displays about children's literature. Three of the classes contained teacher-made bulletin board displays and three of the classes displayed commercially produced displays about literature. These displays included a variety of bulletin boards and murals covering such topics as outer space and barn-raising, poetry, and calendar events.
**Children's books in the classroom.** Each classroom contained a variety of books from which students could develop their oral language as well as reading skills. All of the classes contained shelves of picture books, ranging from little soft bound books in a basket to big books hanging on racks. Books were noted in bookcases, plastic bags, on pegboards, baskets, display racks, in a tray, on chairs, and on the floor. The number of books in each classroom was estimated to be between 150-250 books. Most of the books were picture books, beginning biographies, books in a series, little books, and big books.

**Other classroom materials/equipment that support children's literature.** Each of the classes contained centers, including a listening center with a tape recorder and headsets and a computer center. Each classroom had a computer; three classrooms contained two computers. Other centers contained science, activities, art, puzzles, and housekeeping items. Each room had a television and one class sometimes used a record player. The furniture in the rooms included a wagon with a large read cushion, picnic table, bean bags, carpet squares, floor mats, pillow, tables, chairs, and rugs. There were few props, with the exception of two stuffed animals that were seen in one classroom. Three of the classrooms had art materials available to students. The materials included markers, glue, crayons, clay, and paint.

**Evidence of cross-curricular links.** Each of the four classrooms showed some evidence of cross-curricular links involving children's literature. One classroom integrated social studies and art to create a bulletin board entitled "Welcome to our neighborhood." Two classrooms used art, science, reading, and writing to extend the theme of a large bulletin board on outer space. Another classroom infused language arts concepts into the curriculum with a flip chart that helped students develop a vocabulary of mathematical terms.
**Teacher created planning materials.** There was little evidence that teachers created planning materials for literature based lessons. In most cases, the schedule and plan books were not visible or sketchy in detail. Webs, unit plans, and teacher's guides were not used frequently by most teachers when observations of classes occurred. While teacher's guides were seen in the classroom, neither the guides nor lesson plan books were often seen with the teachers during instructional reading periods. Since students read little books most of the time during instructional reading, there did not appear to be accompanying materials that served as teacher's guides. This area appears lacking in resources.

**Resources for literacy based teaching.** From November through mid-March, the school's library learning center served as a classroom while the entire building was painted. Each class was moved to the library for a couple of days while workers painted their classroom. In lieu of weekly classroom visitations to the library, the library assistant visited each classroom weekly and shared a book or a video with the students.

The library aide indicated that teachers did not use many of the materials in the professional section of the library. She stated that it was difficult for teachers to find time to look at the materials and many of the teachers located resources on their own. Additionally, some of the materials in the school's library were dated. Teachers indicated that they did use the services of the public library to support their instructional programs.

The loss of the library as a resource for literature-based teaching was significant. The library learning center is a primary source of literature based teaching and learning. It allows children to gain a greater appreciation for reading materials and allows them to learn about the services provided at
libraries. When children are unable to visit the library and check out books, this may hinder their access to literature and weaken the importance of literature in their lives.

During the last week of the study, the library learning center had returned to its normal operation. Reading and checking out books and viewing videotapes were the main activities conducted in the school's library.

**Artifacts of children's literature-based work.** Each of the four classrooms displayed artwork and writings completed by the students. No videotapes of children's literature or personal artifacts that children might have brought from home were noted.

**Results of Analysis—Classroom Resources**

An analysis of the pre-post checklist of classroom resources indicates:

1. One or more displays about children's literature were present in each of the classrooms. Each classroom also contained either teacher made and/or commercially prepared materials about literature.

2. The number of books and equipment or materials that support children's interactions was adequate. The children had a variety of materials to read that accommodated differing interests and skill levels. Each class was informally arranged and children often sat on rugs or in bean bags, as well as chairs as they read. Each of the classrooms contained three to four centers in which students could read or work on age appropriate activities in such areas as science, art, and math. Three of the classes made art materials available to the students. All four classes had a listening center with tape recorder and headsets and three of the classes contained two computers each. Every classroom contained a closed circuit television that permitted a daily in-school news program to be seen in each room.
3. While there was some indication that teachers did connect literature to other curricula, there was little change noted in the use of bulletin board displays or learning centers from February to mid-March.

4. An analysis of the availability of teacher created materials indicates that often times teachers did not use their plan books or teacher's guides when they taught. While teacher's guides and some plan books were noted, during instructional reading periods, they were not used often by teachers in the reading groups. The little books so often used in reading groups did not have guides. While some teachers did refer to lesson plans while at their desk, their plans were not as visible in the instructional reading groups. Additionally, some of the lesson plans were very sketchy.

6. Further analysis shows that the library learning center, designed as a source of literature for teachers and students, served instead as a temporary classroom for several months while the building was being painted. Because students were unable to check out books, their access to books and other reading materials was hampered. This important resource was not available to students who needed a host of opportunities to become familiar with literature. The professional section of the library was also under-utilized by staff members who elected to use local libraries or seek resources from other locations.

To summarize, the classrooms contained sufficient reading books, materials and equipment to support children's literature. There were some teacher-made and/or commercially prepared displays involving children's literature, children's artwork and writing, and some evidence of cross-curricular connections to literature. The two major areas in which resources seemed to be insufficient included: (1) evidence of teacher created schedules,
plan books that included webs, unit plans, and teacher guide references; and
(2) use of the library learning center during several months of the school year.

Summary

Chapter 4 consisted of four parts. The first two sections of the chapter
described the use of triangulation and establishment of coding categories to
label and analyze data. Next, student achievement data were presented to
construct a baseline from which to interpret data collected throughout the
study. Student achievement data included final reading grades in
kindergarten, current reading grades in first grade, Concepts About Print
scores at the beginning of kindergarten, and scores from a word test
administered at the beginning and midpoint of the study. The last section
offered descriptions and results of data collected from students, teachers, and
classrooms.

Data involving students, teachers, and classrooms came from multiple
sources. Data collected from students included formal and informal
observations and interviews. Data collected from teachers included informal
observations and teacher interviews. A pre and post classroom checklist of
available resources and classroom observations were used to gather data
about the classrooms that participated in the study.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS

This chapter will summarize the study by reviewing its purpose, procedures followed, and findings. Finally, a discussion of various related issues and recommendations for future research are presented.

Purpose of the Study

This study was conducted for the purpose of investigating those characteristics that contribute to literacy acquisition. The scope of the inquiry was multifactorial as it included students, teachers, and classroom components. Related literature includes such topics as language acquisition, literacy as a social process, social competence and Head Start. A review of the literature suggests that oral language systems are generally well developed by age six (DeStefano, 1978) and that variations in speech are associated with social background and parental occupational (Wood, 1988). Halliday (1975) categorizes language usage according to the "context of the situation" while Strickland (1983) views the development of the languages arts as an "interdependent network."

This study allowed us to view children naturalistically as they learned language, learned about language, and learned through language in the social environment of their classrooms. This inquiry was needed because language acquisition is thought to influence academic success, and teacher reactions
may lead to expectations of students without knowledge of students' academic development (Stone, 1992). Because some expectations compromise the ability of teachers to offer equally effective education to all children, it is important that students, teachers, and classrooms become linked in ways that maximize the benefits of the teaching and learning that occur within school settings.

To probe the nature of teaching and learning, one question was raised and accompanied by three subquestions that focused the inquiry: What characteristics contribute to literacy acquisition in eleven first grade students who completed Head Start preschool and Project Reach kindergarten? Subquestions addressed specific student, classroom, and teacher characteristics that contribute to literacy acquisition.

Procedures

The site of the study was determined by ascertaining which elementary school in a large urban district contained the largest cohort of first graders who completed both Head Start preschool and Project Reach kindergarten. This information was obtained by consulting the evaluator and two coordinators of Project Reach. Once the building was identified, the two Project Reach coordinators at the selected site supplied the investigator with names of 28 students who met the criteria of completion of two prior years of schooling in Head Start and Project Reach kindergarten. The school's two kindergarten teachers were then asked to recommend students from the list that they believed to be successful in kindergarten and expected to be successful as first graders. The number of students selected by the kindergarten teachers was 14. Parental consent forms were then sent home and telephone calls and some home visits were completed by the program
coordinators and investigator to answer questions and to request that forms be returned by students who were approved to participate in the study. Eleven students returned the consent forms before the onset of the study and were included as participants. Corresponding letters of solicitation and participation were also forwarded to the building administrator and the six first grade teachers at the school. The principal and five teachers agreed to participate in the study.

Tasks designed to provide information regarding those student characteristics that lead to successful literacy acquisition included formal and informal observations of students as they participated in reading as well as other activities. To learn more about their attitudes as readers, pre and post interviews were conducted with students. Students also completed a pre and post word list to test their mastery of 15 high-frequency words. This information was gathered during a six-week period in February and March, 1995.

At the same time, information related to teacher and classroom characteristics that contribute to literacy acquisition was also gathered. To learn more about the teachers, informal observations were made as they worked within their classrooms. To obtain information about their attitudes towards themselves as teachers of reading, the students they teach, and success and failure in reading, a pre and post interview (adapted, Pinnell, 1989) was conducted. To learn more about each of the classrooms in the study, informal observations were made and a pre and post checklist of available classroom resources (Lehman, Freeman & Allen, 1994) was completed.
At the outset of the study, classroom teachers and Reading Recovery teachers identified the reading levels of participating students. These levels were compared with those included on a chart of suggested reading levels that had been supplied by the school district.

Findings

The present investigation probed those characteristics that contribute to literacy acquisition in eleven first graders who completed Head Start and Project Reach kindergarten. Specifically, three subquestions were posed about which findings are presented below:

1. What student characteristics contribute to literacy acquisition in first grade students who were evaluated as successful completers of Head Start preschool and Project Reach kindergarten?

Opportunities that develop social competence and language development are critical elements of successful reading achievement in first grade. One finding of this study suggests that students were not as active in initiating their learning and there were few opportunities in which students used their background knowledge to increase reading achievement. Differences in the Head Start model of teaching and first grade instruction may not always be advantageous to students, particularly when the instruction from year to year is dissimilar and without connection.

Another finding of this study points to differences in the curriculum and teacher evaluation between kindergarten and first grade. While each of the 11 students received a final reading grade in kindergarten of Successful or Partially successful, 8 of these students were placed in Early Literacy classes in
first grade. Student placement in Early Literacy classes was based on scores obtained from the *Concepts About Print* assessment administered to each first grader at the beginning of the year.

The results of this study suggest that students with solid reading readiness success in kindergarten are more likely to be successful in first grade reading. Four of the five students (Tenika, Louis, Barbara, and Sheila) who were evaluated as S (Successful) in kindergarten reading were evaluated as S (Satisfactory) or O (Outstanding) in reading during the second quarter of first grade.

Students who had partial success were more likely to fall behind in reading. Four of the six students who received a reading grade of P (Partially Successful) in kindergarten, Natalie, Michael, William, and Deborah, received either a grade of I (Improvement needed) or U (Unsatisfactory) in first grade reading.

Many of the more successful readers had high levels of responses, rather than initiations. The two students with high reading levels (Natalie and Michael) also had high levels of student responses (70 and 67). Some students with high levels of initiation received lower grades in reading. While some students were clearly verbal, their use of language did not result in increased reading achievement. The student viewed as most successful was in the middle of the group in terms of her total initiations and responses; she was also very balanced in the number of initiations and responses that she made (49 and 50 respectively). The student who seemed the least active learner had very low levels of both initiation and response.

The fact that student response was more often rewarded in the study may suggest a connection between student achievement and teaching style.
For example, there were far fewer recorded examples in which students asked for help, displayed prior knowledge, or used their comprehension knowledge to go beyond the text. There were many instances documented in which students responded to teachers' questions about letter and sound knowledge or engaged in independent or choral reading.

2. What teacher characteristics contribute to literacy acquisition in first grade students who were evaluated as successful completers of Head Start preschool and Project Reach kindergarten?

Several findings surfaced regarding the teachers in the study. The number of years teachers taught first grade varied from 1 to 9 years. Teachers taught reading in informal settings. All reading groups were taught as students sat on rugs within the classrooms. Reading groups tended to be fluid because students moved from small books to the Houghton Mifflin Literary Readers. Many of the students read little books during the observations of their reading groups. Some teachers taught reading in small groups of 3 or 4 students while other teachers taught the class as a whole.

While the teachers seemed to have sufficient materials for instructional reading, they expressed concern that they were not always able to meet the needs of the students. This may be due to the fact that considerable time was spent on calendar/circle time activities. Although each of the classrooms averaged 12 students, the degree of individualized instruction was limited.

The teachers did promote reading activities throughout their classrooms and provide sufficient materials for students to become engaged in literacy tasks. There was also evidence that teachers did read to their students on a daily basis. Additionally, however, classroom teachers
sometimes assigned independent reading to students who needed more teaching in the development of reading skills and strategies. Some teachers sought the help of the Reading Recovery teachers to better help students having reading difficulty.

3. What classroom characteristics contribute to literacy acquisition in first grade students who were evaluated as successful completers of Head Start preschool and Project Reach kindergarten?

Within the classrooms, each room had adequate reading materials and equipment to support literacy acquisition. During the six weeks of the study, there were not many changes in the physical arrangement of the classrooms and most of the displays remained the same throughout the duration of the study.

While some teachers referred periodically to lesson plan books or teacher's guides, often these resources were not clearly visible during the formal and informal observations that occurred. Some teachers referred to lesson plan books more frequently than did others and some lesson plans seemed sketchy and less detailed. One teacher's planning book contained headings such as "Pleasure Reading" or "Social Studies" rather than detailed descriptions of actual lessons. There was little evidence of unit planning seen throughout the lesson plans or classroom displays.

Overall, the study suggests that it is critical that students enter first grade with a solid year of growth from kindergarten upon which they can build new knowledge and skills. Additionally, teachers need more than physical resources to increase student achievement. It is paramount that teachers bring components of successful teaching to the classroom. Such
components include adequate planning, competence in the teaching of reading skills and strategies, and individualized instruction that meets the needs of students.

Discussion

Implications of the study are discussed in terms of small class size and more individualized instruction; teaching for reading strategies; definitions of success and transition to first grade; and teacher knowledge and confidence in teaching reading.

