ARF

American
Reading Forum

Yearbook

2004

Keynote Address Presented at the American Reading Forum 2003

Literacy Research on Student Learning: What Counts and Who's Counting

Donna E. Alvermann
University of Georgia

Websites, newspapers, national broadcasts, and professional journals in education continue to draw large audiences for information about the federally legislated and controversial *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001. In the year following its enactment a flagship report entitled *Every Child a Graduate* (2002) appeared on the Alliance for Excellent Education's website http://www.all4ed.org/publications/EveryChildAGraduate/every.pdf. The Alliance, a nonpartisan policy group located in Washington, DC, published the *Every Child a Graduate* framework as a means of highlighting the needs of middle and high school students—elements in our society that traditionally have been underserved by federal legislation.

Following the publication of *Every Child a Graduate*, two bills were introduced in Congress—the *Pathways for all Students to Succeed (PASS) Act* (S. 1554, available at http://www.senate.gov/%7Emurray/news.cfm?id=207153) and the *Graduation for All Act* (H.R. 3085, available at http://hinojosa.house.gov/legislation/legislation.cfm?id=419). These bills, which have yet to gain bipartisan support, nonetheless set the stage for President Bush's *Striving Readers Initiative*, a new $200 million program that is part of the proposed FY2005 budget. [Note, however, that the amount Congress appropriated for this initiative was only $24.8 million in Fiscal Year 2005 (J. Amos, personal communication, December 9, 2004)]. The *Striving Readers Initiative*, which is aimed at promoting adolescent literacy and effective reading interventions for secondary school students who read significantly below grade level, will provide funds to approximately 100 school districts for the implementation of demonstrative programs that have shown to be effective in improving adolescents' reading achievement.

Defining the Challenges

The active policy scene just encapsulated is partially fueled by the 2002 report on reading achievement from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)(National Center for Education Statistics, 2003), which indicates that approximately 25% of 8th and 12th grade students read at "below basic" levels. Translated, this means that 1 out of every 4 secondary school students tested could not identify the main idea, comprehend informational text passages, or elaborate on ideas found in the NAEP Reading 2002 passages. Looking more broadly across the age spectrum, the Alliance for Excellent Education (2003) estimates that approximately 10,000 literacy coaches will be required to meet the needs of close to 9 million 4th – 12th graders who read at what NAEP determines "below basic" level.

Although arguably persuasive, the NAEP Reading report's influence on policy makers has paled in comparison to the influence a report issued by the Manhattan Policy Institute on public high school graduation and college readiness rates in the United States (Green & Forster, 2003) has had. According to a study conducted by the Manhattan Policy Institute (Green & Forster), only 70% of all students in public high schools graduate from high school with a diploma. Every day approximately 3,000 adolescents drop out of school. In the 2002-2003 academic year, alone, close to 540,000 students left without graduating. Specifically, the study's findings (Green & Forster) include the following:

- Only 70% of all students in public high schools graduate, and only 32% of all students leave high school qualified to attend four-year colleges.
- Only 51% of all black students and 52% of all Hispanic students graduate, and only 20% of all black students and 16% of all Hispanic students leave high school college-ready.
- The graduation rate for white students was 72%; for Asian students, 79%; and for American Indian students, 54%. The college readiness rate for white students was 37%; for Asian students, 38%; for American Indian students, 14%.
- Graduation rates in the Northeast (73%) and Midwest (77%) were higher than the overall national figure, while graduation rates in the South (65%) and West (69%) were lower than the national figure. The Northeast and the Midwest had the same college readiness rate as the nation overall (32%) while the South had a higher rate (38%) and the West had a lower rate (25%).
- The state with the highest graduation rate in the nation was North Dakota (89%); the state with the lowest graduation rate in the nation was Florida (56%).
- Due to their lower college readiness rates, black and Hispanic students are seriously underrepresented in the pool of minimally qualified college applicants. Only 9% of all college-ready graduates are black and another 9% are Hispanic, compared to a total population of 18-year-olds that is 14% black and 17% Hispanic.
- The portion of all college freshmen that is black (11%) or Hispanic (7%) is very similar to their shares of the college-ready population (9% for both). This suggests that the main reason these groups are underrepresented in college admissions is that these students are not acquiring college-ready skills in the K-12 system, rather than inadequate financial aid or affirmative action policies.

Looking to Literacy Research to Address the Challenges

This paper reports on the status of research into exemplary literacy instruction in the intermediate, middle, and high school years (roughly from grades 4 – 12). Its focus is on addressing the challenges just described by looking for ways to bridge the achievement gap. This gap and how to bridge it is also the focus of a book I recently co-edited with Dorothy Strickland of Rutgers University (Strickland & Alvermann, 2004). The research literature that addresses the gap between basic and more advanced levels of reading growth among preadolescents and adolescents is concentrated largely in the areas of comprehension and vocabulary development. A smaller body of research looks at students' motivation and self-efficacy in learning with and from text. Less well researched but still important is the topic of cultural relevance in teaching.

Each of these topics is discussed in the first three sections of the paper, with particular attention given to research that has been compiled and published in the *Handbook of Reading Research: Volume 2* (Barr, Kamil, Mosenthal, & Pearson, 1991), *Handbook of Reading Research: Volume 3* (Kamil, Mosenthal, Pearson, & Barr, 2000), the *Report of the National Reading Panel* (National Reading Panel, 2000), RAND Reading Study Group's *Reading for Understanding* (2002), *Adolescents and Literacy* (Kamil, 2003), and the National Reading Conference's position paper on *Effective Literacy Instruction for Adolescents* (Alvermann, 2001). In the last two sections of the paper, I focus first on redefining exemplary instruction from a New Literacies perspective and then on drawing implications for research and policy.

Comprehension and Vocabulary Development

As a member of the RAND Reading Study Group, I worked for over two years with other literacy teacher educators and researchers, as well as with individuals outside the teaching profession, to develop a list of principles for exemplary literacy instruction at the middle and high school level. Grounded in the existing literature on reading comprehension and vocabulary development, these principles include:

- Effective reading instruction provides students with a repertoire of strategies for fostering comprehension.
- Strategy instruction that is embedded within subject-matter learning, such as history or science, improves students' reading comprehension.
- Effective strategies for teaching students to comprehend complex materials include self-questioning, answering a teacher's questions, cooperative learning, comprehension monitoring, representing information using graphic organizers, making use of different text structures, and summarizing.
- The more explicit teachers are in their strategy instruction, the more successful low-achieving students are in their reading and learning.
- Vocabulary knowledge is strongly related to successful text comprehension, and it is especially important in teaching English language learners.
- Exposing students to various genres of text (e.g., informational, narrative, poetry) ensures that they do not approach all reading tasks with the same purpose in mind.

Drawn from some of the same studies on which the National Reading Panel (NRP) (2000) based its conclusions, these six principles were framed within a sociocultural perspective. Thus, unlike the NRP, which relied solely on experimental and quasi-experimental research studies that were designed primarily to test the effectiveness of certain cognitive processes in comprehending printed texts (often within controlled conditions that did not represent typical classroom learning environments), the RAND Reading Study Group took into account the work of socioculturally, situated literacy practices as well (e.g., Dillon & O'Brien, 2001; Guzzetti & Hynd, 1998; O'Brien, 1998; Sturtevant, 1996).

However, because both the NRP and RAND Reading Study Group focused largely on comprehension studies in which individuals read in isolation of one another and recalled information in print-based texts, their respective reports reflect a rather narrow and restrictive view of the reading process. In fact, six of the seven categories of text comprehension that both

groups found effective—self-questioning, answering a teacher's questions, cooperative learning, comprehension monitoring, representing information using graphic organizers, making use of different text structures, and summarizing—include strategies content area teachers might use if their view of the reading process were one in which students work by themselves to extract information from printed texts. As pointed out elsewhere (Wade & Moje, 2000), this rather narrow view of the reading process risks disenfranchising large groups of students for whom printed texts are not the primary means through which they learn.

Motivation and Self-Efficacy in Learning From and With Text

During adolescence, as well as later in life, it is the belief in the self (or lack of such belief) that makes a difference in how competent a person feels. Perceptions of self-efficacy are central to most theories of motivation, and the research on exemplary literacy instruction bears out the hypothesized connections. For example, providing clear goals for a comprehension task to students who are experiencing reading difficulties and then giving feedback on the progress they are making can lead to increased self-efficacy and greater use of comprehension strategies (Schunk & Rice, 1993). Similarly, creating technology environments that heighten students' motivation to become independent readers and writers can increase their sense of competency (Kamil, Intrator, & Kim, 2000).

In an extensive review of how instruction influences students' reading engagement and academic performance, Guthrie and Wigfield (2000) concluded that various instructional practices, while important, do not directly impact student outcomes (e.g., time spent reading independently, achievement on standardized tests, performance assessments, and beliefs about reading). Instead, the level of student engagement (including its sustainability over time) is the mediating factor, or avenue, through which classroom instruction influences student outcomes. What this means is that teachers must take into account the degree to which students engage (or disengage) over time in a learning task.

Guthrie and Wigfield's conceptualization of the engagement model of reading calls for instruction that fosters student motivation (including self-efficacy and goal setting); strategy use (e.g., self-monitoring for breaks in comprehension and analyzing new vocabulary); growth in conceptual knowledge (e.g., reading trade books to supplement textbook information, viewing videos, and hands-on experiences); and social interaction (e.g., collaborating with peers on a science project or discussing an Internet search with the teacher).

Cultural Relevance in Teaching

As anthropologists McDermott and Varenne (1995) have pointed out, all cultures (including schools) are historically evolved ways of "doing" life. Cultures teach people about what is worth working for, how to succeed, and who will fall short. To be concise, one might say cultures are all about *what* counts. Applied to education, this notion of culture takes on a special meaning. For example, what I might view as exemplary adolescent literacy instruction (and thus "what counts" in my preservice and graduate education classes) may differ substantially from what counts as exemplary practice in middle and secondary schools. Moreover, teachers, reading specialists, counselors, and administrators working within the same school may go about this

counting in different ways, to say nothing of how policy makers at local, state, and national levels may do their counting. Thus, it is important to ask not only *what* counts but also *who* is doing the counting—and is it culturally relevant?

Cultural relevance is undeniably important in contexts that are conducive to middle and secondary school learning. For example, Moore (1996) found in an in-depth synthesis of the qualitative research on strategy instruction that the type of strategy taught is less important than the nature of the context in which it is taught, and engaging students in cooperative learning activities is conducive to subject-matter learning. Not surprisingly, the RAND Reading Study Group (2002) found similar support for these practices in the experimental and quasi-experimental research literature on comprehension instruction.

Teachers working within contexts that are conducive to learning provide students with adequate background information and relevant hands-on experience as a means of preparing them to read a textbook, view a video, listen to a tape, or search the Web for related content (Alexander & Jetton, 2000). They also look for ways to integrate reading, writing, and discussion because they know that each of these processes reinforces the other and can lead to improved comprehension and retention of course content (Alvermann, Young, Weaver, et al., 1996; Applebee, Langer, Nystrand, & Gamoran, 2003; Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko, & Mueller, 2001; Tierney & Shanahan, 1991). In sum, teachers create exemplary contexts for literacy instruction when they provide students with opportunities to use what they already know as a basis for learning new content in mutually supportive classrooms that celebrate diversity rather than view it as a problem to be overcome or "normalized."

Urban schools with large numbers of minority students have on occasion sparked some of the most creative teaching to be found anywhere, especially among teachers who have both a deep understanding of a particular subject's domain structure and a desire to make teaching that subject more responsive to students' cultural knowledge. For example, Lee (1997; 2001) used *signifying*, which is a form of talk widely practiced within the African American Vernacular English (AAVE) speech community, to scaffold or facilitate her underachieving high school students' literary responses to the mainstream canon. In writing about her experiences as a teacher in the Cultural Modeling Project that she developed, Lee (2001) explained,

> Signifying…involves innuendo, double entendre, satire, and irony, and is dense in figurative language. It often involves forms of ritual insult, but is not limited to insult. An example of signifying might be 'Yo mama so skinny she can do the hula hoop in a cheerio.' (p. 122)

Although signifying is valued for language play in its own right, Lee used her ninth graders' tacit knowledge of this discourse to help them hypothesize the meanings of various canonical texts (especially the tropes, ironies, and satires associated with these texts) and to change their hypotheses as evidence warranted. Lee took on the role of more knowledgeable other (Vygotsky, 1986) as a means of guiding and supporting her class of underachievers as they learned to bridge differences in home and school cultural practices.

Redefining Exemplary Instruction from a New Literacies Perspective

By emphasizing the ideological nature of literacy practices, Street (1995) opened the way for seeing them as socially constructed within seemingly absent but always present power relations, a view that is prevalent among individuals who subscribe to a New Literacies perspective (Luke & Elkins, 1998; New London Group, 1996; Willinsky, 1990)—one that takes into account how globalization, new information communication technologies, and multimedia are transforming our ways of knowing and making meaning in a digital world (Alvermann, 2002; Flood & Lapp, 1995; Lankshear & Knobel, 2003). These changes are not lost on adolescents or their teachers, and they have significant implications for teaching and learning in content area classrooms.

The term *adolescent literacy*, broader in scope than secondary reading, is also more inclusive of what young people currently count as texts (e.g., textbooks, music lyrics, magazines, graphic novels, blogs, and hypertexts). In fact, it is the case that many adolescents of the Net Generation are finding their own reasons for becoming literate—reasons that go beyond reading to acquire school knowledge of academic texts (Bean & Readence, 2002; Hagood, 2002; Moje, 2000; 2002; Ivey & Broaddus, 2001; Moore, Bean, Birdyshaw, & Rycik, 1999; Nixon, 1998; O'Brien, 2003). This is not to say that academic literacy is unimportant; rather, it is to emphasize the need to address the implications of youth's multiple literacies[1] for classroom instruction. For as Vacca (1998) observed years ago (and it is still the case today), "we know very little about what counts as literacy from adolescent perspectives or the literacies that adolescents engage in outside of an academic context" (p. xvi).

A small but growing body of research on youth's out-of-school literacy practices provides empirical evidence of the dynamic and permeable boundaries between age categories that were once thought separate and hierarchically in opposition to one another. Whether in home-schooling environments (Young, 2000), community-based after-school programs (Alvermann, Young, Green, & Wisenbaker, 1999; Garner, 2002; Hull & Schultz, 2001, 2002), youth organizations (Heath & McLaughlin, 1993; Kelly, 2001), or digitally-mediated environments where youth are free to exchange information through anonymous networks (Duncan & Leander, 2000; Lewis & Fabos, 1999), age differences appear to have little influence over the ways in which adults and adolescents alike make use of various literacy practices. In fact, the research on youth's out-of-school literacies complicates the very notion of *adolescence*—a term Appleman (2001) refers to as a status category, or "a kind of purgatory between childhood and adulthood" (p. 1).

This research disrupts certain assumptions about what counts (or should count) as valued literacy practices among people of all ages, while not falling prey to an overly simplistic celebration of youth culture (Hagood, 2000; Hinchman, Bourcy, & Thomas, 2002; Hull & Schultz, 2001; Lewis & Finders, 2002; Sefton-Green, 1998). What this body of research does not provide, however, is an in-depth look at how young people go about developing a sense of critical awareness of the ways in which they are implicated in the production and consumption of popular media texts that do not privilege print.

With few exceptions (e.g., Dillon & O'Brien, 2001; Chandler-Olcott & Mahar, 2001; Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 1999; Moje, 2000; Myers, Hammett, & McKillop. 2000), researchers

interested in adolescents' critical awareness have worked in classrooms where the curriculum is primarily print driven and necessarily constrained by school-based norms for teaching and learning. Thus, it remains unclear as to whether teaching youth to be critically aware using largely conventional print texts within the confines of a school curriculum can sufficiently prepare them to do the same with symbol systems other than print in out-of-school contexts. This concern is not trivial for it marks a very real tension in a post-typographic world (Reinking, Labbo, McKenna, & Kieffer, 1998).

Implications for Instruction and Policy

Although much is known about exemplary literacy instruction for adolescents, the challenge lies in implementing this research in ways that make sense to teachers whose plates are already full and overflowing. This is no small matter. In fact, remarking on the gravity of the challenge, members of the RAND Reading Study Group (2002) noted that despite a fairly well articulated knowledge base on the value of strategy instruction that fosters reading comprehension, such instruction continues to receive too little time and attention in most content area classrooms.

Important as strategy instruction is, there are larger needs not being met, perhaps due in part to a general reluctance among U.S. teachers to move beyond older programs and methods (Anders, 2002) in search of newer and more comprehensive ways of ensuring that youth's literacies in and out of school work together. For that to happen, as well as for the achievement gap to narrow, I propose the following:

- Instruction that is exemplary should take into account adolescents' personal and everyday literacies in ways that enable them to use those literacies as springboards for engaging actively in academic tasks that are both challenging and worthwhile. To accomplish this presumes an openness on educators' and policy makers' parts to think of adolescence as something other than "a kind of purgatory between childhood and adulthood" (Appleman, 2001, p. 1). It also presumes a willingness to view literacy teaching at the middle and high school levels differently. For as Lesko (2001) has so aptly stated, "if we want to see adolescence differently, we must first understand the ways we currently see, feel, think, and act toward youth, or we will merely tinker with the reigning practices" (p. 10).
- Instruction that is exemplary should be embedded in the regular curriculum and make use of the new literacies (Lankshear & Knobel, 2003), including multiple forms of texts (print, visual, and digital) that can be read critically for multiple purposes in a variety of contexts. For this to become a reality, it will be important to teach students how to use relevant background knowledge and strategies for reading, discussing, and writing about a variety of texts. It will require the support of administrators and policy makers who buy into the idea that all students, including those who struggle to read in subject area classrooms, deserve instruction that is developmentally, culturally, and linguistically responsive to their needs.
- Instruction that is exemplary should address issues of self-efficacy and engagement. It will need to involve youth in higher level thinking as they read, write, and share orally. It will mean avoiding, as Wade and Moje (2000) recommend, a transmission model of teaching with its emphasis on skill and drill, teacher-centered instruction, and passive

learning, and substituting, instead, a participatory model of instruction that actively engages students in their own learning (individually and in small groups) and that treats texts as tools for learning rather than as repositories of information to be memorized and then all too quickly forgotten.

- Instruction that is exemplary will need to draw from a knowledge base built on both experimental and qualitative research. To continue current U.S. policies for funding and reporting research that largely ignore rigorous and systematically designed qualitative research, in effect, relegating it to the status of a pseudoscience (Gutierrez et al., 2002), will produce at best only a partially informed knowledge base. At worst, such policies will be detrimental to discovering what counts as literacy from adolescents' perspectives. These policies will also deter researchers from exploring ways to integrate the "what counts" into instructional practices that hold promise for bridging the achievement gap. A broadening, rather than a narrowing, of what counts as research on adolescent literacy instruction will produce a knowledge base on which to make instructional decisions that take into account both the "what works and for whom" questions of experimental designs and the "who's counting and why" questions of qualitative research**.**

Author Note

[1]The assumption that literacy exists in the singular has been critiqued by Street (1995) and others (Barton, Hamilton, and Ivanic, 2000; Gee, 1996) for ignoring the socially situated aspects of one's multiple literacies (print, nonprint, computer, scientific, numeric) and their accompanying literate practices. A preference for literacies, as opposed to literacy in the singular, also signals a critique of the autonomous model of reading that has dominated Western thinking up to the present. The autonomous model views reading largely from a cognitive perspective—as a "natural" or neutral process, one supposedly devoid of ideological positioning and the power relations inherent in such positioning. Conceiving of literacies in the plural and as ideologically embedded does not require giving up on the cognitive aspects of reading. Rather, according to Street (1995), the ideological model subsumes the autonomous model of reading in an attempt to understand how reading is encapsulated within broader sociocultural structures (schools, governments, families, media) and the power relations that sustain them.

References

Alexander, P. A., & Jetton, T. L. (2000). Learning from text: A multidimensional and developmental perspective. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research: Vol. 3* (pp. 285-310). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2003, November 19). *Straight A's*: *2003 Progress report on American high schools*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Available at: http://www.all4ed.org/publications/reports.html

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2004, September 13). *Straight A's*: *Must be in the front row*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Available at: http://www.all4ed.org/publications/reports.html

Alvermann, D. E. (2001, September). *Effective literacy instruction for adolescents: Executive summary and paper commissioned by the National Reading Conference*. Retrieved October 19, 2003, from http://nrconline.org

Alvermann, D. E. (Ed.). (2002). *Adolescents and literacies in a digital world*. New York: Peter Lang.

Alvermann, D.E., Young, J. P., Green, C., & Wisenbaker, J. M. (1999). Adolescents' perceptions and negotiations of literacy practices in after-school Read and Talk Clubs. *American Educational Research Journal, 36*, 221-264.

Alvermann, D. E., Young, J. P., Weaver, D., Hinchman, K. A., Moore, D. W., Phelps, S. F., et al. (1996). Middle and high school students' perceptions of how they experience text-based discussions: A multicase study. *Reading Research Quarterly, 31*, 244-267.

Anders, P. L. (2002). Secondary reading programs: A story of what was. In D. L. Schallert, C. M. Fairbanks, J. Worthy, B. Maloch, & J. V. Hoffman (Eds.), *51st Yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 82-93).

Applebee, A. N., Langer, J. A., Nystrand, M., & Gamoran, A. (2003). Discussion-based approaches to developing understanding: Classroom instruction and student performance in middle and high school English. *American Educational Research Journal, 40,* 685-730.

Appleman, D. (2001, April). *Unintended betrayal: Dilemmas of representation and power in research with youth*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.

Barr, R., Kamil, M. L., Mosenthal, P. B., & Pearson, P. D. (Eds.). (1991). *Handbook of reading research, Vol. 2*. New York: Longman.

Barton, D., Hamilton, M., & Ivanic, R. (2000). *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context*. London: Routledge.

Bean, T. W., & Readence, J. E. (2002). Adolescent literacy: Charting a course for successful futures as lifelong learners. *Reading Research and Instruction, 41,* 203-209.

Chandler-Olcott, K., & Mahar, D. (2001, November). Considering genre in the digital literacy classroom. *Reading Online, 5*(4). Retrieved March 10, 2003, from http://www.readingonline.org/electronic/elec_index.asp?HREF=hillinger/index.html

Dillon, D. R., & O'Brien, D. G. (2001, April). *Reconceptualizing "at-risk" adolescent readers as literate intellectuals.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.

Duncan, B., & Leander, K. (2000, November). Girls just wanna have fun: Literacy, consumerism, and paradoxes of position on gURL.com. *Reading Online, 4*(5). Retrieved March 2, 2001, from http://www.readingonline.org/electronic/elec_index.asp?HREF=/electronic/duncan/index.html

Every child a Graduate (2002). Retrieved October 1, 2003 from http://www.all4ed.org/publications/EveryChildAGraduate/every.pdf

Flood, J., & Lapp, D. (1995). Broadening the lens: Toward an expanded conceptualization of literacy. In K. A. Hinchman, D. J. Leu, & C. K. Kinzer (Eds.), *Perspectives on literacy research and practice* (pp. 1-16). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Garner, R. (Ed.). (2002). *Hanging out: Community-based after-school programs for children.* Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Graduation for All Act (n.d.). Retrieved October 1, 2003 from http://hinojosa.house.gov/legislation.cfm?id=419

Green, J.P., & Forster, G. (2003). *Public high school graduation and college readiness rates in the United States.* New York: Manhattan Policy Institute (Education Working Paper #3).

Greenleaf, C., Schoenbach, R., Cziko, C., & Mueller, F. (2001). Apprenticing adolescent readers to academic literacy. *Harvard Educational Review, 71,* 79-129.

Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research: Vol. 3. (*pp. 403-422). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gutierrez, K. D., Asato, J., Pacheco, M., Moll, L. C., Olson, K., Horng, E. L., et al. (2002). Sounding American: The consequences of new reforms on English language learners. *Reading Research Quarterly, 37,* 328-343.

Guzzetti, B., & Hynd, C. (Eds.). (1998). *Perspectives on conceptual change: Multiple ways to understand knowing and learning in a complex world*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hagood, M. C. (2000). New times, new millennium, new literacies. *Reading Research and Instruction, 39,* 311-328.

Hagood, M. C. (2002). Critical literacy for whom? *Reading Research and Instruction*, *41,* 247-266.

Heath, S. B., & McLaughlin, M. W. (Eds.). (1993). *Identity and inner-city youth: Beyond ethnicity and gender*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hinchman, K. A., Bourcy, L. P., & Thomas, H. (2002). Representing adolescents' literacies: Case studies of three white males. *Reading Research and Instruction, 41*, 229-246.

Hull, G., & Schultz, K. (2001). Literacy and learning out of school: A review of theory and research. *Review of Educational Research, 71*, 575-611.

Hull, G., & Schultz, K. (Eds.). (2002). *School's out!: Bridging out-of-school literacies with classroom practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ivey, G., & Broaddus, K. (2001). Just plain reading: A survey of what makes kids want to read in middle school classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly, 34,* 224-343.

Kamberelis, G., & Dimitriadis, G. (1999). Talkin' Tupac: Speech genres and the mediation of cultural knowledge. In C. McCarthy, G. Hudak, S. Miklaucic, & P. Saukko. (Eds.), *Sound identities: Popular music and the cultural politics of education* (pp. 119-150). New York: Peter Lang.

Kamil, M. L. (2003). *Adolescents and literacy: Reading for the 21st century*. Retrieved November 23, 2003, from, http://www.all4ed.org/publications/AdolescentsAndLiteracy.pdf

Kamil, M. L., Intrator, S. M., & Kim, H. S. (2000). The effects of other technologies on literacy and literacy learning. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research: Vol. 3* (pp.771-788). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kamil, M. L., Mosenthal, P. B., Pearson, P. D., & Barr, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Handbook of reading research: Volume 3*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kelly, M. M. (2001). The education of African American youth: Literacy practices and identity representation in church and school. In E. B. Moje & D. G. O'Brien (Eds.), *Constructions of literacy: Studies of teaching and learning in and out of secondary school* (pp. 239-259). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2003). *New literacies: Changing knowledge and classroom learning*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Lee, C. D. (1997). Bridging home and school literacies: Models for culturally responsive teaching, a case for African American English. In J. Flood, S. B. Heath, & D. Lapp (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching literacy through the communicative and visual arts* (p. 334-345). New York: Macmillan.

Lee, C. D. (2001). Is October Brown Chinese? A cultural modeling activity system for underachieving students. *American Educational Research Journal, 38,* 97-141.

Lesko, N. (2001). *Act your age! A cultural construction of adolescence*. New York: Routledge.

Lewis, C., & Fabos, B. (1999, December). *Chatting on-line: Uses of instant message communication among adolescent girls*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Reading Conference, Orlando, FL.

Lewis, C., & Finders, M. (2002). Implied adolescents and implied teachers: A generation gap for new times. In D. E. Alvermann (Ed.), *Adolescents and literacies in a digital world*. New York: Peter Lang.

Luke, A., & Elkins, J. (1998). Reinventing literacy in new times. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 42*, 4-7.

Manhattan Policy Institute. (2003). *Public high school graduation and college readiness rates in the United States*. (Education Working Paper #3). New York: Green, J. P., & Forster, G.

McDermott, R., & Varenne, H. (1995). Culture as disability. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 26,* 324-348.

Moje, E. B. (2000). To be part of the story: The literacy practices of gangsta adolescents. *Teachers College Record, 102*, 651-690.

Moje, E. B. (2002). Re-framing adolescent literacy research for new times: Studying youth as a resource. *Reading Research and Instruction, 41,* 211-228.

Moore, D. W. (1996). Contexts for literacy in secondary schools. In D. J. Leu, C. K. Kinzer, & K. A. Hinchman (Eds.), *Literacies for the 21st century: Research and practice* (pp. 15-46). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Moore, D. W., Bean, T. W., Birdyshaw, D., & Rycik, J. A. (1999). Adolescent literacy: A position statement. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 43,* 97-112.

Myers, J., Hammett, R., & McKillop, A. M. (2000). Connecting, exploring, and exposing the self in hypermedia projects. In M. A. Gallego &. S. Hollingsworth (Eds.), *What counts as literacy: Challenging the school standard* (pp. 85-105). New York: Teachers College Press.

National Center for Education Statistics (2003). *The nation's report card: Reading highlights 2002.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Reading Panel. (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review, 66,* p. 60-92.

Nixon, H. (1998). Fun and games are serious business. In J. Sefton-Green (Ed.), *Digital diversions Youth culture in the age of multimedia* (pp. 21-42). London, UK: University College London Press.

O'Brien, D. G. (1998). Multiple literacies in a high-school program for at-risk adolescents. In D. E. Alvermann, K. A. Hinchman, D. W. Moore, S. F. Phelps, & D. R. Waff (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing the literacies in adolescents' lives* (pp. 27-49). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

O'Brien, D. (2003, March). Juxtaposing traditional and intermedial literacies to redefine the competence of struggling adolescents. *Reading Online, 6*(7). Retrieved March 15, 2003, from http://www.readingonline.org/newliteracies/lit_index.asp?HREF=obrien2/

Pathways for All Students to Succeed (PASS)Act. Retrieved October 1, 2003 from http://www.senate.gov.%7Emurray/news.cfm?id=207153

Rand Reading Study Group (2002). *Reading for understanding: Toward an R & D program in reading comprehension.* Santa Monica, CA: Science & Technology Policy Institute, RAND Education.

Reinking, D., Labbo, L., McKenna, M., & Kieffer, R. (Eds.). (1998). *Handbook of literacy and technology: Transformations in a post-typographic world.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Schunk, D. H., & Rice, J. M. (1993). Strategy fading and progress feedback: Effects on self-efficacy and comprehension among students receiving remedial reading services. *Journal of Special Education, 27,* 257-276.

Sefton-Green, J. (1998). Introduction: Being young in the digital age. In J. Sefton-Green (Ed.), *Digital diversions: Youth culture in the age of multimedia* (pp. 1-20). London, UK: University College London Press.

Street, B. V. (1995). *Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy in development, ethnography, and education*. New York: Longman.

Strickland, D. S., & Alvermann, D. E. (2004). *Bridging the literacy achievement gap, grades 4-12*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sturtevant, E. G. (1996). Lifetime influences on the literacy-related instructional beliefs of experienced high school history teachers: Two comparative case studies. *Journal of Literacy Research, 28,* 227-257.

Tierney, R. J., & Shanahan, T. (1991). Research on the reading-writing relationship: Interactions, transactions, and outcomes. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research, Vol. 2* (pp. 246-280). New York: Longman.

Vacca, R. T. (1998). Foreword. In D. E. Alvermann, K. A. Hinchman, D. W. Moore, S. F. Phelps, & D. R. Waff (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing the literacies in adolescents' lives* (pp. xv-xvi). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. (A. Kozulin, Ed. & Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wade, S. E., & Moje, E. B. (2000).The role of text in classroom learning. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research: Vol. 3* (pp. 609-627). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Willinsky, J. (1990). *The new literacy: Redefining reading and writing in the schools*. New York: Routledge.

Young, J. (2000). Boy talk: Critical literacy and masculinities. *Reading Research Quarterly, 35,* 312-323.

Keynote Address Presented at the American Reading Forum 2003

Literacy Research on Student Learning: What Counts and Who's Counting

Donna E. Alvermann
University of Georgia

Websites, newspapers, national broadcasts, and professional journals in education continue to draw large audiences for information about the federally legislated and controversial *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001. In the year following its enactment a flagship report entitled *Every Child a Graduate* (2002) appeared on the Alliance for Excellent Education's website http://www.all4ed.org/publications/EveryChildAGraduate/every.pdf. The Alliance, a nonpartisan policy group located in Washington, DC, published the *Every Child a Graduate* framework as a means of highlighting the needs of middle and high school students—elements in our society that traditionally have been underserved by federal legislation.

Following the publication of *Every Child a Graduate*, two bills were introduced in Congress—the *Pathways for all Students to Succeed (PASS) Act* (S. 1554, available at http://www.senate.gov/%7Emurray/news.cfm?id=207153) and the *Graduation for All Act* (H.R. 3085, available at http://hinojosa.house.gov/legislation/legislation.cfm?id=419). These bills, which have yet to gain bipartisan support, nonetheless set the stage for President Bush's *Striving Readers Initiative*, a new $200 million program that is part of the proposed FY2005 budget. [Note, however, that the amount Congress appropriated for this initiative was only $24.8 million in Fiscal Year 2005 (J. Amos, personal communication, December 9, 2004)]. The *Striving Readers Initiative*, which is aimed at promoting adolescent literacy and effective reading interventions for secondary school students who read significantly below grade level, will provide funds to approximately 100 school districts for the implementation of demonstrative programs that have shown to be effective in improving adolescents' reading achievement.

Defining the Challenges

The active policy scene just encapsulated is partially fueled by the 2002 report on reading achievement from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)(National Center for Education Statistics, 2003), which indicates that approximately 25% of 8th and 12th grade students read at "below basic" levels. Translated, this means that 1 out of every 4 secondary school students tested could not identify the main idea, comprehend informational text passages, or elaborate on ideas found in the NAEP Reading 2002 passages. Looking more broadly across the age spectrum, the Alliance for Excellent Education (2003) estimates that approximately 10,000 literacy coaches will be required to meet the needs of close to 9 million 4th – 12th graders who read at what NAEP determines "below basic" level.