Small Class Size and More Individualized Instruction

The State Foundation Program allocated funding to the school district for students receiving Aid to Dependent Children. This program, known as Disadvantaged Pupils Impact Aid (DPIA), focused attention on dropout prevention coupled with ongoing teacher inservice and provided money to pay for salaries, fringe benefits, supplies, and purchased services. One of the authorized purposes for the expenditure of these funds included new programs that reduced class enrollment in grades K-4 to a 15 to 1 student-teacher ratio.

At this school, DPIA funding permitted the first grade classes to maintain an average enrollment of 12 students. Because of limited space, one first grade classroom contained 23 students and two teachers. Some activities were completed with the whole group (such as library visits, television lessons, and art lessons) even though each teacher was responsible for a particular group of 11-12 students. Students were divided into two reading groups and both teachers taught reading at the same time in different areas of the room. Students had the additional responsibility of learning to attend to their assigned group while another one was being taught across the room.
The teachers in this classroom chose to work in the same room rather than house one of the classes in a portable classroom next to the main building. It is reasonable to assume that first graders who are easily distracted may not receive the greatest benefit from instructional reading in this type of classroom organization. Additionally, one of the four classrooms studied had an instructional aide, one classroom had two teachers assigned to the same classroom and the remaining two classrooms each contained one teacher only. It is critical that students receive the benefit of additional staff who are assigned to the classrooms. Teaching and learning should be positively effected in classrooms that contain added staffing.

Although the first grade class size averaged 12 students, the amount of individualized instruction did not seem to be significantly increased. Students were asked to do a considerable amount of independent reading. During instructional reading periods, children were often asked to read aloud as a group. There can and should be provisions for individualized attention in classrooms that contain fewer students. It would be beneficial for teachers to adjust their teaching methods when they have smaller classes.

**Teaching for Reading Strategies**

Students stayed in reading groups from 6 minutes to 53 minutes. Three of the five teachers who participated in the study taught reading as a group exercise in which 12 students met together and read little books aloud. (One of the teachers met with the group for 22 minutes on average while the other two teachers met with their reading groups for 33 minutes and included other activities such as art and independent reading in the lessons.) The two
remaining teachers met with small groups of 3-4 students; one teacher averaged 18 minutes per group while the other teacher spent 26 minutes in the group.

Sometimes not much time was devoted to helping first graders develop actual strategies to become better readers. Some classroom teachers relied on the Reading Recovery/Early Literacy staff to diagnose and remedy reading difficulties. Eight of the 11 students in the study received Early Literacy services which involved 45 minutes of supplemental reading instruction in another classroom. On some days, students did not receive formal reading instruction within their regular classrooms. It was not apparent that there was a definitive scope and sequence to ensure the development of reading skills and strategies for students involved in reading instruction.

In one class, students discussed what they would write about their pumpkins that they had painted the previous day. While some students were able to articulate what they would write, some of the students had difficulty completing the writing exercise once they were dismissed from the reading group to work on the assignment independently. Activities need to occur during the instructional reading period that lead to the development of strategies that assist students in becoming successful independent readers.

In the classroom shared by two teachers, 23 students were divided into two reading groups. The two groups met at the same time for instructional reading. The distance between the two groups was approximately 12 feet. Instructional reading focused on looking at words and pictures and reading independently. Sometimes not much time was given to the development of strategies to improve reading comprehension. In some classes, a considerable
amount of time was spent on disciplining students and at directing their attention to the task at hand.

The kinds of activities that took place in the reading groups varied from class to class. Early Literacy groups, conducted outside the regular classroom, focused attention on the development of reading strategies, comprehension, and independent reading. Reading groups held inside the regular classroom spent more time on students reading aloud as a group. All teachers used learning centers in the classrooms. The use of centers varied from room to room. Some teachers operated centers when students completed their seat work while others used the centers as a primary means of instruction. Some classes used centers daily while some operated centers 2-3 times a week. The types of activities placed in the centers also varied. Classroom teachers placed such activities as writing, science, puzzles, art, and computers in centers. Early Literacy teachers placed reading materials in the centers in their room. Materials used included books on tape, picture books, writing activities, and big books on racks.

Reading groups appeared informal. Classroom teachers sometimes did not identify a specific time in which a particular group would be meeting. Students sat on rugs to complete instructional reading. They often read little books that contained few pages and controlled vocabulary. While the school has a basal reading program, most of the time students did not use the preprimers or readers in the literature based series adopted by the Board of Education.

Large rugs, easels for language activities, and tables, rather than student desks, were found throughout most of the first grades at this school. Only one of the five teachers used individual student desks in her classroom. This
teacher indicated that she wanted her students to feel a sense of ownership and responsibility by having their own space within the classroom. She also stated that she believed her students' attendance was better because students passed fewer germs when sharing materials and spaces with others. In three of the four classrooms, students sat at a couple of tables or on the rugs most of the time.

On March 2, in one class students spent the morning completing a music lesson, calendar activity, scouting lesson, and attending Early Literacy classes. No instructional reading was taught in the morning. The teacher was uncertain as to whether reading instruction would occur in the afternoon. While well-intentioned, supplemental programs sometimes yield less beneficial effects on the overall instruction that occurs within classrooms.

**Definitions of Success and Transition to First Grade**

There are important issues regarding the criteria teachers use when identifying groups of students to participate in the study and in Early Literacy classes. One point for discussion is that kindergarten teachers perceived girls as more successful than boys. In first grade, more girls, however, received Early Literacy classes.

In defining success, the definition may change from preschool to first grade. One Early Literacy teacher and one classroom teacher seemed surprised that some of the students were identified as "successful" by their kindergarten teachers. Students were selected from a roster of 28 students who had completed Head Start preschool and Project Reach kindergarten. No mention was made of the factors for identification of success; kindergarten teachers were asked to select students who had appeared successful as kindergartners and who were expected to do well as first graders.
Part of the difference in teacher expectations from kindergarten to first grade may lie in the coding system used to evaluate students. In kindergarten there are three codes used to describe academic achievement: S(Successful), P(Partially Successful), and N(Not at this time.) In first grade, four descriptors are used to grade students: O(Outstanding), S(Satisfactory), I(Improvement Needed), and U(Unsatisfactory). The S coding may be interpreted differently by kindergarten and first grade teachers. Additionally, teacher perceptions of the type and degree of reading success expected from kindergartners and first graders will vary.

The school in which the study was conducted had a population in which 98% of the students received free/reduced price lunches. When teachers described their classes during interviews, they sometimes used socioeconomic references such as “poor, deprived, high-crime, government assistance, and lower SES.” Educators need more tools to successfully teach children who live in economic poverty. Economic poverty need not keep us from educating our students. The research on resilience points to gains that some students make while in a state of economic poverty.

One of the ways school personnel can help students to succeed is to lessen the number of classrooms interruptions that take place. At this school, public address announcements, and visits from other teachers, support staff, and parents sometimes broke the continuity of instruction within the classrooms.

Some of the services conducted by support staff that affected the instruction within the classroom included: Early Literacy, music, art, self-esteem classes and in-school scouting. It is sometimes difficult for students to succeed when there is variation in instruction and organization from year to
year. There are more school based activities and greater expectations made of first grade students. It is necessary for educators to help students make the transition from preschool to kindergarten to first grade and beyond.

**Teacher Knowledge and Confidence in Teaching Reading**

Throughout the study, students sometimes had difficulty completing a task independently. Some students had difficulty in comprehending and completing assignments without adult supervision. The amount of work to be completed was minimal, yet children were sometimes unsuccessful at attending to the task(s) without being easily distracted. In the class that had an instructional aide, several of the students did not complete a writing activity that involved copying five short sentences that had been written by the teacher earlier and read by the group. In the same class, very few students appeared to be successful at independently completing a two-page spelling assignment after reading the assignment in the larger group.

Some of the first grade teachers expressed concern that their students may not be completing enough work in first grade to move to second grade. Some teachers also indicated that their students would not be successful as second graders when the expectations for the amount of independent work increased.

This study challenges school personnel to think about what we are preparing our students to do. It is paramount that staff members have high expectations that are activated and result in increased student achievement. Some students can produce more each day; all students need challenging materials that help them to reach their personal best.

Board adopted reading materials need to be reviewed for their effectiveness in meeting the needs of the students. Teachers in this building
indicated that they did not use the board-adopted basal reading series because the selections were difficult; instead they used sets of little books that could be read at earlier levels. These materials were also supplied by the school district. While these books have a rhyming or repeated pattern and a very controlled vocabulary for easier reading, students will be expected to read more difficult materials as second graders.

Although teachers maintained individual portfolios and running records of students, a concern is raised regarding the degree of frequent monitoring and measurement that occur when teachers do not give or receive feedback of a child's individual efforts while in the group. In several cases throughout this study, when students were asked to read aloud as a group, the more successful readers often read faster and louder, and tended to "carry" the rest of the group. It was difficult for teachers to detect individual reading difficulties and strengths when students read passages aloud as a group during instructional reading periods.

The roles of classroom teachers and reading support teachers are expected to enhance the instruction children receive. When I asked one classroom teacher to identify the reading level of a student, she replied that the Reading Recovery teacher would be the best person to consult because "she works directly with the child and has a better grasp of their actual reading level." This response surprised the Reading Recovery teacher who said that reading teachers work with classroom teachers to decide which reading levels and methods are most appropriate for students. Furthermore, the classroom teacher is responsible for the primary reading instruction that an assigned student receives and Reading Recovery/Early Literacy programs are not intended to replace such instruction.
Of the 11 student participants in the study, eight received Early Literacy services, a supplemental reading program that involved 45-minutes away from the regular classroom. Some of these students were also on the waiting list to receive Reading Recovery, an individualized reading support program also taught at the school. As the study ended, one student entered Reading Recovery; the second student remained on the waiting list. The two teachers who taught the Early Literacy/Reading Recovery classes have been trained in Reading Recovery.

Due to variations in the delivery of services and scheduling conflicts, it was not possible to record all student and teacher interactions in uniform increments of time during instructional reading periods.

Throughout the study, staff members expressed a desire to receive feedback from parents and increase their participation at the school. However, some teachers indicated they do not send written communications to parents on a daily or weekly basis. Parents need to be informed about the levels of progress students make on a regular basis. Feedback from school can be a powerful tool to increase parental involvement.

Recommendations for Future Research

Given the findings in this study, more investigation is needed and is enhanced by considering the following recommendations:

1. More training in the diagnosis and remediation of reading difficulties for classroom teachers, especially at the primary level is needed. Research on the effects of prevention and early intervention supports varying strategies including, but not limited to: provision of high-quality preschool programs (Berrueta-Clement, et. al., 1984; Karweit, 1989a), one-to-one
tutoring of at-risk first graders (Pinnell, 1989; Slavin, 1990; Silver & Hagin, 1990), and improvements in reading curriculum and instructional methods (Adams, 1990).

2. More research and teacher training regarding the effects of class size on teaching methods and on reading achievement is beneficial. While teachers often report that there is not enough time in the instructional day to meet the individual needs of their students, there is reason to suggest that the teaching that occurs in classes that contain 15 students may not differ significantly from the teaching that occurs in larger classes (Slavin, 1990). Some of the likely benefits of smaller classes include more opportunities for teachers to concentrate on the individual needs of their students, more opportunities for active student participation, fewer classroom management problems, higher student and teacher morale, and a willingness on the part of teachers to use more innovative practices that would less likely occur in larger classrooms. In practice, while these features may seem attractive to teachers, researchers (Evertson, Folger, Breda & Randolph, 1990) find only slight and inconsistent differences in the actual teaching strategies or behaviors of teachers in smaller classes. Slavin, Karweit, & Wasik (1994) conclude that the effects of substantial reductions in class size on reading in the early grades are positive, yet small and tend to fade beyond the first grade even when students remain in small classes.
3. More research on the effects of pull-out programs on academic achievement is necessary. One of the reasons given by teachers in this study for lack of time in the day to individualize was the amount of time expended on supplemental programs. Teachers indicated that they did not have enough time to spend with students because students spent considerable amounts of time outside of the regular classrooms.

4. More research on transitional programs and their effect on student achievement is needed. One of the dilemmas in conducting this study has been the paucity of research completed on transition programs in the primary grades. While there are efforts within the school district to expand Project Reach services through third grade, at the time of this study, the program was offered only in kindergarten and first grade at a few schools. Throughout the country, transitional programs that allow for continuation of services beyond preschool are not as widespread and collection of data in these programs needs to continue.

Summary

Chapter 5 has summarized the study in five parts. The first three sections of the chapter review the purposes of the study, procedures used, and findings. The final two sections contain implications and recommendations.

As a follow-up to the study, I revisited the school in April, 1997 to obtain information about the students and teachers since the study ended. The reading grades for the students during the third and fourth quarters of first grade were similar to those obtained during the second quarter. In the case of two students, there were notable changes. Natalie's third and fourth
quarter reading grades in first grade improved from Improvement Needed (second quarter) to Satisfactory during the final two quarters of the year. Amber, however, after receiving Satisfactory grades during the second and third quarters of first grade, slipped to Improvement Needed during the final quarter of the year.

In the two years since the study ended, one of the 11 students has transferred to another district, five students have transferred to other schools within the district, and five students remain at the school in which the study was conducted.

All 11 students in the study were promoted at the end of first and second grades. Each student has remained in regular education classes with the exception of William, who was placed in a Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) class at another school within the district during the 1996-97 school year.

Two of the five participating teachers have transferred to other schools within the last two years. One teacher transferred to another school district and the other teacher transferred to another school within the school district in which the study was conducted.
APPENDIX A
FLOW SHEET: SCHEDULE OF RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES
September, 1995

Principal was notified of my desire to conduct research at the school. Site selection was based on the location with the greatest number of students who completed Head Start and Project Reach kindergarten and were now first graders. Principal gave verbal commitment to participate contingent on approval from the review committee of the district.

Five copies of proposal were sent to the Public Schools review committee. Proposal was read by the district's program evaluator, supervisor of early childhood education, and former vice-president of the teachers' union.

October

Two on-site Project Reach coordinators provided investigator with a list containing the names of every student who completed Head Start and Project Reach kindergarten during the last two years and were now in first grade. This list contained 28 names.

Kindergarten teachers were asked to identify students from the list who were successful as kindergartners last year and who were expected to succeed in first grade this year. The number of students selected was 14.

January

With the assistance of the Project Reach coordinators at the school, parents of the 14 students identified as successful by kindergarten teachers were asked for a verbal agreement to involve their child in the proposed study.

Five first grade teachers were individually consulted regarding interest in conducting research within their classrooms and were asked for verbal agreement to participate.

February

Consent forms were collected from principal, cooperating teachers, and parents.
APPENDIX B
LETTER OF APPROVAL, ADMINISTRATIVE/TEACHER SOLICITATION AND PARTICIPATION LETTERS, AND PARENTAL CONSENT LETTER
November 15, 1995

Dear Administrator:

I write this letter to introduce Sarah Joyce Jordan, a researcher from The Ohio State University. Ms. Jordan's research proposal titled "Observations of Eleven Head Start and Project Reach Kindergarten Graduates as They Make the Transition to First Grade Reading" has been reviewed and approved by the Research Proposal Review Committee.

Be that as it may, this letter does not obligate you to participate in the study. Rather, it serves as an introduction and official notification that Ms. Jordan has followed established procedures and has been granted permission to solicit subjects to participate in the study.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact my office.

Sincerely,

Assistant Superintendent
I'm Sarah Jordan and I'll be conducting research in February and March for my doctoral dissertation at the State University. Your building contains students who have completed Head Start and Project Reach kindergarten. This study, to be conducted by Sarah, will consist of observations, audio tape recordings, field notes, cumulative information from student records, work samples, and limited interviews with participating teachers and students. Audio tapes acquired throughout the study will be erased at the end of this research project. Data collected from student records will consist of portfolio information from Project Head Start, progress reports from kindergarten and first grade, and reading assessment information.

I would like to begin informal visits to your building at the beginning of February before starting the actual study in mid-February. Data will be collected from 13 students, five first grade teachers and their classrooms.

Throughout my 23 years of employment with the Public Schools, I have worked with your staff for several years through the Department of College Readiness/Career Education at Center. I can be reached at .

Dr. Evelyn Freeman, an associate professor at the State University in the Department of Theory and Practice, will serve as my advisor throughout the study. She can be reached at . At any time, you have the right to withdraw your participation in this study or terminate any observation without penalty.
I'm Sarah Jordan and I'll be conducting research in February and March for my doctoral dissertation at the State University. Your building contains students who have completed Head Start and Project Reach kindergarten. I would like to observe 13 students, their teachers, and classrooms as reading and reading related activities are conducted during a six-week period beginning in mid-February.

I would like to visit the five first grade classes during the beginning of February to become more familiar with students and their classrooms. The actual study will consist of four formal observations of participating students during instructional reading periods, three informal observations of the students, teachers, and classrooms, audio tape recordings, field notes, cumulative information from student records, work samples, a pre-and post reading assessment (Concepts About Print) and two pre- and post interviews with each participating student and teacher. Audio tapes acquired throughout the study will be erased at the end of this research project. Data collected from student records will consist of portfolio information from Project Head Start, progress reports from kindergarten and first grade, and reading assessment information.

Throughout my 23 years of employment with the Public Schools, I have worked with your staff for several years through the Department of College Readiness/ Career Education at . I can be reached at .

Dr. Evelyn Freeman, an associate professor at the State University in the Department of Theory and Practice, will serve as my advisor throughout the study. She can be reached at .

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and all information will be treated confidentially. Code names will be used rather than the actual names of participants. At any time, you have the right to withdraw your building from participation in this study or terminate any related activities without penalty.
As building administrator, your signature below is a voluntary consent to permit the activities described above to be conducted in the building to which you are assigned.

Signature of Administrator________________________
Date____________________________
Teacher Solicitation Letter

I'm Sarah Jordan and I'll be conducting research in February and March for my doctoral dissertation at the ____ State University. Your class contains one or more students who have completed Head Start and Project Reach kindergarten. This study, to be conducted by Sarah, will consist of observations, audio tape recordings, field notes, cumulative information from student records, work samples, and limited interviews with you and your student(s). Audio tapes acquired throughout the study will be erased at the end of this research project. Data collected from student records will consist of portfolio information from Project Head Start, progress reports from kindergarten and first grade, and reading assessment information. I would like to begin informal visits to your class at the beginning of February before starting the actual study in mid-February.

Throughout my 23 years of employment with the ____ Public Schools, I have worked with your staff for several years through the Department of College Readiness/Career Education at ____ Center. I can be reached at _____________.

Dr. Evelyn Freeman, an associate professor at the ____ State University in the Department of Theory and Practice, will serve as my advisor throughout the study. She can be reached at _____.

At any time, you have the right to withdraw your participation in this study or terminate any observation without penalty.
I'm Sarah Jordan and I'll be conducting research in February and March for my doctoral dissertation at the State University. Your class contains one or more students who have completed Head Start and Project Reach kindergarten. I would like to observe these students in the classroom as you teach reading and do reading related activities for six weeks beginning in mid-February.

I would like to visit your class during the beginning of February to become more familiar with your students and classroom schedule. The actual study will consist of four formal observations of participating students during instructional reading periods, three informal observations of the students, teachers, and classrooms, audio tape recordings, field notes, cumulative information from student records, work samples, a pre-and post reading assessment (Concepts About Print) and two interviews with you and each participating student. Audio tapes acquired throughout the study will be erased at the end of this research project. Data collected from student records will consist of portfolio information from Project Head Start, progress reports from kindergarten and first grade, and reading assessment information.

Throughout my 23 years of employment with the Public Schools, I have worked with your staff for several years through the Department of College Readiness/ Career Education at Center. I can be reached at .

Dr. Evelyn Freeman, an associate professor at the State University in the Department of Theory and Practice, will serve as my advisor throughout the study. She can be reached at .

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and all information will be treated confidentially. Code names will be used rather
than the actual names of participants. At any time, you have the right to withdraw your participation in this study or terminate any observation without penalty.

Your signature below is a consent to voluntarily participate in this study as described in the preceding paragraphs.

Signature of Teacher__________________________
Date__________________________
Parental Consent Letter

I hereby grant permission for my child______________
to be part of a study to identify factors related to success in school. I
understand that Sarah Jordan is collecting information about the reading
skills used by selected children at ______ Elementary School with the
intent that this knowledge will be useful in improving instruction for other
children. The name of your child was obtained from a Project Reach
coordinator at the school. This research is the doctoral work of Sarah Jordan,
who is a student at the ___ State University.

Dr. Evelyn B. Freeman, Associate Professor, Department of Educational
Theory and Practice, is Sarah's faculty advisor at the ___ State University.
She can be reached at The Ohio State University at Newark. The direct phone
number to the Newark Campus is ____.

I further understand that Sarah will observe my child in the classroom
during four formal and three informal reading periods, administer two
reading assessments and conduct two interviews on reading attitudes with
my child. The reading assessments and interviews will be conducted in the
library learning center on those afternoons that follow morning observations
within the class. Throughout the six-week period of the study, she will also
take notes and/or audiotape records of my child. Sarah will erase the audio
tapes at the end of the study.

The actual name of my child will never be used in any writing and a
code name will be used throughout the study. Participation in this study is
voluntary and I may withdraw my child from this project at any time.

Thank you very much.

Signature of Parent________________________
Date________________
Signature of Witness_______________________
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APPENDIX C
PROCEDURES (READING SURVEY, CONCEPTS ABOUT PRINT, TEACHER INTERVIEW, AND CLASSROOM OBSERVATION CHECKLIST)
Reading Survey

1. At a display of 9 books (including the student's assigned reader), say: Look at the books on this table. Which three books would be fun to read?

2. This is your reader. When you read the stories in this book are they: EASY TO READ ___ HARD TO READ ___ JUST RIGHT ___

3. When you read, what are your favorite characters?

4. Where do you like to read your books?

5. When you have free time, what do you like to do?

6. When you read a story, what is the first thing you do? Then what do you do?

7. When you read a story and come to a word you do not know, what do you do? How can the story help you?
8. Your class goes to the library learning center each week. What is the best part of your trip to the library?

9. This is Teddy. He would like to become a good reader. How would you help him. Tell him what he should do if he wants to be a good reader.

10. What would you like to learn while you are in first grade?
## Concepts About Print

Say to the child: "I'm going to read you this story but I want you to help me."

### COVER

**Item 1**
- **Test:** For orientation of book. Pass the booklet to the child, holding the book vertically by outside edge, spine towards the child.
  - **Say:** "Show me the front of this book."
  - **Score:** 1 point for the correct response.

### PAGES 2/3

**Item 2**
- **Test:** Concept that print, not picture, carries the message.
  - **Say:** "I'll read this story. You help me. Show me where to start reading. Where do I begin to read?"
  - **Read the text to the child.**
  - **Score:** 1 point if print, 0 for picture.

### PAGES 4/5

**Item 3**
- **Test:** For directional rules.
  - **Say:** "Show me where to start."
  - **Score:** 1 for top left.

**Item 4**
- **Say:** "Which way do I go?"
  - **Score:** 1 for left to right.

**Item 5**
- **Say:** "Where do I go after that?"
  - **Score:** 1 for return sweep to left.
  - **(Score items 3-5 if all movements are demonstrated in one response.)**

**Item 6**
- **Test:** Word by word pointing.
  - **Say:** "Point to it while I read it." (Read slowly, but fluently.)
  - **Score:** 1 for exact matching.

### PAGE 6

**Item 7**
- **Test:** Concept of first and last.
  - **Read the text to the child.**
  - **Say:** "Show me the first part of the story."
  - **Score:** 1 point if BOTH are correct in any sense, i.e., applied to the whole text OR to a line, OR to a word, OR to a letter.

### PAGE 7

**Item 8**
- **Test:** Inversion of picture.
  - **Say:** "Show me the bottom of the picture" (slowly and deliberately).
  - **(Do NOT mention upside-down.)**
  - **Score:** 1 point if verbal explanation, OR for pointing to top of page, OR for turning the book around and pointing appropriately.

### PAGES 8/9

**Item 9**
- **Test:** Response to inverted print.
  - **Say:** "Where do I begin?"
  - "Which way do I go?"
  - "Where do I go after that?"
  - **Score:** 1 point if beginning with "The" (Sand), or "I" (Sianes), and moving right to left across the lower and then the upper line. OR 1 for turning the book around and moving left to right in the conventional manner.

**Read the text to the child.**

### PAGES 10/11

**Item 10**
- **Test:** Line sequence.
  - **Say:** "What's wrong with this?" (Read immediately the bottom line first, then the top line. Do NOT point.)
  - **Score:** 1 point for comment on line order.

### PAGES 12/13

**Item 11**
- **Test:** A left page is read before a right page.
  - **Say:** "Where do I start reading?"
  - **Score:** 1 point for left page indication.

**Item 12**
- **Test:** Word sequence.
  - **Say:** "What's wrong on this page?" (Point to the page number 12. NOT the text.)
  - **Read the text slowly as if it were correct.**
  - **Score:** 1 point for comment on either error.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Test Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Test: Letter order. Say: 'What's wrong on this page?' (Point to the page number 13 — NOT in the text.) Read the text slowly as if it were correct.</td>
<td>Score: 1 point for any ONE re-ordering of letters that is noticed and explained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Test: Re-ordering letters within a word. Say: 'What's wrong with the writing on this page?'</td>
<td>Read the text slowly as if it were correct. Score: 1 point for ONE error noticed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Test: Meaning of a question mark. Say: 'What's this for?' (Point to or trace the question mark with a finger or pencil.)</td>
<td>Score: 1 point for explanation of function or name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Test: Punctuation. Say: 'What's this for?'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Point to or trace with a pencil, the full stop (period).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Point to or trace with a pencil, the comma.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Test: Capital and lower-case correspondence. Say: 'Find a little letter like this.' <strong>Sand:</strong> Point to capital T and demonstrate by pointing to an upper case T and a lower case t if the child does not succeed. <strong>Stones:</strong> As above for S and s.</td>
<td><strong>Sand:</strong> Point to capital M, H in turn. <strong>Stones:</strong> Point to capital T, B in turn. Score: <strong>Sand:</strong> 1 point if BOTH Mn and Hh are located. <strong>Stones:</strong> 1 point if BOTH Tt and Bb are located.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Test: Reversible words. Say: 'Show me was.' 'Show me no.'</td>
<td>Read the text. Score: 1 point for BOTH correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Test: Letter concepts. Say: 'This story says (Sand) &quot;The waves splashed in the hole&quot; [or (Stones) &quot;The stone rolled down the hill&quot;]. I want you to push the cards across the story like this until all you can see is (deliberately with stress) just one letter.' (Demonstrate the movement of the cards but do not do the exercise.) Say: 'Now show me two letters.'</td>
<td>Score: 1 point if BOTH are correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Test: Word concept. Say: 'Show me just one word.' 'Now show me two words.'</td>
<td>Score: 1 point if BOTH are correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Test: First and last letter concepts. Say: 'Show me the first letter of a word.' 'Show me the last letter of a word.'</td>
<td>Score: 1 point if BOTH are correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Test: Capital letter concepts. Say: 'Show me a capital letter.'</td>
<td>Score: 1 point if correct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CONCEPTS ABOUT PRINT SCORE SHEET

**Date:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: ____________________________</th>
<th>Age: ___________</th>
<th>TEST SCORE: 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recorder: __________________________</td>
<td>Date of Birth: ______</td>
<td>STANINE GROUP:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cover</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Front of book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Print contains message</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Where to start</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Which way to go</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Return sweep to left</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Word by word matching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>7. First and last concept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Bottom of picture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/9</td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Begin 'The' (Sand) or 'I' (Stones) bottom line, top or turn book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Line order altered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Left page before right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td></td>
<td>12. One change in word order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td></td>
<td>13. One change in letter order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>14. One change in letter order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>15. Meaning of ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>16. Meaning of full stop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>17. Meaning of comma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>18. Meaning of quotation marks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/17</td>
<td></td>
<td>19. Locate M m H h (Sand) or T t B b (Stones)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/19</td>
<td></td>
<td>20. Reverses words was, no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>21. One letter: two letters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>22. One word: two words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>23. First and last letter of word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>24. Capital letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Front of book.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Print (not picture).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Points top left at '1 took...'; 'I walked...'; (Stones).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moves finger left to right on any line.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moves finger from the right-hand end of a higher line to the left-hand end of the next lower line, or moves down the page.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Word by word matching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Both concepts must be correct, but may be demonstrated on the whole text or on a line, word or letter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Verbal explanation, or pointing to top of page, or turning the book around and pointing appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Score for beginning with 'The' (Stones) or 'I' (Stones) and moving right to left across the lower line and then the upper line, OR, turning the book around and moving left to right in the conventional movement pattern.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Any explanation which implies that line order is altered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Says or shows that a left page precedes a right page.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Notices at least one change of word order.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Notices at least one change in letter order.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Notices at least one change in letter order.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Says 'Question mark', or 'A question', or 'Asks something'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Says 'Full stop', 'Period', or 'It tells you when you've said enough' or 'It's the end'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Says 'A little stop', or 'A rest', or 'A comma'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Says 'That's someone talking', 'Talking', 'Speech marks', 'Print' (from computers).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Locates two capital and lower case pairs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Points correctly to both was and no.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Locates one letter and two letters on request.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Locates one word and two words on request.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Locates both a first and a last letter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Locates one capital letter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher Interview

NAME________________________
GENDER___________
TEACHING EXPERIENCE: TOTAL YEARS__ IN FIRST GRADE__
CERTIFICATION__________________________________________

NOTES:

TEACHER INTERVIEW
A.
1. What do you think are the most important factors in helping a child become successful in reading?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. What kinds of reading take place in your classroom outside of formal reading instruction?
   ____ individual reading of library books
   ____ reading aloud by teacher, others
   ____ sharing of books between students
   ____ other:______________________________________________

3. Do you read aloud to your children each week? _________________
   If yes, how often? __________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
4. Do you ever do activities with a book in addition to reading it aloud? _______. What would be an example of a particular book and the related activities?