Although arguably persuasive, the NAEP Reading report's influence on policy makers has paled in comparison to the influence a report issued by the Manhattan Policy Institute on public high school graduation and college readiness rates in the United States (Green & Forster, 2003) has had. According to a study conducted by the Manhattan Policy Institute (Green & Forster), only 70% of all students in public high schools graduate from high school with a diploma. Every day approximately 3,000 adolescents drop out of school. In the 2002-2003 academic year, alone, close to 540,000 students left without graduating. Specifically, the study's findings (Green & Forster) include the following:

- Only 70% of all students in public high schools graduate, and only 32% of all students leave high school qualified to attend four-year colleges.
- Only 51% of all black students and 52% of all Hispanic students graduate, and only 20% of all black students and 16% of all Hispanic students leave high school college-ready.
- The graduation rate for white students was 72%; for Asian students, 79%; and for American Indian students, 54%. The college readiness rate for white students was 37%; for Asian students, 38%; for American Indian students, 14%.
- Graduation rates in the Northeast (73%) and Midwest (77%) were higher than the overall national figure, while graduation rates in the South (65%) and West (69%) were lower than the national figure. The Northeast and the Midwest had the same college readiness rate as the nation overall (32%) while the South had a higher rate (38%) and the West had a lower rate (25%).
- The state with the highest graduation rate in the nation was North Dakota (89%); the state with the lowest graduation rate in the nation was Florida (56%).
- Due to their lower college readiness rates, black and Hispanic students are seriously underrepresented in the pool of minimally qualified college applicants. Only 9% of all college-ready graduates are black and another 9% are Hispanic, compared to a total population of 18-year-olds that is 14% black and 17% Hispanic.
- The portion of all college freshmen that is black (11%) or Hispanic (7%) is very similar to their shares of the college-ready population (9% for both). This suggests that the main reason these groups are underrepresented in college admissions is that these students are not acquiring college-ready skills in the K-12 system, rather than inadequate financial aid or affirmative action policies.

Looking to Literacy Research to Address the Challenges

This paper reports on the status of research into exemplary literacy instruction in the intermediate, middle, and high school years (roughly from grades 4 – 12). Its focus is on addressing the challenges just described by looking for ways to bridge the achievement gap. This gap and how to bridge it is also the focus of a book I recently co-edited with Dorothy Strickland of Rutgers University (Strickland & Alvermann, 2004). The research literature that addresses the gap between basic and more advanced levels of reading growth among preadolescents and adolescents is concentrated largely in the areas of comprehension and vocabulary development. A smaller body of research looks at students' motivation and self-efficacy in learning with and from text. Less well researched but still important is the topic of cultural relevance in teaching.

Each of these topics is discussed in the first three sections of the paper, with particular attention given to research that has been compiled and published in the *Handbook of Reading Research: Volume 2* (Barr, Kamil, Mosenthal, & Pearson, 1991), *Handbook of Reading Research: Volume 3* (Kamil, Mosenthal, Pearson, & Barr, 2000), the *Report of the National Reading Panel* (National Reading Panel, 2000), RAND Reading Study Group's *Reading for Understanding* (2002), *Adolescents and Literacy* (Kamil, 2003), and the National Reading Conference's position paper on *Effective Literacy Instruction for Adolescents* (Alvermann, 2001). In the last two sections of the paper, I focus first on redefining exemplary instruction from a New Literacies perspective and then on drawing implications for research and policy.

Comprehension and Vocabulary Development

As a member of the RAND Reading Study Group, I worked for over two years with other literacy teacher educators and researchers, as well as with individuals outside the teaching profession, to develop a list of principles for exemplary literacy instruction at the middle and high school level. Grounded in the existing literature on reading comprehension and vocabulary development, these principles include:

- Effective reading instruction provides students with a repertoire of strategies for fostering comprehension.
- Strategy instruction that is embedded within subject-matter learning, such as history or science, improves students' reading comprehension.
- Effective strategies for teaching students to comprehend complex materials include self-questioning, answering a teacher's questions, cooperative learning, comprehension monitoring, representing information using graphic organizers, making use of different text structures, and summarizing.
- The more explicit teachers are in their strategy instruction, the more successful low-achieving students are in their reading and learning.
- Vocabulary knowledge is strongly related to successful text comprehension, and it is especially important in teaching English language learners.
- Exposing students to various genres of text (e.g., informational, narrative, poetry) ensures that they do not approach all reading tasks with the same purpose in mind.

Drawn from some of the same studies on which the National Reading Panel (NRP) (2000) based its conclusions, these six principles were framed within a sociocultural perspective. Thus, unlike the NRP, which relied solely on experimental and quasi-experimental research studies that were designed primarily to test the effectiveness of certain cognitive processes in comprehending printed texts (often within controlled conditions that did not represent typical classroom learning environments), the RAND Reading Study Group took into account the work of socioculturally, situated literacy practices as well (e.g., Dillon & O'Brien, 2001; Guzzetti & Hynd, 1998; O'Brien, 1998; Sturtevant, 1996).

However, because both the NRP and RAND Reading Study Group focused largely on comprehension studies in which individuals read in isolation of one another and recalled information in print-based texts, their respective reports reflect a rather narrow and restrictive view of the reading process. In fact, six of the seven categories of text comprehension that both

groups found effective—self-questioning, answering a teacher's questions, cooperative learning, comprehension monitoring, representing information using graphic organizers, making use of different text structures, and summarizing—include strategies content area teachers might use if their view of the reading process were one in which students work by themselves to extract information from printed texts. As pointed out elsewhere (Wade & Moje, 2000), this rather narrow view of the reading process risks disenfranchising large groups of students for whom printed texts are not the primary means through which they learn.

Motivation and Self-Efficacy in Learning From and With Text

During adolescence, as well as later in life, it is the belief in the self (or lack of such belief) that makes a difference in how competent a person feels. Perceptions of self-efficacy are central to most theories of motivation, and the research on exemplary literacy instruction bears out the hypothesized connections. For example, providing clear goals for a comprehension task to students who are experiencing reading difficulties and then giving feedback on the progress they are making can lead to increased self-efficacy and greater use of comprehension strategies (Schunk & Rice, 1993). Similarly, creating technology environments that heighten students' motivation to become independent readers and writers can increase their sense of competency (Kamil, Intrator, & Kim, 2000).

In an extensive review of how instruction influences students' reading engagement and academic performance, Guthrie and Wigfield (2000) concluded that various instructional practices, while important, do not directly impact student outcomes (e.g., time spent reading independently, achievement on standardized tests, performance assessments, and beliefs about reading). Instead, the level of student engagement (including its sustainability over time) is the mediating factor, or avenue, through which classroom instruction influences student outcomes. What this means is that teachers must take into account the degree to which students engage (or disengage) over time in a learning task.

Guthrie and Wigfield's conceptualization of the engagement model of reading calls for instruction that fosters student motivation (including self-efficacy and goal setting); strategy use (e.g., self-monitoring for breaks in comprehension and analyzing new vocabulary); growth in conceptual knowledge (e.g., reading trade books to supplement textbook information, viewing videos, and hands-on experiences); and social interaction (e.g., collaborating with peers on a science project or discussing an Internet search with the teacher).

Cultural Relevance in Teaching

As anthropologists McDermott and Varenne (1995) have pointed out, all cultures (including schools) are historically evolved ways of "doing" life. Cultures teach people about what is worth working for, how to succeed, and who will fall short. To be concise, one might say cultures are all about *what* counts. Applied to education, this notion of culture takes on a special meaning. For example, what I might view as exemplary adolescent literacy instruction (and thus "what counts" in my preservice and graduate education classes) may differ substantially from what counts as exemplary practice in middle and secondary schools. Moreover, teachers, reading specialists, counselors, and administrators working within the same school may go about this

counting in different ways, to say nothing of how policy makers at local, state, and national levels may do their counting. Thus, it is important to ask not only *what* counts but also *who* is doing the counting—and is it culturally relevant?

Cultural relevance is undeniably important in contexts that are conducive to middle and secondary school learning. For example, Moore (1996) found in an in-depth synthesis of the qualitative research on strategy instruction that the type of strategy taught is less important than the nature of the context in which it is taught, and engaging students in cooperative learning activities is conducive to subject-matter learning. Not surprisingly, the RAND Reading Study Group (2002) found similar support for these practices in the experimental and quasi-experimental research literature on comprehension instruction.

Teachers working within contexts that are conducive to learning provide students with adequate background information and relevant hands-on experience as a means of preparing them to read a textbook, view a video, listen to a tape, or search the Web for related content (Alexander & Jetton, 2000). They also look for ways to integrate reading, writing, and discussion because they know that each of these processes reinforces the other and can lead to improved comprehension and retention of course content (Alvermann, Young, Weaver, et al., 1996; Applebee, Langer, Nystrand, & Gamoran, 2003; Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko, & Mueller, 2001; Tierney & Shanahan, 1991). In sum, teachers create exemplary contexts for literacy instruction when they provide students with opportunities to use what they already know as a basis for learning new content in mutually supportive classrooms that celebrate diversity rather than view it as a problem to be overcome or "normalized."

Urban schools with large numbers of minority students have on occasion sparked some of the most creative teaching to be found anywhere, especially among teachers who have both a deep understanding of a particular subject's domain structure and a desire to make teaching that subject more responsive to students' cultural knowledge. For example, Lee (1997; 2001) used *signifying*, which is a form of talk widely practiced within the African American Vernacular English (AAVE) speech community, to scaffold or facilitate her underachieving high school students' literary responses to the mainstream canon. In writing about her experiences as a teacher in the Cultural Modeling Project that she developed, Lee (2001) explained,

> Signifying…involves innuendo, double entendre, satire, and irony, and is dense in figurative language. It often involves forms of ritual insult, but is not limited to insult. An example of signifying might be 'Yo mama so skinny she can do the hula hoop in a cheerio.' (p. 122)

Although signifying is valued for language play in its own right, Lee used her ninth graders' tacit knowledge of this discourse to help them hypothesize the meanings of various canonical texts (especially the tropes, ironies, and satires associated with these texts) and to change their hypotheses as evidence warranted. Lee took on the role of more knowledgeable other (Vygotsky, 1986) as a means of guiding and supporting her class of underachievers as they learned to bridge differences in home and school cultural practices.

Redefining Exemplary Instruction from a New Literacies Perspective

By emphasizing the ideological nature of literacy practices, Street (1995) opened the way for seeing them as socially constructed within seemingly absent but always present power relations, a view that is prevalent among individuals who subscribe to a New Literacies perspective (Luke & Elkins, 1998; New London Group, 1996; Willinsky, 1990)—one that takes into account how globalization, new information communication technologies, and multimedia are transforming our ways of knowing and making meaning in a digital world (Alvermann, 2002; Flood & Lapp, 1995; Lankshear & Knobel, 2003). These changes are not lost on adolescents or their teachers, and they have significant implications for teaching and learning in content area classrooms.

The term *adolescent literacy*, broader in scope than secondary reading, is also more inclusive of what young people currently count as texts (e.g., textbooks, music lyrics, magazines, graphic novels, blogs, and hypertexts). In fact, it is the case that many adolescents of the Net Generation are finding their own reasons for becoming literate—reasons that go beyond reading to acquire school knowledge of academic texts (Bean & Readence, 2002; Hagood, 2002; Moje, 2000; 2002; Ivey & Broaddus, 2001; Moore, Bean, Birdyshaw, & Rycik, 1999; Nixon, 1998; O'Brien, 2003). This is not to say that academic literacy is unimportant; rather, it is to emphasize the need to address the implications of youth's multiple literacies[1] for classroom instruction. For as Vacca (1998) observed years ago (and it is still the case today), "we know very little about what counts as literacy from adolescent perspectives or the literacies that adolescents engage in outside of an academic context" (p. xvi).

A small but growing body of research on youth's out-of-school literacy practices provides empirical evidence of the dynamic and permeable boundaries between age categories that were once thought separate and hierarchically in opposition to one another. Whether in home-schooling environments (Young, 2000), community-based after-school programs (Alvermann, Young, Green, & Wisenbaker, 1999; Garner, 2002; Hull & Schultz, 2001, 2002), youth organizations (Heath & McLaughlin, 1993; Kelly, 2001), or digitally-mediated environments where youth are free to exchange information through anonymous networks (Duncan & Leander, 2000; Lewis & Fabos, 1999), age differences appear to have little influence over the ways in which adults and adolescents alike make use of various literacy practices. In fact, the research on youth's out-of-school literacies complicates the very notion of *adolescence*—a term Appleman (2001) refers to as a status category, or "a kind of purgatory between childhood and adulthood" (p. 1).

This research disrupts certain assumptions about what counts (or should count) as valued literacy practices among people of all ages, while not falling prey to an overly simplistic celebration of youth culture (Hagood, 2000; Hinchman, Bourcy, & Thomas, 2002; Hull & Schultz, 2001; Lewis & Finders, 2002; Sefton-Green, 1998). What this body of research does not provide, however, is an in-depth look at how young people go about developing a sense of critical awareness of the ways in which they are implicated in the production and consumption of popular media texts that do not privilege print.

With few exceptions (e.g., Dillon & O'Brien, 2001; Chandler-Olcott & Mahar, 2001; Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 1999; Moje, 2000; Myers, Hammett, & McKillop. 2000), researchers

interested in adolescents' critical awareness have worked in classrooms where the curriculum is primarily print driven and necessarily constrained by school-based norms for teaching and learning. Thus, it remains unclear as to whether teaching youth to be critically aware using largely conventional print texts within the confines of a school curriculum can sufficiently prepare them to do the same with symbol systems other than print in out-of-school contexts. This concern is not trivial for it marks a very real tension in a post-typographic world (Reinking, Labbo, McKenna, & Kieffer, 1998).

Implications for Instruction and Policy

Although much is known about exemplary literacy instruction for adolescents, the challenge lies in implementing this research in ways that make sense to teachers whose plates are already full and overflowing. This is no small matter. In fact, remarking on the gravity of the challenge, members of the RAND Reading Study Group (2002) noted that despite a fairly well articulated knowledge base on the value of strategy instruction that fosters reading comprehension, such instruction continues to receive too little time and attention in most content area classrooms.

Important as strategy instruction is, there are larger needs not being met, perhaps due in part to a general reluctance among U.S. teachers to move beyond older programs and methods (Anders, 2002) in search of newer and more comprehensive ways of ensuring that youth's literacies in and out of school work together. For that to happen, as well as for the achievement gap to narrow, I propose the following:

- Instruction that is exemplary should take into account adolescents' personal and everyday literacies in ways that enable them to use those literacies as springboards for engaging actively in academic tasks that are both challenging and worthwhile. To accomplish this presumes an openness on educators' and policy makers' parts to think of adolescence as something other than "a kind of purgatory between childhood and adulthood" (Appleman, 2001, p. 1). It also presumes a willingness to view literacy teaching at the middle and high school levels differently. For as Lesko (2001) has so aptly stated, "if we want to see adolescence differently, we must first understand the ways we currently see, feel, think, and act toward youth, or we will merely tinker with the reigning practices" (p. 10).
- Instruction that is exemplary should be embedded in the regular curriculum and make use of the new literacies (Lankshear & Knobel, 2003), including multiple forms of texts (print, visual, and digital) that can be read critically for multiple purposes in a variety of contexts. For this to become a reality, it will be important to teach students how to use relevant background knowledge and strategies for reading, discussing, and writing about a variety of texts. It will require the support of administrators and policy makers who buy into the idea that all students, including those who struggle to read in subject area classrooms, deserve instruction that is developmentally, culturally, and linguistically responsive to their needs.
- Instruction that is exemplary should address issues of self-efficacy and engagement. It will need to involve youth in higher level thinking as they read, write, and share orally. It will mean avoiding, as Wade and Moje (2000) recommend, a transmission model of teaching with its emphasis on skill and drill, teacher-centered instruction, and passive

learning, and substituting, instead, a participatory model of instruction that actively engages students in their own learning (individually and in small groups) and that treats texts as tools for learning rather than as repositories of information to be memorized and then all too quickly forgotten.

- Instruction that is exemplary will need to draw from a knowledge base built on both experimental and qualitative research. To continue current U.S. policies for funding and reporting research that largely ignore rigorous and systematically designed qualitative research, in effect, relegating it to the status of a pseudoscience (Gutierrez et al., 2002), will produce at best only a partially informed knowledge base. At worst, such policies will be detrimental to discovering what counts as literacy from adolescents' perspectives. These policies will also deter researchers from exploring ways to integrate the "what counts" into instructional practices that hold promise for bridging the achievement gap. A broadening, rather than a narrowing, of what counts as research on adolescent literacy instruction will produce a knowledge base on which to make instructional decisions that take into account both the "what works and for whom" questions of experimental designs and the "who's counting and why" questions of qualitative research**.**

Author Note

[1]The assumption that literacy exists in the singular has been critiqued by Street (1995) and others (Barton, Hamilton, and Ivanic, 2000; Gee, 1996) for ignoring the socially situated aspects of one's multiple literacies (print, nonprint, computer, scientific, numeric) and their accompanying literate practices. A preference for literacies, as opposed to literacy in the singular, also signals a critique of the autonomous model of reading that has dominated Western thinking up to the present. The autonomous model views reading largely from a cognitive perspective—as a "natural" or neutral process, one supposedly devoid of ideological positioning and the power relations inherent in such positioning. Conceiving of literacies in the plural and as ideologically embedded does not require giving up on the cognitive aspects of reading. Rather, according to Street (1995), the ideological model subsumes the autonomous model of reading in an attempt to understand how reading is encapsulated within broader sociocultural structures (schools, governments, families, media) and the power relations that sustain them.

References

Alexander, P. A., & Jetton, T. L. (2000). Learning from text: A multidimensional and developmental perspective. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research: Vol. 3* (pp. 285-310). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2003, November 19). *Straight A's*: *2003 Progress report on American high schools*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Available at: http://www.all4ed.org/publications/reports.html

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2004, September 13). *Straight A's*: *Must be in the front row*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Available at: http://www.all4ed.org/publications/reports.html

Alvermann, D. E. (2001, September). *Effective literacy instruction for adolescents: Executive summary and paper commissioned by the National Reading Conference*. Retrieved October 19, 2003, from http://nrconline.org

Alvermann, D. E. (Ed.). (2002). *Adolescents and literacies in a digital world*. New York: Peter Lang.

Alvermann, D.E., Young, J. P., Green, C., & Wisenbaker, J. M. (1999). Adolescents' perceptions and negotiations of literacy practices in after-school Read and Talk Clubs. *American Educational Research Journal, 36*, 221-264.

Alvermann, D. E., Young, J. P., Weaver, D., Hinchman, K. A., Moore, D. W., Phelps, S. F., et al. (1996). Middle and high school students' perceptions of how they experience text-based discussions: A multicase study. *Reading Research Quarterly, 31*, 244-267.

Anders, P. L. (2002). Secondary reading programs: A story of what was. In D. L. Schallert, C. M. Fairbanks, J. Worthy, B. Maloch, & J. V. Hoffman (Eds.), *51st Yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 82-93).

Applebee, A. N., Langer, J. A., Nystrand, M., & Gamoran, A. (2003). Discussion-based approaches to developing understanding: Classroom instruction and student performance in middle and high school English. *American Educational Research Journal, 40,* 685-730.

Appleman, D. (2001, April). *Unintended betrayal: Dilemmas of representation and power in research with youth*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.

Barr, R., Kamil, M. L., Mosenthal, P. B., & Pearson, P. D. (Eds.). (1991). *Handbook of reading research, Vol. 2*. New York: Longman.

Barton, D., Hamilton, M., & Ivanic, R. (2000). *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context*. London: Routledge.

Bean, T. W., & Readence, J. E. (2002). Adolescent literacy: Charting a course for successful futures as lifelong learners. *Reading Research and Instruction, 41,* 203-209.

Chandler-Olcott, K., & Mahar, D. (2001, November). Considering genre in the digital literacy classroom. *Reading Online, 5*(4). Retrieved March 10, 2003, from http://www.readingonline.org/electronic/elec_index.asp?HREF=hillinger/index.html

Dillon, D. R., & O'Brien, D. G. (2001, April). *Reconceptualizing "at-risk" adolescent readers as literate intellectuals.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.

Duncan, B., & Leander, K. (2000, November). Girls just wanna have fun: Literacy, consumerism, and paradoxes of position on gURL.com. *Reading Online, 4*(5). Retrieved March 2, 2001, from http://www.readingonline.org/electronic/elec_index.asp?HREF=/electronic/duncan/index.html

Every child a Graduate (2002). Retrieved October 1, 2003 from http://www.all4ed.org/publications/EveryChildAGraduate/every.pdf

Flood, J., & Lapp, D. (1995). Broadening the lens: Toward an expanded conceptualization of literacy. In K. A. Hinchman, D. J. Leu, & C. K. Kinzer (Eds.), *Perspectives on literacy research and practice* (pp. 1-16). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Garner, R. (Ed.). (2002). *Hanging out: Community-based after-school programs for children.* Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Graduation for All Act (n.d.). Retrieved October 1, 2003 from http://hinojosa.house.gov/legislation.cfm?id=419

Green, J.P., & Forster, G. (2003). *Public high school graduation and college readiness rates in the United States.* New York: Manhattan Policy Institute (Education Working Paper #3).

Greenleaf, C., Schoenbach, R., Cziko, C., & Mueller, F. (2001). Apprenticing adolescent readers to academic literacy. *Harvard Educational Review, 71,* 79-129.

Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research: Vol. 3. (*pp. 403-422). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gutierrez, K. D., Asato, J., Pacheco, M., Moll, L. C., Olson, K., Horng, E. L., et al. (2002). Sounding American: The consequences of new reforms on English language learners. *Reading Research Quarterly, 37,* 328-343.

Guzzetti, B., & Hynd, C. (Eds.). (1998). *Perspectives on conceptual change: Multiple ways to understand knowing and learning in a complex world*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hagood, M. C. (2000). New times, new millennium, new literacies. *Reading Research and Instruction, 39,* 311-328.

Hagood, M. C. (2002). Critical literacy for whom? *Reading Research and Instruction*, *41,* 247-266.

Heath, S. B., & McLaughlin, M. W. (Eds.). (1993). *Identity and inner-city youth: Beyond ethnicity and gender*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hinchman, K. A., Bourcy, L. P., & Thomas, H. (2002). Representing adolescents' literacies: Case studies of three white males. *Reading Research and Instruction, 41*, 229-246.

Hull, G., & Schultz, K. (2001). Literacy and learning out of school: A review of theory and research. *Review of Educational Research, 71*, 575-611.

Hull, G., & Schultz, K. (Eds.). (2002). *School's out!: Bridging out-of-school literacies with classroom practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ivey, G., & Broaddus, K. (2001). Just plain reading: A survey of what makes kids want to read in middle school classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly, 34,* 224-343.

Kamberelis, G., & Dimitriadis, G. (1999). Talkin' Tupac: Speech genres and the mediation of cultural knowledge. In C. McCarthy, G. Hudak, S. Miklaucic, & P. Saukko. (Eds.), *Sound identities: Popular music and the cultural politics of education* (pp. 119-150). New York: Peter Lang.

Kamil, M. L. (2003). *Adolescents and literacy: Reading for the 21st century*. Retrieved November 23, 2003, from, http://www.all4ed.org/publications/AdolescentsAndLiteracy.pdf

Kamil, M. L., Intrator, S. M., & Kim, H. S. (2000). The effects of other technologies on literacy and literacy learning. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research: Vol. 3* (pp.771-788). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kamil, M. L., Mosenthal, P. B., Pearson, P. D., & Barr, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Handbook of reading research: Volume 3*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kelly, M. M. (2001). The education of African American youth: Literacy practices and identity representation in church and school. In E. B. Moje & D. G. O'Brien (Eds.), *Constructions of literacy: Studies of teaching and learning in and out of secondary school* (pp. 239-259). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2003). *New literacies: Changing knowledge and classroom learning*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Lee, C. D. (1997). Bridging home and school literacies: Models for culturally responsive teaching, a case for African American English. In J. Flood, S. B. Heath, & D. Lapp (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching literacy through the communicative and visual arts* (p. 334-345). New York: Macmillan.

Lee, C. D. (2001). Is October Brown Chinese? A cultural modeling activity system for underachieving students. *American Educational Research Journal, 38,* 97-141.

Lesko, N. (2001). *Act your age! A cultural construction of adolescence*. New York: Routledge.

Lewis, C., & Fabos, B. (1999, December). *Chatting on-line: Uses of instant message communication among adolescent girls*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Reading Conference, Orlando, FL.

Lewis, C., & Finders, M. (2002). Implied adolescents and implied teachers: A generation gap for new times. In D. E. Alvermann (Ed.), *Adolescents and literacies in a digital world*. New York: Peter Lang.

Luke, A., & Elkins, J. (1998). Reinventing literacy in new times. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 42*, 4-7.

Manhattan Policy Institute. (2003). *Public high school graduation and college readiness rates in the United States*. (Education Working Paper #3). New York: Green, J. P., & Forster, G.

McDermott, R., & Varenne, H. (1995). Culture as disability. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 26,* 324-348.

Moje, E. B. (2000). To be part of the story: The literacy practices of gangsta adolescents. *Teachers College Record, 102*, 651-690.

Moje, E. B. (2002). Re-framing adolescent literacy research for new times: Studying youth as a resource. *Reading Research and Instruction, 41,* 211-228.

Moore, D. W. (1996). Contexts for literacy in secondary schools. In D. J. Leu, C. K. Kinzer, & K. A. Hinchman (Eds.), *Literacies for the 21st century: Research and practice* (pp. 15-46). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Moore, D. W., Bean, T. W., Birdyshaw, D., & Rycik, J. A. (1999). Adolescent literacy: A position statement. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 43,* 97-112.

Myers, J., Hammett, R., & McKillop, A. M. (2000). Connecting, exploring, and exposing the self in hypermedia projects. In M. A. Gallego &. S. Hollingsworth (Eds.), *What counts as literacy: Challenging the school standard* (pp. 85-105). New York: Teachers College Press.

National Center for Education Statistics (2003). *The nation's report card: Reading highlights 2002.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Reading Panel. (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review, 66,* p. 60-92.

Nixon, H. (1998). Fun and games are serious business. In J. Sefton-Green (Ed.), *Digital diversions Youth culture in the age of multimedia* (pp. 21-42). London, UK: University College London Press.

O'Brien, D. G. (1998). Multiple literacies in a high-school program for at-risk adolescents. In D. E. Alvermann, K. A. Hinchman, D. W. Moore, S. F. Phelps, & D. R. Waff (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing the literacies in adolescents' lives* (pp. 27-49). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

O'Brien, D. (2003, March). Juxtaposing traditional and intermedial literacies to redefine the competence of struggling adolescents. *Reading Online, 6*(7). Retrieved March 15, 2003, from http://www.readingonline.org/newliteracies/lit_index.asp?HREF=obrien2/

Pathways for All Students to Succeed (PASS)Act. Retrieved October 1, 2003 from http://www.senate.gov.%7Emurray/news.cfm?id=207153

Rand Reading Study Group (2002). *Reading for understanding: Toward an R & D program in reading comprehension.* Santa Monica, CA: Science & Technology Policy Institute, RAND Education.

Reinking, D., Labbo, L., McKenna, M., & Kieffer, R. (Eds.). (1998). *Handbook of literacy and technology: Transformations in a post-typographic world.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Schunk, D. H., & Rice, J. M. (1993). Strategy fading and progress feedback: Effects on self-efficacy and comprehension among students receiving remedial reading services. *Journal of Special Education, 27,* 257-276.

Sefton-Green, J. (1998). Introduction: Being young in the digital age. In J. Sefton-Green (Ed.), *Digital diversions: Youth culture in the age of multimedia* (pp. 1-20). London, UK: University College London Press.

Street, B. V. (1995). *Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy in development, ethnography, and education*. New York: Longman.

Strickland, D. S., & Alvermann, D. E. (2004). *Bridging the literacy achievement gap, grades 4-12*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sturtevant, E. G. (1996). Lifetime influences on the literacy-related instructional beliefs of experienced high school history teachers: Two comparative case studies. *Journal of Literacy Research, 28,* 227-257.

Tierney, R. J., & Shanahan, T. (1991). Research on the reading-writing relationship: Interactions, transactions, and outcomes. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research, Vol. 2* (pp. 246-280). New York: Longman.

Vacca, R. T. (1998). Foreword. In D. E. Alvermann, K. A. Hinchman, D. W. Moore, S. F. Phelps, & D. R. Waff (Eds.), *Reconceptualizing the literacies in adolescents' lives* (pp. xv-xvi). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. (A. Kozulin, Ed. & Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wade, S. E., & Moje, E. B. (2000).The role of text in classroom learning. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research: Vol. 3* (pp. 609-627). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Willinsky, J. (1990). *The new literacy: Redefining reading and writing in the schools*. New York: Routledge.

Young, J. (2000). Boy talk: Critical literacy and masculinities. *Reading Research Quarterly, 35,* 312-323.

Family Literacy in the Context of Welfare Reform

Ray Wolpow
Eunice N. Askov

Let us start our discussion of family literacy with a look back to January 1931, at which time the National Education Association provided American business leaders with "carefully thought-out predictions of material and social changes in this country" that would be "probabilities" by the year 1950 ("*What shall we be like in 1950?*" 1931, p. 43-44). On the material side, probable achievements included:

1. A system of health and safety that will practically wipe out preventable accidents and contagious diseases.

2. A system of housing that will provide for the masses homes surrounded by beauty, privacy, quiet, sun, fresh air, and play space.

3. A flat telephone rate for the entire country at moderate cost.

4. Universal air transportation at low cost.

5. A system of paved, beautiful highways will connect every part of the nation.

6. The further development of school buildings and playfields until they will exceed in nobility the architectural achievements of any other age.

7. The organization of industry, business and agriculture to minimize uncertainty and depression.

8. The perfection of the insurance system to give universal protection from disaster, unemployment, and old age.

9. The extension of national, state, and local parks to provide convenient recreation areas for all people.

10. The perfection of community, city, and regional planning to give to all surroundings increasingly beautiful and favorable to the good life.

11. The shorter working week and day, so extended that there will be work for all.

On the social side the probable achievements listed included:

12. Hospitalization and medical care will be available for all who need them.

13. There will be a quickened appreciation of the home as a center of personal growth and happiness.

14. Educational service, free or at small cost, will be available from the earliest years of childhood throughout life.

15. The free public library will grow in importance, leading the way toward higher standards in maintained intelligence.

16. The nation will achieve an American standard of citizenship which means wholesome community life and clean government.

17. Crime will be virtually abolished by transferring to the preventive processes of the school and education the problems of conduct which police, courts and prisons now seek to remedy when it is too late.

18. Avocational activities will become richer, leading to nobler companionships and to development of the creative arts.

19. Ethical standards will rise to keep pace with new needs in business, industry, and international relations.

20. The religious awakening will grow in strength until most of our citizens will appreciate the importance of religion in the well-ordered life.

We Americans have yet to realize all of the ambitious possibilities listed above. Nonetheless, with the benefit of 72 years of historical perspective one could argue that we are making substantive progress towards most. With this in mind, the authors of this paper wish to revisit predictions 11 and 14, especially as these may be related to efforts made in the last ten years to improve economic self-sufficiency and literacy development of families consisting of low-income/low-literate parents and their young children.

First, through a review of the literature, the impact of current welfare and educational reform legislations on the educational performance of children of low-income families will be discussed. Then, keeping in mind the importance of federal programs designed to give children an "even start", the most beneficial instructional and programmatic "ingredients" of family literacy programs, as revealed through current research studies conducted by the Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy at Penn State, will be discussed. Finally, implications and points of interest raised by the audience during the ARF 2003 Panel will be summarized.

The Impacts of Welfare and Educational Reform

The United States has embraced two important policy shifts in the past ten years—one in welfare and the other in education—both inspired by political movements advocating increased personal and institutional accountability. These goals include reducing economic dependency on the State among adults and increasing educational attainment for children. The literature reveals

that demands created by these policies often clash with potential consequences for low-income parents and their children.

We have known for some time that parents play a critical role in both their children's academic achievement and their children's socio-emotional development. Most contemporary educators are aware of the various influences as well as the many barriers to parent involvement in their children's schooling (Eccles & Harold, 1996). Whereas finding time to realize the potentials of this role is a challenge for most parents, recent welfare reform programs have added to the challenge faced by American's working poor. In 1998, 5.3 million low-income children between the ages of 6 and 12 had either two parents or a single parent working after school (Halpern, 1999). There is an estimated 20 - 25 hour per week gap between parents' work schedules and students' school schedules (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 1998).