B.

5. How can you tell if a child is going to be a successful reader? (What behaviors would you see...) _____________________________________________

What behaviors might you see in a child who could eventually have difficulty with reading?

6. Once school begins, when is it apparent that a student will succeed or fail at reading?

7. What factors might discourage children from being able to learn to read?

8. How have your methods of teaching reading in the classroom changed throughout your years as an educator?

C.

10. Does the background of the children contribute to or impede their progress in reading? Contribute? How?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Impede? How?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

11. What has been most helpful to you in learning how to teach reading?
- Experience (trial and error)
- Personal traits (e.g., love of books)
- College classes
- Professional journals/books
- Observing others/advice from colleagues
- Teachers' manuals
- Workshops/inservice
- Other: ____________________

12. What kinds of things make it difficult to teach reading well?
- Schedules
- Unsupportive parents
- Class size
- Climate of school
- Using the system's series
- Principal
- The children in the system
- Testing/evaluation
- Other: ____________________

13. What does a child need to learn in order to read well?
- Motivation/enjoyment
- Conventions of print
- Connections with language
- Meaning and story
- Skills/phonics
- Functions and purpose
- Other: ____________________

14. What are the most important things to look for in a good teacher of reading?
- Enjoyment of reading
- Facilitative environment
- Focus on skills
- Flexibility/variety of instruction
- Compassionate
- Reads aloud
- Respect for child
- Knowledge of reading process
- Patience
- Use of good books
- Confidence
- Other: _________________
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15. What would a good teacher of reading avoid doing?
__Having low expectations  __Over-relying on skills
__Teaching too much phonics  __Making reading unpleasant
__Communicating to children that they cannot read
__Failing to meet individual needs  __Other:__________________
Classroom Observation Checklist

1. Displays about children’s literature
   a. Children’s own work
   b. Teacher-made
   c. Commercially-prepared
   d. Other

2. Children’s books in the classroom
   a. How are these organized?
   b. How are these displayed?
   c. How many books are there?
   d. What types of books are there?

3. Other classroom materials or equipment that support children’s interactions with books
   a. Centers (i.e. listening)
   b. Furniture (i.e. cushions)
   c. Props (i.e. puppets)
   d. Art materials
   e. Other equipment (i.e. tape recorder)
4. Evidence of cross-curricular links involving children's literature

5. Teacher-created planning materials for literature-based lessons
   a. Schedule
   b. Plan book sample pages
   c. Web, unit plan, teacher's guides
   d. Other

6. Resources for literature-based teaching
   a. School library (how used, how extensive)
   b. Public library (how used)
   c. Professional books, journals, published teacher's guides or programs
   d. Other

7. Artifacts of children's literature-related work
   a. Artwork
   b. Writing
   c. Videotapes of literature events
   d. Other
Many student, teacher, and classroom observations were completed in the mornings; I conducted student and teacher interviews, administered student assessment, collected cumulative information regarding students, and completed a daily log of events during the afternoons. A summary of the day-to-day activities follows:

Day 1 February 13

Students began the day by engaging in informal reading. The classroom schedule called for children reading independently for approximately 1/2 hour upon entering the room. Several students willingly read to me today and the students participating in the study (Amber, William, Carolyn, and Barbara) were introduced to me as they came into the room.

The following activities were completed by the class:

- Independent reading (30 minutes)
- Calendar activities (whole group)
- Reading with entire group (big books on topics of birthdays and space)
- Center activities (writing, puzzles—substitute for the science center, computer, listening center—book on tape)

Students were called together as a large group (14 students present.) Selected students rewarded with stickers for working quietly and independently at their centers.

The children were sent to two tables with their journals to complete journal writing exercise. I exited the room after the journal writing activity was well underway.

After lunch, I returned to Ms. Martin's room to complete one classroom observation (12:55-1:15). Students entered the classroom after
leaving the lunchroom. Because of inclement weather, students remained inside during recess. During the observation, I observed the teacher as she demonstrated cutting out hearts by folding red and white construction paper in half and then cutting out half the heart.

Students worked at two tables. Ms. Martin gave each child a bag. She then placed a plastic carrier containing scissors and glue on each of the two tables and gave each child two pieces of construction paper (red and white). A couple of heart patterns were placed on each table. Students began tracing and cutting out hearts.

I left the room after children have begun tracing and cutting out hearts for approximately 10 minutes.

Tasks completed—AM: Informal observations—Amber, William, Carolyn, Barbara, Ms. Martin
Task completed—PM: Informal observation—Room 19

Day 2 February 14

I arrived in the classroom at 8:40 to speak with the two teachers who were assigned to one classroom space. The class contained 23 students; half of the class were assigned to each teacher.

Students to be observed were identified by Ms. Vaughn as they come into the room. I observed Tenika as she completed a math sheet at the beginning of the morning. Deborah was observed during circle time and a TV program. Sheila and I left the room in order that she could be observed while involved in a task conducted by a staff member from Godman Guild, a community service agency. The two classroom teachers were observed as they worked with students in reading groups.
Day 3 February 15

No activities were completed due to school closing.

Day 4 February 16

I entered the room after Louis opened the locked door to the portable classroom. He then sat on the rug with his class as Ms. Banks took attendance. I listened to Louis read from *Frosty the Snowman and Little Blue and Little Yellow*. Students then moved to another rug near the TV to watch their closed-circuit daily news program. Classes rotated in providing student broadcasters for this program. The news report included the weather, lunch menu, monthly celebrations and ended with "We are #1; we respect ourselves and others."

Students moved back to the rug to complete calendar events which included selected students writing a sentence on a chart with a marker. Ms. Banks read *Three Billy Goats Gruff* with students responding when the troll says: "Who's that tripping on my bridge? Now I'm going to gobble you up." Afterwards, the children lined up to go to the restroom.

When the students returned from the restroom, they met on the rug, were given two assignments to complete and were sent to their tables to work. The assignments were to complete a sheet from their math books on addition of two and three digit numbers with color coding and to write a make-believe story and draw a picture to accompany it in their journals. The group of approximately 14 students met at two tables and were monitored by
an instructional aide while the teacher called two students to the rug for reading group. Ms. Banks met with Lamar and George and listened as the two students read "Winter Sleep," a story from the Houghton Mifflin Literary Readers. I exited the room shortly after the group began.

Tasks completed: Informal observations: Louis, Pamela, Ms. Banks, Room 18

I entered Ms. Anderson's room at 11:03 as she sat alone at the reading table. Students were working independently at their seats. Ms. Anderson introduced me to the class and asked students to tell me the name of the group of words they had been studying. After approximately four attempts, a student said "compound words," the correct response. One student then left for Reading Recovery; shortly after that, six students left the room to go to their daily Early Literacy class, a reading group outside of their classroom.

I left the room to observe students during their out-of-class reading session. When I arrived in the class, I saw students sitting at a table, working on an alphabet card sheet in which they pointed to the picture that names the sound made by the teacher. Student then read independently for approximately 7 minutes and listened to a favorite story selected by the group. Students moved to another side of the room to hear the story being read by their teacher. They sat on the rug, while the teacher sat in the chair. They were told they would be able to listen to the story at the listening center since they have the book on tape. The story is entitled Wrong Way Rabbit.

Students reassemble at the table and one student said the alphabet as each child lined up when the first letter in their name was called. The students stopped at the restroom, returned to their rooms, got their coats, and were taken to the lunchroom by the reading teacher.

Task completed: Informal observation: Natalie
Day 5  February 17

I entered Ms. Anderson's room at 9:30 as the children were spelling their second dictated sentence on a weekly spelling test: Did you do it? Their teacher was rechecking the spelling of their new words: did, hid, kid, lid, rid and their review list: and, for, said, the, and my. Ms. Anderson reminded students of their first dictated sentence: I said the lid is hot! Students took their spelling tests to the reading table and then assembled on the rug for reading.

They began their calendar activity.
Teacher: What days did we come to school this week?"
Students: Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday.
Teacher: Name the day that comes before Friday.
Students: Yesterday, Thursday.
Teacher: Name the month.
Students: February.

Michael and Natalie appeared attentive throughout the exercise. Students completed this activity and remained on the rug, taking turns writing a sentence on the chart and signing their name next to it. After approximately 20 minutes, one student led the group (approximately 12 in number) in reciting the sentences that had been written. They are:

Today is Friday. Steven
It is sunny. Michelle
It is February 17, 1995. Lauren
We have 8 girls here. Natalie
It is day 106. Paul
We have 5 doys here. (corrected: boys) Denise
We have 13 Friends here. Sam
see you on Tuesday. (corrected: See) Linda
It is art day. Cynthia

Students then lined up for restroom and returned to the class at 10:12. As they returned, they picked up a Houghton Mifflin Preprimer C and assembled on the rug for group reading. Their teacher reviewed the story with students by telling them the name of the author and illustrator, James Marshall. Students had read the story twice previously. Students turned to page 18 and the entire group read the story aloud together. The group had difficulty when they came to the word being. The group read most the story together, although faster readers sometimes pulled away from the group or appeared to "carry" the group. After reading the nine-page story together as a group, the teacher and students discussed the title, main characters, and events in the story. Ms. Anderson then held a legal size sheet before the group and explained that they were to complete the sheet. It's contents follow:

Title: ______________________________

Characters:

________________________
________________________
________________________

________________________
________________________

________________________
finds a ____________.

He puts it on his ____________.

He jumps ____________and ____________.
I do too.

Ms. Anderson chose one student to pass the sheet to each of the remaining students as she went to sharpen pencils for each student who needed it. Students began working independently at their seat. I assisted Paul in completing this sheet because he was away from the classroom when the explanation was given.

Task completed: Informal observation: Michael, Ms. Anderson, Room 17

Day 6 February 20 (Parent Conference Day)

Since students were not in attendance, I spent the day completing tasks that focused on their teachers and classrooms. Teachers met with parents throughout the day. I asked each of the participating teachers to schedule me for a 15-minute conference to allow me to complete their initial teacher interview. Because the classrooms were not occupied during the entire day, I also used spent time completing the first classroom checklist of the four classrooms.

Tasks completed: Interview I: Ms. Anderson, Banks, Martin, Toliver, and Vaughn

Classroom Checklist #1: Rooms 17, 18, 19, 20

Day 7 February 21

I arrived in the Early Literacy/Reading Recovery room shared by two teachers. I asked Michael’s teacher if she was about to begin his group. She indicated that she was and soon ceased working individually with a student.
She left the room to escort students from their rooms to the Early Literacy class. I set up a microphone and then stepped outside the room to place a remote microphone on Michael when he arrived. He and the rest of the group of six students did not overtly react to the microphone. One student noticed it and then continued with her reading. Children met at the table, received a vocabulary card and began to repeatedly say their words as they moved their fingers along the card to indicate the letters made by the sounds they said. Each child took turns writing their word on the chalkboard. Michael wrote his name on the board and received an alphabet card. Children made each sound and named each picture as they went over their alphabet cards together. Afterwards, students removed a small book from the bin on the table and began reading independently. Each child chose a book they would later read to their teacher. After Michael read his book, he began working independently across the room while the teacher worked individually with one student. The lesson ended with the children coming back to the table, saying the alphabet drill, and lining up.

Task completed: Formal observation: Michael

Day 8 February 22

At 10:27, I entered the room to tape Deborah who sat quietly on the rug in the reading area. Ms. Toliver read a story about Native Americans entitled Arrow in the Sun. It is the story of a boy who travels as an arrow from the earth to the sun. Throughout the reading, Deborah sat quietly. Ms. Toliver made a question mark on the board and began asking questions to introduce the next story I Have a Question, Grandma. Students were given a copy of the book and told to look at the pictures. After a few minutes, they
were told to close their books. The group was asked to turn to the title page. The group then began to read the pages together.

At 11:00, I began taping Sheila who is in Deborah's group. I listened as she read *I Have a Question, Grandma*. After the story, I looked at a picture Sheila had completed yesterday. The picture contained two houses, a sun and a tree. Today Sheila is to complete a related writing sample. She wrote: "I went to my friend." At the end of the session (11:30), Sheila sat drawing details on one of the houses in the picture.

During the afternoon, I returned to the room to tape Tenika during her instructional reading period. She read a story entitled *Happy Birthday, Sam* by Pat Hutchins. I then escorted Tenika to the library to complete her first interview and reading task.

Tasks completed: Formal observations: Deborah, Sheila, and Tenika
Word Test and Interview #1: Tenika

Day 9 February 23

I began the morning by completing Phase I tasks with Deborah and Sheila, who were in Room 20 (Ms. Toliver and Ms. Vaughn). Tasks were completed in the rear of the library. Tasks included a 15-word vocabulary task which took two minutes to administer and a 10-question interview of student attitudes towards reading. I went to the Room 20 and took Deborah to the library for the session which lasted almost 20 minutes. Deborah was taken back to her room at 9:30 and Sheila was brought to the library where the same tasks were completed. The library was unusually busy as the building has had a painting crew moving from room to room for several months. Today, a kindergarten class, and two Reading Recovery/ Early Literacy teachers held
classes in the library at the same time. I went to Ms. Martin's room at 10:08 to set up for formal observations of Carolyn and Barbara. I entered the room with Ms. Martin sitting on the floor with four students, including Carolyn. The remaining students were completing center activities (writing, computer, puzzles). I set up a tape recorder and microphone on the floor behind the sofa near the reading group. Several students including Delores were interested in the microphone and asked to wear it. I told them I would give them the opportunity to wear it before I left their school. Barbara's group was called over to read with Ms. Martin after Carolyn's group finished. Just after 11:00, I began taking each of the four students in the study to the library to complete their first interview and word test. Each child was escorted back to the room after completing their tasks.

After lunch, I went to Ms. Anderson's room and brought Natalie to the library learning center. The vocabulary task and interview were given. Natalie seemed excited about reading—she indicated she would like to read all the books in the library. She was taken back to the room and Michael was brought to the library for the vocabulary task and interview. Afterwards, I walked back to his room with him.

I spent the remaining time organizing tapes, preparing materials for entry into the appropriate folders, taking down the Lollipop Dragon book display (first question in the interview), typing field notes and preparing for morning and afternoon sessions on Friday, the final day in Phase I.
Tasks completed—AM: Word Test and Interview #1: Deborah Sheila, Carolyn, Amber, William, Barbara
Formal observations: Carolyn and Barbara
Tasks completed—PM: Word Test and Interview #1: Natalie and Michael
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Day 10  February 24

I began the morning by placing the word tests and interviews in personal folders and visiting the cumulative records of Michael and Natalie who were assigned to Room 17. I arrived in Room 18 at 10:30. Ms. Banks sat on the rug working with a group of students. The group appeared to be writing dictated sentences. The remaining students sat at two tables and completed a cut-and-paste sheet using rhyming words for cave and hot. The class was scheduled for an hour-long class with the art teacher from 10:30-11:30. The class appeared talkative and seemed to move more than during previous times when I was in the classroom. Several minutes lapsed before children cleared their work space at the tables and arrived on the rug to receive instructions from the art teacher. Ms. Banks left the room to place school photos on the cumulative records of the students. The art teacher was left with approximately 11 students. He laid out four samples of the chalk drawing that had been completed earlier. The group of students sat on the floor. They seemed interested in learning how the art had been created; however they sometimes challenged the art teacher by disobeying his warnings to be quiet. The art teacher was interrupted several times throughout the lesson. Students were eventually sent back to their tables to receive materials. Some appeared frustrated when they attempted to tear their paper in small sections to create the image of mountain as instructed by the art teacher. I observed Louis and Pamela throughout the lesson. Louis sat quietly working; Pamela was disruptive and eventually lost her "buck" for the day. Children throughout the entire school may earn bucks for good behavior/grades that can be spent weekly at the school store. When Ms. Banks arrived back at the room, she was told that the class had not been well-
behaved. She stated that they were having a bad day with her as well. I took Pamela and Louis individually to the library to complete a word test and interview.

Tasks completed: Word Test and Interview #1—Pamela and Louis

Day 11 February 27

I began the morning by collecting background information from the cumulative records of students in Room 20 (Deborah, Sheila, and Tenika). The information was placed in a folder I kept for each student in the study.

At 9:15, I went to Room 20. Students were seated on the rug as Ms. Toliver told the class about Daniel Hale Williams, the first American to perform open heart surgery.

Following a brief discussion, students were given a blackline master that noted the stages of Daniel Williams life and were asked to color it at their tables. Students were chosen to place a basket of crayons on each table as they began coloring their sheet. Ms. Toliver moved among the children as they worked at the tables; Ms. Vaughn sat working at the teacher's desk.

Afterwards, students were asked to return their crayons to the baskets and prepare to go to the restroom. They lined up by rooms as the redbirds (Ms. Vaughn's class) and bluebirds (Ms. Toliver's class). Students returned from the restrooms and each teacher reminded the group of the student chosen to be the February Good Citizen. An awards assembly had been held the previous week to recognize a student(s) from each class.

Ms. Vaughn began the calendar activity by choosing a student to tell the date. Just then, Ms. Nelson, the library library aide entered the room to share a tape with the class. This is their regularly scheduled time to be in the
library. The library aide has been visiting the classrooms due to painting that is occurring throughout the building. Students listened attentively to the tape, which ran approximately 20 minutes. Ms. Nelson announced that Sooper Puppy (Baxter to his owners) is getting into trouble today because he allowed someone to do his thinking for him. He made a wrong decision. The children are familiar with the character, since they had seen other video tapes in this series.

After a short discussion at the end of the tape, students were escorted to the hallway outside the main office to browse at books that will be available for purchase during the Book Fair, to be held later in the week. The Book Fair gave students the opportunity to buy books ranging in price from $1-$13. The average price was about $5. Students were able to buy one book and receive a second book at no additional cost. At least two other classes were in the hallway as Ms. Toliver's class arrived. Ms. Vaughn's class had left the room a couple of minutes earlier and were browsing at books in the Book Fair. The Book Fair was held in the hallway outside the library learning center. Ms. Toliver kept her class in the hallway just around the corner from the Book Fair as they looked at the African-American alphabet that was displayed on the wall. After five minutes, Ms. Toliver's class moved to the Book Fair and began looking at books. Ms. Vaughn's class continued to look through the books on display.

After browsing through the books, the two classes returned to the room and assembled in two reading groups. A psychologist entered the room to observe a student in his reading group. Ms. Toliver began her reading group by sharing a few of the books entitled "Out on the Street" that had been written by students. The group then began a discussion about words that
begin with /st/ and read a mini-book entitled What’s for Dinner? Ms. Vaughn’s reading group was reading a short story and would plant radish seeds by the end of today’s session.

At the end of the day Amber was observed during her out-of-class Early Literacy lesson. Her group entered the room, began working on a vocabulary card individually, and practiced writing their assigned word on the chalkboard. This was followed by students going over an alphabet card in which the group said the initial sound twice and the picture once for each of the 26 letters of the alphabet.

Students chose books and read independently for a few minutes. Ms. Young, their teacher, introduced What Would You Like?, the book the whole group would read together today. It is a story about a child who is going to make a sandwich. Unusual creatures begin to appear in the sandwich—a spider, grasshopper, a worm. Students read the story together and discussed the kind of sandwiches they like. The group of six students lined up around the table to return to their room. Each student lined up at the door as the initial sound in their first name was made by Ms. Young. The session lasted from 2:45-3:10.

Tasks completed--AM: Formal observation: Deborah
Informal observations--Ms. Toliver, Sheila
Task completed--PM: Formal observation: Amber

Day 12  February 28

I entered the room at 9:20. Students were sitting at tables and on the floor reading independently. I went to the area behind a sofa which was across from the rug on which group activities were conducted. I began to set
up a tape recorder and remote microphone. Some children approached me and asked me to listen to them read. After setting up the equipment, I moved to the nearest table and began to listen as the children read aloud. The children seemed excited as they read their books.

I then began informally to observe Barbara. She was sitting on the rug with several books. Two classmates sat with her. She read *I'm Going on a Dragon Hunt*, *Who Will Be My Mother?* and *Mrs. Sato's Hens* during independent reading time.

Students then gathered on the rug to complete their calendar activity. Kenneth was the calendar director and he led the class in reciting the days of the week. He then asked: What was yesterday? What is today? and Tomorrow will be ____. Kenneth was asked to go across the hall to another first grade class to find out how many days the class had been in school. He returned and said this was the 112th day of the school year. Students heard the daily public address announcement that the daily news service would air in one minute. Due to technical difficulty, the newscast was abbreviated today.

Following the newscast, I observed William informally. He was sitting quietly as the group began to sing their weather song. The following melody was sung to the tune of *London Bridge*: What's the weather like today, like today, like today; What's the weather like today, On this Tuesday? Students then described the weather. A graph had been posted on the board and the calendar director shaded in the appropriate box to indicate the weather for today. The choices on the graph were sunny, rainy, cloudy, and snowy. After completing the calendar activity, Ms. Martin asked students to line to go to the restroom.
When students returned to the room, Ms. Martin gathered the books to be read with the group. Ms. Martin and the class read *Any Kind of Dog* and they reread *What is in Space?* Students were then given booklets that contained the text from *What is in Space?* Students were asked to illustrate each page in the booklet. Each page contained a line of text at the bottom that corresponded with the text they read in the big book on space. Students were to read the text at the bottom of the page and illustrate it appropriately. The text follows:

The sun is in space.
The moon is in space.
The stars are in space.
The planets are in space.
The asteroids are in space.
The meteors are in space.
The comets are in space.
The earth is in space, too.

William's group remained on the rug for their instructional reading period. They matched sentence strips with pictures they had completed earlier that related to the story entitled *Mrs. Sato's Hens.*

Barbara's group read next. They read *Car Care.* Students read six rules for safe driving and riding in a car. Students discussed the importance of care safety.

In the afternoon, I observed Pamela (Room 18) and Sheila (Room 20) during their out-of-class reading groups. About two-thirds of the way through Sheila's audio taping, she disconnected her microphone. Much of her individual reading had been completed at this point and she was showing
the microphone to Nathan who had joined her on a beanbag after completing his individual reading with the teacher.

Tasks completed--AM: Formal observation: William and Barbara
Informal observation: Barbara, William, Ms. Martin, Room 19
Tasks completed--PM: Formal observation: Pamela, Sheila

Day 13 March 1

I arrived in Ms. Banks' room at 9:25. The aide was with the class as Ms. Banks had taken Pamela (who was to be observed) to the office. She had become ill at school. Students were in different locations around the room and were choosing books to read. Four boys joined me at a table in the back of the room as I set up the tape recorder and microphone to tape Louis in his reading group. Howard, Eugene, Louis and Nicholas remained with me throughout their independent reading time and read several books aloud both individually and with a partner. Titles included: *Stop, If You Meet a Dragon*, *Shadow*, *Wake Up Mom*, *Mr. Grump*, *Henry and the Helicopter*, and *Sleeping Out*. An announcement was made on the public address system that the news service would be on the air in one minute. Ms. Banks asked students to put their books away and to sit on the carpet near the television. Two girls were working at the calendar; they joined the rest of the group just as the news program began. The news follows: Today is March 1. The weather is cool. The high will be 33. This day is special because Ohio became the 17th state to enter the union on March 1, 1803. The Book Fair will continue today. Today's lunch is ... Have a nice day. We are #1. We respect ourselves and others.
Following the news, students moved to the rug to complete the calendar activity and reading groups.

Ms. Banks: What is today?

Students: March 1.

Ms. Banks: Why can't we put March 1 in the first box on the calendar?

Students: Because today is Wednesday. March begins on Wednesday (Louis).

Students repeat:

Yesterday was Tuesday.

Today is Wednesday.

Tomorrow will be Thursday.

Ms. Banks: How many days have we been in school? Ms. Banks asked the children to tell her the number of sticks she was holding. (The sticks were bundled as 1 hundred 1 ten and 2 ones.

Ms. Banks wrote on the language experience chart:

Today is Wednesday, March 1, 1995. Our class has collected 31 food items for Operation Feed. We have 2 more days to bring foods to school. The book fair ends tomorrow. Have a good day.

Ms. Banks: Why is there a capital O in the middle of the second line?

After a few attempts, one student indicated that "Our" is the first word in the sentence. One student read the first sentence. Howard read the second sentence; he had difficulty reading the words "collected" and "items". Candyce read the next sentence. She had difficulty with the words "more"
and "bring." Louis read the fourth sentence and self-corrected "ended" for "ends." The entire group read the last sentence together: "Have a nice day."

Ms. Banks announced that Louis and Sherri brought money in so they could go to the Book Fair. The rest of the class went outside to enter the main building and go to the restrooms.

When students returned to the room, they met on the rug and were given two assignments to complete. They were to finish two pages in their spelling workbook and copy the story written on the language chart. The class read and answered the two workbook pages together as they sat on the rug. Students were then sent to their tables to begin working independently. Ms. Banks tore the chart page from the easel and taped it to the front board. Students were given a sheet of beginning first grade writing paper with three half-inch lines followed by an inch wide space. Louis' group remained on the rug for their instructional reading group. The other children worked at one of the tables and began to complete their spelling assignment.

Several students had difficulty completing the spelling and writing task without help from the instructional assistant. Almost no one completed the spelling pages independently. I began to move to the children to help them complete their assignments when some of the students became disruptive or came to me for help. Louis' mother had come into the room and had joined his reading group. Students in the reading group discussed the book to be read: *Dad's Headache* by Joy Cowley.

I remained in the class unto 11:50. As I left, Ms. Banks, her assistant, and Louis' mother were in the class. Students were turning in their assignments and clearing their tables as they prepared to go to lunch.
Just before 2:30, I went to Carolyn's Early Literacy reading group to observe her.

Tasks completed—AM: Formal observation: Louis
Informal observation: Ms. Banks, Room 18
Task completed—PM: Formal observation: Carolyn

Day 14    March 2

As I entered the room, I noticed three college students were also in the room with Ms. Anderson and the class. Ms. Anderson was working on the daily calendar activity with the group. Students named the date. They completed: Yesterday was____; today is____; and tomorrow will be ________.

One of the college students then taught music to the class. She sang the song "Funny Bones" to the class. She used a prop to show how the song was divided into three parts. The student teacher distributed circles to the girls and bones to the boys. The group sang the song. The boys and girls then stood up, switched props and repeated the song. Students made a human funny bones sandwich, using girls for the filling and boys for the bread. They sang the song again. The boys and girls switched parts and sang the song a final time. At 9:40, the music lesson ended.

Ms. Anderson returned to the rug to complete the calendar activity with the students. The group stood up, recited the date and began marching around the room. Natalie placed a stick in the box to note the number of days the class had been in school. Michael went to the window and commented on the weather: "It is cloudy, dry, cold." The school's news service is on the
public address system today rather than on the television monitor. Students began taking turns writing their sentences on the language chart. They wrote:

Today is Thursday. Paul.
It is March 2, 1995. Lauren.
We have 5 boys here. Natalie.
It is cloudy. Jerry.
We have 7 girls here. Sam.
We have 12 friends. Linda.
We have library today. Denise.
It is pizza day. Beth.