Inadequate income, irregular shifts, overcrowded schools, and uneven quality in after-school care burden many low-income families, many of whom are working increased hours. These same parents, many of whom are themselves poorly educated and low in literacy skills, are expected to help meet the greater accountability goals of the education reform movement by monitoring homework, helping children organize time, and assisting student learning by reinforcing basic skills taught during the school day. Thus some argue that the increasing number of hours that poor parents, particularly single mothers, spend in the workplace is having a negative impact on parental capacity to help their children over the increasingly challenging hurdles of elementary school. (Newman and Chin, 2003)

Although there is considerable discussion in the literature on how schooling affects students as well as about the role families may play in the success of schooling (Gamoran, 1996), scientific studies of how school and welfare reform is affecting children in these families are first coming to the fore. In their comprehensive examination of findings from six separate evaluations of recent welfare and employment programs, Morris, Huston, Duncan, Crosby and Bos (2001) report:

1. Programs with mandatory employment services, which required parental employment without also increasing income, had "mixed" effects on children. "Only one of the six programs affected test scores at all…The pattern of impacts appeared to be more closely associated with particular sites than with program characteristics…." (p. 44-48)

2. "All of the programs that provided earnings supplements without mandatory employment services improved children's school achievement…Children in the program group had an average score that was 4 percentage points higher than the average score of children in the control group." (p. 20-21)

3. Programs that included earning supplements that increased *both* parental employment *and* income also produced "reduced behavior problems, increased positive social behavior, and/or improved…[the] overall health" of elementary school-aged children. (p. ES-4).

4. "The positive effects of earnings supplement programs on children were most pronounced for the children of long-term welfare participants." (p. 33-34)

5. Even the programs "with the most benefits to children left many families in poverty and many children at risk of school failure and behavior problems. These programs do not eliminate the need for child-focused interventions and reforms that promote school achievement and reduce behavior problems." (p. ES-5)

In summary, requiring parents to work without increasing their income above welfare payments seemed to affect their children's achievement negatively. This finding makes sense in that the parents are now absent from the home without additional means of providing alternative childcare. The most positive effects were obtained when parents were able to earn more income through work. However, child-focused intervention programs, like family literacy, were still necessary.

Two of the studies examined in the Morris et al. (2001) monograph considered the effect of welfare program reform on adolescents in low-income families. Both indicated that parents' transition from welfare to work may decrease adolescents' school achievement. In a subsequent study of four major welfare programs Gennetian et al. (2002) concluded:

1. "Adolescents' school progress was affected adversely by a variety of welfare and work policies targeted at single parents. Averaged across studies, the impacts are small, but any harm to these high-risk youth is noteworthy…;" and that

2. …adolescents who had younger siblings experienced the most pervasive and troubling negative effects as a result of the programs.

The average impacts in these programs on "grade repetition and receipt of special educational services for emotional, physical or mental conditions" were also unfavorable. Adolescents with younger siblings experienced the "most troubling effects on school performance and were most likely to be suspended or to drop out." They were more likely to have substantial responsibilities to care for their younger siblings, while those who did not have younger siblings were more likely to either work to help support the family, or to participate in "unstructured out-of school activities." (Gennetian et al., 2002, p. 45-49)

One study of a program that encouraged employment among single-parent welfare recipients revealed, alongside benefits for elementary school-aged children, that the adolescent children of parents in this program were more likely than their control group counterparts to engage in minor delinquency and to use tobacco, alcohol, or drugs. (Morris & Michalopoulos, 2000).

Nonetheless, holding school children and their lower-income parents to high standards hasn't lost much of its appeal. President Bush (2002) caught the public mood when he argued that softening standards results in the soft tyranny of "low expectations" and further warned, "children are segregated by low expectations, illiteracy and self-doubt." Given the current political and economic climate, what role can family literacy programs play in helping poor families realize these expectations? What research can best guide the implementation of these programs so that they are able to serve low-income and low-literate families?

Family Literacy Programs

Family literacy programs operate under the assumption that the parent can and should be the child's first teacher and with an inherent "value added" dimension not associated with other early childhood education programs. Through their participation, low-income, low-literate parent/teachers receive both valuable adult education and the tools and training necessary to play a critical role in their children's future academic achievements. (Philliber, Spillman, & King, 1996; Wasik, Dobbins, & Herrmann, 2001) Family literacy, as defined by the William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy programs (Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I as reauthorized by the *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001), typically includes four instructional components: Adult basic and literacy education, parenting education, structured interactive literacy time between parent and child, and early childhood education.

The National Even Start Association or NESA (2002) reports that the population served under the Even Start Act includes 80% of the families having an income below $15,000, more than 40% of whom have incomes below $6000. NESA also reports that participants have low levels of education (86% have not completed high school, as compared to 27% of Head Start parents). What is more, dependence upon public assistance, which supports families of unemployed adults, has now become time-limited, as was described in the previous section.

Family literacy programs are typically conducted during the day. With the passage of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act or PRWORA (US Congress, 1996), the National Center for Family Literacy (NCFL)(2002) became concerned because the large numbers of parents attending these programs who are welfare recipients. Therefore it was deemed important to incorporate work-related activities as part of the adult education component of family literacy programs. In fact, NCFL reported in *Momentum* (November 2000) that the number of parents expressing employment-related goals at the time of entry into family literacy programs dramatically increased with the passage of PRWORA (1996) from 1% in 1991 to 37% in 1999. NCFL (2002) also reported that the percentage of families receiving public assistance at entry ranged from 81% in 1991 to 45% in 1999, showing that parents have moved into the workforce during that time period.

Thus, adults coming to family literacy programs now have two needs: To improve their literacy and employability skills and to foster their young (birth – age 8) children's literacy skills for academic success in school. How effectively can this be done? How valid is the assumption that participation in adult/family literacy education will improve the ability of the parent to serve as the child's first teacher? And in light of this, is it fair to assume that as adults improve their own literacy and language skills they will, in turn, foster the development of children in various developmental domains?

The Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy at Penn State decided to test these assumptions using an existing database. The database was derived from the Pennsylvania Statewide Evaluation of Family literacy conducted by the Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy (ISAL) at Penn State, which is affiliated with the Goodling Institute. Since 1998, the ISAL has been conducting the statewide evaluation to track the performance of adults and their

children in all of the family literacy programs in Pennsylvania.   The research question was: What are the effects of parental participation in a family literacy program on children's developmental skills as measured by early childhood assessments?

A quasi-experimental design was used to test the research question.   Data were collected from families who participated in Pennsylvania's family literacy programs between July 1, 2001 and June 30, 2002 (2001-2002 program year). It had been established in prior research (Kassab, Askov, Weirauch, Grinder, & Van Horn, 2004) that greater participation in adult education was associated with significantly greater outcomes on adult education tests. The next question that is addressed here is whether or not increased participation in adult education would be associated with significant gains in early childhood developmental measures.

To assess children's growth and development, the family literacy programs chose from among three criterion-referenced assessment instruments to assess children who ranged in age from birth to 5 years of age. The instruments for children age three to five (inclusive) included the High/Scope Child Observation Record (COR) and the Learning Accomplishment Profile-Revised (LAP-R). For children who ranged from birth to 3 years of age programs were able to use the Early Learning Accomplishment Profile (ELAP). Not all children were administered each domain of the COR, LAP-R, and ELAP. Across the different analyses for the COR, sample sizes ranged from 194 to 198. For the LAP-R, sample sizes ranged from 431 to 444, while for the ELAP, sample sizes ranged from 450 to 498.

Each of these instruments measures essentially the same developmental skills using a slightly different definition for each depending upon the methodology of the instrument. The developmental skills the COR measures include initiative, social relations, creative representation, music and movement, language and literacy, logic and mathematics, and the average across these domains. The LAP-R and ELAP both measure the following domains: gross motor, fine motor, cognitive, language, and self-help. Slight differences exist with these two instruments where the LAP-R measures personal/social and pre-writing while ELAP measures social/emotional and no writing domain.

In order to test the research question, a series of models were estimated that included variables indicating whether hours of parental participation in a particular component of the family literacy program influenced the children's developmental skills, as measured by the COR, LAP-R, and ELAP. The following variables were controlled in all analyses: Age of the child at the time of the assessment, whether the child had participated in an educational program prior to his/her enrollment in the family literacy program, and whether special services needs were identified for the child since the child enrolled in the family literacy program (Grinder, Kassab, Askov, & Abler, 2004).

Results

Results indicate that intensity of participation in adult education, that is the number of hours of parental participation in adult education, had a significant effect on most of the developmental skills measured by the ELAP, which is administered to children less than three years of age. Specifically, greater parental participation in adult education was associated with

children's higher fine motor (p<0.06), cognitive (p<0.06), self-help (p<0.01), and social/emotional (p<0.001) posttest scores on the ELAP. Furthermore, greater participation in parenting education was associated with higher ELAP language posttest scores (p<0.05) as would be predicted in the family literacy model.

For the LAP-R, preschool children in families with more interactive literacy between parents and children hours had higher posttest scores on the cognitive domain (p<0.001). Participation in adult education, parenting education, or interactive literacy did not seem to result in higher posttest scores for the other domains on the LAP-R. In addition, greater participation in parenting education was associated with higher COR creative representation posttest scores (p<0.05). Participation in adult education, parenting education, or interactive literacy was not related higher posttest scores for the other domains on the COR.

The finding that adult education and parenting education (in the case of language skills) were associated with ELAP posttest scores has important implications. Parents' participation in family literacy appears to have the greatest impact on the very youngest children's developmental skills which do relate to later literacy acquisition. This result may have occurred because these components (adult and parenting education) led to increased self-esteem or self-confidence among adult participants, and this in turn may lead to more positive interaction with their very young children. Darling and Lee (2003) speculate that adult education provides two functions to parents by attending family literacy programs. First, by increasing their education, parents are able to provide a more economically stable environment for their children. Second, through family literacy programs, parents may "change their perspective on literacy, recognizing and capitalizing on their role as their child's first and most important teacher" (p. 383).

This research, furthermore, supports the efficacy of the family literacy model. As parents develop their own literacy skills, they are better equipped to foster the literacy and language growth in their very young children. This relationship is most clearly evident in very young children (ages birth to 3 years old) where the parents are not only the primary teachers but also the greatest developmental influence. This study demonstrates the important linkage that exists between the parents' education and children's literacy and language development. It reaffirms the assumption of family literacy programs that parents can and should be the child's first and most important early teacher.

Implications Brought Forth During Panel Discussion

Reaction to, and subsequent discussion of, the information presented by the panel included, but was not limited to comments/concerns about the 72 year-old goals, the crushing demands placed on welfare families, the need for more research to guide the use of limited funding, the current climate demanding "scientific research," and the "value- added" of family literacy programs.

How optimistic we educators must have been in 1931! We believed, with passion, that in but twenty years we could and would accomplish incredible goals, thus truly make a difference. Now, some 72 years later such sanguine confidence is seen mostly in the eyes of students entering the field. Is it that we family literacy veterans have been sobered by the crushing

realities of the low-income, low-literate families with whom we work? Or is it that we are frustrated by the implementations of a decade of education and welfare reform policy shifts, many of which have served to further devastate the lives of low-income parents and their children?   Or is it that we have come to realize that the goals of family literacy programs are intergenerational and therefore need be measured longitudinally over generations? Would longitudinal research meet the current demand for "scientific research" and if it did, how could we possibly construct control groups?

Whether veterans or newcomers, participants agreed that we need research to help us focus our resources on those programs that do "make a difference." Herein, the Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy at Penn State provides us with data affirming that parents can and should be the child's first teacher and that family literacy programs do provide an inherent "value added" dimension not associated with other early childhood education programs by providing low-income, low-literate parent/teachers both valuable adult education and the tools and training necessary to play a critical role in their children's future academic achievements. Referring to the study of four major welfare programs by Gennetian et al. (2002), and noting the harmful effect of current welfare policies on the academic achievement of adolescents, one participant asked, "Is there not yet another 'valued-added'?" He added, " I can't help but wonder how many of the low-income, low-literate adolescents who are currently dropping out of high school are future mothers/participants in family literacy programs?" The participant was told that participation in teen family literacy programs has, indeed, been on the rise. Interventions that break the intergenerational cycle of low literacy and poverty are very much needed, especially in the context of welfare reform where everyone is expected to work regardless of their family commitments.

References

Annie E. Casey Foundation. (1998). *Childcare you can count on: Model programs and policies*. Baltimore: Author.

Bush, G. (2002). Education bill of 2002. Retrieved December 2002, from www.ed.gov/offices/oese/esea/nclb/part1.html

Darling, S., & Lee, J. (2003). Linking parents to reading instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, *57*(4), 382-384.

Eccles, J., & Harold, R. (1996) Family involvement in children's and adolescents' schooling. In A. Booth & J. Dunn (Eds.) Family-School links: How do they affect educational outcomes (pp. 3-31). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Gamoran, A. (1996). Effects of schooling on children and families. In A. Booth & J. Dunn (Eds.), *Family-school links: How do they affect educational outcomes* (pp. 107 – 113). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Gennetian, L., Duncan, G., Knox, V., Bargas, W., Clark-Kaufman, E., & London, A. (2002). *How welfare and work policies for parents affect adolescents: A synthesis of research.* New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Grinder, E.L., Kassab, C., Askov, E.N., & Abler, D. (2004). *Testing the assumption: The impact of family literacy on children's development.* University Park, PA: Penn State, Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy.

Halpern, R. (1999). After-school programs for low-income children: Promises and challenges. In *The future of children: When school is out.* Retrieved February 25, 2004, from http:www.futureofchildren.org/usr_doc/vol9no2Art8done.pdf

Kassab, C., Askov, E.N., Weirauch, D., Grinder, E.L., & Van Horn, B. (2004). Adult participation related to outcomes in family literacy programs. *Family Literacy Forum*, *3*(1), 23-29.

Morris, P., Huston, A., Duncan, G., Crosby, D., & Bos. J. (2001). *How welfare and work policies affect children: A synthesis of research.* (MDRC report). New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Morris, P., & Michalopoulos, C. (2000). *The self-sufficiency project at 36 months: Effects on children of a program that increased parental employment and income*. Ottawa: Social Research and Demonstration Corporation.

National Center for Family Literacy. (2000, November). *Momentum.* Louisville, KY: Author.

National Center for Family Literacy. (2002). [Trend analysis of primary family literacy research database]. Unpublished raw data. Louisville, KY: Author.

National Even Start Association (2002). *Even Start Family Literacy Program.* Fact sheet distributed at the annual conference. San Diego, CA: Author.

Newman, K., & Chin, M. (2003). High stakes: Time poverty, testing, and the children of the working poor. *Qualitative Sociology, 26*(1), 3-34.

Philliber, W.W., Spillman, R.E., & King, R.E. (1996). Consequences of family literacy for adults and children: Some preliminary findings. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *39*(7), 558-565.

United States Congress, Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (1996). *Public Law 104-193*. Washington, DC.

United States Department of Education (September, 2003). *Policy guidance for the William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs, Part B, Subpart 3 of Title I of the Elementary Secondary Education Act*, Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/programs/evenstartformula/legislation.html

Wasik, B.H., Dobbins, D.R., & Herrman, S. (2001). Intergenerational family literacy concepts, research, and practice. In S.B. Neuman & D.K. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook of early literacy research*. New York: Guilford Press.

What shall we be like in 1950. (1931, January 10). *The Literary Digest*, 43-44

Gleanings From Literacy Research For The Education Of Harvest Wolf

Thomas Cloer, Jr. Furman University

"All composite things must pass away. Strive onward vigilantly." These, according to tradition, are the final words of the historical Buddha (Leavell, 2001, p. 259). I will revisit them later. It's good to be back in Florida where one can relax, retire, revote, and recount. In fact, here is where your vote counts, and counts, and counts. They don't just cheat in football. It seems ironic, however, that a state so renowned for its football power would come to be known for its electile dysfunction.

As some of you may have inferred, in the twenty-four years I have participated in ARF, I am not a Slythering, blue blooded member of the educational aristocracy. My deep, abiding, and sustaining roots are from the riffraff scum, the proletariat. I come from a road less graveled on Stinking Creek. The peasant stock of Appalachia, from which I emanate, would actually find the moniker "proletariat" ingratiating. It has a good rhythmic quality to it – proletariat. From the road less graveled on Stinking Creek, one could see the moon coming over the mountain in Mason jars. We raised everything we ate and made everything we drank. As young irresponsible adults, we used to play this game where we would sit in a circle and pass the shine around to each one. The point of the game was for someone to get up and leave, and the others try to guess who left.

Harvest Wolf

My grandma's folks moved into Hanging Dog, my birthplace in the Western North Carolina Mountains, and intermarried with the Wolf Clan of the Cherokees. Thus, I was proud and thankful when my daughter, Shana Cloer Newton, named her darling baby boy, my grandson, Harvest Wolf Newton. My daughter had married a tall, powerfully built man whose major and degree from college was in history, but whose quest was to be a park ranger, and to be in tune with nature. Harvest Wolf was soon to become the epitome of health, vigor, and imagination. We spent all our free hours between sessions at Furman, and during free time away from Dad's ranger duties, camping, fishing, hiking, and loving the Blue Ridge, the Blue Wall, as the Cherokees called the escarpment, and the Great Smoky Mountains. Harvest Wolf's most enjoyable part of it all was to play baseball, football, and creative made-up ball with Grandpa. He was the talk of the camps where we camped for weeks at a time and fly fished in the cascading streams of Western North Carolina, Northern Georgia, and East Tennessee. He loved to skinny dip and wear nothing but his hat. Campers shot videos, honked, and took pictures of Harvest skinny dipping with his hat as we all swam in the icy waters of Appalachia. Harvest Wolf couldn't get enough of those mountain rivers.

Tragedy Pays a Visit

As school was about to begin in September of 2002 at Furman, I received a call from my wife whose voice hinted of trouble. Harvest Wolf, whose second birthday was to be celebrated that same month, had suddenly and inexplicably collapsed in a restaurant, and was in intensive care in the Greenville Hospital System. When I arrived, it was clear that Harvest was seriously sick. The pediatrician diagnosed the problem as viral meningitis/encephalitis.

After an unconscionably short stay in the hospital, he was released while still unable to walk or even sit. Then came the tragic day when my terrified daughter called and said Harvest had suffered a seizure, lapsed into a coma, stopped breathing, and had been airlifted to a special children's hospital in Asheville, North Carolina.

My wife and I then made the longest drive I have ever undertaken, although I have never missed an ARF conference, and have only flown to one. I live on the North Carolina/South Carolina border. I thought I knew about long trips. As we approached Caesar's Head State Park, at the top of the Blue Ridge Escarpment where Harvest lived and his dad was the Park Ranger, I began to weep as I passed a certain sign. It was a sign that Harvest and I had read thousands of times as we stood before the words and he ran his hands from left to right, mimicking me as I said, "Rim of the Gap Trail; All hikers and campers must register." Then my good colleagues, I totally lost it, and for once in my life I couldn't regain my composure. All of a grandpa's love for a toddler, and a realization that one's worst nightmares can indeed come true caused me to crash and burn.

When we arrived at the hospital in Asheville, the helicopter that had brought Harvest Wolf was still on its pad. Furman's chaplain met us as we stepped off the elevator and we all hurried to intensive care. Harvest was on a respirator and was still in a coma.

When we talked to Harvest's doctor, she told us that she believed he was a victim of the LaCrosse Virus. This mosquito-borne virus had attacked hundreds of children in thirteen states, and was really active in the mountains of Western North Carolina, East Tennessee, and West Virginia. Spinal fluid had been sent to the Raleigh Center for Disease Control to confirm the virus. When asked for the prognosis, none of the doctors would give us a word of encouragement. They clearly doubted that Harvest was going to survive.

For days and nights we stood by his bed as the redundant respirator kept Harvest Wolf tethered to Grandpa's world where there were tractors to drive, gardens to till, and woods to explore, and rivers, so many rivers, for skinny dipping. One evening the doctor came in and said the respirator was going to be removed to see if Harvest might breathe on his own. If he couldn't, the respirator would be started again right away. Harvest made the transition, but remained in a coma.

Harvest Wolf is Alive!

The neurologist, we called him Dr. Gadget, came to us and said the MRI results showed that Harvest Wolf had suffered a massive stroke to his tiny brain stem, through which all neurons must pass. This had paralyzed Harvest. He further said that Harvest was at very high risk for learning problems, developmental problems, epilepsy, language difficulty, etc. Dr. Gadget, totally unable to relate to humans in need of encouragement, held back nothing.

My daughter and son-in-law, after numerous days and nights without sleep, finally had collapsed into bed. My wife and I were keeping watch over Harvest when I suggested that she catch a little rest in the intensive care waiting room. I was sitting in a straight chair looking with tear-filled eyes at my darling grandson. It was 3:30 a.m., and an old mountain night hunter accustomed to lost sleep was on watch. Suddenly, Harvest opened his eyes -- both of them -- and stared straight at me. I sprang to my feet and said excitedly, "Hey sugar!"

Although Harvest hadn't eaten in days, a food tray had been left earlier that evening. I noticed a cup of old jello on the tray and said to Harvest, "You want Grandpa to give you some jello? Huh? Would you like jello?" Harvest managed a slight nod, enough for me to realize a positive response. I stepped outside the room, motioned with urgency to the nurse, and eagerly said "Harvest wants some jello; Harvest is awake!"

"What kind of jello?" came a question back to me.

"Never mind what kind of jello -- just bring any you have -- quickly."

I opened the jello, dropped in the spoon, and Harvest opened his mouth! Harvest chewed and swallowed, then stared at the spoon. I acted as if I didn't know that he would want more. After batting his eyes and looking at me, and then at the spoon, I said, "Harvest, did you want Grandpa to give you more jello?" He looked at me for about five seconds and then said loudly and clearly, "Yeah!"

All the angels in heaven clapped and gave each other high fives. An old turkey gobbler roosting just below Harvest's house gobbled as a barred owl hooted. The ravens, so thick in the trees on the cliffs near Harvest's house, all made their guttural sounds trying to say "Harvest Wolf is alive! Harvest Wolf is alive!" The deer that had walked daily through his yard and the giant black bear that had just walked across his driveway jerked their heads into the air and smelled for the scent of Harvest Wolf as the forest echoed with the sound, "Harvest Wolf is alive! Harvest Wolf is alive! Harvest Wolf is alive!"

Harvest started regaining his functioning that night. He had to start over as if he were newly born, and learn to sit, crawl, stand, and, hopefully, walk. His progress has been nothing short of miraculous. Harvest continues now in several types of therapy. He loves hippo therapy with horses the best. This has helped with his balance, his motor skills, and even more importantly, his affective domain. He did develop epilepsy for which he has been on medication.

My daughter asked me if I could glean anything from literacy research that might help Harvest Wolf with his language development and subsequent reading and writing. She further stated that she would probably home-school him, and what did I think of that?

<center>Quintessentials for Harvest Wolf's Literacy</center>

So, these gleanings are not comprised of mere pedantic rambling or some dialectic excursion where an army of words are marching forth through a conference in search of an idea. These for me represent the quintessentials for Harvest Wolf's literacy.

The new South Carolina 2002 English Language Arts Standards still state different listening, speaking, reading, and writing standards. Teachers are very commonly required to take these fragmented standards and arrange them into some cohesive classroom program. This really requires teachers to put back together that which never needed separating in the first place. Many of these standards across the nation came from Educational Seagull Consultants. I learned about these at ARF. We have many South Carolina Educational Seagull Consultants. Do you know what a bonafide Educational Seagull Consultant is? It is a consultant who flies in, makes a lot of noise, shits on everything, and then flies away.

We now see more clearly that reading is just one integral part of a multifaceted human communication sequence that also includes listening, speaking, and writing. Allen (1976) suggested that the basic question is not whether we teach listening, speaking, reading, and writing, but whether we deal directly or indirectly with communication experiences.

First Gleaning

We must integrate Harvest Wolf's listening, speaking, reading, and writing. By that, I mean whoever teaches Harvest must value, use, and make useful what he has experienced, listened to, and has heard and said himself. The Language Experience Approach to Reading holds great potential for him and avoids the problem of plugging in at language recognition or reading. Harvest's oral language background will be valued, used, and made useful for his other language arts learning. The inherent difficulty of materials will be minimized when Harvest's teacher uses personal writing to learn how to recognize words (Cloer, 1990). Direct teaching of the word recognition skills will occur within the framework of Harvest's personal language, and a hole in the hedge between reading and writing will be utilized fully. All those studies on phonemic awareness (Juel, 1991; Scarborough, 1989; Stanovich, 1986; Wagner, Torgueson, & Roshotte, 1994) which show that the ability to hear sounds in words predicts future reading achievement will be covered by writing for Harvest and in front of Harvest. When one writes or transcribes a child's personal language, language falls apart naturally as we spell, and then comes back together naturally as we reconstruct the talk put down on paper.

Harvest's personal language will include all the necessary ingredients for teaching him to read and write. Many of the words used by Harvest Wolf, John Grisham, and Truman Capote will be the same. The words of highest frequency will occur naturally as they would in any other material. Reading will be viewed initially as a process of reconstructing oral language that has been transcribed. Harvest will be taught that ideas can be verbalized, written, and verbalized again.

Allen (1976) made obvious the problems associated with language arts classes that focused only on language recognition. Allen emphasized language acquisition, language prediction, language production, and language recognition.

We must also have multifaceted language arts goals that attempt to: (1) teach language that makes reading possible; (2) teach strategies for acquisition, decoding and comprehending; and (3) make avid readers and writers.

Language Acquisition

There is one thing, I believe, on which all literacy educators could agree. Reading aloud to Harvest, which actually started before conception, is probably the most essential aspect for learning to read and write (Chomsky, C., 1972; Durkin, D., 1966; McCormick, S., 1977).

Heath (1983) found that children of parents who related storybook reading to real life experiences did better in school than children of parents who asked questions that only required repetition of facts. Anything that Harvest hears from a book can be related to his parents, his Grandpa, his home, his life. By doing that, we increase the likelihood that the brain will store information long-term.

What things can be read aloud? We can start with really great children's literature. The Children's Choices from the October issue of The Reading Teacher, and Teachers' Choices from the November issue of The Reading Teacher offer a beginning point. Both of these lists can be obtained from I.R.A. Of course, Aaron and Hutchinson's (2002) contenders and winners of children's book awards from five English speaking countries will be a source of numerous read-alouds for Harvest. In fact, last year when Bob Jerrolds (2002) traced reading instruction back to the garden of Eden, I caught only one error. It wasn't Adam there in the garden, it was Aaron, Ira Aaron doing something related to children's literature! Ira has been a force in reading longer than anyone I know. Well Ira and Sylvia, your research will really matter in Harvest Wolf's learning.

We will refer often to Sarah Dowhower's (1997) marvelous work with wordless books. Will that research make a difference in Harvest Wolf's learning? I have never found anywhere in the literature, Sarah, a more comprehensive, helpful, and necessary type of research. One can certainly benefit from those wordless concept books with familiar sequences, counting books, months of the year, and the naming and labeling books. The thematic books that are wordless will allow Harvest and his instructor to talk

and write the text for these hundreds and hundreds of wordless books. They can change the written text and write different texts for the same books!

When Harvest shows the ability to listen for longer periods of time, Trelease's (1992) <u>Hey! Listen to This</u> should be utilized along with Trelease's <u>Read Aloud Handbook</u> (1995). These two references alone should furnish enough read alouds to do Harvest until he draws his first Social Security check. The giant treasury of read-alouds in Trelease's third edition includes wordless books, predictable books, picture reference books, picture books, short novels, novels, poetry, fairy tales, folk tales and different anthologies.

Language acquisition will need to occur daily. Another language component essential to early reading is knowledge of language prediction.

Language Prediction

Advocates of an holistic approach to reading believe that children learn to read by reading. Both of my children learned to read by reading. They were given opportunities to read meaningful, predictable, materials where their ears simply guided their eyes. They then figured out for themselves the manner in which grapheme-phoneme correspondences work. My daughter was reading on an eighth grade level when she began first grade. The principal called me and said he was going to place her in a sixth grade classroom for reading! He stated that was as high as the grades went in the school. Furthermore, Shana was to do all the workbooks, or else she might have "gaps" in her skill knowledge. This is a classic case of a faulty paradigm. We don't learn to read in order to do workbooks.

Gibson and Levin (1975) in their classic text, <u>The Psychology of Reading</u>, made an excellent point. When learning any complex task, it is a good idea to start working on the very thing you're trying to do, or as close as you can get to the real thing. We have seen the mayhem, the demolition derby, the wrecked paradigm of giving training on each tiny component of reading and then trying to integrate them. Predictable texts of all types help mitigate the demolition derby sponsored by narrowly designed phonics programs that separate the symbols from real meaning and put all the emphasis on the symbols.

Bridge (1988) made some excellent instructional recommendations that focused on holistic approaches to reading that are consistent with a constructivist view of the reading process. First, beginning reading instruction should begin with meaningful, functional texts. This includes environmental print, instructions, recipes, riddles, letters, storybooks, and a variety of others. Every teacher of early grades in any of my classes at Furman is asked to make meaningful, functional texts of their own instructions, admonitions, and "teacher talk" that they use every day before their classes. This integrates listening, speaking, reading, and writing in a most meaningful way. Smith (1982) has always maintained that a prerequisite to reading is learning that print is meaningful.

By now, everyone in the literacy business has seen research on the value of predictability. Bridge (1988) did a marvelous job of reviewing the literature and showing how the cognitive and affective domains are both affected positively by children reading many texts that are highly predictable. The need for early fluency is great, and highly predictable texts can cause early fluency to happen! Harvest's ears can guide his eyes!

I have stumbled upon an insight I wish to share with my colleagues. Since I started in literacy, there have been two problems that have not been resolved in reading. One is individual differences. Wouldn't it have been nice if all children would have come to school ready to read? But even after Bill Clinton declared that all children should be ready for school, and after our current esteemed president declared that no child shall be left behind, children are not ready for school and children are being left behind. Individual differences are at the very foundation of this debacle concerning high stakes testing. Kids are different.

Secondly, since all children are different, we have to be careful when we make assumptions about texts used to teach reading. Are the concepts and language familiar to the child? Are the concepts and language interesting to the child? Does the child give a fiddler's fart about the concepts or activities described in the text?

We can deal with both these problems by doing what Sylvia Aston Warner (1963) said about putting our hands into the minds of children and using what we get on our hands to teach them how to read. We deal with comprehension by beginning with comprehension. By using the language and the experiences of a child in initial reading instruction, we circumvent the problems associated with plugging in at reading without taking into consideration the listening and speaking of a child.

Higher Level Texts

Chomei (1972), a downsized Shinto priest stated the following:

> Ceaselessly the river flows, and yet the water is never the same, while in the still pools the shifting foam gathers and is gone, never staying for a moment. Even so is man… unenduring as the foam on the water. (p. 1)

It seems not that long ago that we met for the first ARF conference and I was excited about Durkin's classic comprehension study (1978-1979). Durkin did something that changed the direction of reading comprehension instruction in the late 70's. She sought to define comprehension instruction and comprehension assessment in order to research these in the schools. She defined comprehension instruction as the activities in which the "teacher does or says something to help children understand or work out the meaning of more than single isolated word." (Durkin, 1978-1979, p. 488).

Durkin (1978-1979) started a veritable firestorm when she defined comprehension assessment as activities in which the "teacher does/says something in order to learn

whether what was read was comprehended" (p. 490). That distinction, I believe, was the most important happening in reading comprehension in the 20th century.

In the monumental research study that followed, reading comprehension instruction and assessment were defined and measured. Thirty classrooms were observed in 17 schools in 13 different school systems in the state of Illinois. Grades three through six were observed during Reading and Social Studies. Social Studies was observed to determine if teachers taught reading in the content areas. The research went throughout the school year.

In this writer's opinion, the results forever changed the teachers' manuals for basal readers, the reading methodology textbooks, the preparation of teachers, and the publications of all the assistant and associate professors in literacy trying to obtain tenure and promotion. The results showed that out of 300 hours of observation, 44 minutes of "instruction" occurred. The most time went to comprehension assessment and assignment giving. No teacher during the year saw the Social Studies period as a time to help with reading.

I started dividing reading comprehension instruction into two major eras, B.D. and A.D., Before Durkin and After Durkin. The era B.D. was explained by Spache and Spache (1973):

> One group emphasizes long lists of comprehension skills and the need to develop these. . . . Apparently this group believes answering a lot of questions, time after time, will enable the student to show whatever type or degree of comprehension later reading tasks demand. Another group of experts believe that the answer to comprehension development is to start with students' experiences and interests and exploit them (p. 558).

In 1989, A.D., I looked at the ten years of research after Durkin had audaciously suggested that initial questions didn't count as comprehension instruction (Cloer, 1989). Durkin had said that teachers must first explain, describe, model, and demonstrate before questioning students.

Unfortunately, the term direct instruction used in relation to comprehension in the 1980's was to be confused with the general term direct instruction B.D. and all the baggage affiliated with it. The term "direct instruction model" was originally introduced by Science Research Associates through the Distar programs. These programs, by Engelmann and Bruner (1969) simply programmed the teacher and attempted to make all reading lessons fool-proof. Becker (1977) supported the model by stating that teachers don't have the time to find appropriate words and examples, or how to sequence things correctly. The teacher's role B.D. was very limited. If one announced here at ARF in the 1980's that the session was about direct instruction in comprehension A.D., members were less likely to get up and go feed the pelicans. The direct instruction to be associated with reading comprehension in the eighties emphasized the teacher and children more.

There were numerous good examples of this new type of direct instruction A.D. where students were being given declarative knowledge, verbal explaining about what was to be learned, when to use it, and why it was useful (Aulls, 1986). Modeling by the teacher was to become a major aspect of basal comprehension lessons.