Students then lined up to go to the restrooms. Students left at 10:08 and returned at 10:12. Students voted on which of two books they wanted Ms. Anderson to read later in the day. Each child came to the chart when their name was called, received their clothespin (with their name on it), and placed it on the side of the chart that indicated the location of the book they were voting for. The books, entitled How Big? How Fat? How Hungry? and Pigsty had been placed at the bottom of the chart. The vote was 5 to 6 in favor of Pigsty. One student had left the room and would be asked to vote later in the day. Natalie was asked to tell the group the title of the story they were reading this week (The Pig and the Pencil).

Ms. Anderson asked for names of characters in the story. Students answered: Fox, Pig, Frog, Father, Mother.

The scouting instructor then entered the room. Informal observations of Michael and Natalie were completed while the scouting instructor was in the room. Michael, along with the rest of the group sat quietly as the instructor asked the girls and boys to go to a box located on the back bookcase,
get the plastic bags that contained their scouting scarves, and come back to
their desks to tie them correctly around their necks. The group stood and
recited the Pledge of Allegiance and their respective Boy and Girl Scout
Pledges. The group then assembled on the rug as Ms. Smith, the scouting
instructor, began writing on the language chart. She wrote: Room 17 is full of
Good Citizens because we... Students provided the following responses and
afterwards signed their name on the chart:

- Do what the teacher says
- Follow rules
- Help others
- Share
- Feed the birds
- Pick up trash
- Put our books away
- Are good listeners
- Try to be good citizens
- Respect others
- Follow directions
- Are good Scouts
- Don't fight
- Have good manners (Michael)

The group then played a game called Four Corners. The student who is
"It" puts his or her head down throughout the entire game. Each corner in
the room is given a number (1-4, for example). Each of the remaining players
quietly hides in one of the four corners of the room. The monitor tells "It"
which corners have one or more players in them. "It" then chooses one of
those numbers while his or her eyes remain covered. The player who is "It" then calls a number. Everyone in that corner sits down because they have been "caught". The game continues until only one student is standing. The students in the class played the games at least three times and seemed to get faster at playing it each time.

Following the scouting lesson, I was placed on the "hot seat." I was asked to sit on in Ms. Anderson's chair and answer questions asked by students who sat on the rug in front of me. Questions posed included: What is your favorite fruit? What is your favorite color? Do you have a car? I then sang a song to the group.

Ms. Young and Ms. Roberts came to the took most of the children out for reading. Only three students remained in the class at 11:15.

Students had spent the morning completing the following activities: music, calendar, scouting, Reading Recovery/Early Literacy. The three remaining students were given a sheet to complete. They were to write what it would be like if they were a teacher for a day. The three students sat at individual desks and worked on their sheet. Ms. Anderson went to her desk to work. A Project Reach coordinator and Ms. Vaughn came into the room to speak with Ms. Anderson. Students left for lunch just before 11:30.

After lunch, I observed Room 17 informally as they returned to the library learning center for their weekly visit. The library learning center had not been used as such since the end of November. It was used instead as a classroom while each room was being painted. The building lacks the space to put each class inside the main building. Even with a class assigned to the library, smaller offices inside the library were used by Project Reach coordinators and the field librarian.
At 1:00, Ms. Anderson's class entered the library. Ms. Nelson, the library aide introduced the class to the tape they were about to see. It was a video about Sooper Puppy, a dog, who lives his life in search of answers to the problems he encounters. Students then viewed the tape, which lasted about 20 minutes. Students left the library at 1:27 without getting library books.

Tasks completed—AM: Informal observation: Michael, Natalie, Ms. Anderson, Room 17 (2)
Task completed--PM: Informal observation: Room 17

Day 15 March 3

I began the morning by arriving in Room 20 at 9:20. Students were about to line up to go to the restrooms. They would have an art lesson from 9:30-10:30. Mr. Wood, the art specialist, arrived in the room during the time the classes were out of the room. One student remained in the room when the teachers and other children existed the room. When the classes returned, students assembled on the rug to learn about the masks they would make in art. Mr. Wood demonstrated the activity by folding a piece of paper in half and cutting patterns along the unfolded sides. He opened the paper and cut out two eyes. He showed students how to draw a nose by using three strokes and he told them to draw, rather than cut out a mouth. Mr. Wood displayed two examples of masks he had completed earlier. Several students had difficulty settling down or attending to the project.

Tenika was observed as she sat quietly listening to the directions. After directions were given, students were sent back to their tables to receive the materials they would use. Tenika worked carefully on her mask and began
methodically folding the paper in half and cutting designs on the unfolded edges. She completed the task without much assistance. She did receive help from Mr. Wood as she began to cut the eyes into her mask.

Deborah was also informally observed during the art lesson. At the beginning of the observation, Deborah sat quietly following the instructions previously given. When the daily news service came across the public address system, most children, along with the instructor, continued to talk or work. Deborah was praised by the art teacher for making faster progress with her mask.

During formal reading, Tenika was observed as she sat with eight other children. Ms. Vaughn held up pictures painted by each the students the previous day. The pictures were those of a pumpkin. Ms. Vaughn told the group they were to write a story to go with their illustration. After each of the nine students had received an opportunity to tell what they would write in their story, the children went back to their seats with their pictures, a sheet of paper, and a pencil. Creating their own sentences, spelling the words correctly, and writing their thoughts on paper seemed difficult for some of the children. Several became disruptive, moved around the room, or talked with each other. Tenika sat quietly throughout the writing activity. Her story follows:

Tenika James

I went to a
Halloween party.

My pumpkin wasn't

After students completed their work, they were told to get a book and return to the rug and begin reading it quietly. Many of the children did not
follow directions. Half of the students wanted to wear the portable microphone that was used to tape students individually and some students asked me to read to them or to listen to them read to me. At 11:20, the children in Ms. Vaughn's group were told to sit on the rug. They were scolded for their failure to follow directions. Throughout the period, Ms. Toliver was working on a different activity with her group.

Tasks completed: Formal observation: Tenika
Informal observation Tenika, Deborah, Ms. Vaughn, Room 20

Day 16 March 6

I arrived in the room at 9:45. The news service was on the air. Ms. Martin had forgotten I would be in her classroom and had made arrangements to take her class to view a video in Ms. Banks' room. After the news services, she took the class to the restrooms. Ms. Martin indicated she would return to the room around 10:30. I informed her I would return at that time. Before leaving the room, I set up the tape recorder and microphone. I then returned to the library learning center to record notes and set up a weekly schedule.

I went back to Room 19 at 10:30. The class was returning at the same time. I observed four reading groups, each lasting approximately 10-15 minutes.

William's group read independently Try It, a mini-book the group had read earlier. Ms. Martin then gave each student a booklet that contained a compilation of their work. The booklets contained pages with dictated sentences, students' writing on things they like or don't like and student illustrations. The student booklet was also entitled Try It and contained work
done by William and three other students who read in this group. (I received a copy of the booklet.) While in the reading group, students read their version of the book twice, once together as a group and a second time with each student reading only the pages aloud they had written. Afterwards, students were sent back to their tables to color the pages in their booklets.

Barbara’s group was called to the rug. The group was asked to read Care Care independently as Ms. Martin gathered the books they would read today. The group was then introduced to a new mini-book entitled: The Humongous Cat by Joy Cowley. Students looked through a copy of the book as their teacher held it in front of them. They then looked at the title. With the assistance of their teachers, students read through the book together. The repetitive sentences contained in the text are: "A little bit of this and a little bit of that. That's how you feed a growing cat." Difficult words for students included: sausages, humongous, giant, mountain, never, thunder, and bit. Carolyn reads with this group, although she is not assigned to it. (Ms. Martin permitted her to join the group because she said Carolyn wanted to become a better reader). Carolyn followed along; however, she didn't appear to be reading the pages as independently as others in the group.

Carolyn’s assigned group read What’s for Dinner? Students practiced writing /have/ three times on small chalkboards that had been issued to them. The group was then asked to write two sentences that contain the word /have/ on their chalkboards.

Amber completed a running record by reading What’s for Dinner? independently with 97% accuracy.

Tasks completed: Formal observation: William, Carolyn, Amber, Barbara
Day 17    March 7

I arrived in the room as the students were seated at tables. Students were working on a math sheet that used clocks to tell time. I began informally observing Tenika. Tenika was completing the math portion of the sheet. After she finished, Ms. Vaughn asked her to place a tray of crayons on her table. (Three students were seated at her table.) Students were told to color the pictures on the front of the sheet, making sure they did not cover up their answers. Math sheets, crayons, and pencils were collected from students.

The group then met on a rug near the television monitor to begin their daily calendar activity. Ms. Toliver asked the student to identify the following: the date, month, yesterday, tomorrow, and number of days school had been in session. She stopped several times to quiet the children. Some students seemed restless and inattentive. The school’s news program was about to air. Students turned towards the television monitor to see the news program. They then resumed their calendar activity. Ms. Toliver asked the students to stand and stretch for a couple of minutes. They continued to appear restless as they moved around on the floor, talked among themselves and failed to pay attention. Just after 10:00, students viewed a 15-minute science program on the television.

From 10:20-10:32, students from the two classes were in the restrooms. Ms. Toliver went out of the room at 10:20 and returned at 10:30; Ms. Vaughn’s class left at 10:24 and returned at 10:32.

Tenika was observed during her reading group, which lasted approximately 50 minutes. Ms. Vaughn read “The Pig and the Pencil” to the group of seven students. One student had been sent out of the room for
misbehavior. Ms. Vaughn looked at a page from a binder she had taken from her desk and gave each child a mini-book to begin look through. Each student was asked to read the book they had been given independently until she could listen to each child read to her. Tenika was given a Houghton Mifflin Preprimer C. Ms. Vaughn indicated that Tenika is her most successful reader. Tenika smiled as she began to look through the book. She turned to the story her teacher had just finished reading (The Pig and the Pencil) and began reading through the story. Ms. Vaughn began to read along and listen to each student as he or she read the book or story she had given them. Towards the end of the morning, Tenika was asked to read to the students in her group as the group listened.

In the afternoon, I completed the second word tests and interviews in the library learning center with Tenika, Deborah, and Sheila and formally observed Sheila. Sheila had missed her in-class reading instruction because she attended an hour-long session on social skills taught by a staff member at one of the community agencies. I spoke with Ms. Roberts regarding Sheila's progress. She has been attacking the beginning sounds in words with more success. She has difficulty in attacking the ending sounds in words as seen in her spelling of five dictated words during the session.

Task completed—AM: Formal observation: Tenika
Task completed—PM: Formal observation: Sheila
Informal observation: Tenika, Sheila, Deborah
Word Test #2/Student Interview #2: Tenika, Sheila, Deborah
Day 18    March 8

Just before 10:00, I arrived in the classroom as students were seated on
the floor receiving their morning assignments (writing, spelling, math).
Students lined up to go to the restroom. When they returned, they went to
their tables to begin their spelling assignment. Four students were called to
the reading rug where Ms. Banks introduced them to a new mini-book:
*Julia's List*. The group spent several minutes talking about the pictures in the
book, naming words they knew in the book, and naming various groups of
things found throughout the book (names of characters, games, signs).

Louis' group was the second group to read. They also began a new
mini-book: *Alligator Shoes*. The group of three children went through the
book with their teacher and described what was happening from page to page.
I left the room at 11:15.

I met with Michael and Natalie, Room 17, to complete their second
word test and Interview.

Task completed: Formal observation: Pamela, Louis
Word Test #2 and Student Interview #2: Michael, Natalie

Day 19    March 9

I arrived at Room 18 around 9:30. Students were reading
independently in various locations around the room. I began observing
Pamela as she sat reading with Mrs. West, an instructional assistant. The
story she was reading is entitled *A Good Home*, located in the middle of
Preprimer B of the Houghton Mifflin Literary Readers. The story seemed
difficult as Pamela seemed to guess at several of the words she encountered.
Later, Pamela approached me and shared another story in this reader which
she read with more success (*Cat Goes Fiddle-i-fee* by Paul Galdone.)
After an announcement that there would be no news service today, students assembled on the rug and completed part of their calendar activity. The class was then taken to the restrooms. When they returned, Ms. Banks read a book to the group entitled *I Need a Lunch*.

Students were given a morning assignment to write a story and draw a picture on storybook paper about either a lunch or an animal. I observed Pamela and Louis in reading groups.

A visitor, formerly from the school's Adopt-A-School program came in at 11:30 and shared a book entitled *Peanut Butter, Apple Butter, Cinnamon Toast*. She autographed the book and left it as a gift to the class. Ms. Banks then located a riddle book that the class had read earlier and they reread it to the visitor.

Tasks completed—AM: Formal observation-Pamela and Louis
Informal observation: Pamela, Louis, Ms. Banks, Room 18
Tasks completed—PM: Informal observation: Michael (completed in the library learning center during scheduled classroom visit)

Day 20 March 10

I arrived in Ms. Martin's room around 9:30. Students were seated on the rug as they completed their calendar activity. Their teacher gave a writing assignment for the morning:

Name

Today is Friday, March 10, 1995.

Students were sent back to their tables to begin the writing. It was to be copied from the board. Afterwards, students met on the rug where Ms. Martin read a big book with the group entitled *Teeny Tiny*. A visitor would come in later
in the morning, share two books and leave bookmarks and lollipops for the class. I did not observe reading groups today as the class worked independently, in the large group, or at centers.

Tasks completed—AM: Formal observation: William
Informal observation: Carolyn, Barbara, William, Amber, Ms. Martin, Room 19

Tasks completed—PM: Word Test #2 & Student Interview #2—Louis, Pamela, Barbara

Day 21 March 13

I began the day by observing in Room 20. Students were seated at tables completing a connect-the-dot sheet of Guion Bluford. The class left for the restroom, returned to the classroom, and lined up to go to the library learning center. Part of the period was sent looking for a book to check out; the remaining time was spent watching a video entitled Sylvester and the Magic Pet.

I spent time observing both reading groups. One student was so disruptive, he was taken out of the room until he could control his emotions. It was very difficult to concentrate on the reading lessons since the student moved about the room, talking and sobbing throughout the lessons.

I copied the texts in Julia's Lists and Mrs. Sato's Hens to provide a future reference of the types of stories read by the students in their instructional reading groups.