I (Cloer, 1989) reviewed positive outcomes in research studies where direct instruction A.D. was given in how to summarize (Brown & Day, 1983; Taylor, 1986), how to make a comprehension map (Taylor, 1986; Reutzel, 1986), how to understand metaphors (Readance, Baldwin, & Head, 1986), how to use narrative structure to comprehend (Fitzgerald & Spiegel, 1983), and how to critically comprehend (Patching, Kameenui, Carnine, Gersten, & Colvin, 1983). All these studies had very positive outcomes.

Since Harvest Wolf's affective state in relation to his literacy will be just as critical, of course, as his cognitive state, his instructor will need to use whatever strategy that has proven to be most reinforcing affectively. Since Rosenshine and Stevens (1984) concluded that children who basically taught themselves in student-centered classrooms had lower achievement, less creativity, curiosity, and self-esteem, we must be sure to explain, describe, model, and demonstrate before expecting Harvest Wolf to have a go at it. This also leads smoothly and nicely into my last gleanings regarding the affective domain.

The Affective Dimension

I know that Harvest will be asking daily the ancient Biblical question, "Who do ye say that I am?" Our answers to that question must provide him powerful invitations that say formally and informally, verbally and nonverbally, that he is a valuable, capable, and responsible reader and writer (Purkey & Novak, 1984), and that he and Grandpa have descended into the bowels of hell, and all the devils therein will not be able to remove one little dot over one of the "i's" in any of the invitations that have been issued. Whatever is done for Harvest Wolf in relation to invitations is done forever.

Alexander Dumas in the Three Musketeers (1962) said it so well. He said that a person who doubts himself is like a man who would enlist in the ranks of his enemies and bear arms against himself. He makes his failure certain by being the first person to be convinced of it.

The person working with Harvest will need to be aware of the types of things associated with the affective domain and language arts. Our most recent large-scale study at Furman (Cloer & Ellithorp, 2001) studied the relationship of teachers' self-perceptions and classroom practices to students' self-perceptions as writers. This study involved 802 students from 34 different classrooms in 13 different schools in urban, suburban, and rural elementary settings. We found, of course, that reading aloud was highly related to three different self-perception scales for males. This is an important gleaning for Harvest. When we read to him frequently, he will have better self-perception as to how he is progressing, not only in reading, but also in writing.

Nothing, however, triggered more discussion than our finding of an inverse relationship between the teachers' self-perceptions as writers and the childrens' self-perceptions. The higher the score on the teacher's self-perceptions as writers, the lower the score of the children's self-perceptions as writers. These data do not suggest that we ourselves need to be inept, and thereby make inexperienced writers feel good about their own ineptitude. They do clearly show, however, that there is a veritable need to be careful and sensitive as to the signals we send students. Probably, all of you can remember a teacher who was so good at something such as math, physics, or educational statistics that it seemed hard for the instructor to tolerate your own ineptitude as you tried through successive approximations to become better.

The negative correlation between teachers' self-perceptions about their writing and students' self-perception as writers is a troubling one that must be addressed. One hypothesis is that the teachers, in their passion for good writing, place too much early emphasis on the mechanics of writing while failing to meaningfully interact with the writers' content. Hillerich (1985) pointed to research which showed that students who received reactions to their ideas, instead of beginning with corrections to mechanics, actually had fewer mechanical errors. Writing teachers who believe that for every action on the part of a writer there is an equal and opposite criticism from a teacher, listen up!

There seems to be a phenomenon at work between teacher and student in writing instruction and assessment that is not evident in reading. We have found only high positive correlations between teachers' love of reading and children's recreational reading. In writing, however, a student leaves a paper trail. There is a product in writing that involves capitalization, punctuation, organization, grammar conventions, etc. Conversely, when a child reads purely for pleasure, there is not a tangible product to examine, analyze, and criticize unless there are worksheets or comprehension questions. These worksheets are perceived by the student as concomitants to academic reading, not "real" reading for pleasure.

We did an earlier study (Cloer & Pearman, 1993b) that showed how critical teachers as readers really are. When the teachers in the study loved to read, as measured by how much they read silently each week for pleasure, their students loved to read. This study has an important gleaning for Harvest Wolf. It points to the veritable importance of positive modeling by those who wish to inculcate within their students a lifelong love of reading.

Do you recall teachers in your school years who made a difference for you? I personally had the joy of encountering two teachers who obviously loved to read and shared their ebullient joy with their students. Mrs. Bailey always read books aloud that she found most satisfying. She shared treasures of literature I remember to this day. Mrs. McGhee was a teacher who read voraciously and modeled to us constantly how good literature of all types could awaken powerful imagery and stir our deepest emotions. She genuinely reinforced us when we read and imagined, laughed, cried, and shared our pleasure in doing so. Both of these teachers taught me immeasurably more than the mechanics of reading. Ms McGhee did not become a master teacher because of

"assmosis," advancement by kissing up to the principal. She knew what really mattered in teaching. Assessment

I must not leave out assessment for Harvest Wolf. I must assess whether or not he has positive attitudes about reading. I will start with the Elementary Reading Attitude Scale (McKenna & Kear, 1990) for grades 1-6. Harvest likes Garfield and will identify easily with his four different states of mind from very happy to really pissed.

The assessment of attitudes changed forever with publication of the Reader Self-Perception Scale (RSPS) by Henk and Melnick (1995) and the Writer Self-Perception Scale (WSPS) by Bottomley, Henk, and Melnick (1997/1998). The research behind these instruments suggests that students' self-perceptions of their reading and writing ability will affect subsequent reading and writing achievement in various ways. Those students who hold more positive perceptions will likely pursue more reading and writing opportunities. Students who hold more negative self-perceptions related to reading and writing will expend less effort and demonstrate less persistence. These are two more instruments that I will really put to good use with Harvest. He can't slip below the 50th percentile or a standard deviation below the mean; we can't let that happen!

Another study we did showed how males became negative toward reading very early in school, and their attitudes toward academic and recreational reading dropped very significantly as they progressed through the grades (Cloer & Pearman, 1993a).

We found in another study (Cloer & Dalton, 2001) that males and females differed significantly in their self-perceptions as readers even when their standardized test scores were not significantly different. Males were more negative in their self-perceptions. We also found that a group of females with significantly low standardized reading achievement scores had higher self-esteem as readers than boys who had significantly higher standardized reading achievement on the same test.

Our study (Cloer & Ross, 1997) showing how standardized reading test scores predict self-perception as readers made us ask the obvious question. Should these tests which do not resemble an authentic pleasurable literary endeavor predict self-esteem as a reader? The standardized reading tests are very different from books that have interesting, dynamic characters doing exciting things. Real reading of enjoyable literature involving authentic stories with predictability and charm is a very different experience from reading a set of passages followed by a series of questions designed to "catch" students who are not test-wise.

Boys are really susceptible to low self-esteem as readers, even when they score well on these tests. Our studies show the need for students to see themselves as readers who read, and not just readers who could read. We hypothesize that girls who read recreationally for pleasure may not score high on a test designed to catch them. However, with the girls the recreational reading may preserve their self-esteem as readers, even if their standardized reading test scores were low.

We must begin to address the negative attitudes of boys if we are to be successful in creating lifelong readers. This study suggested that if we could get boys really interested in reading recreationally for pleasure, their negative attitudes about school might ameliorate as well. Since boys cause most of the mayhem in school, this is of pressing import. The implications for Harvest are obvious. We must find what interests him and proceed to fuel that interest.

Recommendations for Instruction From Our Affective Research

Based on the affective research from these studies, the following recommendations are offered:

1. First and foremost, put emphasis on the content of Harvest's writing as interesting and important before working through successive approximations at punctuation, spelling, grammar, etc.
2. Give reading and writing tasks that are not too difficult for him.
3. Make him more physically and mentally comfortable during reading and writing projects.
4. Give more frequent and concrete illustrations of progress in reading and writing. Model and point to examples of the enjoyment, appreciation, relaxation and gratification that we, and Harvest, can gain from reading and writing.
5. Solicit more positive reinforcement and shared enthusiasm from other kids, other parents, and interested others.
6. Provide Harvest with a rich array of engaging literature that is frequently read aloud.
7. Use much predictable reading material and patterned text for reading and writing that allows Harvest to be successful.
8. Monitor body language closely to make sure positive messages are sent to Harvest regarding his reading and writing. Harvest Wolf's self-perception as a reader and writer can tolerate no less in his quest for literacy.
9. And lastly, make sure we live out a guiding divine principle for all educators. Anything genuinely worth doing by my beloved grandson is worth doing poorly when he cannot do any better. That includes motor skills, playing music with Grandpa, and yes, reading and writing.

Good Bye Old Friends

All composite things must pass away. Change is inevitable, except from vending machines. Good literacy researchers, I will retire at the end of this thirtieth academic year at Furman University, and will assist with the education of Harvest Wolf. But I'd like to return to the American Reading Forum with Harvest Wolf after two decades if I am still vertical, or even diagonal. He will be the presenter and I will be the reactor. He will simply tell you about his journey, how he obtained literacy, and hopefully about his genuine love of the language arts.

All composite things must pass away. Strive onward vigilantly. Good-bye for now old friends.

References

Aaron, I.E., & Hutchinson, S.M. (2002). 2001 contenders/winners: Children's book awards in five English speaking countries. In W. Trathen (Ed.) *A Literacy Odyssey: Yearbook of the American Reading Forum,* 22, Retrieved June 17, 2003 from www.fd.appstate.edu/arfonline/

Allen, R.V. (1976). *Language experiences in communication.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Aulls, M.W. (1986). Actively teaching main idea skills. In J.F. Baumann (Ed.), *Teaching main idea comprehension* (pp. 133-178). Newark: International Reading Association.

Becker, W.C. (1977). Teaching reading and language to the disadvantaged-what we have learned from the research. *Harvard Education Review, 47,* 518-543.

Bottomley, D.M., Henk, W.A., & Melnick, S.A. (1997/1998). Assessing children's views about themselves as writers using the Writer Self-Perception Scale. *The Reading Teacher, 51,* 286-291.

Bridge, C.A. (1988). Focusing on meaning in beginning reading instruction. In J.L. Davidson (Ed.), *Counterpoint and beyond: A response to becoming a nation of readers* (pp. 51-62). Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

Brown, A.L., & Day, J.D. (1983). *Strategies and knowledge for summarizing text: The development and facilitation of expertise.* (Tech. Rep. No. 270). Champaign-Urbana, IL: University of Illinois. Center for the Study of Reading.

Chomei, K.N. Hojoki. (1972). *Ten foot square hut and tales of the heike.* (A.L. Sadler, Trans.). Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle.

Chomsky, C. (1972). Stages in language development and reading exposure. *Harvard Educational Review, 42,* 1-33.

Cloer, C.T., Jr. (1989). Teaching reading comprehension: Direct instruction revisited. In B. Hayes & K. Camperell (Eds.), *Reading researchers, policymakers, practitioners: Yearbook of the American Reading Forum,* 9, Available: http://www.fd.appstate.edu/arfonline/

Cloer, C.T., Jr. (1990). *A teacher's handbook of language experience activities* (3rd ed.). Raleigh, NC: Stone's Southern School Supply.

Cloer, C.T., Jr., & Dalton, S.R. (2001). Gender and grade differences in reading achievement and in self-concept as readers. *Journal of Reading Education, 26* (2), 31-36.

Cloer, C.T., Jr., & Ellithorp, M.V. (2001, December). *The relationship of teachers' self-perceptions and classroom practices to students' self-perceptions as writers.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Reading Forum, Sanibel Island, FL.

Cloer, C.T., Jr., & Pearman, B. (1993a). The relationship of gender to attitudes about academic and recreational reading. In B. Hayes & K. Camperell (Eds.), *Reading: Strategies, practices, and research for the 21st century*: *Yearbook of the American Reading Forum,* 13, Available: http://www.fd.appstate.edu/arfonline/

Cloer, C.T., Jr., & Pearman, B. (1993b). The relationship of teachers' attitudes and classroom behaviors to students' attitudes about academic and recreational reading. *Journal of Reading Education, 18* (3), 7-19.

Cloer, C.T., Jr., & Ross, S. (1997). The relationship of standardized reading scores to children's self-perceptions as readers. In K. Camperell, B. Hayes, & R. Telfer (Eds.), *Promises, progress and possibilities: Perspectives of literacy education*: *Yearbook of the American Reading Forum*, 17, Available: http://www.fd.appstate.edu/arfonline/

Dowhower, S. (1997). Wordless books: Promises and possibilities, a genre come of age. In K. Camperell, B. Hayes, & R. Telfer (Eds.), *Promises progress and possibilities: Perspectives of literacy education: Yearbook of the American Reading Forum,* 17, Available: http://www.fd.appstate.edu/arfonline/

Dumas, A. (1962). *The three musketeers*. New York: Macmillan. (Original work published in 1844).

Durkin, D. (1966). *Children who read early: Two longitudinal studies*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Durkin, D. (1978-79). What classroom observations reveal about reading comprehension instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly, 14* (4), 481-533.

Engelmann, S., & Bruner, E.D. (1969). *DISTAR reading: An instructional system*. Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Fitzgerald, J., & Spiegel, D.L. (1983). Enhancing children's reading comprehension through instruction in narrative structure. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 15*, 19-36.

Gibson, E., & Levin, H. (1975). *The psychology of reading.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Heath, S.B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language life and work in communities and classrooms.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Henk, W.A., & Melnick, S.A. (1995). The reader self-perception scale (RSPS): A new tool for measuring how children feel about themselves as readers. *The Reading Teacher, 48,* 470-482.

Hillerich, R.L. (1985). *Teaching children to write, K-8: A complete guide to developing writing skills*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Jerrolds, B. (2002). In five thousand years of teaching reading, what have we learned. In W. Trathen (Ed.). *Reading at the crossroads: Yearbook of the American Reading Forum,* 23, Retrieved on November 2, 2004, from http://www.fd.appstate.edu/arfonline/

Juel, C. (1991). Beginning reading. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research, 2,* (pp.759-788). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Leavell, J.B. (2001). What really matters? In T.O. Buford (Ed.), *What really matters? A collection of lectures in the L.D. Johnson series* (pp. 259-266). Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Publishing.

McCormick, S. (1977). Should you read aloud to your children? *Language Arts, 54*, 139-143.

McKenna, M.C., & Kear, D.A. (1990). Measuring attitudes toward reading: A new tool for teachers. *The Reading Teacher, 43* (9), 626-639.

Patching, W., Kameenui, E., Carnine, D., Gersten, R., & Colvin, G. (1983). Direct instruction in critical reading skills. *Reading Research Quarterly, 18,* 406-418.

Purkey, W.W., & Novak, J. (1984). *Inviting school success* (2nd ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing.

Readance, J.E., Baldwin, R.S., & Head, M.H. (1986). Direct instruction in processing metaphor. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 18,* 325-339.

Reutzel, D.R. (1986). Investigating a synthesized comprehension instructional strategy: The cloze story map. *Journal of Educational Research, 79,* 343-349.

Rosenshine, B.V., & Stevens, R. (1984). Classroom instruction in reading. In P.D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 745-798). New York: Longman.

Scarborough, H.S. (1989). Prediction of reading disability from familial and individual differences. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 81* (1), 101-108.

Smith, F. (1982). *Understanding reading* (3rd ed.). New York: CBS College Publishing.

Spache, G.D., & Spache, G.D. (1973). *Reading in the elementary school* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Stanovich, K.E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly, 21,* 360-407.

Taylor, B.M. (1986). Teaching middle grade students to summarize content textbook material. In J.F. Baumann (Ed.), *Teaching main idea comprehension* (pp. 195-209). Newark: International Reading Association.

Trelease, J. (Ed.). (1992). *Hey! Listen to this: Stories to read aloud.* New York: Penguin Books.

Trelease, J. (1995). *The read aloud handbook.* New York: Penguin Books.

Wagner, R.K., Torgueson, J.K., & Roshotte, C.A. (1994). Development of reading related phonological processing abilities: New evidence of biodirectional causality from a latent variable longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology, 30* (1), 73-87.

Warner, S.A. (1963). *Teacher.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Copyrights Conundrums and Perplexing Permissions

Sarah L. Dowhower

This past February (2003), I contacted the editor of a well-known scholarly journal (for privacy, I will call it Journal X) to track down the owner of an online image. His first comment brought me up short. *"Everyday I'm confronted with the mess we call copyright law. In truth this mess adversely affects academia, particularly in the areas of scholarly publishing and global dissemination of knowledge—issues to which I am deeply committed."*

As I hung up the phone, I realized (with some dread) that I was wading into a quagmire (theoretically and practically) as I pursued the permissions for 33 painting images in my conference paper to be published in the American Reading Forum Online Yearbook (Dowhower, 2002). Before that conversation, the librarian at Appalachian State University had warned that the process of getting permissions was very labor intensive and time consuming. Talk about red flags! But before I get to that story, let me give you some background by briefly summarizing the relevant copyright laws for online publishing and the theory behind them.

Copyright Law Affecting Online Publications--In Brief

"Copyright law is central to our society's information policy and affects what we can read, view, hear, use or learn" (Litman, 2001). It is, also, our system for protecting and encouraging scholarly research, creativity and open dissemination of knowledge.

Maintaining equilibrium between the right to research, discuss, and critique the works of others and protecting and encouraging creative works through the copyright laws is very difficult. "Resolving 9 sometimes conflicting claims requires policymakers, in the words of the Supreme Court to strike a 'difficult balance' between rewarding creativity through the copyright system and 'societies competing interest in the free flow of ideas, information and commerce' " (Heins, 2003).

The Copyright Act of 1976 (Title 17) provides the basic framework for the laws we have today. (See Stanford University Libraries for an explanation and the document.) Two important aspects of this law are critical to this discussion (a) Public Domain and (b) Fair Use. *Public Domain* means publications or works not protected under patent or copyright. This allows free exchange of knowledge. *Fair Use* allows reasonable public access to copyrighted works without paying as long as there is no commercial gain. Education, parody, criticism, news reporting, research, scholarship, and commentary are all examples of fair use. Section 107 of Title 17 gives four tests that courts should use to determine if there is fair use or not: (See US Code Fair Use.)

1. Purpose (commercial vs. nonprofit educational);

2. Nature of copyrighted work (a factual reproduction may be considered more fair use than a highly creative work);

3. Amount of copyrighted work used (whole or part); and

4. Effect on potential market (profit).

Two additional laws were passed in 1998, the Digital Millennium Copyright Act and the Copyright Extension Act that have had an extraordinary impact on copyrights.

In 1994 Clinton initiated a proposal called the Green Paper advocating that everything on the Internet be copyrighted. As a result, The Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) went into law in 1998, with the hope that it would clear up Internet copyright issues. This hasn't happened because the law was vaguely written and to many minds, incoherent. The result has been a series of lawsuits (everyone has heard of Napster and other big cases) that are trying to clarify the act (King, 2000). I will summarize some of these court battles as they relate to various online publishing issues later on in the paper.

Another 1998 law called the Copyright Extension Act (also known as the Sonny Bono Act) extended the term of copyright protection to nearly a century for corporations and even longer for individuals and their heirs. This translates into a 20-year freeze on copyrighted works before they go into the public domain. A 2003 court challenge (*Eldred v. Ashcrof*) supported by publishers and librarians, upheld this ruling. (See Copyright Extension Act.)

Conundrums of Copyright Laws

The laws and the numerous digital copyright court cases that have ensued are what Journal X's editor meant by "the mess of copyright law and the threat to academia and democratic dissemination of knowledge." Looking at the big picture, several scholars would agree with his negative assessment of the whole situation, e.g., Heins, 2003; Litman, 2001; Vaidhyanathan, 2001. The basic message of these three academics is that in the last 30 years copyright law has locked up expression, shrunk available works in the public domain and worked against scholarly creativity.

1. Jessica Litman, a law professor at Wayne State, suggests in *Digital Copyright* (2001) that because of these laws and court battles, big business (recording studios, movie studios, and publishers) and aggressive copyright lawyers are systematically restricting the information all people can get and hurting the research and scholarly community.

2. Siva Vaidhyanathan, a cultural historian and media scholar at NYU argues persuasively in *Copyrights and Wrongs* (2001) that "in its current punitive, highly restrictive form, American copyright law chokes cultural production and

expression. The whole concept of 'intellectual property" has tipped the balance of public and private interest in favor of the private sector."

3. In an online public policy report, *Why Copyright Today Threatens Intellectual Freedom* (2003), Marjorie Heins (First Amendment lawyer and Director of NYU Free Expression Policy Project) suggests that the "digital rights management" (DRM) of the last 30 years which controls the access and use of creative materials is inconsistent with a free and democratic copyright system. By and large, the two federal laws passed in 1998 (described above) have distorted the system by favoring industry at the expense of public's interest in accessing, sharing and transforming creative works.

Example of a Copyright Court Case Directly Effecting Online Journals

Now, let us look at an example of a court case that hits close to home--that is, the resounding ramifications of a court ruling on a scholarly online journal.

As compared to our ARF Yearbook, the scholarly publication I mentioned earlier is a heavyweight! Journal X is one of the oldest academic journals in the world. With the help of an online archiving database and a major grant, Journal X has recently scanned all the editions published in the last 120 years. Thanks to our colleagues at Appalachian State University, ARF also has archived online all the Yearbooks (i.e., papers presented at the yearly conferences) published in book form (1981-2001). While ARF gives free access and global electronic viewing and copying for the Yearbook, the professional organization that publishes Journal X allows free access on a read-only basis on the Internet. They use a software program that allows worldwide viewing, but only copying or downloading if the reader is a subscriber or paying member of the organization.

The rationale behind this self-archiving of peer reviewed scholarly journals is eloquently expressed by the Open Society Institute, a foundation set up by George Soros. The Institute's Budapest Open Access Initiative (BOAI) believes that "free and unrestricted online availability to all refereed scholarly journals removes the barriers to open access and builds a future in which research and education in every part of the world can flourish;" thus providing a "foundation for uniting humanity in a common intellectual conversation and quest for knowledge" (BOAI, 2002).

One recent court case has made this goal of BOAI difficult in the United States, particularly for scholarly Internet publications. In the Tasini Case (see Ebbinghouse, 2001), the Supreme Court ruled in 2001 that freelance writers should be compensated for electronic copies of their work. At no time did the publishers (the New York Times Co.) seek the consent of the authors nor were they compensated when their individual works were put into an electronic database. This sounds fair and right.

3

However, the Supreme Court made that decision on the basis of a strange rationale—that of bundled vs. unbundled works. The judges ruled "the databases did not reproduce and distribute the articles as part of a collective work." In practical terms, this means that when professional organizations put the papers from their journal into a different database without signed author contracts, they cannot allow access to those separate papers (unbundled) on the website for fear of litigation. To protect the organization from copyright infringement under the Tasini decision, the Journal X editor had to make a major revision to the website. Now when a reader clicks on the title of an individual article, the whole journal issue appears. Being apprehensive, Journal X's editor sees the publication moving to contracts—although how he would contact the early authors, when most are dead, is indeed a problem!

<div align="center">Perplexing Permissions</div>

Next, I would like to take this issue of copyright to a more personal level. In January and February of 2003, I spent six intense weeks getting 33 image permissions for my discussion of paintings of children and family literacy (Dowhower, 2002). Many good things came out of the endeavor—I'll highlight two of them.

Museums Without Walls

First, my research on literacy paintings, as well as the process of getting permission to use the images, underscored an amazing cultural shift quietly taking place in the last five years. As the Internet has facilitated worldwide access to scholarly journals, so too, has it unwrapped the whole world of art. In addition to museums and galleries opening up their collection to be viewed online, a number of quality web-based image archives have become available without charge. By giving unlimited free access to great art, "these institutions (and online collections) are engaging in an educational mission unlike any the world has ever seen--a museum without walls in the truest sense" (Phelan, 2003).

To help access these "museums without walls," there is available a wonderful art history search engine called *Artcyclopedia* created by John Malyon (Artcyclopedia: The Fine Art Search Engine). I immediately contacted Mr. Malyon with the hopes that he could give me the permissions I needed since most of the paintings in my paper were available through his website. This was a dead end because Artcyclopedia does not own the copyrights to any of the images.

Image search engines, like *Google, Alta Vista* and *Artcyclopedia* are allowed to exist because of another court ruling in 1999, *Kelly v. Arriba Soft* or more popularly, the Ditto.Com Case. The court ruled that when thumbnail images are created as navigational aids, they fall under fair use. Thumbnails are not considered infringement because "of the transformative nature of using reduced versions of images to organize and provide access to them" (see Kelly v. Arriba, 1999). A more recent ruling upheld the 1999 decision with respect to fair use of thumbnails but reversed its ruling on use of inline

linking. Search engines now can only link images to the original websites and cannot display the full-sized images on their site ([See Revised Ruling](#)).

Generous Professionals

Secondly, those I contacted for permission to use copyrighted images were, for the most part, incredibly professional and helpful. Although the process was slow and involved numerous contacts, the majority of rights and reproduction personnel from various art collections worked with me to grant permissions. Amazingly, 16 different museums and galleries worldwide gave me rights to use their images without any fees--a heartening response.

In fact, most of the professionals I communicated with underscored my faith in academia and the art world in general! I will give you four examples. The curator of the National Gallery of Australia at Melbourne went beyond my request by offering me an additional work by the impressionist E. Phillips Fox called *The Lesson* which I added to my discussion of parents teaching children to read. (See Dowhower, 2002, Figure 31.)

Several art history scholars who have created wonderful comprehensive online "image archives" and hold rights to the pictures on their website were exceedingly generous. Fred Ross, Director of the *Art Renewal Center* ([ARC International - The Art Renewal Center](#)) granted permission to use three quality images from his website and then introduced me to the work of a new artist, William Bouguereau—giving me authorization for several of the artist's paintings. I added the amazing image of a child reading (entitled *The Difficult Lesson)* to the first section of my paper. (See Dowhower, 2002, Figure 16.)

Lastly, (and much to my relief) Dr. Emil Kren of Hungary gave me rights to download seven paintings when several large museums did not respond to my faxes and emails or wanted to charge me for permission to use their images. Drs. Kren and Daniel Marx are the creators of the nonprofit *Web Gallery of Art* with 12,000 images of European art between 1150-1800 ([Web Gallery of Art](#)).

One contemporary art gallery was exceedingly supportive. Painter Brenda Joysmith and her husband Robert Bain are deeply committed to the cause of advancing Afro-American literacy. In fact, their Gallery in Memphis had a month-long exhibition called "Literacy: Within Reach" showing Blacks in the act of reading and writing. They munificently offered the painting called *The Ritual of Goodnight* in addition to the two others I requested from their website ([Joysmith Gallery and Studio](#)). (See Dowhower, 2002, Figure 36.)

Thus, thanks to the research support of a museum, two online image archives and a contemporary gallery, I was able to bring the initial total of 33 paintings to 36. While the quality of the paper was enhanced by the whole process of gaining permissions, the journey was not without its challenges. I will briefly describe seven rather intriguing dilemmas.

5

The Seven Dilemmas

1. The peeling onion effect.

Intellectual property rights to visual images can be like peeling an onion—a real conundrum. This is how the Conference on Fair Use (1996) explained the problem:

> Often, a digital image is several generations removed from the visual image it reproduces. For example, a digital image of a painting may have been scanned from a slide, which was copied from a published book that contained a printed reproduction of the work of art; this reproduction may have been made from a color transparency photographed directly from the original painting. There may be intellectual property rights in the original painting, and each additional stage of reproduction in this chain may involve another layer of rights. (CONFU, 1996)

You can see the problem: "*Who owns the image*?"

The best example I encountered of this "peeling the onion effect" was the first image in the paper. (See Dowhower, 2002, Figure 1.)

This painting on a Greek vase is at a website entitled *Images of Orality and Literacy in Greek Iconography* assembled by Andrew Wiesner in 1996 [(Orality and Literacy)](.). The caption says that the owner of the vase is the private Henri Seyrig Collection and the photo is from a paper by J. D. Beasley from a 1948 issue of *American Journal of Archaeology* (AJA). After weeks of searching, I find that Andrew Wiesner, now a banker in NYC, had scanned the image from Beasley's article when he was in graduate school and put it on the Internet along with other Greek literacy images. His mentor Dr. O'Donnell says Wiesner assembled the image collection himself and so owning them, would be glad to "propagate them in scholarly endeavors." After talking to the publications director of AJA, it is questionable if Wiesner owned the image just because he scanned it and AJA does not own the photo even though it is in their journal. The author is dead so there is no way of knowing if he photographed the vase himself or if he used a slide or photograph that was owned by the Seyrig Collection. Finally, after numerous emails and dead-ends (article author Beasley is dead and Seyrig Collection has been impossible to locate), AJA said that it would have no problem if I used the image from the journal, based on fair use and good faith effort to find the original owner of the photograph.

2. "The already there" dilemma.

As I searched for image owners, I was haunted by the realization that the Internet had multiple digital image reproductions of most of the paintings I put in my paper. For example, if you put "Pompeii Sappho" into *Google* Images Search Engine, you will get at least nine different sites with similar pictures of the *Portrait of a Young Writer* that I

received permission to use from the Naples National Archaeology Museum's website. (See Dowhower, 2002, Figure 4.)

Not only were there multiple sites, I soon determined that at least 75% of the 33 images in my paper were <u>on the web without copyright permission—and had been for many years</u>!

Several individuals in the mid-to-late 1990s developed online image archives by scanning paintings from books and other sources, e.g., Carol Gerten-Jackson, Olga Mataev, and Mark Harden. These three wonderful nonprofit educational art resources sites give free, unlimited access to thousands of painting reproductions—the majority of the images I needed permissions for were on these websites.

Both *CGFA Virtual Art Museum* created by Carol Gerten-Jackson (CGFA) and *Olga's Gallery* originally developed by Olga Mataev to help children learn art history (Olga's Gallery Online Art Museum) did not answer my requests. However, Mark Harden, developer of *The Artchive,* emailed me that he regrettably has been forced to take off some paintings from his site (e.g., Matisse, Picasso and Dali) because he did not have permissions for the images. Like Gerten-Jackson and Olga, Harden has an extensive copyright page that cautions that the thousands of scanned images are just for personal nonprofit and educational use (The Artchive).

What is of import here is that the three sites do not hold the rights to the painting images and they do not give the sources of their scans. They claim "fair use", particularly since most paintings are in the public domain. For me the big question was why couldn't I do the same? After all, ARF Online is a nonprofit, noncommercial, professional, educational publication.

3. The "publishing" dilemma.

Of course, *publication* is the operative word here. As Dr. Christine Sundt (a scholar on image rights) suggests, the <u>accepted practice</u> is to require image permissions for online publishing, like those in book form. Requiring consent and fees are carry-over traditions based on copyright laws for publishing images in hardcopy (Sundt, 2003b). The Conference on Fair Use (1996) published the following statement:

> 3.3   Use of Images for Publications.
> These guidelines do not cover reproducing and publishing images in publications, including scholarly publications in print or digital form, for which permission is generally required (CONFU, 1996).

As private and public museums and galleries have expanded their online collections over the last few years, they also have added clear guidelines for the use of images on their websites. For the most part, they state in their reproduction and rights page that images may be used for personal or educational purposes, but not in any publications—printed or electronic—without special permission. In truth, the

stipulation on museum websites that images cannot be downloaded without permission into digital publications has not been tested in the courts, nor has the accepted practice of requiring permissions and fees for reproductions of paintings in the public domain downloaded into scholarly not-for-profit papers.

Another court battle (*Bridgeman v. Corel*, 1999) gives some weight to questioning these museum practices. The judge ruled that a photograph of two-dimensional works whose very intent is to replicate a work in the public domain is not itself an original work of art and is not subject to copyright. "Since such a case had never before arisen, many museums for years have operated under the assumption that they hold copyright in such reproductions and invoke it to control the use of images of works in their collection" (Szczesny, 1999).

4. The "holding paintings hostage" dilemma.

Works in the public domain may be freely copied and used by anyone. Note that except for three paintings by contemporary artists, ALL the works in my paper were in the public domain. At first blush, you would think that I would have little trouble putting these images in my paper without charge. Think again.

Unfortunately, the digital images of paintings taken by museums photographers are generally NOT free—the museums claim they are protected by copyright and therefore can charge for their use. The situation is best explained by Tyler T. Ochoa, who at the time was an Associate Professor at Whittier Law School. He argued "where the public does not have access to the original painting, the ONLY way it has to reproduce the painting itself is to reproduce a reproduction of it. Unless we hold that photographs can be freely copied, the painting, as a practical matter, is not in the public domain" (Ochoa, 1999).

However, museums do not give the public free access, because most will not allow the public to take photographs or they demand a special charge for the right. "Museums restrict access to the originals for many good reasons (it takes time and money to make good reproductions), but also because it gives them a monopoly on reproductions" (Ochoa, 1999).

Thus for educators, researchers and the general population, museums are establishing a continuous copyright of works in the public domain.   Barry Szczesny, American Association of Museums Government Affairs Counsel explains it this way:

> To have museums who argue vigorously (and rightly) on the one hand for "fair use" and on the other to assert perpetual copyright (by taking photos over and over again) over works which have fallen into the public domain would be seen by some as a bit of a double standard and would be all the more troubling coming from institutions with educational missions who hold their collections in the public trust (Szczesny, 1999).

5. The double standard: economics over scholarship.

Indeed, I soon learned through my inquiries that museums and galleries raise money by requiring fees for online image use in a variety of creative ways: (a) by charging for permission to incorporate an image into an Internet publication; (b) by further requiring that the institution MUST supply the reproduction of the image for which the author must pay extra; (c) by levying fees for the length of time the publication will appear on the Internet—i.e., perpetual re-occurring costs; and/or (d) by charging for world-wide circulation. Even while offering educational discounts, most of the 16 public and private collections I contacted initially requested one or more of these fees. I began to identify with a question proposed by an art scholar (Sundt, 2000) who humorously inquired "Why do I have to mortgage my house to put illustrations in my book?"

The image below from the Roman Catacombs is not in my paper because of the exorbitant charges that the Vatican required. (Note: For this discussion, I made a low resolution scan from a photograph. The work is in the "public domain" and I claim "fair use" based on US Title 17 and the *Bridgeman v. Corel* decision that said an exact photograph of a two-dimensional work in the public domain was not original enough to be subject to a copyright.)

My request to the Photographic Archive of the Pontificia Commissione di Archeologia Sacra (PCAS) was to use the black and white image that I reproduced from a book--without charge. In an email response, the Minister said, "The PCAS could not grant my request." Furthermore, the charge would be 41 Euros to purchase a color digital image, 129 Euros to put the image in an online journal, and 129 Euros for worldwide circulation—a total of 299 Euros or $390.91.

In another example, the Tate Collection in London emailed me that it does not grant permissions for free and would only charge the educational rate of $15 a year for the next ten years. I would have to reapply to extend the permission. I replied that the

fee was unconscionable for a work in the public domain and I would take the image out of my paper, supplying a link to the image at the Tate Online site (see Martineau Painting, Tate Online).   (See Dowhower, 2002, Figure 30 discussion)

Indeed, why do I have to mortgage my condo to use images in my online paper?

6. *Unprepared for the digital age.*

What also became clear as I corresponded with reproduction representatives of various art collections was that they were staggeringly unprepared for the digital age. Museums seem to be operating in the limited mind-set of publications in printed form, which required image reproductions of high quality. As you will surmise from the examples below, the interchanges I had were both frustrating and humorous.

In this age of high-tech, what surprised me most was the problem of communication. Several large museums never responded, even though I used the email addresses and fax numbers supplied on their websites. One museum Webmaster said he daily throws away whole batches of emails—that is why he did not respond until my third try. I got his attention that time by entitling my email "Do Not Delete. Desperate, Dr. D."

Of all the collections, The National Gallery of London was the only one who had a website to electronically request copyright permissions. The site was impressive and well designed--giving multiple options for navigation, including a page spelling out permission requirements for any use of its copyrighted images. Unfortunately one option was missing. There was no avenue to request the use of a digital image from their online collection (National Gallery Picture Library).

After reading my letter clearly asking for permission to download an image from the museum website into an online publication, representatives repeatedly responded by offering me a transparency of the image to be sent through the mail. One very prestigious international museum even replied back that they did not have electronic images—I humbly pointed out that they had hundreds on their website!

Several museums with a huge number of paintings displayed online, said they did not allow images to be downloaded for reproduction purposes. One of their concerns was use of lower resolution of online images as compared to those used in hardcopy publications. Subsequent to explaining that the lower quality of 72 DPI was fine for my purposes, one European museum gave permission to use the image from its website. After pleading my case over several weeks of emails with two major US museums, they each generously emailed me a free image—exactly the same size and resolution as the one I had downloaded from each website!

Perhaps the most humorous reply was when one museum asked that I submit my request in *writing* (i.e., mail or fax) after I had sent a two-page letter with a permission form via e-mail!

7. *The web--a tangle of practice, tradition, law and scholarship.*

As a way of recapping and pulling together this "mess of copyright laws and practice," I would like to conclude with an issue that has become near and dear to my heart over the last year and a half—that of the tangled web of scholarship and image copyright on the Web!

In a talk to the American Association of Museums in May 2003, Professor Christine Sundt from University of Oregon, Eugene, succinctly put the digital scholarship dilemma this way. "There is real conflict between practice and tradition, law and museums" and "there is real distinction between hard core exploitation and creative, scholarly use of images" (Sundt, 2003a).

Dr. Sundt argued "for raising the bar for commercial uses to cover and eliminate cost for scholarship. " She made the following points:

1. For professors, scholarship IS mandated by universities, not just an option;

2. Because of the expense, color images are seldom possible in low-budget scholarly publications;

3. An educator is unlikely to reap profits from scholarly publishing; and

4. Regrettably, museums have gone well beyond copyright law in making their requirements for image use (e.g., images cannot be used in digital publications without permission). They are able to do this because (a) the law is vague; (b) "image" publication is not well defined; and (c) traditional practices of book publication are wrongly extended to the Internet. (Sundt, 2003a; Sundt, 2003b).

As an audience of literacy educators, I am sure the ironies of Dr. Sundt's comments are not lost on you. As a forum for educational ideas and research, the American Reading Forum has been at the forefront of online journal publication—with that comes the challenge of how to handle images. The ease of scanning and downloading images into Internet publications truly has confounded the issue of ownership as pictures proliferate on the Web. It remains to be seen whether economics, law, museums, tradition or scholarship will prevail. The results will either open up new opportunities for research and dissemination or truly limit education and creative scholarship.

How wonderful that the public, as well as scholars, have growing access to paintings on the Internet (truly an evolving museum without walls) and how unfair that educators (who are generally not paid for their work) have to jump so many hurdles to put images in research, non-profit publications. As to the copyright conundrums and

perplexing permissions of illustrative images on the Internet and six weeks of "begging" for free permissions, I have come to one conclusion. Art collections should be PAYING US for showcasing their works in a worldwide forum!

References

BOAI (2002, February). Budapest Open Access Initiative. *ARL*, *No. 220.* Retrieved August 5, 2004, from http://www.arl.org/newsltr/220/boai.html

CONFU (1996). *A Proposal for Educational Fair Use Guidelines for Digital Images: Introduction.* Retrieved August 5, 2004, from http://www.utsystem.edu/OGC/IntellectualProperty/imagguid.htm

Dowhower, S. L. (2002). Picturing the word: A literacy odyssey in paintings of children, youth and families. *American Reading Forum Online Yearbook, 22*. Retrieved from http://www.americanreadingforum.org/02_yearbook/html/06_Dowhower_final.htm

Ebbinghouse, C. (2001, September). Tasini case final decision: Authors win. *Information Today.* Retrieved August 5, 2004, from http://www.infotoday.com/newsbreaks/nb010628-1.htm

Heins, M. (2003). *The progress of science and useful arts: Why copyright today threatens intellectual freedom: A public policy report* (2nd Ed.). The Free Expression Policy Project. Retrieved August 5, 2004, from http://www.fepproject.org/policyreports/copyright2dexsum.html

King, B. (2000, May). Tuning up digital copyright law. *Wired News.* Retrieved August 5, 2004, from http://www.wired.com/news/business/0,1367,36323,00.html

Litman, J. (2001). *Digital copyright.* Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

Ochoa, T. T. (1999). *Fine art reproductions.* Retrieved August 5, 2004, from http://www.cni.org/Hforums/cni-copyright/1999-02/0226.html

Phelan, J. (2003). If paintings could talk: Paul Johnson's Art: A new history. *Artcyclopedia Feature Archive*. Retrieved August 5, 2004, from http://www.artcyclopedia.com/feature-2003-11.html

Sundt, C. L. (2000). Been there, done that! Presentation at the College Art Association, New York, NY. *Copyright and Art Issues.* Retrieved August 20, 2004, from http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~csundt/copyweb/

Sundt, C. L. (2003a). Protection and control of museum images in education: Straddling the not-so-bright line between necessity and infringement. Presentation at the American Association of Museums Conference, Portland. *Copyright and Art*

Issues. Retrieved August 20, 2004, from
http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~csundt/copyweb/

Sundt, C. L. (2003b). Personal communication, December 8, 2003.

Szczesny, B. G. (1999, April). What's happening in Washington? Excerpts from
American Association of Museums Annual Meeting Presentation. Retrieved
August 18, 2004, from http://www.panix.com/~squigle/rarin/corel2.html

Vaidhyanathan, S. (2001). *Copyrights and copywrongs: The rise of intellectual property and
how it threatens creativity*. New York: New York University Press.

From Practitioners to Researchers: Facilitating Classroom Research

Rosalind Raymond Gann
Jane E. Melendez
>	East Tennessee State University
Melissa Bray
>	Churchill Elementary School
Stephanie Mann
>	Mount Carmel Elementary School
Teresa Young
>	Fairmont Elementary School

Introduction

We are living an era when a physicist is heading the National Panel on Literacy, and only four of its members have had hands-on experience with the teaching of reading, or the administration of reading programs (National Panel on Reading). We cry "foul!" arguing the expertise of the literacy profession has been swept to the side. Yet we ourselves can be guilty of the same disregard for the contributions of those who labor long and hard in our field. I speak of the failure to include the voices of K-12 practitioners in many of our reading conferences and journals, or even at times to recognize that those who teach reading daily would have important things to say. In part, the problem is one of professional discourse and dialect. Professors and researchers can be embarrassed by the way their elementary and secondary school colleagues talk. K-12 teachers are socialized to speak in a discourse that is anecdotal, situationally specific, and embedded in concrete detail. Here is an example:

> To help her students develop schemata for understanding a reading on the early life of Abraham Lincoln, a fourth grade teacher has her students build "log cabins" out of popsicle sticks and school glue. While they are building, she has students imagine what it would be like to live within one of these structures. The activity generates much productive discussion. The students understand the reading. When she discusses the project with colleagues, her talk is replete with admonitions on how to unstick the tops of glue bottles and how important it is that structures be left to dry on paper towels, not on the tops of desks.

The teacher in this case, employs a discourse that North has described as "lore" (1987), which he characterizes as an oral tradition for conveying guidance to fellow educators. Lore is easy to caricature. It is not a discourse of power (Fairclough, 1995). Such discourses do not "play" well in many of our academic reading conferences and journals.

This paper relates an experience in which I (Gann) required a group of seasoned teachers—all masters' degree candidates in reading—to design action research projects in their

classrooms. In the course of the project, the teachers not only developed teaching strategies that might interest the rest of us; they became fluent in the language of research, a discourse of power. The control of such discourses is vital in an era that fails to respect the contribution of classroom practitioners to the educational enterprise, minimizes it through a process some have called "deskilling" (Shannon, 1989), and often treats teachers as mere technicians of the testing process.

Arguably, today's K-12 teachers are measured and tested at least as much as their students. Despite creativity and motivation, teachers exist in a professional culture of accountability, where it is assumed they must be told what to do with specific structural mechanisms in place to assure they do it (Stephens, 1998). Politicians and the public are obsessed with romanticized visions of an educational past where rules were enforced and students learned basics. Teachers are assumed to be the "passive recipients of the dictates of experts," and incapable of self direction (Kincheloe, 2003, p. 2). Uninformed by the knowledge base of teachers, research is often removed from the reality of practice in today's society, and reforms are imposed on the schools from the outside, limiting the effectiveness of the reforms.

Elementary and secondary teachers seldom learn to perform research, and when they study research the techniques are rarely the sort that can be applied in a classroom. For example, positivistic modes of research require investigators to control artificially devised experimental groups and conditions, in a way unachievable in a practitioner's own classroom. Broadly speaking, however, research is asking questions, making predictions, and showing evidence for what one does. It is about actively seeking knowledge and using it (Boomer, 1987). This is why action research paradigms are so useful to classroom teachers. The notion that teachers as well as academics and professional researchers can engage in research is grounded in democratic social theory which assumes that educational research is not the exclusive preserve of an elite minority (Kincheloe, 2003). In classroom action research, the investigator identifies a problem, reads what others have done in similar circumstances, and formulates a strategy for addressing the problem in a particular setting. The investigator keeps records of how well the intervention works and shares the results with other educators (Stringer, 2004). He or she behaves as teacher and researcher at the same time (Mills, 2000). The research is integrated into pedagogic practice. The method, which was first developed by Kurt Lewin in the 1930's, is plastic and can merge with a variety of educational ideologies. Some writers (e.g., Stringer, Mills), seem to value action research most as professional development for teachers. Others, like Kincheloe, stress its knowledge generating capacity and its potential for stimulating organizational change within schools.

Getting Started: Rosalind Gann

In the Fall of 2002, when I undertook teaching Content Area Reading to ten experienced classroom teachers in the Reading Masters Program at East Tennessee State University, I had no intention of requiring them to do action research. I was new to the faculty, and content area reading was not my specialization. I followed the established syllabus and textbook. Having been a K-12 educator, I was accustomed to writing materials to supplement content area textbooks. I planned to cover the textbook, to show the teachers how to write supplementary materials, and to assign them term papers. But grading the first assignments was humbling. The teachers, most of

whom worked in low-resource and otherwise challenging schools, were already developing highly appropriate learning materials for their students. They already knew the material in our textbook. While a few of the students were slightly newer to the field, the class was mostly composed of creative reading practitioners, who had much to teach me and others in the profession. They were ready to learn new modes of discourse so they could make their own contributions to professional knowledge. Action research would be a worthwhile way of addressing the issue. I therefore upgraded the term paper to the designing of an action research project.

Taking Action: Jane Melendez

About mid semester of fall 2002, Dr. Gann told me that she had included an assignment, which required the students in our Reading MA cohort to develop action research proposals as a component in the course, Reading Instruction in Middle and Secondary Schools. This assignment meant the students would be in possession of action research proposals at the end of the fall semester. I suggested Dr. Gann inform the students that I would have them conduct and report their action research as a part of the practicum course I was scheduled to teach in spring, 2003. While the students had been reluctant to develop the action research proposals in the beginning, the opportunity to carry out their research boosted their willingness to produce the proposals. Action research was then included as a major component of our practicum course. The students conducted several well-designed, creative projects in their classrooms, and it was a pleasure for me to observe their research processes. Toward the end of the semester, we worked on their written reports, and they learned to be cautious about the sorts of claims that can be made related to informal classroom research. They produced well-written action research reports.

The students were to graduate in May 2003, and they were facing the culminating experience for their program – evaluative interviews with their committee members. I suggested to them that we convert the process to a Reading MA symposium for which we would gather on a Saturday and they would present their research to each other, the members of their committees, and other interested faculty. They were very enthusiastic about the idea, and we conducted the 2003 Reading MA Symposium during late March. Our students' presentations were very well received by all present. Faculty commented on the creativity of the action research projects and professionalism with which the students presented their reports. We will continue with this format for our Reading MA program.

Student Action Research Projects

Of the ten students in the Reading MA program, all completed the project satisfactorily. Three of the graduate students further refined and edited their work, presenting it at the 2003 American Reading Forum Conference. Excerpts from their papers appear below. These particular papers were selected because they reflect the quality and range of the projects, and also because their authors were willing to spend the additional time required to edit them for publication. The projects reflect long-standing interests and professional competencies of their authors. The value of the assignment was to challenge these accomplished educators to discuss their activities in the discourse of research.

Excerpts From "Involving Parents in their Children's Reading Development"

by Melissa Bray, M. A.

Introduction

A parent's active role in a child's education has proven to be a key factor in a child's successful schooling. Parental involvement has positive effects on students' academic achievement, work ethic, self-esteem, attendance, motivation, and social behavior. "Parent involvement is a necessary part of the education process...", says Sherlie Anderson (2000). Parental involvement can take many forms – volunteering at school, attending meetings, encouraging the child to try new and harder tasks, maintaining contact with teachers, practicing new skills with the child, or assisting the child with homework. "Passive forms of involvement are better than no involvement at all", say Kathleen Cotton and Karen Reed Wikelund (1989).

This is especially true of developing a child's reading ability. Research has shown that parental involvement can positively impact the reading achievement of students (Cotton & Wikelund, 1989). Students who receive extra help from their parents make significant gains in reading achievement when compared to students who do not receive extra help from their parents (Faires, Nichols, & Rickelman, 2000). "Getting parents involved in their children's reading, regardless of the type or the intensity..., leads to improvements in students' ability to read and... in students' interest and enjoyment of reading" (Rasinski & Fredricks, 1989, p 84-85).

Setting

The school, which was the setting for this study, is in a rural community in Northeast Tennessee. The student population was 352 students in Kindergarten through fifth grade. There were three general education classrooms per grade level. There were two special education resource classes and one Comprehensive Development Class (CDC). The school is a Title One school, which indicates over 50% of the student population qualified for free or reduced lunch based on household income. The population involved in this study was 17 first, second, and third grade students who were served in a special education resource classroom. All 17 of the students received special education services for reading and 12 of the 17 students received special education services for math as well. Fourteen of the students had been identified as having a learning disability in the area of reading or reading and math. Two of the students were health impaired and one was language impaired. The purpose of this research was to investigate the effect that parental involvement at home could have on the reading achievement of special education students.

Methods

Letters were sent to the parents asking permission for their children to be included in the study. The letter went on to ask if parents would be willing to commit to assisting their children with reading at least four nights a week. They were then given the opportunity to attend a training session. The response to the letters determined which group the children and their parents were assigned to. The first group was comprised of students whose parents were actively

involved and who were trained in reading strategies to use with their children. This group was designated Group A. The second group consisted of students whose parents agreed to be actively involved with their children's reading assignments, but they were not trained in any special techniques or methods. This group was designated Group B. The third group included students whose parents gave permission for their children to be included in the study, but did not want to participate themselves. This became Group C. The children's reading levels were assessed by administering the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery – Revised (WJ-R). The WJ-R was given as a pre- and posttest.

The parent training sessions included a simplified format for using reading cueing systems. Strategies included how to effectively use context clues, phonics and syntax when encountering an unknown word, and how to model reading, cueing systems and questioning techniques. Parents were also given the option of attending an individual training session where they observed the researcher reading with their children using the strategies presented in the training session. In an effort to maintain the integrity of the research, there were no changes made in the classroom setting or teaching methods used during this study. The only variable changed was the level of parental involvement. The frequency and duration of the parental involvement was checked by having parents sign a reading log each night and by verbal verification from the students.

Results and Discussion

All 14 parents agreed to read with their children four nights a week for 20 to 30 minutes. Five of the 14 parents agreed to attend a reading training session, but only two parents actually attended. Reading logs documented that 9 of the 14 parents read with their children at least four nights each week. The response to the training sessions resulted in Group A having two students whose parents were actively involved and trained in using cueing systems. Group B had seven students whose parents were actively involved but not trained in using the reading cueing systems. Group C consisted of five students whose parents were not actively involved.

The results of this study strongly suggest that parental involvement may improve the reading achievement of special education students. The students whose parents were trained to use the reading cueing systems made more improvements than those whose parents were not trained or were not involved. Substantial improvements in students' reading were shown by most of the students whose parents were actively involved but not trained. These results imply that parental involvement impacts students' reading performance positively and suggests that parental training may make parental involvement more effective.

Excerpts from "Teaching Fifth Graders to Understand Graphs and Charts"

by Stephanie Mann, M.A.

Introduction

It has been my experience over the past five years that students have a difficult time reading and interpreting the information given in charts, graphs, and maps in content area

subjects. I have observed students paying little or no attention to the visual aids provided in their textbooks. When visual aids are linked to the chapter reading, I have found that students consider them to have little connection to what they are learning. Why do students have trouble reading and interpreting visual aids in content area subjects? Students need to be taught the value and importance visual aids provide to learning. The purpose for my study was to better equip students with visual and reading strategies that would allow them to correctly interpret visual aids in content area subjects. The research addressed the following questions: Will hands-on instruction prove effective in developing skills in reading and interpreting visual aids in content area subjects? Will the hands-on instructional method make a difference in student ability to interpret visual aids? Do skills used when students create their own visuals increase their ability to interpret them in textbooks?

Setting

The location for the study was a rural school serving kindergarten through fifth grade. There were 18 teachers and 331 students. Approximately 40% lived in nuclear families while the other 60% lived in a single or "zero" parent homes. Of the student body, 46.3% received free or reduced-price meals. All students spoke English as their primary language.

Review of the Literature

A number of the studies have explored how students utilized the visuals in their textbooks. According to Mesmer and Hutchins (2002), students were able to explain detailed science processes, but when asked a multiple-choice question they often produced the wrong answer. The students thought that the visuals were irrelevant and did not take the time to use them. Arnold & Dwyer; Booher; Decker & Wheatly; Holiday, Brunner, and Donais; Rigney & Lutz (as cited in DuPlass, 1995), compared the performance of students who were presented material with and without graphic displays. The results of the studies provided evidence that students' comprehension improved when they were taught with graphics as opposed to when they were taught with little to no graphics. DuPlass (1996) used a three-step strategy provided by Mannhood, Biemer, and Lowe (cited by DuPlass, 1996) for teaching the interpretation of graphical images. As a result of using this strategy, DuPlass' students who were not able to read or interpret charts and graphs beforehand were able to read and interpret graphic information after the instruction.

Methods

The students created three graphs each during their social studies class during a six weeks period. Verbal permission was given to me by my principal to conduct this study. Letters were sent home to parents requesting permission for their children to participate. Of the 55 fifth grade students, 47 participated in the study. The study sample was reduced to 40 students due to transfers or absenteeism that affected testing. Students were identified by their textbook numbers during the study.

The class discussed different types of visuals provided in their textbooks before beginning their assignments. This allowed the teacher to determine the students' prior knowledge

of visual aids. Once the teacher had collected the students' background information, a foundation was laid for in-depth instruction about visual aids. The students determined topics they wanted to use for school surveys. One week was spent determining survey questions, gathering the information needed in order to complete a bar, line, and circle graph, and generating a survey form for all students to use. Some of the choices were favorite sports, favorite cars, and favorite pets. After all survey data had been collected, each student created a bar graph showing the results of the first survey, a line graph showing the results of a second survey, and a circle graph showing the results of a third survey. Students were required to provide titles, keys, and all labeling for each graph. Once graphs were completed, each student explained his/her graph to the class. Graphs were displayed for the entire school to see and read. Students were assigned two graphs to review before beginning the study. They answered sixteen questions that were associated with the graphs. The students were assigned the same two graphs and questions at the conclusion of the study. The scores from these tests were compared to determine differences in skill levels used to read and interpret visual aids at the beginning of the study and its conclusion. I also collected data over the six-week period through observations and documented it through note taking. I wrote about the students' reactions, work, and progress at the completion of each day in a reflective journal. This allowed me to monitor student progress in skill development, to identify needs for additional instruction following the study, and to reflect on the study.

The students' answers to the pre-tests and post-tests were analyzed to see if the students had paid attention to the material that was presented only in the visual aids. Some questions were formatted so students would only know the correct answers if they had paid attention to supplemental text and information given with visual aids. The answers allowed me to determine if the students read the supplemental text or merely looked at the graphics.

Results and Discussion

The "hands-on" approach proved to be a beneficial means of increasing students' understanding of content area graphs. Skills developed by students while creating visual aids also improved their skills for correctly interpreting visual aids in content area material. Comparisons were made to see if students' interpretations of charts and graphs increased by using student created visuals as a method of teaching. It appeared that many of the students' skills in correctly reading and interpreting visual aids improved. Of the 40 students who participated in this study, 19 students improved in their ability to interpret charts and graphs, while 21 students' ability to interpret these visual aids remained approximately the same.

Students often look at graphics and bypass the supporting text and information. Their attention is often caught by the image, but they tend to disregard the meaning of the information presented. The purpose of my research was to determine if student awareness of the graphics in content area textbooks could be increased and if their interpretation skills could be improved. The research indicated that many of the students did benefit from this method of instruction. The students who showed the most improvement were the students who performed at a level that was below average in the areas of social studies and science. This study suggests that this method of instruction, which uses a hands-on approach, benefits low-functioning students the most. Follow-up research might use resource or low average students as a population to see if the results are consistent.

Excerpts from: Increasing Spelling Proficiency Through Writing

Teresa Young, M.A.

Introduction

The intent of this project was to promote increased proficiency in students' spelling through meaningful writing instruction and practice. Efforts to teach students to read often focus on the reading process while neglecting to balance instruction with writing and spelling. This research took place at an elementary School located in an older neighborhood that many years ago was deemed prestigious and where only the affluent lived. Today, it is a Title I school serving approximately 230 students, predominately white, with 45 students being served in special education. This study focused on the spelling difficulties of a group of special education third grade students' and examines both weekly spelling tests and written work. The special education group consisted of eight boys and one girl ranging in ages between eight and ten years old from two third grade classrooms. This group receives "pull out" instruction in the special education classroom in reading and language arts for two hours daily on third grade level with the current textbook. The basal includes spelling words; grammar lessons were taken from the weekly story.

It has been the responsibility of the special education teacher to develop and implement strategies to teach learning disabled and sometimes unmotivated students to improve their spelling skills during the reading and language arts class. How could these special education students' spelling be improved in written language daily practice and on their weekly spelling assessments? Was the current curriculum the right curriculum for teaching reading, written language and spelling skills to this population? What is the most effective strategy for long-term retention of spelling that would enable these students to communicate in writing?

Review of the Literature

Degeneffe and Ward (1998) developed a program to increase the application of spelling skills in students' writing. In a study by Boyd and Talbert (1971) on characteristics of good and poor spellers, visual and auditory discrimination were found to have a high correlation with spelling ability, revealing that visual discrimination is more closely related to spelling ability than auditory discrimination. To meet learners' different learning styles and needs, Boyd and Talbert (1971) suggested that frequently used spelling lists and a variety of activities should be used. Many words in spelling need to be over-learned so that they may be written without conscious thought by students. Drill and practice of writing and re-writing spelling words is not an effective strategy because a student may see a word that he is learning to spell, yet reproduce it incorrectly without any metacognitive process. Active intellectual involvement is necessary in learning to spell. Ediger (2000) discussed the acid test of student achievement in spelling, the actual application of correct spelling of words in functional written products without weekly spelling tests. Students should be given spelling words that have relevancy to them. Cued spelling strategies developed and researched in Scotland is a simple procedure that promotes spelling mastery through motivated practice and memory cues developed by the students

(Topping, 2001). Students are paired with partners, either peers or parents, in the learning process. Both students and their partners check the correct spelling of the words, read the words, and write the spelling words. The cued spelling technique distinguishes itself from traditional spelling methods by having the students develop their own cues for remembering the correct spelling of words. In an action research program to increase application of students' spelling skills in their writing that targeted first graders in a city school, three interventions consisting of establishing a print-rich environment, implementing direct teaching of spelling strategies, and creating student centered activities were implemented (Bleck, Crawford, Feldman, & Rayl, 2000). The first grade teachers had used the traditional drill and test teaching method while using commonly basic written words for weekly tests. Teachers had chosen spelling words randomly for each thematic reading unit, and they were inhibited in teaching spelling skills to their students by the lack of time allocated in the daily language arts schedule. The print-rich environment began developing when the teacher modeled writing a paragraph about a child in the classroom, and posted that paragraph on the wall for children to refer to when reading and writing (Gentry & Gillet cited in Bleck, Crawford, Feldman, & Rayl, 2000).

An action research by Angelisi (2000) was conducted in a third grade classroom for three weeks. It focused on the pros, cons, and effects of three different spelling strategies and activities. The study used the traditional rote, drill, and memorization spelling strategy that is typically used in classrooms and introduced two different strategies of phonemic awareness and word identification. Results showed that the traditional method caused all students in the study to show frustration with this strategy incorporated to learn spelling. Laminack (1996) offered observations of the success of any spelling strategies lies in children using them. Teachers can get a sense of how children use various strategies to spell as they write through observation, questioning, and analysis of writing samples. However, curricular and instructional decisions are not left to the classroom teacher to decide upon; the one person who knows the students' needs most. When spelling instruction is a matter of moving students through the spelling textbook, teachers do not have to make any decisions about what to teach and when to teach it. Yet, when writing is the focus with spelling instruction as a part of it, then teachers must rely on their own knowledge of spelling in use. This comes from their professional training, and experience as writers and observers. A balanced literacy program requires a supportive classroom environment that is rich in print and resources for supporting the work of students as readers and writers.

Methods

The study population was a group of nine third grade special education students in pull out language arts instruction. Parents received a letter explaining the project that asked for permission for their children's participation. New strategies and procedures for spelling instruction in this study involved small-group rotation in fifteen-minute intervals of activities. Emphasis was placed on students learning functional words from a frequently used word list in everyday writing. Special education students have limited experience with writing, especially on-going creative writing that involves editing.

Spelling words were chosen from the *Guide to the Rank List* (Becker, Dixon, & Anderson-Inman, 1980), in addition to the ten to twelve spelling words for each weekly story in the basal textbook. Students had twenty spelling words on weekly tests. A pretest was given for

each set of one hundred words in order to determine words the majority of the special education group did not spell appropriately. This was done to eliminate redundant work on skills already mastered by the students.

The study population of nine special education students was divided into groups of three. At the beginning of each week, the students were given their weekly spelling list. During the language arts class, each group rotated through three different skill centers. The skills were a grammar lesson from the basal with direct instruction, a writer's workshop, and an individual spelling activity. Each center activity was 15 minutes long. The language arts class consisted of an hour with three 15-minute rotations.

The grammar skills consisted of direct instruction from the basal's workbook, skills book, and assessment. Grammar lessons included nouns, pronouns, adjectives, punctuation, capitalization, and abbreviations. One skill was studied each week with assessment each Friday. The vocabulary words were included in the lessons from the basal. The writer's workshop was comprised of a written activity where students wrote sentences, paragraphs and letters. The students worked individually on a modeled and pre-directed writing assignment for 15 minutes daily. The students were required to use all their spelling words in their writing assignment each day. Neat handwriting, grammar, punctuation, capitalization, content, and spelling were emphasized in the students' writing. Daily work was graded on spelling accuracy. Written work was assessed daily, and feedback was given to the students in written and verbal form. The final written assignment was due at the end of each week.

The individual spelling activities were worksheets. Students were familiar with the format. A different custom-designed spelling activity was presented daily. These activities used the weekly spelling words and incorporated visual-perceptual skills, spelling and phonemic patterns, and fine motor skills to meet the students' individual needs. Activities included alphabetic order, crossword puzzles, coding, matching, missing letters, jumbled words, word search puzzles, and copying. These activities were rotated weekly to motivate student participation and interest.

A weekly spelling test was given on Friday from the spelling list tape-recorded by the teacher. This test was presented in the traditional method in which a word was pronounced in isolation, and pronounced again in a sentence. Students checked and corrected their own tests with the use of an answer key. This helped the students take ownership of their work.

Results and Discussion

The researcher gathered baseline data that consisted of special education students' spelling errors on pretests of frequently used words from the *Guide to the Rank List*. All students' daily grades and written products for spelling proficiency and writing accuracy showed an increase in accuracy and proficiency. In comparing students' work samples from the beginning of the six weeks to the end of the six weeks, students were able to develop sentences and paragraphs that were much more meaningful and fluent. Their attention to details in all three activity centers improved. Overall, the special education students' handwriting was also more legible. Data collection of the fourth six weeks spelling tests and averaged grades, in comparison

to the second and third six weeks spelling tests and averaged grades, showed a 9.8% decrease in the majority of special education students' grades instead of the desired increase.

When interviewed, students stated that they preferred the learning environment of the daily skill centers to the traditional spelling instruction. They agreed that they would like to continue the group rotation activities after the action research was completed. The researcher observed improved spelling on daily work. Students' handwriting improved in sentences, paragraphs and letters. Written work improved through meaningful and fluent content. The researcher noted that this strategy required more preparation time for daily activities, generated more papers to grade for student feedback, and necessitated more worksheet copies to be printed for students' use. However, the researcher was able to teach more curriculum skills successfully to the students than in the traditional setting.

Based on the analysis of the data on weekly spelling tests and six weeks' grades, the students did not show improvement in the use of correctly spelled words. The project did not prove to have a positive impact on special education students' spelling performance on tests reflected by grades during the fourth six weeks grading period.

There were obvious limitations to this study when one reviews the factors that may have interfered with the research that caused the undesired results. The short time span of six weeks for students to learn the new routine and for the researcher to collect data may have had a negative effect on the outcome of the project. Also, the inclement weather and holidays shortened five of the six weeks by as little as one day and as much as three days during the research. The students' increased absenteeism due to influenza during this study may have been another factor causing lower grades. Or, it may be the case that careful selection of appropriate words for study should be considered. Bear, Invernizzi, Templeton, & Johnson (2000) and others argue that words selected for spelling should be organized around sound, visual, or meaning patterns, selected to match students' levels of orthographic development (Henderson, 1990; Schlagal & Trathen, 1998; Templeton & Morris, 2000) Given these limitations, one may conclude that further action research should be considered in order to compare results to this study.

Reflecting on Student Action Research Projects

The papers excerpted above represent the thoughtfulness and creativity of the K-12 reading practitioners we regularly encounter in our Reading Masters program. Long before they arrived in our classes, these accomplished teachers were developing strategies for addressing the often daunting circumstances under which they work. We can claim no credit for having taught Ms. Bray how to help parents of special education students to use the multiple cueing systems for which she gained understanding in her reading diagnosis courses. We did not teach Ms. Mann how to show fifth graders to read and create graphs. Ms. Young's strategy for teaching standard spelling to special education students is her own intellectual property. What this joint project supplied to the teachers was another discourse, that of action research. It is an important discourse for teachers to know and control, for it is a discourse of power. In these times when persons far removed from the classroom seek to control methods teachers use in equipping

children with literacy, it is vital that teachers assert their claim to direct the educational enterprise.