Tasks completed: Formal observation: Sheila, Deborah, Tenika
Informal observation: Ms. Vaught, Room 20

Word Test #2 and Interview #2: Carolyn, William
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Day 22 March 14

Before school began, I completed the second teacher interview with Ms. Vaughn in Room 20. At approximately 9:35, I arrived in Ms. Martin's room. Students were seated on the rug conducting their calendar activity. A few minutes later, students lined up to go to the restroom. An announcement came on the public address system that the school's news service would air in one minute. While in the hallway, the class practiced a tornado drill with Room 17. There would be a city-wide drill at 10:10 on tomorrow morning.

Students returned to the room and Ms. Martin read *Sheila Rae the Brave* to the class. The class read *I Like Me* as a group. Students were then dismissed to an assigned center. Amber sat and rocked in a rocking chair for almost 30 minutes; she periodically looked at one of the books in the area. William's group read *The Farm Concert* by Joy Cowley. Students read through the story three times. The first time they read the story together; the remaining times they read aloud through the story taking turns reading only the part of a particular animal or the farmer.

Barbara's group read *Horses Read Standing Up*. Students received a copy of the book from Ms. Martin and they were instructed to move to a part of the rug where they could read the story independently. Students were given individual chalkboards and were told to practice writing sentences that tell about a sleeping animal.

Carolyn's group read *Cookie's Week*. The group began reading the story yesterday. After reading the book, the group began a language experience story which the members of the group said a sentence about Mr. Wood, the art teacher.
Sentences that were written were:

On Monday, Mr. Wood knocked over the paint. There was paint everywhere.

On Tuesday, Mr. Wood used the chalk. There was chalk everywhere. The group was then sent back to their tables. They were inattentive.

During the afternoon, Carolyn brought a copy of Cookie's Week to the interview and read the story to me. She read with accuracy and experienced difficulty with only one word: windowsill.

I visited William in his Early Literacy class. The group practiced saying their letter sounds and corresponding pictures from an alphabet card. Students took baskets of books and read in different areas of the room. William and a group of two students read Where Are You Going Asked Rose?

Ms. Young introduced the group to a new big book: The Springtime Rock-and-Roll. It has a repetitive pattern which students began to repeat as Ms. Young read through the book:

That's a nice song said the ________(animal)
So the______ (animal) danced in the green grass singing
Well bless my___and bless my soul
I'm doing the Springtime Rock and Roll.

Tasks completed—AM: Interview #2: Ms. Vaughn
Formal observation: Amber, Carolyn, Barbara, William
Informal observation: Amber, Carolyn
Task completed--PM: Formal observation: William
Day 23 March 15

All first grade teachers participated in a full-day meeting at one of the resource centers regarding their special funding that allows the classes to remain small (DPIA). No in-class observations were completed today.

Tasks completed: Classroom Checklist #2: Room 17, 18, 19, 20

Formal observation: Natalie (out-of-class)

Day 24 March 16

I began the morning by interviewing Ms. Anderson in Room 17 before the students arrived. After the school day began, I returned to the classroom to do an informal observation of the teacher and a formal observation for Michael. Natalie was absent today.

When I arrived in the room at 9:40, students were seated on the rug doing their daily calendar activity. Individual students wrote the following sentences during the 20 minutes I observed Ms. Anderson:

- It is Thursday. Denise
- We have 5 boys. Cynthia
- It is a sunny day. Jerry
- We have 4 girls here. Paul
- We have 9 friends. Steven
- We are having library. Michael
- It is March 16, 1995. Sam
- It is pizza day. Michelle
- It is day 124. Linda.

Students read the sentences from the chart as Michelle pointed to each word. Throughout the observation, Ms. Anderson was attentive to the letters
students are writing. She also consistently monitored student behavior emphasizing the need for students to raise their hands and sit quietly as each student wrote his or her sentence. Students appeared to be familiar with the structure of the classroom. After Michael wrote his sentence on the chart, an announcement that the school's news service would air in one minute came across the public address system. Students faced the monitor and after listening to the 1-1/2 minute segment, they continued writing their sentences. Ms. Anderson played a short basic movement tape to allow the students to stand up and move around on the rug. Afterwards, the students completed writing sentences and lined up to go to the restroom. Ms. Anderson told me she would teach reading when the students returned to the room since the in-school scouting instructor was absent today. (On Thursday, the scouting instructor teaches a 45- minute lesson of citizenship).

I returned to my work area to get a tape recorder and microphone to tape Michael during the instructional reading period. Natalie is absent today.

When I returned to the room, Ms. Anderson had momentarily left the room. Ms. Anderson returned to the room and students took turns reading the remaining daily news papers they had written earlier.

Ms. Anderson asked the students who the #1 person in our country is (students said either George Washington or Abraham Lincoln.) After considerable help with the first syllable (which Ms. Anderson wrote on the chalkboard) a student concluded that the answer was President Clinton. Ms. Anderson then gave the group their writing assignment for the day: they were to put themselves in the role of reporter and tell what the President does. A student gave each of the remaining children a legal size sheet of
paper on which to write their responses. Students returned to their seats to begin writing.

Ms. Anderson then called Michael's group to the rug for reading. The group read Boo Bear Takes a Rest. Michael successfully read p. 46 and p. 52 aloud. The group was asked to alternate the reading; one page was read individually and the next page was read as a group.

I left the room with Michael's and Natalie's portfolios. Information related to reading was copied.

I went to Room 19 to schedule a time to interview and conduct the final word test and interview with Amber. The student was absent.

In the afternoon, I went to Room 20 and obtained the portfolios of Ms. Toliver's students, Sheila and Deborah. Ms. Vaughn would remove Tenika's portfolio from her car during recess. I interviewed Ms. Toliver in Room 20 after school.

Tasks completed—AM: Interview #2: Ms. Anderson
Informal observation: Ms. Anderson
Formal observation: Michael
Task completed—PM: Interview #2: Ms. Toliver

Day 25 March 17

I arrived in Room 20 to complete the final teacher observation of Ms. Toliver. The art teacher and children were seated in a circle on the rug near the teacher's desk. Ms. Toliver stood next to Ms. Vaughn who was seated at the teacher's desk. Students were being instructed on how to mold an animal out of a block of clay. Several finished models were displayed before the children. Mr. Wood, the art specialist, told the students they would
eventually paint the animals and line them up on the upper edge of the coat room. Students were sent back to their seats to begin working on the clay that was placed before each of them. The art teacher moved around the room, helping each child by shaping each block into a piece of clay that had the beginnings of a head and four legs. Students and teachers chatted as students worked with a plastic tool designed to help them with details (eyes, nose, their initials on the bottom of the animal, etc.).

Throughout the observation, Ms. Toliver remained at the desk with Ms. Vaughn most of the time. Ms. Toliver appeared to be looking over upcoming lesson plans. She discussed with Ms. Vaughn their coordination of activities for the next week. At one point, Ms. Toliver picked up a math test booklet and resource manual. She moved for just a minute to the opposite side of the room, as if to check something related to the test booklet/resource manual. She then returned to the teacher's desk.

I left the room as Mr. Wood told students to work on the smaller details of their animal. Both classroom teachers remained at the single teacher's desk looking over their plans.

At 10:15, I went to Room 17 to record formal reading observations of Michael and Natalie (whose class had not been observed as much throughout the study). Ms. Anderson called two groups of children to the reading rug to reread the story *All By Myself*. The lessons were almost the same since both students normally read in the same group. (Ms. Anderson taught the same group at two different times to allow me to individually pick up the separate interactions of Natalie and Michael. The text follows:

"All By Myself"

By Mercer Mayer
1. I can get out of bed all by myself.
2. (Illustration)
3. I can button my overalls.
4. I can brush my fur.
5. I can put on my socks...
6. and tie my shoes.
7. I can pour some juice for my little sister...
8. and help her eat breakfast.
9. I can pull a duck for her.
   I can drive my truck.
10. I can ride my bike.
   I can give a drink to my bear.
11. I can kick my ball...
   and roll on the ground.
12. I can pound with my hammer.
   I can sail my boat.
13. (Illustration)
15. I can help Dad trim a bush...
16. or ice a cake for Mom.
17. I can look at a
    book and find
    a mouse.
18. I can color a picture.
19. I can put my toys away...
20. and get into my pajamas.
21. I can brush my teeth.
22. I can put myself to bed...
    but I can’t go to sleep
    without a story.
23. Good night.

Students were sent back to their desks to complete a booklet with the
same title in which they wrote and illustrated two things they are able to do
by themselves.

Michael’s story:
I can cook all by myself.
I will play with my toys and put them back all by myself.

Natalie’s story:
I can read a book by a tree all by myself.
I can ride a bike all by myself.

Following a demonstration of Irish folk dancing from the scouting
instructor, I went to Room 20 to observe Deborah in her reading group. The
group of nine students were called to the rug to read with Ms. Toliver.
Students were to reread a poem entitled "A Kite" and complete making
individual kites. Much of the time was spent in disciplining the group. They were inattentive to the lesson and moved around considerably. The group ended with half of the group away from the reading area. These students were kept inside during the noon recess.

Tasks completed: Formal observation—Natalie, Michael, Deborah
Informal observation: Ms. Toliver

Day 26 March 20

I conducted separate teacher interviews with Ms. Martin and Ms. Banks at 8:30 in Room 19. I left the room before students arrived.

I returned to Room 19 around 9:15 to tape record students. Students were reading independently (pleasure reading) when I arrived. After the recorder and microphone were set up, students were asked to meet with me on the rug. The group read Sing a Song and I Like Me aloud as they were tape recorded. The portable microphone was then clipped on each student who wanted to be audiotaped as he or she read two pages of a book they liked. After playing back a small segment of the tape, I gave it to Ms. Martin so that students could continue to tape their voices after the study ended. I then left the room as Ms. Martin began the daily calendar activity.

I then went to Ms. Banks' room where students had been given their morning assignments. Students lined up to go to the restroom. I set up the recorder and microphone while students were out of the room.

When the class returned to the room, Louis' group was called to the reading group. Three students were given a copy of the book to be read: The Doorbell Rang. Ms. Banks played a tape recording of the book as students followed along. Louis followed along using his left index finger to do a left to
right, top to bottom sweep of the text on each page. After the tape ended, students took turns reading the pages round robin style. Louis read quietly, as if he needed assurance from the teacher (he looked from the text and received approval with a nod from Ms. Banks). The group consisted of three students.

Pamela’s group was the second group to read. The group of five students was each given a copy of a wordless story entitled: *Deep in the Forest*. Students took turns describing the pictures on each page of the book. Ms. Banks asked the group if the story reminded them of another story they knew (*The Three Bears*). The students did not appear to see the connection after looking through and describing the book that contains bears, chairs, porridge, and beds. After students described the pictures, Ms. Banks retold the story and again asked the students if it sounded like any other story they knew. One student said it sounded like *The Three Bears*. Students then were assigned to meet in small groups and discuss/retell the story. Pamela seemed not to be as involved in this activity at the beginning; however she became quite animated in her retelling of the story before the group was sent back to their seat to work on their assignments.

I then informally observed Pamela as she worked on a cut-and-paste sheet that identified ending sounds. She asked the aide where the picture of the lamp was to be pasted. She worked attentively for a few minutes; she then left her seat to go to the aide. Students lined up to go to the library learning center at 10:55. The class stopped at one of the classrooms to drop off a student who had been mainstreamed into Room 18 for morning work. The class then proceeded to the library. The group sat down at the tables to find out who had not returned library books from the previous week. Pamela
was named as one of the students who had to remain at the table because she has misplaced her book.

Louis was then observed informally in the library. He worked quietly, looking through the shelves for a few minutes before choosing a book entitled *Eagles*. The group seemed excited when Ms. Banks placed several magazines on each table. *Barbie* was a popular magazine with the girls. The class left the library at 11:30.

During the afternoon, I completed the second interview and word test with Amber. These activities were conducted in the library learning center.

After recess, I observed Natalie and Michael in two different groups. The same reading lesson was taught twice to allow each student to be individually taped.

Tasks Completed—AM: Interview #2-Ms. Banks, Ms. Martin

Formal student observation: Pamela, Louis, Natalie, Michael

Informal student observation: Pamela, Louis

Task completed—PM: Word Test #2 & Student Interview #2: Amber

Day 27 March 21

Deborah's reading group was observed after students watched a TV program followed by a visit to the restrooms. As the group came back into the room, Ms. Toliver's group was told to sit on their assigned space on the rug where she teaches reading. Ms. Toliver discussed a story the group had worked on yesterday. The story, entitled *Good morning, Chick* was reread by Ms. Toliver. She then gave each of the seven students in the group a copy of the Houghton Mifflin Preprimer B. Students were told to locate the starting page of the story by using the Table of Contents. One student did correctly
Ms. Toliver walked around the carpet as students read the story together as a group.

Ms. Toliver then began a web by drawing an oval shape on the board. Inside the oval, she wrote: It rained. Ms. Toliver drew spokes on the oval and asked students to tell her something about yesterday's rain. She wrote: It is wild up here. Students had difficulty with the word wild; they called it wet. Ms. Toliver asked: What's the rain like? Students and teacher offered the following responses: walked (ran) home, wind blew, feet wet, trash cans fell over, scared, lightning, mud, damp, thunder, cold. Students were given a writing assignment. They were asked to write and illustrate a story about yesterday's rainy weather. Ms. Toliver demonstrated where to begin writing on the paper. She wrote: "I was not scared when it rained. The lightning was in the sky." Students were given a pencil and sheet of storybook paper as they returned to their tables to begin writing.

The final formal observation of Natalie was conducted at the end of the day when students visited the school store to spend their "bucks" and shared their news with the class. I visited Natalie and her class as they sat in a long line in the school store pretending to be a train. Ms. Anderson gave each student a word to spell. The children spelled their words correctly. Ms. Anderson then asked each child to stand as she gave each of them a word to spell. If they spelled their word correctly the second time they were allowed to sit down. The class was waiting on the school store to open. An older student came down and students were called to the school store table in small groups to make their purchases.

I followed the class back to their room where Natalie was chosen to be the director of "Sharing". She was able to sit in the teacher's chair and call on
students to share their news. Several children shared their new purchases. Natalie and another student were called to line up to go home.

Tasks completed: Formal observation: Deborah
Informal observation: Natalie

An audiotape was given to each class to record the students' reading after this project ended. I taped three of the four classes in a pleasure reading activity on the last two days of the study.