Conclusion

This paper has related how three exemplary teachers—representatives of a class—learned to use the language of action research for their classroom projects. We continue to hope that they and teachers like them will continue to present, write and publish so that their work will influence the future of education in general and reading education in particular. In the popular press, teachers like Ms. Bray, Ms. Mann and Ms.Young are sometimes called "Veterans." There is a reason they are called this. These women are the heroes of the educational system. The conditions under which they work are often daunting. They are blamed for societal problems not of their making, and their expertise is not always respected.

We hope they will continue writing and sharing what they know, and we hope the reading profession will listen. In this paper, they have agreed to speak in the discourse of academic research. However, in the future, we hope the academic community will have the professional humility to listen respectfully when K-12 teachers speak in their accustomed professional discourse of teacher lore.

References

Anderson, S.A. (2000). How parental involvement makes a difference in reading achievement. *Reading Improvement, 37,* 61-86.

Angelisi, M.A. (2000). *Teaching spelling: Which strategies work best*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED346082)

Becker, W.C., Dixon, R., & Anderson-Inman, L. (1980). *Morphographic and root word analysis of 26,000 high frequency words*. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, College of Education.

Bleck, J., Crawford, B., Feldman, I., & Rayl, T. (2000). *Improving student spelling in daily written work*. Chicago, IL: Saint Xavier University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED443130)

Boomer, G. (1987). Addressing the problem of elsewhereness: A case for action research in the schools. In D. Goswami, & P.R. Stillman (Eds.), *Reclaiming the classroom: Teacher research as an agency for change.* Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Boyd, G.A., & Talbert, E.G. (1971). *Spelling in the elementary school.* Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Cotton, K. & Wikelund, K.R. (1989). *Parent involvement in education*. Retrieved October 10, 2001, from http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/sirs/3/cu6.html

Degeneffe, L., & Ward, L. (1998). *A constructivist approach to spelling strategies.* Chicago, IL: Saint Xavier University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED420848)

DuPlass, J. A. (1996). Charts, tables, graphs, and diagrams: An approach for social studies teachers. *The Social Studies, 87,* 32 – 37.

Ediger, M. (2000). *Assessing student achievement in spelling.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED447487)

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language.* New York: Longman.

Faires, J., Nichols, W.D., & Rickelman, R.J. (2000). Effects of parental involvement in developing competent readers in first grade. *Reading Psychology*, *21,* 195-215.

Henderson, E. H. (1990). *Teaching spelling*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Kincheloe, J.L. (2003). *Teachers as researchers: Qualitative inquiry as a path to empowerment.* New York: Routledge Falmer.

Laminack, L. (1996). *Spelling in use.* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Mesmer, H. A., & Hutchins, E. J. (2002). Using QARs with charts and graphs. *The Reading Teacher*, *56,* 21 – 27.

Mills, G.E. (2000). *Action research: A guide for the teacher researcher.* Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

National Panel on Reading. *Bibliographies of members.* Retrieved on March 3, 2004, from http://www.nationalreadingpanel.org/NRPAbout/Biographies.htm

North, S. M. (1987). T*he making of knowledge in composition: Portrait of an emerging field.* Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton-Cook Publishers.

Rasinski, T. & Fredricks, A.D. (1989). Working with parents: Can parents make a difference? *The Reading Teacher, 43,* 84-85.

Schlagal, B. & Trathen, W. (1998). American spelling instruction: What history tells us. In R. J. Telfer (Ed.) *Finding our literacy roots: Yearbook of the American Reading Forum,* 18, Retrieved on November 8, 2004, from http://www.americanreadingforum.org/98_yearbook/volume98toc.htm

Shannon, P. (1989). *Broken promises: Reading instruction in twentieth century America.* Granby, MA.: Bergin & Garvey.

Stephens, D. (1998). Literacy education as a political act. In C. Weaver (Ed.), *Practicing what we know: Informed reading instruction* (pp.viii-xiv). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Stringer, E. (2004). *Action research in education.* Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson, Merrill, Prentice Hall.

Templeton, S. & Morris, D. (2000). Spelling. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.) *Handbook of reading research, Vol 3* (pp. 525-543). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Topping, K. (2001). *Peer-and parent-assisted learning in reading, writing, spelling and thinking skills*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED452496)

PARTICIPATING AS LITERACY VOLUNTEERS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

Sharon Kossack, Florida International University
Ellie Friedland, Wheelock College
Janet C. Richards, University of South Florida

International representatives at the 2000 World Education Forum unanimously acknowledged education as a "fundamental human right….key to sustainable development and peace and stability" (World Education Forum, 2000). They launched the Education For All (EFA) initiative, a collaboration between governments, organizations (e.g., World Bank and UNESCO), civilian groups and associations which dedicates resources to form within- and cross-county projects designed to provide education for "every citizen in every society" (World Education Forum, 2000). Their goal: 50% improvement in levels of adult literacy by 2015.

Having worked with developing educational systems for some time, this resolution seems an impossible dream. Social, political, and educational realities in developing nations seem to move at cross purposes to thwart progress. However, we have experienced, dedicated individuals determined to make a difference in literacy within their own sphere of influence. In this article, we share such developing initiatives: They are in Abaco, Bahamas; Guatemala; and northern Thailand. In this article we share our individual and collective volunteer experiences. As outsiders, we try to represent "what is subtle and significant…making public what (we have) seen, enabling others to see this as well" (Pitman & Maxwell, 1992, p. 746).

Our stories should not be viewed as comprehensive, but might best be viewed as cameos of the situations in which we worked. Nor should they be viewed as entirely objective, for we can only offer our perceptions of what we experienced, viewed through the lens of our own culture and experience. By sharing what we experienced, we hope to expand appreciation of the complexities of such initiatives while emphasizing the strong spirit of the in-country participants with whom we worked. In spite of the diversity of the projects, each author came to understand to a deepened understanding of the courage, self-reliance, dignity, and determination of the in-country participants.

<div align="center">Abaco, Bahamas (Stateside Contact: Sharon Kossack, FIU)</div>

Context and Historical Perspective

The schools across the Caribbean still feel the effects of the British Colonial System of education (Perry, de Ferranti, Ferreira, & Walton, 2003). The British who occupied these countries structured colonial society to prevent those at the bottom of the power structure from learning to read and write. Literacy is power. And power is not often freely given over by an occupying force.

Schools in the Bahamas are organized in two tiers, primary (K-5) and secondary (grades 6-12), paralleling the British educational structure. There is no graduation or diploma. Students

build knowledge toward taking tests at the end of their secondary years which qualify them for university and/or certain careers. Because teachers are relatively scarce most begin teaching right out of high school. After teaching begins, there is little opportunity (or desire) to extend knowledge through in-service or educational conferences. Thus many teachers have limited knowledge of literacy process and are less likely to provide the best available instruction. This problem is compounded by the lack of libraries and print materials.

Abaco is a collection of remote out-islands in the Northeast part of the thousands of islands called The Bahamas (see map, above, http://www.abacolife.com/map.html). The number of residents limits the gene pool within such small, self-contained communities. Lack of knowledge of the genetic implications of intermarriage results in unusually high incidents of autism, deafness, blindness, elective mutism, mental retardation, behavior disorders, language anomalies. Medical assistance comes in the form of limited, widely-spaced, regional nurse-staffed clinics. This precludes much-needed genetic counseling, prenatal care, emergency assistance or post-partum intervention. Special supportive programs such as pre-school screenings, developmental instruction or early intervention do not exist. This combination of factors contributes to an inordinately high percentage of academically struggling students. Residents of out-island communities struggle with meeting the needs of children who present a staggering variety of learning disabilities. Their learning is made more frustrating by limited instructional resources. Students must share books and must leave them in the classroom. Pencils are broken into two halves so everyone will have something with which to write.

There are limited number of ways to earn money in the Bahamas. There are no income or property taxes. Tourism remains the predominant means of income. The tourist taxes (exit fees), permanent non-Bahamian resident property taxes, and duty applied to all incoming goods constitute the sole tax base. These are insufficient to pay for much needed services. Outside sources of funding are similarly limited. For example, the World Bank no longer classifies the Bahamas as an emerging nation because of its per-capita wealth. But this wealth reflects the wealth of the part-time residents and not the reality of its citizens. Poverty-stricken immigrants compound the problem by absorbing limited available jobs and by draining medical and educational resources.

In addition, educational funding is a low national priority. Larger population centers such as Nassau and Freeport absorb most of the available resources. Even when educational evaluations can be obtained for special needs students in outlying islands, few suggestions can be

used because educators in remote areas lack the knowledge, training, or resources (e.g., medicines, instructional materials or equipment) to implement them.

All of this came painfully to light when an Abaco resident, Mrs. Evelyn Major (M.S. in Counseling, Seaton Hall) adopted twin boys from an orphanage. James and Vincent soon showed severe developmental, emotional, physical difficulties stemming from the living conditions in the orphanage. They were the only two survivors of approximately a hundred children housed in a concrete-floor, barracks-like institution. In 1996, she sought to enroll the twins in school. Their applications were denied. Public (Ministry) schools and private academies had no services that would accommodate special needs children. So Mrs. Major began seeking help, contacting literally hundreds of potential resources.

As parents of special needs youngsters learned of potential assistance via the "coconut telegraph", more and more began to seek help for their children. Over time, parents of special needs youngsters banded together to pool resources that launched and sustained a grass-roots initiative called Every Child Counts (ECC), a literacy and special education program.

Though various institutional entities supported it (e.g., the local Catholic church and Florida International University), ECC gained its strength from a network of hundreds of community volunteers. An early example of this kind of grassroots volunteering is Eric's father, a contractor. Eric had Down's Syndrome. Because ECC's first classroom was a dilapidated trailer, Eric's father spent a hot Caribbean summer renovating his son's first classroom, despite a variety of financial and familial crises. At last, when he offered Mrs. Major money toward an air conditioner for this room, she refused, pointing out all he had already done. He insisted, saying with tears in his eyes, "Don't you understand, Lyn? For years I have not been able to be a proper dad for my son. I knew of no way to help him but to love him. You have finally given me a way to do this. You <u>will</u> accept this money!" (E. Sawyer, personal communication, 1997) The money was accepted and applied to pay for Eric's aide.

Over time, and as a result of various appeals in and outside the country, a network of diverse volunteers began to form hoping to address the needs of Mrs. Major's children and others like them. Among those who came to help were some of the following. Volunteers from Florida International University's (FIU) College of Education focused on curriculum and intervention related to early childhood and reading. They trained clinical educators to diagnose and provide entry-level instructional suggestions. A private Speech Therapist, Jacqueline Sullivan (Orlando), supplied special education resources and training. Dr. Edwin Demeritt (Director of the Neuro Developmental Clinic in Nassau) brought his intervention team consisting of a speech and language specialist, social worker, nurse, occupational therapist, and physical therapist. Another team from the states provided community and physical therapy equipment and resources.

Project Activities: Every Child Counts Literacy and Special Education Programme;
(http://www.fiu.edu/~kossacks/every_child_counts)

Academic Years 1996-2000 Early Goals.

Every Child Counts was formed to offer assistance, materials, and training to students who struggle academically, some of whom are learning disabled. ECC works to provide l) direct service to academically struggling youth in the form of diagnosis and, when needed, adapted instruction or suggestions for intervention, 2) training for teachers in reading, writing, special education, and mathematics, 3) resources (books, equipment), and 4) funding to sustain the program. ECC initially provided assessment and recommendations and a FIU professor and graduate students delivered monthly training for all interested teachers, parents, students, and volunteers. The following is a listing of some milestones in ECC's development.

Academic Years 1997-1999.

The first special education teacher to get involved (a volunteer from the US) enabled ECC to provide direct pull-out work with students as well as extend additional assistance to students in the schools. Monthly training was continued and expanded. Because the project needed to be community-owned, volunteers were actively recruited. Abaco has a great number of active educationally-oriented service clubs and this provided the first step toward building local capacity.

September 14, 1999 – Hurricane Floyd.

Hurricane Floyd devastated the island. Two schools were completely flattened and all others sustained such damage that materials and equipment were barely salvageable. Because of its clinical educator training, ECC had an educator network in place that served as a form of "bucket brigade" allowing relatively easy distribution of over 20,000 pounds of books and materials to all schools and settlements. Relief work to the schools raised ECC's profile through a newly launched website (http://coconuttelegraph.net/forums/) on which we posted pleas for books and materials. A great number of people from all over the world thus became aware of the project. We received audiovisual equipment from a California media company (overhead projectors, computer projectors), computers, and software. People stopped by the school to leave bags of books. The response continues to build.

2000-2002.

A dilapidated trailer was renovated to become the first ECC classroom. There the more severely disabled children could be given direct instruction. All other services continued, including diagnosis and intervention for children in every settlement on Abaco, monthly training for hundreds of educators, development of well-trained and ECC-certified Clinical Educators (discussed below), and the development of a professional library.

2002-2003.

ECC, gaining new students almost daily, needed more space. An unused convent was converted into a school which serves as the Every Child Counts Learning Centre. Initially thirty learning disabled students from all over Abaco and surrounding islands were given adaptive instruction there.

Hundreds of volunteers worked to teach life skills, assisted in grant writing, provided training, and tutored. A volunteer couple donated all the equipment necessary to set up a dive shop and enabled dozens of Abaco youth to learn how to dive and become dive instructors. One of our ECC students, Souvenier, became a certified dive instructor. Although he reads at a pre-primer level, his motivation was so great that he learned the dive tables and the skills necessary for him to certify!

By this time, over a dozen educators and volunteers in Abaco had worked to attain ECC Clinical Educator Certification. This training verifies their competency to diagnose and suggest or provide remedial intervention for academically struggling students. ECC provides training and materials free of charge. In return, trainees agree to offer assessment and diagnostic reports to anyone who requests. As a result of the quality of the work of these volunteer educators, the Bahama's Education Ministry recognizes ECC Diagnostic/Prescriptive Reports as official reports. This experience appears to have been an incentive for further professional development. Clinical Educators have presented at Florida Reading Association and International Reading Association conferences. One Clinical Educator was recruited to teach for the College of the Bahamas. Others seek to complete undergraduate and masters degrees to further their careers.

2003-2004.

The staff and students continue to grow. By this time five teachers provides their unique contribution to over fifty students. The lead teacher, Mr. Marsden Lawley, (M.S. in Exceptional Education from FIU) provides vocational training and mentored internships that allow the students self-sufficiency upon graduation. Mrs. Pamela Hepburn, (A.A., Barry University) works with the primary (1-4th grade) children. Melanie Masada's (M.S., Early Childhood) provides early intervention with the preschool children and Ellen Hardy (B.A., English) works with the more severe disabilities until they can be merged into regular classrooms. A part-time special educator, Monica Bianci, works with students with hands-on learning. Children have learned all about the plants on the island while they harvested orchids that will be prepared for sale to tourists. They learn about animals via a petting zoo boasting donated rabbits and chickens and an injured dove they rescued after the hurricanes (Frances and Jeanne). All the work with the students at ECC is designed to make them independent and self-sufficient.

Because of the continued growth in numbers of students and the complexity of instructional goals, more space was needed. A Vero Beach based group offered to build a new wing if ECC could provide the materials. They assembled workmen and students on Spring Break. In the two weeks they were there, sidewalks were poured, a basketball court was poured over the foundation of the old burned-down church, and a large, airy classroom was built. This wing now provides a living classroom where the students can learn practical skills which began with apprenticeships with the local plumbers, electricians, and carpenters who finished off the building.

Sept. 2004-5: Hurricanes Frances and Jeanne and Rotary Community Clinic Collaboration.

Once again Abaco was devastated by two hurricanes, Frances and Jeanne, less than a month apart. Two schools were so damaged they were unable to open during the 2004-5 academic year. The ECC facility, however, located high on a ridge, was spared.

Still there was progress. ECC was able to link up with the Abaco Rotary Club to provide community reading clinics in outlying settlements. Clinicians came together from all over the islands to caravan to a location and provide a rapid screening diagnosis. In these situations, a short report is compiled and suggestions for instruction are provided. Follow up training is provided to show teachers how to use these techniques.

Clinical Educator training continued. After two years of study, seven new educators were certified as Clinical Educators, three of which serve secondary students.

2005-2006.

Funded by local philanthropists, a new wing with three classrooms will be built by the same group from Vero Beach that erected the first expansion. Land in the back of the ECC Learning Centre will be bulldozed to create a soccer field and a new home for the Disney-donated playground equipment and a tent-cafeteria. Two new educators will join the staff, one youth minister will teach the older students construction skills as they complete the inside of the new wing and another special educator will work with behaviorally handicapped youngsters.

Ongoing – Transition to the World of Work.

If ECC had not provided training that enabled the students to be self-sustaining after graduation, it would have failed. Initially ECC students were matched to unique jobs in the community. (ECC has placed successful interns at a marine electronics company, a local restaurant, a resort, and in an apprenticeship with a local sculptor, for example.) Volunteers teach students marketable skills such as garment painting and crafts; ECC reproduces students' art work on note and holiday cards, raising money for the purchase of materials. Students raise orchids for sale. They have their own garden and raise chickens which become lunch for the school. There are plans in the works to have a fish farm, to supply fish for the local restaurants. Plans are in the works to build a sheltered home for functionally able students, and to maintain a thrift shop that would provide low-cost food and goods to the community.

Lessons Learned from the Every Child Counts Literacy and Special Education Programme

Community Perceptions.

Because ours was a grassroots project, initiated by a parent, many educators—from local ones all the way up to the Ministry of Education--were suspicious about what we were doing to Abaco children. Educators worried that the significant parental support we received for the project would undermine the authority of the schools, and that testing would reveal program inadequacies, and that results might be published, thus shaming the community. One principal forbade her teachers from attending our trainings and discouraged parents from using Every Child Counts' services.

Initially we were defensive and viewed these community reactions as criticism. We did not realize that these suspicions were useful and could help us reframe our approach in more effective ways. Here are some examples.

There is an understandable concern among many developing countries about outside perceptions of their educational systems and literacy rates. As mentioned above, concern about the ECC project extended up to the Ministry of Education, which carried out an unannounced spot check on an assessment. We were fearful about such a visit, but quickly learned that when our processes are open and shared, much is gained. As a result of our openness and the quality of our work, the Ministry granted official and public endorsement of the project. But we had also feared the consequences of the Ministry endorsement. Contrary to our expectations, this official endorsement enhanced ECC's credibility and opened the doors for broader participation. Though the Ministry has never contributed to the project monetarily, the referrals via Ministry contacts have provided resources we sorely needed.

Nonetheless, schools remained sensitive that reports would shine negative light on their programs. This prompted a revision of the clinical reports. Rather than referring to student *deficits* we began to refer to *growth areas*, and *range of potential* replaced the notion of grade level performance. We embraced the lesson of person-to person communication as a means of building understanding. Instead of sending a report, we now speak to the parents, administrator, teacher, and student when possible and as soon after the diagnosis as we can, emphasizing the positive performances, complimenting the school, then gently indicating next steps. In addition to attaching descriptions of recommended strategies, we briefly demonstrate them and are developing video/CDs so there is a greater chance there will be effective intervention.

 During our work in training clinicians we discovered that there were cultural differences that caused me to modify my customary mode of teaching and sharing. When introducing new techniques I often lent credibility to them by referring to stateside teachers who have used such methods successfully. This was often taken as bragging. In order not to be seen as looking down on local educators, we learned to confirm the methods they employed and then share other approaches that "*might be used.*"

We also learned that although ECC never charged for any of its services (with the exception of tuition at the school), Abaconians could not countenance this. They wished to do their part and we learned to accept the fresh-caught lobster, conch, and fish as payment in full for services.

Professional development.

We quickly learned that there was little incentive for continued professional development among teachers. Attaining a teaching position was viewed as an end point. Because it is so difficult to get teachers in more remote communities, a large percentage of the teachers do not have (or need) terminal degrees. And because there are no pay increases for additional training, there is little incentive to continue professional development. We therefore recognized that

though ECC provides its services at no charge, trained clinicians should be allowed to charge fees, though few did.

Further, due to the lack of books and other materials, we have learned to work with what is at hand, like teaching comparison and contrast or main idea by using objects rather than texts. Bringing the latest teaching tools in for training sessions was not helpful as these would not be locally available.

A goal of our work is to build expertise. We found, however, that although many Certified Clinicians had become skilled with diagnosis and intervention, they were not comfortable providing training to others. They feared making mistakes and being seen by peers as "putting on airs." As a result we have experimented with creating training modules based around power point and video presentations. Clinicians have been willing to use these to facilitate training sessions.

Self-efficacy, decision making and priorities.

Perhaps the most important thing that we learned was how important it is to assist individuals in making a project such as ours there own. One cannot simply impose a model from outside on another culture. Initially, I tended to imprint my own values and expectations on the project. For example, the development of a centralized professional library was one of my pet projects. I was mystified as to why this not seen as priority in Abaco. Professional library space and bookshelves it turned out was far better used for teaching their children. Once we began working collaboratively to set goals, releasing responsibility and ownership to the community whenever possible, there was no end of volunteer assistance.

Resiliency.

Humans are infinitely resilient (Brooks, 2001). In spite of ridicule, rejection, labeling, and the like, ECC students have willingly taken on the responsibility of being young adult learners and future adults within the Abaco community. More than simply providing important educational services, we were helped to see the importance of finding what the students could do and assisting them to build on those capacities. Our students now are working happily as valued employees in local restaurants, resorts, and other businesses.

Self emergence.

Teaching for me became far less about the materials we rely on here than the human interaction. Materials can get in the way. The eyeball to eyeball teaching allowed me to be much closer to those I taught in a way that is much more real. I learned to have Plan B, C, and D when the electricity went out or the airline left me without handouts.

I came to sense when someone wasn't understanding; I learned to see past the exquisite politeness of the residents (who perceived questioning an instructor as an insult) and found ways to check participant understanding in ways that didn't cause offense. And I came to understand

the value of long-term involvement. The "blow in, blow off, blow out" training that doesn't work in the states doesn't work in Abaco either.

The most profound lesson was always what I did, rather than what I said. Some who came to help caused enormous harm by engaging in shocking or offensive behavior on their own time--nothing is private in a small island community—or through arrogant or incompetent teaching. Those who committed to the project and understood the mission of the project and the enormous toll it takes on one emotionally, physically, and spiritually made the most significant contributions.

<center>Guatemala (Stateside Contact: Ellie Friedland, Ph.D.)</center>

Background

Guatemala is a developing country with a recent history of dictatorship, political violence, disappearances, and oppression. The military controlled the government until 1985, and even though civilian leaders were elected after that, the military still exercised ultimate control (Microsoft Encarta Encyclopedia, 2003). Today the government is again in transition, and the future is unclear.

Official figures state the Guatemalan rate of illiteracy for adult males as 25%, and 40% for females (UNESCO, 2001). However, Edgar Contraras, editor of the newspaper La Prensa (one of the two major newspapers in Guatemala City) estimates that the true illiteracy rates are probably more in the range of 50-60% for males, and higher for females (E. Contraras, conversation, August 22, 2002). Almost half the population over 25 years of age has had no schooling at all, and only 8% have completed primary school (Perry, et al., p. 437).

Students can specialize in education in their last two years of secondary school. This is the only education required to teach in the public schools. Teachers may have classes of 60 to 90 children, and the average student: teacher ratio is 40: 1(UNESCO, 2001). Public schools have some textbooks, but not many. Other supplies are also scarce.

Activities: The Guatemala Literacy Project

In 1989 a few educators from Guatemala and the United States began to work together as volunteers to improve literacy education in Guatemala. They were individuals who met each other and decided to work for change. They had no government sponsorship or agency grants, in fact, no funding at all. Early in their partnership they decided not to seek funding, but to remain a grassroots teacher-to teacher partnership.

The Americans, led by Marcia Mondschein of Long Island, New York, were members of the Nassau NY Reading Council of the International Reading Association. The Guatemalan educators were from various universities and public schools. Together they created an international literacy project that has thrived for fifteen years, and continues to serve hundreds of Guatemalan teachers and children every year.

Here is a chronological overview of the Guatemala Literacy Project from 1989, when the Nassau Reading Council (NRC)/Guatemalan partnership began, to the present.

1989-ongoing.

Groups of educators from the US volunteer to travel to Guatemala twice a year as workshop leaders. During each trip they, along with Guatemalan workshop leaders, provide several days of workshops for educators in Guatemala. The Guatemalan educators are responsible for and arrange all workshops, including volunteer translators. In addition, a different group of Guatemalan educators visit Long Island, NY each year to attend professional conferences, visit local school districts and meet with teachers, students and administrators to exchange educational ideas and practices.

1991-1993.

NRC worked with Guatemalan educators to form the Guatemalan Reading Council, which became the Guatemalan Reading Association, fully affiliated with the International Reading Association.

1991-ongoing.

The GRA holds monthly workshops for educators throughout Guatemala. More than 300 educators voluntarily attend each month. Many Guatemalan educators who have participated in the Partnership have begun or returned to higher education programs and have attained degrees. Some have become teacher trainers throughout Latin America.

The National Reading Conference (NRC) donates mini-libraries (each consists of 150 new, high-quality children's books in Spanish) to Guatemalan public schools. The GRA distributes the libraries to schools whose teachers have consistently attended monthly GRA workshops. As of January 2004, more than 250 mini-libraries have been distributed. NRC raises the funds for mini-libraries by selling Guatemalan handicrafts at IRA national, state and local conferences. All profits are used for the purchase of books. The only expense paid before profit is the cost of the handicrafts.

1993-ongoing.

Every two years the GRA and the NRC have sponsored an international literacy conference in Guatemala City. At each conference, 1500-2000 Guatemalan educators participate in workshops on the latest techniques and strategies in education. Presenters have traveled from Central and South America, Puerto Rico, New Zealand, and nine states in the US. The International Literacy Conference sponsored by the GRA and NRC in 1999 was the Latin American Regional Conference of the International Reading Association.

Lessons Learned- Guatemala Project

Why has this international literacy project continued for fifteen years, while many similar projects (and their positive effects), end after a few years? Why do hundreds of teachers in Guatemala and the United States volunteer their time and spend their own money to teach and attend the Project's professional education workshops, while other professional development programs struggle for teacher attendance? What can other educators who want to create educational change in developing countries learn from the Guatemala Literacy Project? I offer here my answers to these questions, based on my ten years of experience with the Guatemala Literacy Project, and my conversations and interviews with several Guatemalan and American educators who work with the project.

Project Leadership.

One aspect of the project that stands out as unusual and that project leaders view as an important reason for its long-term success, is that all decision making with regard to the project has always been done by the Guatemalan teachers, not by the Americans.

The Guatemalan Reading Association members decide the kinds of workshops that will be offered, when and where they will be offered, who will visit the United States, and which schools will receive mini-libraries. They base these decisions on teachers' attendance at reading council meetings and their willingness to share expertise by organizing or giving workshops themselves. The reading councils organize workshops for teachers throughout the year, and twice a year they organize the workshops by teachers from the United States.

This is clearly an important reason for the longevity of the project. After all, the Guatemalans know much better than we do what they need and what will serve them. But the recognition of this obvious fact is immensely powerful, and surprisingly unusual. Many Guatemalan educators have told me stories of international aide projects that have come, and gone, from their schools, and have left little impact. Some of these projects offered supplies the teachers couldn't use like computers or overhead projectors.

Other programs donated books to schools, but never talked with administrators or teachers about what to do with the books. Those who donated such books probably never found out that the books often stayed in boxes in administrators' offices. Books are often considered so precious that school directors tell teachers that they will have to pay for any books that are damaged by their students. Since a book costs as much as a teacher earns in three or four months, they choose not to risk their livelihood and do not use the books (A. del Cid, conversation, February 23, 2003).

Independence from Funding Sources.

The teachers who began the Guatemala Literacy Project decided not to seek funding or grants that would have time limits. The Guatemalans were familiar with change programs that offer materials and training for a year, or a few years, and then simply stop. The change that begins from such projects also stop when the money does. They wanted to be able to sustain their project, and so decided to raise their own funds.

For example, the mini libraries created in pubic schools are fully funded by the sale of Guatemalan handicrafts at professional conferences in the United States. Marcia Mondschein buys handicrafts in bulk during her two trips a year to Guatemala. She and the other American volunteers carry them home in their luggage (everyone is told to bring only one suitcase so she/he can carry one full of handicrafts). Volunteers then sell the handicrafts at professional conferences, and all profits are used to buy books for mini-libraries. More than 250 mini-libraries have been created this way.

Independence from Government Sponsorship.

Marcia Mondschein remembers cool receptions from unresponsive teachers when she first offered workshops in Guatemalan public schools as part of the new Guatemala Literacy Project in 1989. At first she and the Guatemalan teachers offering the workshops were puzzled by teachers' reluctance to participate in the interactive, engaging literacy activities they offered. But when they had the opportunity to talk further with teachers, they learned that the teachers assumed they were from the government. They did not trust the government, and so were immediately suspicious of any programs that were brought to the schools.

The project leaders began to tell participants at the beginning of workshops that they were not from the Guatemalan government or the US government and that they were not funded by any agency. They explained that they were teachers from the US and from Guatemala who wanted to share and exchange ideas and learning. From then on teachers received them not only with willingness and enthusiasm but also with musical programs, performances, and special snacks (M. Mondschein, personal interview, August 20, 2000).

Voluntary Participation and Choice.

The Guatemalan government does offer professional development workshops to public school teachers. The content and approaches vary depending on the government in power, but such workshops are almost always mandatory for teachers. Like in the US, this can lead to resentment and resistance from educators. From the beginning, all programs offered by the Guatemalan Literacy Project have been offered by volunteers who make it clear that attendance is voluntary.

In addition, at least four or five different workshops are usually offered, and teachers choose which to attend. I took this kind of thing for granted based on my own experiences until the first International Literacy Conference in Guatemala in 1999. The Guatemalan Reading Association members had written the schedule of workshops for the first day on a huge sign in the entrance area of the conference, in addition to the schedule in the conference program.

When I arrived I noticed large crowd of teachers standing in front of this sign. I wondered why they were milling about and thought maybe they didn't understand how to register or where to go next. I saw a teacher I knew and approached her. I asked her why she was waiting here, and I was surprised to see tears in her eyes when she turned to answer me. "We have never had such choices before. It's overwhelming," she said, choking on the words. "I

can choose what to learn about. It's remarkable" (R.E.G. de Luarca, conversation, February 20, 1999).

Cultural Competence.

Culturally competent educators make the effort to learn the values and views of the culture in which they work. They then "provide professional services in a way that is congruent with behaviors and expectations that are normative for a given community" (Green, 1995, p. 89). It is important that we Americans adjust to the culture and realities of the people with whom we work. We are used to doing things our way, and that is not appropriate when we are guests in someone else's country, school, or home. Here are some important lessons I've learned in Guatemala. Many will apply to other places.

I have learned to always honor the language(s) of those present. If I don't speak the language, I make sure I have a translator. I am careful not to hold conversations in English when people present don't speak English. In fact, I have found that the more I try to speak their language, the more people appreciate my effort and understand that I respect them and their language. They seem to welcome my ideas and opinions even more than they did before I tried (and often, failed) to communicate in their language. Similarly, it is vital to make sure all written information, including visual aides, and workshop handouts are in the language of the people present.

It took me a while to learn that "bilingual" does not always means that people speak their language and English. For example, in Guatemala, "bilingual" usually means that people speak Spanish and a Mayan language. Bilingual people often do not speak English. If people speak English, it is often their third or fourth language.

We are careful to show respect when donating materials and find out ahead of time what the people know they can really use. For example, the Guatemala Literacy Project mini libraries contain only new, high quality books in Spanish. The Project volunteers always find out from the Guatemalans what resource materials people are likely to have and not to have. We offer only ideas and strategies that can be implemented with available materials. For example, we have learned not to bring overhead transparencies to a place unlikely to have overhead projectors; not to talk about use of computers in education to people who don't have access to computers; not to talk about special education services to educators who have none; to bring crayons and paper for our workshops, and to give them to the teachers when we leave. (I brought markers to Guatemala until I learned that crayons are more expensive than markers, more rare, and much more desirable—they last much longer).

One of the biggest adjustments for many of us in Guatemala is to follow the cultural mores in relation to time and not to misinterpret or demean them. For example, in Guatemala time is much more flexible than it is in the US. People are usually late for appointments, and tasks might or might not be completed when they tell you they will be completed. This is frustrating for many Americans who see this as a sign of incompetence or of not caring. We have to recognize that it does not have that meaning in this culture. It is our job to adjust.

We have also had to learn cultural styles of communication that are different than ours. It's difficult for us not to assume that everyone should communicate on the same schedule or in the same manner that we Americans do. For example, when we are planning our trips to Guatemala to lead workshops for the Project, we usually don't find out where we going, who and how many people we are teaching, or what day or time we will be in any particular city. The Guatemalans in the Literacy Project usually give us this information when they pick us up to drive us to a workshop. Until we Americans know better, we are likely to send email after email in the months before we go to Guatemala, asking for this information, and getting anxious and upset when they don't send it. They don't, and they always get us where we need to be when we need to be there.

I have also learned to remember that assumptions about how adults and children relate to each other are different in different cultures. I am careful not to apply American cultural assumptions in other cultures. For example, in Guatemala, children show great respect to teachers. I have often seen a teacher leave a classroom of 50-60 five year olds to come outside to talk with us visitors, and the children sit quietly and wait for her to return. When I first saw this, I assumed that discipline must be harsh and rigid to elicit such quiet passivity. But I have learned that there is no need for harshness or rigidity. Children behave because they respect teachers.

These are just some of the specific ways I have learned to respect the Guatemalan culture and work in partnership with people whose ways of being in the world are very different from mine. There are many other examples, and many more lessons to learn. The teachers who work with the Guatemala Literacy Project are deeply dedicated, and are always enthusiastic participants in learning and teaching.

Many of us Americans keep going back to Guatemala with the Project because the work is so gratifying and exciting. At the end of a workshop, there is often a line of teachers waiting to talk to the presenters. The teachers often want to know how they can learn more, where and how they can get books in Spanish on the topic, or they want to give a specific example in their teaching experience and discuss how to apply what they learned in the workshop to that experience. Often they wait patiently in line to say "Thank you."

<div align="center">

Northern Thailand (Stateside Contact: Janet Richards, Ph.D.)
Working with Burmese Refugee Teachers in the
Reading and Writing for Critical Thinking Project

</div>

Please Note: Because of security considerations, the Burmese teacher's name in this manuscript is a pseudonym. Government officials changed the name of Burma to Myanmar in 1986, but the term Burma continues to reflect the broader recognition of Burma throughout the world.

Background

Currently, there are well over 90, 000 Burmese ethnic refugees living in Thai government-regulated camps along the Burmese/Thai border. Some have lived in the camps since the early 1980s, and more refugees arrive every day (Sell, 1999). The majority of the

refugees are not allowed to work outside of the camps. Their tribal affiliations include Karen, Karenna, Shan, Kachin, and some Mong and Lahu (see McCaskill & Kampe, 1997, for specific data about these indigenous groups). These groups have sought autonomy from the Burmese government for over 50 years. Because of their continued struggle for a voice in policies that affect human rights, many have been incarcerated, or they have risked persecution from the current Burmese military regime. In order to survive, they have fled their villages, and escaped through the jungle to take refuge in northern Thailand.

Other political refugees come from Burmese mainstream society. These dissidents from larger towns and cities such as Rangoon and Pegu Township have had opportunities to attend universities and to work in Burma. But, they too, have had to leave their country. Political dissent is not allowed in Burma (*Christian Monitor*, Sunday, August 29, 2004).

Because of their political activism, many teachers have had to escape from Burma. They live and teach in the jungle camps near small northern Thai villages such as Mae Hong Son and Mae Sot. Their lives were dramatically changed when they arrived in Thailand, and their predicaments, struggles, and achievements are largely unknown to the western world. They can never return to their country to visit their families and they often use pseudonyms because they fear that if they disclose their real names, they and their families will be captured and persecuted. Most of the teachers are responsible for teaching 50-60 students who speak various dialects. Their classrooms are three--sided bamboo huts on stilts. They have minimal teaching supplies, few books and no electricity or running water. They receive a minimal salary. Some of the teachers are16 years old with a tenth grade education. Others have degrees in teaching or degrees in other disciplines. All of the teachers teach admirably and skillfully in the camps under adverse conditions. They do not complain or seek pity for their circumstances. Rather, like exemplary teachers everywhere, they are committed to teaching their students.

Serving as an RWCT volunteer scholar in the northern Thai jungle, I asked some of the Burmese RWCT teachers to tell me their stories in an attempt to try to understand their unique experiences from their perspectives. The following story told by Paw Po illuminates one teacher's educational, social, and political struggles. Paw Po has lived in Thailand for 25 years. She holds important positions in the community. For example, she directs an orphanage, and she works with many community organizations. Paw Po is a woman with strong leadership abilities. It is her hope and mine that her story will provoke readers of this manuscript to learn more about the indigenous and mainstream people of Burma and the current Burmese situation.

The Story of Paw Po: A Woman Warrior

Paw Po is not my real name. You might say it is my nickname. Like so many other teachers from Burma, I cannot use my real name because I might be discovered and get arrested, or my family might be sent back to Burma and be persecuted. I have been in Thailand since 1987. I walked through the jungle to get here. I have a husband and five children. The children's ages range from 20 to five.

My father lives in the orphanage with us. He is disabled. During the war, he lost both of his legs from gangrene. He got infections in his legs, and we could not get any medicines to help

treat him, so he has no legs. He was one of the top Karen army opposition leaders. Both my parents were freedom fighters.

The orphanage-school I direct serves about 80 children, although sometimes there are 180. We have five teachers and three volunteers. We receive aid from many non-government groups (NGO's). Just the other day, three young women drove up in an old truck. They had traveled about six hours to deliver food and clothing to the children. One woman was from Great Britain, one was from the United States, and one was from Thailand. They volunteer for a special project called Partners. They gave us lots of raisins and other food and donated clothing that we can put to good use. We also receive funds from an organization called Burmese Refugee Care.

Before I came to Thailand, I was a jungle warrior. I was a guerilla fighter. I fought with the Karen Army for ten years. I narrowly escaped from my village. I did it during a New Year's festival. There had been fighting around my camp so I knew I had to leave. Now, I am acting Chair Person of the Migrant Education Committee, which is a group of classroom teachers and other educators who work for Burmese migrant children in Mae Sot.

Project Activities

Recently, the Reading and Writing for Critical Thinking Program (RWCT), a well-known, award-winning program connected to the International Reading Association, initiated a three-year project with the Burmese refugee teachers. The project serves Burmese educators in five different camps along the northern Burmese/Thai border that are mainly inhabited by Karen and Karenni people. The project is supported monetarily by United States Aid for International development (USAID) and two programs funded by the philanthropist, George Soros: the Open Society Institute, and the Burma Project based in New York City. RWCT is committed to helping teachers learn how to promote students' active learning and critical thinking abilities –a dramatic change from traditional rote learning associated with Burmese education (Lwin, 2003). When teachers complete the first year of their RWCT training, they become trainers themselves, and they work with new groups of teachers. Thus, the project is self-sustaining because it is structured to continue when RWCT volunteers complete the three-year project.
The Burmese Project demonstrates similarities to many other RWCT projects offered in Western Europe. Two volunteer scholars selected from approximately 70 volunteers in the United States, Great Britain, Australia, and Canada travel together as partners. After an overnight stay in Bangkok, partners travel on to northern Thailand to meet the in-country Project Director and the Project interpreter.

Following a series of instructional activities in eight RWCT Guidebooks, the volunteer scholars offer three-to-five all day workshops to the Burmese teachers. The Guidebooks ensure continuity of instruction and promote group collaboration, reading comprehension, and critical thinking. When the Burmese teachers demonstrate competency in what has been offered in the Workshops, they become Workshop leaders and share their knowledge with a new group of teachers.

Understandably, The Burmese Project also varies from other RWCT western European Projects. Language difficulties pose problems. The teachers come from various indigenous tribes and therefore, speak different dialects. There are few teaching supplies available, including

books. Consequently, few lessons are text-based. In addition, unlike the teachers in RWCT western European Projects, the Burmese teachers' education differs considerably. Some teachers are teenagers who have not yet completed high school. Others hold a degree in business, or mathematics, but have no teacher training. Some have a teaching degree.

Lessons Learned

Lessons learned from this project are twofold and can be generalized to other educational contexts. 1) On-going funding is a necessity to ensure that educational projects remain in place, and; 2) Teachers everywhere are resolute, strong, and determined to succeed despite adversity.

Currently, the Burmese RWCT Project is struggling. Funding is limited and precarious. Like so many educational initiatives, a great deal of money was offered at the beginning of the project and once the project experienced some success, budgets tightened. The in-country RWCT leader, Dr. Thein Lwin, and the Burmese teachers are determined to keep the project going by seeking alternative funding. In a poignant e-mail message Dr. Thein Lwin (2003) recently wrote:

I have expected this situation before, now the reality comes. Funding has been withdrawn. However, I could manage to extend the RWCT workshops in the third year within the second year funding, as we have promised to the local community for three years. The RWCT project has been growing its momentum in many different parts of Burma and it should be continued. I would be grateful if you could kindly suggest me to get funding from other sources to continue the project.

There is no doubt that this project will continue at least for another year. Some volunteer scholars have offered to pay their own expenses to travel to Thailand and offer RWCT workshops. The indigenous tribal teachers are also determined to continue the project by teaching other Burmese educators. In all likelihood, the RWCT Burmese Project as we know it today may very well segue into a grassroots movement supported by the Burmese educators who are resolute in their determination to keep the project alive. As one Burmese teacher told me, "We know we have to work together if we are to succeed."

Some Conclusions: What Have We Learned?

Across all of these projects several threads emerge that bind the experiences together and offer lessons to others wishing to assist emerging literacy projects.

Socio-political Realities

It is, on the surface, puzzling why efforts to provide literacy for children--a self-evident good from our point of view--would not be enthusiastically embraced by host societies. Without directly experiencing the complex social, political, and educational contexts within emerging nations one cannot begin to comprehend the viewpoints, interests, and motivations that provide a dynamic force that moves such projects for change. Certainly the life-threatening circumstances in Thailand dramatically accentuate obstacles for educational presence; socio-political forces in more gentle contexts like Guatemala and Abaco are no less compelling. The grassroots nature of the leadership serves as a common bond across each of these projects. These projects eschewed

governmental help, even though the need for funds was crippling. Freedom to move ahead unfettered by governmental restrictions or restraint was a necessary step to success in these contexts.

Resiliency

Robert Brooks' (2001, p. 7) guideposts for raising resilient children provides a unique construct for the effective interactions across these projects and I use it now to frame their commonalities. Brooks states that the "basic foundation of any relationship…is *empathy*…to see the world through (another's) eyes." Each of the authors writes of learning to listen actively, of responding to the educators of the host countries from their perspective. In each case, our hosts rewrote our scripts; and they ultimately reframed the realities in their country, clearly seeing the obstacles but actively seeking ways to circumvent them. Failing to work cooperatively and sensitively with local needs and priorities dooms even the most ambitious and well-funded programs to frustration and failure.

A key need for those participating in international projects is *acceptance* and appreciation (Brooks, 2001, 7). In this article the separate authors illustrate this as they write respectfully about the people and circumstances within these projects, citing the substantial obstacles each faced, while celebrating the special achievements that occurred despite those obstacles. This was an important dimension in the development of these programs. Clear appreciation of participants' concerns, efforts, and successes, and participants' respect for volunteers' expertise and guidance were essential to creating the interpersonal good will that enabled the projects to flourish.

"Identify[ing] and reinforce[ing] *islands of competence*" (Brooks, 2001, p. 7) in the on-going projects also contributed to their success. Each program developed by evolving around the felt needs that it *most effectively* addressed. Though the impact of these projects has been larger than the original needs it set out to meet, each began by helping participants work to their strengths.

Ultimately, the success of these projects hinges on *local ownership and control*. What works at home will not necessarily work abroad. It is by working from the inside, assisting those who know their needs best in attaining their goals and by using the resources at hand that undertakings such as these can take root and grow. Most importantly, we must always remember that we are outsiders and will always have something new to learn about the people with whom we work as well as about ourselves as human beings and as educators.

References

Brooks, R. (2001). *Raising resilient children*. N.Y.: Contemporary Books.

Green, J.W. (1995). *Cultural awareness in the human services* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Lwin, T. (October, 2003). *Reading and writing for critical thinking report*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

McCaskill, D., & Kampe, K. (Eds.). (1997). *Development or domestication? Indigenous peoples of Southeast Asia*. Chiang Mai, Thailand: Trasvin Publications.

Perry, G., de Ferranti, D., Ferreira, F.H.G., and Walton, M. (2003*). Inequality in Latin America and the Caribbean: Breaking with history?* Washington, D.C.: World Bank. Also available at http://wbln0018wordbank.org/LAC/LAC.nsf

Pitmann, M., & Maxwell, J. (1992). Qualitative approaches to evaluation: Models and methods. In M. LeCompte, W. Millroy, & J. Preissle (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 727-770). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Sell, J. (1999). *Whispers at the Pagoda: Portraits of modern Burma.* Bangkok, Thailand: Orchid Press.

UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2001). *Latin American and Caribbean regional report*. Retrieved from http://portal.unesco/org/vis/ev

Kennedy, D. (1993). *Culturegrams* (Vols. 1 & 2). Chicago: David M. Kennedy Center for International Studies.

Editorial. (Sunday, August 29, 2004). *Christian Monitor. http:///www.christianmonitor.org/documents.php?type=Editorials&la*

Microsoft Encarta ® Online Encyclopedia. (2003). *Guatemala*. Retrieved from http://encarta.msn.com.c1997-2003

World Education Forum. (2000). *Senegal.* Retrieved December 22, 2004, from http://www.worldbank.org/education/efa.asphttp://www.unesco.org/education/efa/ed_for _all/dakfram_eng.shtml

Reading Specialists: Do They Do What They "Do?"

Christine Mallozzi
Chet Laine
University of Cincinnati

In this article, using interview data from eight reading specialists, we examine the roles and responsibilities assumed by reading specialists. Although identifying the essence of what it means to be a reading specialist is a continuing goal for researchers, during the past decade, several studies have more clearly defined the roles and responsibilities of this important group of reading professionals. Several studies reveal that the *International Reading Association Standards for Reading Professionals* (Professional Standards and Ethics Committee of the International Reading Association, 1998) are being used in whole or in part by teacher preparation programs in the United States (Barclay & Thistlewaite, 1992; Gelheiser & Meyers, 1991; Tancock, 1995; Bean, Trovato, Armitage, Bryant, & Dugan, 1993; Bean, Trovato, Hamilton, 1995).

These standards, revised in 2003, provide criteria for developing and evaluating preparation programs for reading professionals. At the time of this study, the revised standards (Professional Standards and Ethics Committee of the International Reading Association, 2003) were not available. Although these standards emphasize the performance, knowledge, and skills of candidates completing a preparation program, they indicate a caliber of higher performance expected of a seasoned professional reading specialist. Standards states, "The increased focus on candidate performance . . . is a response to the shifts in the field of education toward a focus on the outcomes of learning rather than inputs" (2003).

Since the roles and responsibilities of reading specialists are constantly changing, administrators and reading specialists often perceive reading specialists' roles differently (Barry, 1997). Classroom teachers' expectations for a reading specialist are different still (Maleki & Herman, 1994; Tancock, 1995). Other factors, like Title I funding guidelines, contribute to the changing role of a reading specialist (Quatroche, Bean, & Hamilton, 2001). Only recently have researchers actually surveyed reading specialists to determine who they are, what they do, and the changes they perceive in their roles (Bean, Cassidy, Grumet, Shelton, and Wallis, 2002). However, these large survey studies have been unable to gather the more detailed descriptions possible through one-on-one interviews and classroom observations. This more detailed description is what we set out to do.

Methods

Procedures

One of the authors contacted, via e-mail or telephone, 22 reading specialists that she knew through graduate courses and professional settings. The participants were selected if they currently served as reading specialists and were willing and available to

be interviewed. Eight reading specialists volunteered for this study. All of the participants, identified by pseudonyms, were female and were employed at various rural, suburban, and urban schools in southwestern Ohio (Table 1). They all taught in primary and/or intermediate settings. The eight participants had a wide range of years of experience, both as classroom teachers and as reading specialists. The reading programs, in which six out of the eight reading specialists worked full time, were funded by U.S. federal government Title I monies, district monies, or a combination of both. Seven out of the eight participants had earned their masters' degrees as well as an Ohio Reading Endorsement. In Ohio a Reading Endorsement may be added to any standard teaching license and is valid for teaching learners in grades P-12. One participant was currently working toward both her master's degree in reading and the Ohio reading endorsement. If a reading specialist responded favorably to being interviewed and observed, a mutually agreeable time and location to meet was established. At that initial meeting, the goals of the research were described, participants read and signed informed consent forms and an interview and/or observation time was established. The interviews took place in the various workplaces (e.g., school classrooms and offices) of the participants.

Data were collected in the late summer and early autumn of 2003. The following data were gathered to capture the actions, beliefs, responses and voices of the reading specialists: (a) audio taped interviews of each reading specialist to be transcribed, (b) written notes of each interview with reading specialist, and (c) informational material volunteered by the participants.

The interview questions (Table 2) were adapted from the results of a study by Bean et al. (2002) and focused on the roles of reading specialists. Participants' responses to questions were audio taped. Each of the informal semi-structured interviews lasted between 35 and 50 minutes. Initially there was a period of introductions and polite conversation in an effort to make the interviews as informal and non-threatening as possible. To transition to the actual interview the interviewer presented the purpose of the study as "finding out what reading specialists do." The interviews started with collecting background information about the participant, followed by open-ended questions to gather information about her role as a reading specialist. The interviewer asked several more specific questions as needed for clarification and ended the session by asking if the participant could add anything not yet discussed that would aid the researchers in their goal of exploring the role of reading specialists. After analysis of the data, some follow-up questions to gain and clarify information were asked via e-mail.

Data Analysis

Following each audio-taped interview, questions and responses were transcribed. A total of 360 minutes of interview data were recorded. Once transcribed, the interview transcripts amounted to 72 single-spaced pages of interview questions and responses. Using content analysis techniques established by Holsti (1969), Miles & Huberman (1984) and Viney (1983), the transcribed interviews were analyzed. The transcriptions were read and reread. Initially, the survey literature, our own experiences, and the IRA competencies suggested codes.

Using colored pencils, descriptive codes, such as "responsibilities for assessment," "serving as a resource," or "responsibilities for instruction," were assigned to sentence or multi-sentence segments. Codes were changed, deleted and added as seemed appropriate. Eventually, the single most appropriate code was assigned to each segment. Not every piece of the interview was coded. Looking for patterns, themes, causal links, and repetitive emergent categories were noted. The original twelve codes were eventually expanded into 64 categories (Table 3).

In addition to coding, reflections were jotted down as marginal notes or remarks. These captured feelings and new hypotheses about what was being said, doubts about the quality of the data, second thoughts about the meaning of the speakers, mental notes to be pursued later, or cross-allusions to something that appeared in another interview.

Results

Our professional organization's recommendations for the roles of the reading specialist (International Reading Association, 2000) relate to three specific areas: instruction, assessment, and leadership.

Instruction

In the area of instruction, the professional organization argues that reading specialists are to "support, supplement and extend classroom teaching." These multiple roles created some concern for our participants. The sample reported guided reading as the most used method of instruction. All participants mention some form of phonemic awareness or word study instruction, as well as independent or semi-independent reading, as part of their repertoire. This reading instruction occurred in several different settings.

All eight reading specialists reported being involved in some form of "pull out" instruction, although only one used it exclusively. This is not in synch with the 37% reported by Bean and her colleagues (2002), but more congruent with Quatroche, Bean, and Hamilton (2001), who acknowledge an increased focus on in-class programs. Six out of the eight instructed in a "push in" setting in the classroom, and a few also taught the students as a whole group within the classroom. One district opted to spend their Title I monies in a way that allowed their reading specialists to work with any student in the school. This instruction was delivered in a combination of pull out, push in, and team teaching whole groups. The sentiments involved in trying to "support, supplement and extend classroom teaching" depended on the setting for instruction.

Regarding the small group pull out, one participant expressed, "It's a more informal comfortable atmosphere. I mean I think that . . . they'll go ahead and try and sound the word out. And the other children, because they struggle, are not so fast to correct them. They'll give them the time that they need. Whereas in a regular setting they often times are corrected by other kids even when they make the attempt." Several participants admitted that the small-group pull out program was more comfortable. They

liked having their own reading room. It provided a quiet environment where they could access their supplies at any moment. "Instructionally, I'm making more progress when I pull them out," says another participant, "as far as the amount of material and really getting at their individual needs."

Those teachers who engaged in a push in program had mixed feelings. Noise, having to carefully plan, and having to tote around supplies were listed as disadvantages in these programs. In support of pushing in, our informants believed that their students experienced a sense of community and felt better about themselves. Several reading specialists strongly advocated going into the classroom to work with children. "The reality is that there are special projects or things that the students need assistance with, and I find it very helpful . . .," stated one informant. "The students in the building kind of know who I am and they don't think of me as only working with certain students because technically I can assist other kids." Another participant in a push in program acknowledged that she favors teaching in the classroom:

> I really like working in the regular teacher's classroom because the kids aren't missing much from that classroom. I'm in there. I see what's going on. It helps me to support what's going on in reading and writing in the classroom, and I can help. . . . I see how my kids perform as opposed to what might be the median in the class as well as the top of the class. I see how they are grasping things, so I, um, get to see an awful lot of their interactions in the classroom with their teachers, with their peers, with the subject matter that is being taught. . . . The kids I deal with, by and large, are the least capable of going back and picking things up in the classroom. So I really like the in-class work a whole lot better.

Within the area of instruction, the IRA standards also point to the need for collaboration. The issue of collaboration emerged among our participants as a point of contention. Many of our informants, although they incorporated information from the regular teacher's classroom, planned their lessons alone. The communication ranged from a very routine exchange of plans ("Every week they fill out a form, telling me what skills, what stories they're working on, and anything they specifically want.") to a harried chat ("I spend a lot of my planning time before and after school hours running from classroom to classroom and just talking briefly, trying to catch a teacher and talk. . ."). Informants who provided reading services to students in more than one classroom had to coordinate with an average of eight different classroom teachers. These reading specialists then wrote their plans individually, using the classroom teachers' input as a guide.

Several reading specialists remarked about the lack of scheduled planning time within the school day. One participant's only scheduled planning time was during lunch/recess time, and due to a rotating cafeteria and recess duty schedule, she lost that planning time once or twice a week. Two of the eight reading specialists traveled to other schools during the day reported that this was a significant constraint on their time for planning. As a result, our informants were forced to plan before and after school.

One reading specialist's schedule required establishing co-planning time with every one of her students' teachers. This accounted for 25% of her school day. "Every week I meet at least once to have contact and receive updating about their reading goals for their students that week." Despite the scheduled time, she said she feels like she gets more done on her own. "Sometimes planning with the other teachers is worthwhile and sometimes it's not. And it really depends on the type of personality you're working as to whether they're up to co-planning or [not]."

Although assessment results were used to design and deliver individualized instruction, directives from classroom teachers were stronger influences in overall planning for our informants. Our data indicate a stronger influence than presented in Bean et al. (2002). For instance, one participant remarked:

> If the regular teacher says we're working on cause and effect this week . . . then I'll make sure that my kids are also learning cause and effect. . . . If they're working on fantasy then we'll work on fantasy. . . . I'll work on just whatever the grade level goals are. I match those goals, but I'll use readability material at a lower level.

A few participants expressed frustration at changes in directives and information given to them by the regular classroom teachers, even after communicating about plans. "I mean sometimes I have what I think I'm going to work on that day, but when I arrive the teacher will indicate that, you know, there is something of higher priority. And so I just do whatever I'm told." One reading specialist alluded to a perceived hierarchy between classroom teacher and reading specialist. "I really feel like in a way they are my boss. I do what they need and work in what the students need at the same time."

Nearly twenty years ago, Fraatz (1987), in her case study interviews with regular classroom teachers and reading specialists, found a similar phenomenon, reading specialists often defined the special needs of their students in terms of the needs of the regular classroom teacher. She called this "the tail wagging the dog (p. 19)." In an effort to be supportive of the classroom teacher, the reading specialist often set aside her own expertise and what she knows is best for the child. The reading specialists in our study felt this same need to be supportive of the regular classroom teacher. In Fraatz's study as well as in ours, reading specialists were often concerned that they were helping the regular classroom teacher or the school's testing mandate more than they were helping the children.

Assessment

In the area of assessment, the IRA position statement (International Reading Association, 2000) maintains that reading specialists have "specialized knowledge of assessment and diagnosis that is vital for developing, implementing, and evaluating the literacy program in general, and in designing instruction for individual students." Moreover, he or she "can assess the reading strengths and needs of students and provide that information to classroom teachers, parents, and specialized personnel such as

psychologists, special educators, or speech teachers, in order to provide an effective reading program." Despite this "specialized knowledge of assessment and diagnosis" only two of the eight reading specialists reported being involved in the assessment that qualifies the students for the instructional programs implemented by the reading specialist. Most of the qualifying assessments were in the form of formal standardized tests, administered in a whole group setting. The qualifying assessments were not always uniform from grade to grade, thus the eligible scores differed from grade to grade. When the state mandated achievement test results were available, those scores took precedence over other standardized assessments in determining eligibility in the reading program. The two reading specialists involved in the qualifying assessment employed reading inventories and/or the standardized assessment from the Reading Recovery Council of North America.

Regarding informal assessments, reading specialists reported using running records as a primary assessment tool. Bean et al. (2002) found observations to be the primary assessment tool used by reading specialists. Although many of our informants mentioned using observation to get a better sense of their students, they did not refer to observation as an assessment tool.

The nature of providing the assessment information to others differed according to the audience. Seven out of eight of our reading specialists stated that they communicated student assessment results to teachers informally. "I just try to be proactive as far a making myself available. Getting into the classrooms and talking specifically to them about what they're seeing as opposed to what I'm seeing or confirmation as to what I'm seeing. Sharing work samples, and asking to see samples of the work that they are doing in the classroom," said one informant, a Reading Recovery teacher in a pull out program. Many conveyed that they met with teachers at lunchtime, before and after school, and at grade level meetings to talk about students. The reading specialists who said they communicate with parents about students' performance explained that this information is exchanged mostly during parent-teacher conferences. Two informants reported providing a supplemental progress report, and one specialist actually gave reading grades to the students for their pull-out reading performance. One participant said she assisted the regular classroom teacher with grade reports but was not responsible for them. Most of our informants stated that they were not involved in this aspect of assessment. Providing information to administrators and specialized personnel about students' assessments occurred at more formal times, as reported by our informants. Individual student results were discussed at formal IEP or MFE meetings. Rankings of students' scores were transmitted in formal reports.

When asked about areas of change in her role as a reading specialist, informants with more than four years of experience as reading specialists expressed that assessment, both formal and informal, had increased. However the perceived purpose for the increased testing varied among our informants. One reading specialist used assessments to "[design] instruction for individual students," the purpose established by her professional association (International Reading Association, 2000). On the other hand, one of our informants pointed to the fact that assessment could help her make the most of

her limited time with individual students. Another experienced reading specialist viewed assessment as removed from instruction. "There is much more reliance on [assessments] to measure student progress, school progress, district progress. You know, it's just across the board of a school district, so that's, that's been huge." Another participant felt that state mandates were responsible for the increased testing. "It just depends year to year of what the state wants."

Leadership

Finally, our professional organization's position statement (International Reading Association, 2000) argues that reading specialists provide leadership and serve as a resource to other educators, parents and the community. This leadership role, as reflected by the responses of our eight informants, is evident in several different ways. Reading specialists reported serving as a resource to teachers, especially those teachers with less experience in education. Informally, when solicited by other teachers, the participants said they offered their opinions about students, both who did and did not qualify for specialized reading services. Several reading specialists also shared book titles, ideas, and strategies with their colleagues. More formally, five out of the eight participants modeled reading lessons in a whole group setting while the regular classroom teacher observed. The reading specialists also indicated that they lead staff development programs on various topics such as types of assessment, state mandated testing, and writing prompts. Often these topics were suggested by an administrator who did not stay for the staff development session. "[They] definitely pop-in when we're doing [in-services], but they don't normally sit through them and take notes," said one of our informants.

This same informant spends the majority of her time in "professional development with classroom teachers in a more formal leadership role" (International Reading Association, 2002). She reported that her job consists of going into the classroom and modeling reading lessons, and observing and serving as a coach to the 70 classroom teachers with whom she works. This reading specialist provides full day and after school sessions for teachers. She also teaches graduate level courses and professional development workshops. Part of her duties also includes serving as a resource to parents in the community. This parental resource role was common among our informants.

Reading specialists noted that early on in their intervention efforts, parents have many questions about the reading program, criteria for qualifying, and scheduling conflicts with other classes. Many of these questions are addressed at parent information nights in the beginning of the year. Later in the year, information about literacy is conveyed during parent-teacher conferences, telephone conversations, and/or through written notes. Several reading specialists said they send home "Reading Connection," a newsletter with tips for families on reading and literacy. Reading specialists said they trained parent volunteers for special programs like Ohio Reads, a program that allows volunteers to work with children having difficulty. One participant also provides modeled teaching to parents. "I find that with parents they mainly want to know about

how to help their own child. They are not interested in, like, reading theory or how we teach reading here . . . or what resources are available. They want to know what I can do to help my child."

A few reading specialists in this study shied away from the formal title of "reading specialist," although seven out of eight participants had earned an Ohio reading endorsement and at least a master's degree. The eighth participant was currently working toward her endorsement and master's degree in reading. All had assumed many of the roles of reading specialists in their schools, but some feared being seen as a pseudo-administrator; they worried that in the role of a reading specialist they would no longer be viewed as a teacher. One said, "I hate to use the word "specialist" because I like to put myself as an equal to every classroom teacher and not someone that is a step above them." Some participants brought in experts from outside the school to speak with teachers about literacy issues, one participants said, "[because] we kind of thought maybe it was better to have an outside person introduce some of the things, so it didn't seem like we were saying, 'Here – you need to do this.'" Studies by Fraatz (1987) and Tancock (1995) echo our findings. The reading specialists in Fraatz's study "approached classroom teachers with caution and a measure of deference" (p. 70). They downplayed their supervisory functions and treated classroom teachers as peers. Tancock found that elementary teachers in her study viewed reading specialists as supportive, rather than as a source of special expertise and leadership.

Some of our informants were annoyed by the administrative duties they had to assume, duties that pulled them away from the day-to-day interactions with children. Many counted paperwork among the least important aspects of their job, except when it related to helping them address the individual needs of their students. Even with that type of paperwork, several participants spoke of the disproportionate amount of time they spent on the details of those tasks compared to the help it afforded the children. One specialist commented on the legal aspects of this paperwork: "The state has changed the volume of paperwork that they require; some of it is obviously for legality reasons . . . . In the past students maybe have been placed in special programs, and maybe inappropriately placed. So we're being, you know, extremely cautious to make sure there are a lot of paperwork items that are required for that."

All of our informants found that more and more was being put on their plates. One of the most demanding parts of their jobs related to testing. Several informants named testing as one of the greatest areas of change in their position over the years. Although testing was not listed in Bean et al. (2002) as a major area of change, paperwork and accountability were. Several reading specialists acknowledged the dramatic increase in paperwork and accountability was due to an increase in testing and other assessments. Many felt that although their expertise was in reading, writing and language instruction, increasingly they were being forced to provide instruction in test taking strategies. Six of the eight reading specialists felt that this added responsibility for teaching test taking strategies left less time for reading instruction.

Two of the participants in the same school district were under an administrative mandate to meet specific curricular standards from the state. The district was a low income, urban district whose students often moved both within the district and out of the district. The rationale for the administrative mandate, as stated by our two participants, was to establish consistency within district building and across districts within the state. Teachers, according to this administrative argument, would have a better understanding of the background knowledge of a student moving in from another district or moving from one building to another within the district. Each week teachers were given a specific set of skills and strategies, to be replaced with new skills and strategies in the following weeks. One reading specialist described the mandate as "test driven" and "developmentally inappropriate for [her students]." Another respondent expressed frustration at having plans placed on her by administrators who do not understand her students' needs:

> For example this week it says, identify or recognize short and long vowel patterns. Well, most of the first graders that I'm working with don't know all of their short vowels yet. And we're actually working on trying to get them to notice ending sounds. So to compensate . . . I'm really just incorporating short vowels even though I know they don't all have ending sounds yet, and I'm just starting in the short vowels. . . . That's not very appropriate for them.

Several of our informants told us that state mandated tests and other assessments left little time for much else. As one participant put it:

> I think as the curricular demands get stronger, there is so little time for me or anybody else that teaches to do the kinds of things that I used to do. I mean, I used to be able to visit classrooms and do read alouds. I used to visit classrooms and do book reviews. . . . For a couple years, I would invite the [students] five at a time, to have lunch with me, and we would read books. I'd read to them, and then they were invited to bring a special book with them and tell how much they liked it. Oh, it was just great! It was just wonderful. But there's no time for that anymore. It's just, I can't do it, just isn't time and I miss that.

Conclusions and Implications

The reading specialist's role in instruction and collaboration is a complex one affected by curriculum, interpersonal relationships, and the needs and wants of others. It is not enough to give reading specialists more time to collaborate with their colleagues, although time is severely limited. It is necessary to prepare reading specialists and other teachers to use that collaboration time effectively to meet the needs of the students (Quatroche, Bean, & Hamilton, 2001). Too often, as in our study, the reading specialist feels compelled to support the classroom teacher's existing program, rather than draw on her own expertise and training to help the children.

Testing affects whether or not students qualify for assistance from the reading specialist, and it affects instruction because in often falls to the reading specialist to set aside reading instruction for test taking instruction. Success to some degree is measured by performance on these tests. It is clear from our respondents that assessments, especially state mandated tests, have a powerful influence on their day-to-day lives. Administrators, in conjunction with reading specialists, need to reevaluate the time devoted to testing. Within schools, and across the wider community, professionals need to decide how much of the reading program is about teaching children to read and how much is about teaching children to take tests.

Our data suggests there is some sort of perceived hierarchy within schools, particularly among classroom teachers and reading specialists. Some research indicates that some elementary teachers view reading specialists as support staff ready to aide the regular classroom teacher in her requests (Fraatz, 1987, Tancock, 1995), suggesting that they hold a lower place on this perceived hierarchy. Yet our data indicate that some reading specialists take leadership roles within their schools and districts. However, when they use their expertise to provide professional development, they are often viewed as administrators. These findings need to be explored further. These perceptions affect interpersonal relationships and have an impact on the quality of the instruction that children receive.