A final tally of the activities to be completed during the study was done. The remaining programmatic and personal information was collected and I officially concluded the data collection phase of the study. A follow-up visit was necessary to collect portfolio information for Pamela and Louis in Room 18. Their portfolios were in the process of being updated by their teacher.
APPENDIX E

EXAMPLES: FORMAL OBSERVATIONS OF STUDENTS
Examples: Formal Observations of Michael

**Shows a Willingness to Engage in Literacy Tasks**

*Michael's book was entitled Fighting. He began to read the book to his teacher. After reading the book, he walked to the other side of the room and began looking at a display of books on shelves.

*Ms. Anderson gave each student a copy of the third preprimer in the Houghton Mifflin series. Students read "Boo Bear Takes a Rest" by David McPhail. Michael read page 45 successfully.

**Asks for Help**

*M: I want to go find me an H. Do you got a H?

S: H?

*M: Did the cat meet? How you spell meet?

S: I don't know. You got a A?

**Uses Prior Knowledge**

*M: What are you doing at 2:00?

M: Recess.

*M: What are you doing at 7:00?

M: Watching Scooby Doo.

**Displays Letter/Sound Knowledge**

*M: What vowel would you hear if the word (fur) was face?

M: You'd hear /a/.

*After the group finished reading the text, they were asked to write a compound word on the chalkboard. Michael wrote into. He then agreed to write the word without. Michael wrote: wiht ot.
**Goes Beyond the Text**

*Ms. Anderson looked at a picture and asks Who comes to pick him up?*

Michael: Grandma.

*Ms. Anderson: His Dad has brought something for him.*

Michael: Water, juice.

**Other**

*Teacher: Do you see another compound word in that last paragraph? What do you see, Michael?*

Michael: Comma. I mean, not a comma, but a...question mark.

*Teacher: He lives far away. Right. So that's why he rides the bus.*

Michael: He probably lives out west.

* Denotes beginning of a student interaction
Examples: Formal Observations of Pamela

Shows a Willingness to Engage in Literacy Tasks

*The group of four students read aloud Julia’s List:

Julia loved making lists. She made a list of numbers. She made a list of names. She made a list of signs. She made a list of games.

(Pamela’s response: toys)

*After reading Julia’s List together as group, students reread the story individually. Pamela read:

The (She) made a list of words (signs). That (Then) she put her mail (list) together and made herself a list (book).

Asks for Help

*Teacher: Okay, Pamela, what can you tell me about the next two pages?

Pamela: What’s that?

Uses Prior Knowledge

*Teacher: Where else can you read? We can read those books in the beanbag on the rug. What if you want to read a big book? Pamela.

Pamela: Read them it on the rug.

Displays Letter/Sound Knowledge

*Students took turns going to the chart to spell a word under the heading Things We Use in Writing. Pamela wrote pan sls for pencils.

*Teacher: Okay, Pamela, what letter would you expect to see at the beginning of grasshopper?

Pamela: G.
Goes Beyond the Text

* Five students assembled to discuss a wordless story entitled Deep in the Forest.

Ms. Banks: What's different about this book?

Pamela: You can make up a story.

* Teacher: A cricket looks a lot like a grasshopper, doesn't it?

Pamela: 'Cause it jumps.

Other

* Student: Pamela, what you got on you?

Pamela: A speaker.

*Pamela: There's a lot of words________.
Examples: Formal Observations of Louis

Shows a Willingness to Engage in Literacy Tasks

*Students read Dad's Headache, a little book by Joy Cowley. Louis' mom stopped in to observe.
Teacher: Read that story to your mom while you are waiting.
Louis: Had a headache; that's headache.
*The three students in the group assembled on the rug. Today they heard a book on tape entitled The Doorbell Rang by Pat Hutchins. Students then took turns reading the pages aloud. Louis read page 4 and had difficulty with the word smell.

Asks for Help

*Teacher: Okay. Louis, can you read the next page for me?
Louis: This page?
*Teacher: I don't think you've seen it before. You put I and then you D.
Louis: I and D?

Uses Prior Knowledge

*Teacher: What else would you do?
Louis: Read a book?
*Teacher: Do you know what, that's close. Cookies has I-E-S.

Displays Letter/Sound Knowledge

*Teacher: What word do you know that rhymes with bed?
Louis: Red?
*Teacher: How would you spell cake?
Louis: C-A-K-E.
Goes Beyond the Text

*Ms. Banks: Keep your books closed and tell me what makes this character happy.
Louis: He went home. He tried on shoes.
*Ms. Banks: What is the story about?
Louis: The mom made cookies, more children came, they needed more cookies, Grandma made more cookies.

Other

*Louis: Knock-knock.
*Louis' mom: You did. Did you brush your teeth today?
Louis: Uh-huh.

* Denotes beginning of a student interaction
Examples: Formal Observations of Amber

Shows a Willingness to Engage in Literacy Tasks

* Amber chose a little book from a basket and began reading it independently. She then chose a second book from the basket and began reading it.

* Amber was reminded of the story What's For Dinner? as Ms. Martin worked with her individually. Ms. Martin was completing a running record of Amber as she read the story. Amber seemed to be attentive as she read each page. Ms. Martin made annotations as Amber read.

Asks for Help

None noted.

Uses Prior Knowledge

* Amber: Last night we went to Ryan's and I had macaroni and chicken wings and some um, some potatoes and gravy and then I ate a salad and I had big, big, and yea, I ate them, too!

* Teacher: Do you want peanut butter on your carrots?

Amber: I would eat that?

Displays Letter/Sound Knowledge

* Ms. Young then made several sounds as students pointed to the appropriate boxes on their page. As Ms. Young made the sound of the letter p, Amber pointed to the pumpkin on her page. Ms. Young used the sounds of the letters h, p, t, o, and j. The students then recited the sounds and pictures on their alphabet card together.
*After the reading, Ms. Martin asked Amber to read one of the words again. Amber correctly read "I did" rather that "I didn't" the second time she read. She then went to the chalkboard and wrote the word did.

**Goes Beyond the Text**

*Teacher: Do you know what that is?
Amber: It's peanut butter.
*Teacher: Good! All right!
Amber: I would eat that. I wouldn't eat, the other things on it (sandwich)... grasshopper, worms, spider, mouse.

**Other**

*Teacher: There, perfect. Ok. We won't take it off; we'll just leave it there.
Amber: I'm hungry.
*Teacher: One of the things that...
Amber: I like to roll.
Examples: Formal Observations of Carolyn

Shows a Willingness to Engage in Literacy Tasks

*Carolyn sat looking through a little book entitled My Very Hungry Pet. The group repeated the title of the story. They then began to read the story aloud. The beginning text of the story is "Today for lunch I fed my pet..."

*Carolyn took a book from the basket and read through it quickly. She then selected another book and read swiftly through it.

Asks for Help

*Teacher: Take a look at that word 'cause I'm going to ask you to practice it on the chalkboard a little bit.

Uses Prior Knowledge

*Carolyn: You know what? My brother's having his birthday on (at) Discovery Zone.

*Teacher: Did they (parents) love your book?

Carolyn: They said they were gonna buy me a lollipop.

Displays Letter/Sound Knowledge

*Ms. Martin asked the group to find the word have on a page. Carolyn located the word in her book.

*Ms. Martin: I want you to write a sentence on your board using the word have. Carolyn wrote: I have a ______. She then wrote the word I and erased it. Carolyn spelled the word dog for a student who has written bog. She then wrote:

I have a dog

Ms. Martin reminded Carolyn to put a period at the end of the sentence.
Goes Beyond the Text

*Teacher: Smart cookie, who's a smart cookie?
Carolyn: Everybody.

*Teacher: What tells you that it flies, Carolyn?
The picture.

Other

*Teacher: I think we'll read it one time together.
Carolyn: Oh God!

*Look at me.

* Denotes beginning of a student interaction
Examples: Formal Observations of William

Shows a Willingness to Engage in Literacy Tasks

*Ms. Martin placed sentence strips and pictures on the floor where children were assembled for reading. Students were to take turns reading a sentence strip and finding the appropriate picture for it. William was the second student to read a sentence. He read: On Tuesday we counted four small eggs. (The correct response was: On Thursday, we counted five small eggs.) The group then read together: On Monday we counted two white eggs.

*Five student met on the rug. Today the group read a story entitled The Farm Concert by Joy Cowley. William and the other members of the group read through the story.

Asks for Help

None noted.

Uses Prior Knowledge

*Teacher: I think that some of you might know this book. We haven't read it in here but how many have read it downstairs with Ms. Young.

Displays Letter/Sound Knowledge

*Teacher: What's that word William?

William: Went.

*Teacher: Ok, we're gonna take a look at it in here today.

William: It said "The".

Goes Beyond the Text

*Teacher: The Farm Concert. Who wrote this book?

William: Joy Cowley.
Teacher: Somebody tell me why do you think the farmer has got his hands over his ears like that?
William: Because they holler.

Other

Teacher: Ok, let's get ready. Everybody get ready. Ok, we're ready Ms. Cow.
William: Ok, she's got to say hers.
Teacher: Great, now close your book and erase the word, William, and see if you can write it without looking in the book.
William: I didn't have to look in the book.

* Denotes beginning of a student interaction
Examples: Formal Observations of Barbara

Shows a Willingness to Engage in Literacy Tasks

*Barbara came to the rug and was asked to read Car Care as the teacher prepared to join the group. Three other students met with the group. *The group put their book away and received a new story entitled The Humongous Cat by Joy Cowley. The group looked at the cover and pictures inside the book. Barbara and the rest of the group began to read the pages on their own.

Asks for Help

*Barbara: How do you spell bat?
Teacher: Bats. No, without looking.
*Child: I know what it says.
Barbara: What?

Uses Prior Knowledge

None noted.

Displays Letter/Sound Knowledge

*Ms. Martin: Think of a sentence that tells about an animal sleeping. One student was asked to get chalkboards so that everyone could write a sentence. Barbara wrote: Bats sleep upside down on the tree. Barbara (looking at her book) then wrote:
Snakes sleep in the river.
*Teacher: What kind of letter do we use at the beginning of a sentence?
*Barbara: Capital letter.
Goes Beyond the Text

*Ms. Martin: Why do you wear seatbelts?
Barbara: So you won't get killed.

*Ms. Martin: What do you think humongous means?
Barbara: He's a big cat.

Other

*Teacher: It could be.
Barbara: I know.

*Teacher: No, they didn't. The weatherman did. What did they say?
Barbara: The cat is...

* Denotes beginning of a student interaction
Examples: Formal Observations of Deborah

Shows a Willingness to Engage in Literacy Tasks

"Ms. Toliver wrote the word question on the chalkboard. She gave copies of a story entitled I Have a Question to each student. She told the group to look at the words and pictures. The children began looking at the pictures as they sat on a rug. Deborah opened her book and began looking through it.

"Teacher: Like this.

Teacher and Deborah read: That's easy said the chick. I can do it too. He flapped his wings and ran. He stretched his neck and opened his beak.

Asks for Help

"Deborah: It was what up here?

Uses Prior Knowledge

"Teacher: And sometimes have you ever heard people called Native American Indians?

Deborah: I know 'cause that's me.

"Teacher: Has anybody ever heard that?

Deborah: Yes.

Displays Letter/Sound Knowledge

"Child: Wadder.

Deborah: Water.

"Teacher: They make"q" like that on Letter People. I like it with the tail. It helps me. "Q" always has a friend.

Deborah: "U."
Goes Beyond the Text

*Teacher: What a beautiful design. Let's see where he goes to now.
*Deborah: Arrowmaker.

*Teacher: What happened? What else happened? I can't think of some other words.
Deborah: Thunder and lightning.

Other

*Deborah: Wait a minute.
*Teacher: What other things happened.
Deborah: I got one.

* Denotes beginning of a student interaction
Examples: Formal Observations of Sheila

Shows a Willingness to Engage in Literacy Tasks

*Ms. Roberts listened to Sheila read a story entitled Let's Play Basketball.

*Teacher: Aren't you a clever girl.

Sheila: (reading aloud) Along comes Jake. Ben helps Ann with the bed. Ann helps Dad with the garden. Ben helps Mom with the paint...paining. And then along comes Jake. Mom helps Dad with the car. Dad helps Ben with the wa-sh ing... wash-ing...wa-shing. Ann helps Mom with the bathroom. And then along comes Jake. Ben helps Dad with the windows. Dad helps Mom with the wood. Mom helps Ben with the bike. And then along comes Jake. Dad helps Ann with the shopping. Mom helps Ben with the cooking. And then along comes Jake.

Asks for Help

None noted.

Uses Prior Knowledge

*Teacher: Sheila, do you have something you'd like to tell the group?
Sheila: I'm going see my grandma...to Florida where the alligators are.

*Teacher: Maybe there's something you'd like to tell us about...

*Sheila: My ma says she's goin' take us to the movies again. I'm goin' to the movies two times.

Displays Letter/Sound Knowledge

*Yesterday the group drew a picture. Sheila's picture contained two houses, a sun and a tree. She wrote the following to describe her picture: I went to my friend
Teacher: I would expect to see this letter at the beginning of the word bounce.
Sheila: B.

Goes Beyond the Text
*Ms. Roberts: Would you like Jake at your house?
Sheila: No, he gets into trouble.
*Ms. Roberts: Aren't you glad you don't have Jake living at your house? Would you like Jake at your house? Why not.
Sheila: He's bad.

Other
*Sheila: (in a singing voice) One, two, three, four, five.
*Teacher: Here...
Sheila: (interrupting) Here's "am."

* Denotes beginning of a student interaction
Examples: Formal Observations of Tenika

**Shows a Willingness to Engage in Literacy Tasks**

*Ms. Vaughn met with the group. She assisted the students as they looked for the following words they would find in their story: still, wardrobe, dressed, taps, and sail. The group then read Happy Birthday Sam by Pat Hutchins. Tenika read the story twice.

*I'll read it. I'll read it.*

**Asks for Help**

None noted.

**Uses Prior Knowledge**

Ms. Vaughn: What can you tell us (about your picture)?

Tenika: It's Halloween and we (Tenika and her mom) went to a Halloween party. The pumpkin melted.

**Displays Letter/Sound Knowledge**

*Tenika wrote:

Tenika finley
I went to a
Halloween pret.
My pumpkin mnot

*Tenika: Post...

Teacher: Post what?

Tenika: Man.

**Goes Beyond the Text**

*Teacher: And he is arriving at the ...

Sheila: Party.

237
Teacher: What kind of party is it?
Sheila: Birthday.

Other

*Sheila: I'm finished.

*Sheila: You do it now. Read that.

* Denotes beginning of a student interaction
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