Our findings have implications for the design of preparation programs for both reading specialists and classroom teachers. The revised standards (Professional Standards and Ethics Committee of the International Reading Association, 2003) place added emphasis on leadership and student advocacy. However, our findings, as well as those of Fraatz (1987) and Tancock (1995), reveal that both classroom teachers and reading specialists have some apprehension about these new roles. Teacher preparation programs can help both classroom teachers and specialists begin to see how specialists can use the expertise they grained through training and experience and more competently serve as literacy leaders and student advocates in the school community.

Bringing about a meaningful change in a complex setting like a school building requires collaboration. Fullan (2001) describes the fragile nature of these collaborative efforts:

> When we try to look at change directly from the point of view of each and
> every individual affected by it, and aggregate these individual views, the
> task of educational change becomes a bit unsettling. When we are dealing
> with reactions and perceptions of diverse people in diverse settings, faulty
> communication is guaranteed. People are a nuisance but the theory of
> meaning says that individual concerns come with the territory; addressing
> these concerns is educational change. (p. 295)

Despite the changing demands on reading specialists, the informants in our study all agreed that students' needs should determine the role of a reading specialist (Bean,

Trovato, & Hamilton, 1995). As students' needs change, so does the role of the reading specialist.

References

Barclay, K.D., & Thistlewaite, L. (1992). Reading specialists of the 90s: Who are they and what do they want? *Reading Research and Instruction*, *32*, 87-96.

Barry, A.L. (1997). High school reading programs revisited. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 40*, 524-531.

Bean, R.M., Cassidy, J., Grumet, J.E., Shelton, D.S., & Wallis, S.R. (2002). What do reading specialists do? Results from a national survey. *The Reading Teacher,* 55, 736-744.

Bean, R.M., Trovato, C.A., Armitage, A., Bryant, J., & Dugan, J. (1993). *Preparing reading specialists for Pennsylvania Schools—Year 2000* (Tech. Rep.). Pittsburgh, PA: Institute for Practice and Research in Education, University of Pittsburgh.

Bean, R.M., Trovato, C.A., & Hamilton, R. (1995). Focus on Chapter I reading program: Views of reading specialists, classroom teachers and principals. *Reading Research and Instruction, 34,* 204-221.

Fraatz, J.M.B. (1987). *The politics of reading: Power, opportunity and prospects for change in America's public schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gelheiser, L.M. & Meyers, J. (1991). Reading instruction by classroom, remedial, and resource room teachers. *Journal of Special Education, 24,* 512-526.

Holsti, O.R. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

International Reading Association. (2000). Summary of a position statement of the International Reading Association: *Teaching all children to read: The roles of the reading specialist.* Retrieved April 1, 2004, from http://www.reading.org/positions/specialist.html

Maleki, R.B., & Herman, C.E. (1994). What do rural middle-secondary teachers expect of reading programs and reading specialists?

Miles, M.B, & Huberman, A.M. (1984). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. London: Sage.

Professional Standards and Ethics Committee of the International Reading Association. (1998). *Standards for reading professionals: Revised.* Newark: DL: International Reading Association.

Professional Standards and Ethics Committee of the International Reading Association. (2003). *Standards for reading professionals: Revised.* Newark: DL: International Reading Association.

Quatroche, D.J., Bean, R.M., & Hamilton. (2001). The role of the reading specialist: A review of the research. *The ReadingTeacher*, *55*, 282-294.

Tancock, S. (1995). Classroom teachers and reading specialists examine their Chapter I reading programs. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, *27*, 315-335.

Viney, L.L. (1983). The assessment of psychological states through content analysis of verbal communications. *Psychological Bulletin*, *94*, 542-563.

Table 1
Study Participants

Reading Specialist	Current Teaching Assignment	Location	Full or Part Time	Years of Experience as Reading Specialist	Years of Experience in Education	Graduate Degree Earned	Special Literacy Training	Program Funding
Belinda	Primary, intermediate, middle	Rural	Full	4	9	Masters in Literacy	Reading Recovery training & Ohio reading endorsement	District
Dee	Primary	Urban	Full	10	15	Masters in Literacy	Reading Recovery training & Ohio reading endorsement	Title I
Erin	Primary	Urban	Full	2	2 plus	Currently working on Masters in Reading	Currently working on Ohio reading endorsement	Title I
Franki	Primary & intermediate	Suburban	Full	9	30	Masters plus 60 hours	Ohio reading endorsement & Ohio reading supervisor's license	Title I & district
Jill	Intermediate	Suburban	Part	4	16	Masters in Education	Ohio reading endorsement	Title I & district
Randi	Primary	Suburban	Full	10	20	Masters in Literacy	Ohio reading endorsement; Reading Recovery trained	District
Sarah	Primary	Suburban	Full	17	17	Masters in Literacy	Reading Recovery training & Ohio reading endorsement	Title I & district
Sheri	Primary & Intermediate	Suburban	Part	23	30	Masters in Reading	Ohio reading endorsement	Title I & district

Table 2
Interview Protocol_____

At what school-age level(s) do you work?
Level: Primary   Intermediate   Middle School   H.S.   College

What developmental area is your school?
School: Suburban   Urban   Rural

Do you work part-time or full-time as a reading specialist?
Working as a reading specialist: Part-time   Full-time   Other:

How many years have you worked as a reading specialist?   How many years have you
worked in education?
Number of years experience: Reading Specialist: _____   In education: _____

What is the source of funding for your reading program?

Funding: Federal Government   Title 1   Grant   Other:

Function: Please tell me about your job.

Instruction: What is your role in instruction of students? How often do you instruct students?
What are the groupings for instruction (individual, small group, large group)? What percentage of
your time is instructional? Do you work with teachers, administrators, parents, etc.? Tell me
about that. Where does this instruction of students take place? What are the advantages and
disadvantages of pullout, push-in, or both, whatever applies to your situation?

Assessment: Tell me about assessing students. How much time do you spend assessing? What
assessment tools do you use? How often do you rely on each assessment tools?

Resources to teachers, school, etc.: Do you ever serve as a resource to the people you work with?
(Teachers, Administrators, Parents) What kind of leadership roles do you take??

Administration: What administrative tasks do you have? How often do you do them? What are
your views on administrative tasks? Do you have any other duties like cafeteria, recess, etc.?

Beliefs: Can you comment on the importance of the tasks you do? Which tasks seem most
important? Which tasks seem least important? Are you consistent in performance with the level
of importance you assign to each task? Is the amount of time you spend reflective of the quality
and importance you assign to each tasks?

Changes: Have you noticed changes in your role within the past 5-6 years? What have been the
areas of greatest change? Have your roles changed? Has there been a decrease or increase in:
Paper work, resource to teachers, instruction in c/r, involvement in special education, with
parents? What has been the area of greatest change?

Table 3
Original Codes & Expanded Categories _____

Assessment done by reading specialist
- Running records
- Phonemic awareness / word study
- Inventories
- Standardized
- Work samples
- Sight words
- Self-assessment
- General
- Formal
- Assessing teachers

Assessment qualifying for program
- General
- Formal

Administrative tasks
- Reports
- Scheduling
- General
- Attendance
- Report cards / Progress reports

Beliefs on tasks
- Time fits
- Time doesn't fits
- Most important
- Least important

Changes in role
- Testing / Assessment
- Trends in reading
- General
- Time
- Accountability
- Viewed as a pseudo-administrator

Communication
- Teachers
- Administrators
- Parents

Grouping
- Push in
- Pull out
- Whole group
- General
- Teacher attitude

Instruction
- Phonemic awareness / word study
- Independent reading
- Strategies and skills
- Guided reading
- Literature circles
- Vocabulary
- Content comprehension
- Minilessons
- General
- Writing
- Test taking skills

Miscellaneous
- Duties
- Management
- Accomodations / Test administration
- Training
- Professional development
- Professional service

Planning
- On own
- With teachers
- With administration
- By administration

Resource
- Teachers
- Administrators
- Parents
- Mentorship from others
- Feelings

Special Needs Students
- Academic
- Behavior
- Physical

Understanding the Relationship Between Attitudes Toward Reading and Home Literary Environment

Angela Nickoli, Ball State University
Cindy Hendricks, Bowling Green State University
James Hendricks, Ball State University
April Smith, Ball State University

It is generally acknowledged that positive reading attitudes lead to positive reading experiences, which, in turn, lead to higher academic performance. Wang (2000) explains that children's literacy development determines their future success in reading and whether or not children read is determined by their attitudes toward reading. According to Wang, "If children do not like reading or they think reading is boring, their negative attitude toward reading will hinder their reading improvement" (p. 120).

In 2001, Panofsky reported that the marginalization of research and theory on affective domain issues in literacy "reflects a much larger avoidance in the dominant traditions of western science…The consequence of this avoidance is that issues of feeling/emotion/affect can become invisible in both research and, importantly, practice" (p. 45). Ignoring or marginalizing attitudinal research may cause teachers to downplay the importance of developing positive attitudes toward reading, particularly at the secondary school level (Panofsky). Tchudi and Mitchell (1999) argue, "Too often the affective domain in secondary classrooms is pooh-poohed" (p. 199).

Factors Affecting Attitudes Toward Reading

A number of recent studies have focused on identifying factors that influence the development of positive attitudes toward reading in secondary students (Bintz, 1993; Kubis, 1994; Metsala, 1996; Spiegel, 1994; Walberg & Tsai, 1983).

Walberg and Tsai (1983) concluded that factors contributing to a positive attitude toward reading among adolescents included believing that reading is important, enjoying reading, having a high self-concept as a reader, and having a verbally stimulating home environment where verbal interaction takes place regularly.

In a study by Bintz (1993) secondary students identified the presence of positive role models (parents, grandparents, siblings, friends, neighbors, relatives) as one of the factors responsible for their love of reading. Bintz reports that these role models created "reading families" or "communities of readers" whose members valued and supported reading.

Spiegel (1994) reported that what parents do in their homes (their literacy environment) significantly affected the development of positive attitudes toward reading in their children. According to Spiegel, home literacy environments included, among other things, artifacts (books, newspapers, pencils, paper, letters, junk mail) and events (reading to children).

Kubis' (1994) research investigated factors influencing attitude development. She concluded that students attribute their positive attitudes toward reading to a significant event or person. According to Kubis, students who were read to as children and who owned personal book collections had more positive attitudes toward reading than those who did not. Also, in her study, families of students with positive attitudes toward reading received more magazines and at an earlier age than the families of those with negative attitudes. One event that influenced positive attitude development was visiting the public library and possessing a library card.

Metsala (1996) reported that one factor that contributes to successful experiences in school is the children's literacy-related home experiences. Metsala identified a common core of characteristics associated with positive reading outcomes: readily available children's books, frequent reading to and with children, special space and opportunities for reading, positive parental attitudes and models of reading, frequent visits to libraries, and many parent-child conversations.

More recently, Reutzel and Fawson (2002) identified eight themes that permeated six national reading research reports. One such theme was Home-School-Community Partnerships. It is important to note that four of the six reports cited here specifically mention that school-home partnerships are essential for children's reading success. It is this connection that the present study sought to investigate.

Present Investigation

Understanding home experiences and parents' perspectives on literacy are important considerations in building connections between the home and the school. Although there are factors known to positively affect attitude toward reading, the relationship between adolescent attitudes toward reading and home literary environments should be more fully explored. The purpose of this investigation was to examine the relationship between the attitudes of college students toward reading and the literary environment in which they were raised.

Participants

A total of 402 college freshmen volunteers from two Midwestern universities participated in this study. Students at both state-supported universities were predominately Caucasian. Two survey instruments were used to document these students attitudes toward reading. The survey instruments were administered in the fall; thus, most of the students at both universities were in their first few months of college.

Instruments

The two instruments used to measure attitudes toward reading were the The Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment Survey (Tullock-Rhody & Alexander, 1980) and The Home Literacy Environment Survey (Kubis, 1994). Test-retest reliability of the Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment Survey scale was determined to be 0.84. Validity of the survey was established by including items constructed from secondary students' comments, a t-

test score of 4.16 discriminating between students perceived as having a positive attitude and those having a negative attitude; and by acceptable correlations between items retained on the final scale and the total scale (Tullock-Rhody & Alexander). The survey included 25 statements that allowed students to respond with a five point Likert scale. A very positive score received a score of five, and a very negative score received a score of one (Tullock-Rhody & Alexander); thus, scores on the survey range from a minimum of 25 to a maximum of 125.

Regarding The Home Literary Environment Survey, Kubis states that its purpose is to establish the literary richness of the environment from which the student has come (1994). The survey consists of 30 questions; 20 require a yes/no response; 6 require students to select from alternatives (multiple choice), and 4 require subjective answers. Kubis field- tested The Home Literary Environment Survey using two freshman English classes and two senior-level Advanced Learning Program classes. No items were changed on the survey after the field-testing.

To facilitate a comparison between the students' reading attitudes and home literary environment and for cohesiveness in responding, the two instruments (The Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment Survey and the Home Literary Environment Survey) were retyped and combined. Questions, deemed not relevant to the investigation were eliminated from the Home Literary Environment Survey. Questions eliminated were three subjective response items related to titles of magazines, one subjective item related to critical reading event, two multiple-choice items related to birth order, one multiple-choice item related to "real" readers, and one yes/no questions related to parents' restriction of television viewing (see Appendix).

Procedures

Students were told that the purpose of the study was to evaluate the relationship between their attitudes toward reading and the home literary environment in which they were raised. All students were told that completing the survey was voluntary; they were also instructed not to write their names on the surveys, regardless of whether or not they completed the surveys.

Data Analysis

All 402 students completed the combined inventories. After scoring the responses on the Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment Survey, the researchers identified the top 25% of the scores (n = 116) as having the most positive attitudes toward reading and the bottom 25% (n = 120) as having the most negative attitudes toward reading. While 25% of the scores would be closer to 100, all surveys with the same score were included in the investigation. The researchersfurther analyzed these 236 surveys for home literary variables.

Finally, frequencies of responses on the Home Literary Environment Survey from the students in both the positive and negative attitude groups were calculated. A Chi-square Test for Independence (p = .05) was used to determine whether significant relationships existed between variables in the students' home environments (according to the Home Literary Environment Survey) and the students' attitudes toward reading as defined by the Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment Survey.

Results

Attitude scores for the 116 students with most positive attitudes toward reading ranged from 95 to 124 (125 points possible), with a mean of 106.19 and a standard deviation of 7.56. The range for the 120 students with negative attitudes toward reading was 29 to 65; the observed mean was 52.86 with a standard deviation of 8.5. The frequency of responses on the Home Literary Environment from the students in both the positive and negative attitude groups were compared (See Appendix). Note that Item 22 ("Do your parent(s) or guardian(s) restrict the number of hours or the tv shows that you watch now?") was eliminated since most of the responders were living on campus.

The Chi-square Test for Independence ($p = .05$) compared each item on the Home Literary Environment Survey with those students who demonstrated a positive attitude toward reading and those who demonstrated a negative attitude toward reading as determined by the Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment Survey (see Appendix). Significant differences were noted between those students identified as having a positive attitude toward reading and those students identified as having a negative attitude toward reading on all items except two. The items were Questions 2 and 4.

Question 2 asked about the person who read to the student the most. There did not seem to be a significant relationship between the responses given by those identified as having a positive attitude toward reading and those identified as having a negative attitude toward reading. A similar conclusion can be drawn for Question 4. There did not appear to be significant differences between the responses given by those identified as having a positive attitude and those identified as having a negative attitude toward reading regarding whether the primary caregiver worked outside the home.

Discussion

The results of this investigation are similar to the results obtained by Bintz (1993), Kubis (1994), Metsala (1996), Spiegel (1994), and Walberg and Tsai (1983) and as reported earlier. Further, using Spiegel's (1994) notion of "artifacts and events" that lead to a positive attitude toward reading, it is evident that students who were identified as having a positive attitude toward reading report experiences in the home that include both artifacts and events. That is to say, this investigation lends support to the argument that there is a correlation between owning and having access to books, newspapers, magazines, and library cards (Items 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17) and positive attitudes toward reading.

This study also lends support to the position that specific kinds of events contribute to positive attitudes toward reading. Such events include such things as being read to as a child, visiting the library, attending story hours, discussing books or magazines with family or friends, having educated parents who show an interest in what the children are reading and who ask about school learning, who recommend books and restrict television watching, and the like (Items 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 18, 20, 21, 23).

Among her observations about reading attitudes, Stokmans (1999) concludes that attitudes are stable dispositions that have been acquired over time through direct and indirect experiences with reading. The kinds of experiences to which Stokmans refers may be the "artifacts and events" found and occurring in the homes of students who have positive attitudes toward reading. Perhaps what is created in these homes is what Walberg and Tsai (1983) called "reading families" or "communities of readers" whose members value and support the activity of reading.

The importance of knowing the reading attitudes of students has relevance for teachers of all students. Understanding how students feel about reading early in their academic careers may allow teachers to construct courses and employ instructional strategies that build on positive attitudes toward reading and eradicate negative attitudes. The results of this investigation demonstrate that it is important to provide both reading artifacts (books, newspapers, etc.) and reading events (reading circles, reading aloud, etc.) if students are to develop positive attitudes toward reading.

References

Bintz, W. P. (1993). Resistant readers in secondary education: Some insights and implications. *Journal of Reading*, 36, 604-615.

Kubis, M. (1994). *The relationship between home literary environments and attitudes toward reading in ninth-graders*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED385822)

Metsala, J. (Ed.). (1996). Early literacy at home: Children's experiences and parents' perspectives. *The Reading Teacher, 50*, 70-72.

Panofsky, C. (2001). Introduction to three views from our problems court. In G. Moorman & W. Trathen (Eds.) *Multiple perspectives in the millennium: Yearbook of the American Reading Forum*, Volume XXI, Available: http://www.fd.appstate.edu/arfonline/

Reutzel, D., & Fawson, P. (2002). Changing the face of reading instruction: Recommendations of six national reading reports. *Reading Horizons, 42*, 235-270.

Spiegel, D. A (1994). *A portrait of parents of successful readers*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED353548)

Stokmans, M. (1999). Reading attitude and its effect on leisure time reading. *Poetics, 26*, 245-261.

Tchudi, S., & Mitchell, D. (1999). *Exploring and teaching the English language arts* (4th ed.). New York: Longman.

Tullock-Rhody, R. & Alexander, J. (1980). A scale for assessing attitudes toward reading in secondary school. *Journal of Reading, 23*, 609-613.

Walberg, H. J., & Tsai, S. (1983). Reading achievement and attitude productivity among 17-year olds. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 15*, 41-53.

Wang, X. (2000). Children's attitudes toward reading and their literacy development. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 27*, 120-125.

Appendix:

Summary of Student Responses to Home Literary Environment Survey

Were you read to as a child?

N = 236	Often	Sometimes	Never
Positive	102	14	
Negative	30	75	15

2. Who was the person who read to you the most?

N = 236	Female Parent	Male Parent	Older Sibling	Grand parent	Other parent
Positive	12	9	3	16	76
Negative	8	9	4	5	92

3. Did more than one person read to you on a regular basis?

N = 235	Yes	No
Positive	107	9
Negative	39	80

4. Did your primary caregiver work outside of the home when you were young?

N = 235	Yes	No
Positive	72	44
Negative	63	56

5. Did you visit the public library when you were young?

N = 236	Yes	No
Positive	114	2
Negative	98	22

6. Did you attend story hours or other programs at the public library?

N = 236	Yes	No
Positive	87	29
Negative	34	86

7. Do you presently have a library card?

N = 236	Yes	No
Positive	103	13
Negative	72	48

8. Do you and your family give each other books as gifts?

N = 236	Yes	No
Positive	99	17
Negative	33	87

9. Does your parent(s) or guardian(s) have a collection of books they own at home?

N = 236	Yes	No
Positive	111	5
Negative	66	54

10.   Do you have a library of your own books at home?

N = 236	Yes	No
Positive	94	22
Negative	28	92

11.   Does your parent(s) or guardian(s) show interest in what you read?

N = 236	Yes	No
Positive	101	15
Negative	35	85

12.   Does your parent(s) or guardian(s) often ask you what you learned in school?

N = 236	Yes	No
Positive	110	6
Negative	83	37

13.   Do you ever discuss books or magazine articles with your parent(s) or guardian(s)?

N = 236	Yes	No
Positive	106	10
Negative	65	55

14.   Does your parent(s) or guardian(s) subscribe to magazines which are mailed to your home?

N = 236	Yes	No
Positive	106	10
Negative	58	62

15.   Do you have your own magazine subscriptions?

N = 236	Yes	No
Positive	84	32
Negative	31	89

16.   Do you remember having subscriptions as a child?

N = 236	Yes	No
Positive	110	6
Negative	46	74

17.   Is there a newspaper coming to your home on a daily basis?

N = 236	Yes	No
Positive	101	15
Negative	65	55

18.   Do your friends like to read books and/or magazines?

N = 235	Yes	No
Positive	106	10
Negative	74	45

19.   Do you discuss books you've read with your friends?

N = 236	Yes	No
Positive	98	18
Negative	34	86

20.   Do you and your friends recommend good books to each other?

N = 236	Yes	No
Positive	98	18
Negative	28	92

21. Did your parent(s) or guardian(s) restrict the number of hours or the shows you watched on tv when you were young?

N = 236	Yes	No
Positive	62	54
Negative	31	89

22. What is the educational level of the parent or guardian with whom you spent the most time with when you were a preschooler?

N= 236	Less than a College Graduate	College Graduate or higher	____
Positive	86	30	
Negative	67	53	

To obtain the positive and negative attitude responses, the Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment Survey (Tullock-Rhody & Alexander, 1980) was used. It was typed in its entirety and labeled Section A on the handout given to students. The 23 items from the Home Literary Environment Survey (Kubis, 1994) were typed on the same handout and identified as Section B. Eight items were eliminated from the original survey. Questions eliminated were three items related to titles of magazines, one item related to critical reading event, two items related to birth order, one item related to "real" readers, and one related to parents' restriction of television viewing.

Parents' Voices in the Discussion of the Rights of Readers

Victoria J. Risko
Peabody College of Vanderbuilt University
Mona W. Matthews
Georgia State University
Laurie Elish-Piper
Northern Illinois University
Sheryl Dasinger
Jo Ann F. Bass
Valdosta State University

How amazing that those tails and circles and little bridges joined together formed real letters! And that those letters could make syllables, and those syllables, one after the other, words. He couldn't believe it. And that some of those words were familiar to him--it was magical! (Pennac, 1992/1999, p. 44).

That is the way Pennac described his son's first attempts to read. By the time his son reached his adolescent years, he struggled to complete the reading material assigned by his teachers and had lost interest in reading.

Now he is a reclusive adolescent in his room, faced with a book he cannot read. His desire to be elsewhere creates a smeary film between his eyes and the page. He is sitting in front of the window, the door closed behind him. Stuck on page 48. He can't bear to count the hours it took him just to get to this forty-eighth page. (Pennac, 1992/1999, p. 20).

Pennac's experiences with his son, coupled with his reflections on how adults read books, led him to create the Reader's Bill of Rights, rights that all readers, including young readers, should be granted. The ten rights are

1. The right to not read.
2. The right to skip pages.
3. The right to not finish a book.
4. The right to reread.
5. The right to read anything.
6. The right to escapism.
7. The right to read anywhere.
8. The right to browse.
9. The right to read out loud.
10. The right to not defend your tastes (Pennac, 1992/1999, pp. 170-171).

Our Inquiries about Readers' Rights

Intrigued by Pennac's discussion of readers' rights, we decided to survey and interview teachers and students, and now parents to determine if these respective groups agreed with Pennac's perspective. Are these rights important for teachers? For readers? And if these rights are important, should they be applied uniformly or are there situations and/or personal preferences that may lead to differential use of these rights? Once we identified these guiding questions, we initiated our inquiry.

Our first investigation on the topic of the Reader's Bill of Rights found that the 131 preservice and inservice teachers who responded to our survey agreed with all the rights except the *right not to read*. Almost half of the teachers did not agree with this right. When asked which rights best represented their actions, they identified five rights (i.e., right to reread, the right to read anything, the right to escapism, the right to read anywhere, and the right to browse) that more closely resembled them and three rights (e.g., right to not read, right to skip pages, right to not finish) that did not (Elish-Piper, Matthews, Johns, & Risko, 1999).

The next year we asked 268 preservice and inservice teachers to identify rights they viewed important for themselves and rights important for their students. We learned that the teachers afforded themselves more rights than they afforded their students (Elish-Piper, et al., 2000).

The third study involved 200 sixth-grade students who were asked their perceptions of their rights as readers when reading for pleasure and when reading their school assignments. The students in this study felt they had more rights as readers during recreational reading than during academic reading (Matthews et al., 2001). For example, students believed that during recreational reading they could read anywhere, skip pages, browse through the text, and stop reading if they were uninterested. For academic reading, however, they felt responsible for the knowing the content and were less likely to browse or skip pages or choose not to finish their reading.

In the fourth investigation, we surveyed 157 fifth and sixth graders and found that they believed they had more rights when reading during free time than when reading to complete assignments the teacher gave them. When asked why they responded as they did to specific items, we discovered that the students tended to think of reading as text specific, were concerned about performing well on reading tests, and lacked an aesthetic response to reading (Bass et al., 2002).

We interviewed 12 students in fifth through eleventh grades in our fifth project. When asked about recreational reading, all the students thought it was ok to reread and most thought it was ok to use their imaginations and escape to another place. Younger students were ambivalent about whether it was ok to choose not to read something, but older students thought it was ok not to read something. In the area of academic reading, most responses related to tests and grades. Most students thought it was ok to read out loud, but they didn't like to do it. Younger students tended to view themselves as having fewer rights related to academic reading than older students (Elish-Piper, et al., 2002).

Two purposes guide this paper. First, we report findings from our sixth and most recent research. In this study we surveyed parents to determine their perceptions of the rights their children were entitled to as readers. Second, we discuss three additional reading rights (of students) that we believe are essential for supporting the literacy learning of children and adolescents.

Parents' Perceptions

Building on our former research, we were interested in parents' beliefs about their children's reading rights. For this study, we surveyed a group of parents and asked them to discuss the rights of their children when they read for school and for recreation. In the following material, we discuss our procedures, analysis, and findings.

Methods

Participants. Parents of 122 children in grades K-12 in school systems in a southern state responded to the survey. The schools were all within a 50-mile radius of a southern regional university. Of the 122 respondents, 68 were the parents of girls and 54 were the parents of boys. The group was divided into parents of primary grade students (K-2) and upper elementary through high school students (3-12). There were 90 parents of primary grade students and 32 parents of upper elementary through high school students. Parents were assured that there were no right or wrong answers and that their child's grade would not be affected by their responses.

Instrument. The survey instrument was developed based on Pennac's Reader's Bill of Rights (1992/1999) as well as previous surveys administered to teachers and students. Revisions were made to the wording to reflect instructions to parents concerning their children and suggestions from participants at Problems Court sessions at the American Reading Forum conference (Elish-Piper, et al., 2000; Matthews, et al., 2001; Bass, et al., 2002). The survey was divided into two sections. On each part, the respondents rated on a Likert-type scale (A=Strongly Agree, B=Agree, C=Not Sure, D=Disagree, and E=Strongly Disagree) their extent of agreement with the statements. Five points were assigned to A, four points to B, three points to C, two points to D, with E having one point. The first ten statements related to children's rights during recreational reading done during students' free time outside of school. On the second part, the respondents rated their extent of agreement with 10 statements related to academic reading during school lessons or assignments. In an open-ended question, parents were asked to make comments if they chose to do so. Surveys requested that each respondent identify his or her child's gender and grade level.

Analysis. Descriptive statistics were generated for each item. T-tests were run to determine if there were significant differences in parents' perceptions related to their children's rights for academic versus recreational reading. A bonferroni correction was applied to account for multiple t-tests (p=.05/10=.005). The data also were analyzed using a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine differences in the opinion of parents on the basis of gender and grade level. The parental comments were analyzed for patterns and illuminating responses.

Results

Rights associated with reading purpose. To determine if there were differences in parents' perceptions of their children's rights as readers during recreational and academic reading, the means for the paired questions were analyzed. In Table 1 we display the results of this analysis.

Table 1

All Parents' Perceptions of Their Children's Rights as Readers

Item	Free time reading not at school M (SD)	Academic reading at school M(SD)	Difference	t (N=122)
1. Choose not to read	3.23 (1.30)	1.64 (.80)	1.59	12.59*
2. Skip pages	2.64 (1.25)	1.75 (.83)	.89	7.76*
3. Not to finish	3.25 (1.23)	1.66 (.77)	1.59	13.75*
4. Reread	4.47 (.74)	4.40 (.82)	.07	.799
5. Read anything	3.49 (1.37)	2.42 (1.08)	1.07	7.90*
6. Escape from real world	4.07 (1.02)	3.30 (1.19)	.77	7.06*
7. Read anywhere	3.61 (1.28)	2.89 (1.21)	.72	7.44*
8. Glance through	3.98 (1.10)	3.55 (1.30)	.43	4.61*
9. Read out loud	3.97 (1.10)	3.87 (1.04)	.10	1.15
10. Not to explain choice	3.05 (1.38)	2.35 (1.01)	.70	5.90*

*$p<.0005$

For all ten paired questions, parents afforded their children more rights related to free time reading done outside of school than academic reading done at school. There were significant differences in all but two of the questions. These exceptions were the right to reread and the right to read out loud. Parents generally do not believe that during academic reading their children should have the right to (a) choose not to read, (b) skip pages, or (c) not finish what they read. These results are consistent with students' perceptions of their own rights obtained when they were surveyed (Matthews, et al., 2001). Teachers also were consistent in limiting these

rights for students, although that particular survey did not differentiate between recreational and academic reading (Elish-Piper, et al., 2000).

Rights associated with gender and grade level. A two-way analysis of variance was conducted to determine if there were differences in parents' perceptions of their children's rights according to the children's gender or grade level. We report the results of these analyses in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2

Parents' Perceptions of Their Children's Rights as Readers by Grade Level

Categories of responses	Parents of younger children N=90	Parents of older children N=32	Difference
Free time reading outside school			
M	30.46	36.03 *	6.43
(SD)	(7.35)	(4.75)	
Academic reading at school			
M	27.15	29.97**	2.82
(SD)	(5.07)	(4.72)	

*Grade level free reading ($F_{1, 121}$=19.92, p<.0005)
**Grade level academic reading ($F_{1, 121}$=15.62, p<.005

Table 3

Parents' Perceptions of Their Children's Rights as Readers by Gender

Categories of responses	Parents of boys N=54	Parents girls N=68	Difference
Free time reading outside school			
M	30.87	32.51	1.64
(SD)	(7.35)	(4.75)	
Academic reading at school			
M	26.80	28.63	1.83
(SD)	(5.07)	(4.72)	

Gender * free reading ($F_{1, 121}$=1.15, p=.29)

Gender * academic reading ($F_{1, 121}=3.36$, p=.069)

Generally, there were differences in parents' perceptions of their children's rights by grade level, but not by gender. Parents of children in grades 3 and above perceived their children to have significantly more rights in both the free reading ($F_{1, 121}=19.92$, p<.0005) and academic reading categories ($F_{1, 121}=15.62$, p<.005). Parents of girls perceived their children to have slightly more rights related to both free reading and academic reading. However, there was no statistically significant difference in responses for free reading ($F_{1, 121}=1.15$, p=.29) nor academic reading ($F_{1, 121}=3.36$, p=.069) between parents of boys and girls. There was no significant interaction between gender and grade level for free reading ($F_{1, 121}=.21$, p=.65) Additionally, there was no significant interaction between gender and grade level for academic reading ($F_{1, 121}=.35$, p=.55).

Not many parents chose to respond to the open-ended comment question. Those who did reinforced the results of the survey. The following quotation is characteristic of the feelings of several parents:

> Free time is different to us--it means you put in your opinion and pick things you might want to learn about or you enjoy. However, anytime an assignment is given, we believe our child is to submit to the leadership of his teacher and do the best he can. Thank you for asking our opinion.

Three Overarching Rights

While engaging in the six studies on the rights of readers, it became clear to the researchers and attendees at previous Problems Court sessions at ARF that some of Pennac's rights (1992/1999) overlapped and focused on closely related areas such as "the right to skip pages" and "the right to not finish," but other broad, significant rights were not included. These concerns led the researchers to discuss and examine their own recent experiences in schools, their roles as teacher educators, and the literature from both professional and popular presses. Through these processes, the researchers identified three overarching rights that they believe are critical for helping students become engaged, motivated, lifelong readers. These rights are:

1. the right to a competent, caring, qualified literacy teacher.
2. the right to choose reading material for both academic and personal reading purposes.
3. the right to instruction that is individually appropriate.

These rights are situated in a challenging political and educational climate characterized by legislation such as the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) (U.S. Department of Education, 2002) that mandates high-stakes testing and advocates the use of structured instructional programs that focus on the individual components of reading rather than promoting lifelong reading. In this present climate, educational administrators, teacher educators, teachers, and parents find themselves struggling to reconcile the federal and state mandates that are pushing literacy education toward a more mechanistic, skills-based view of reading with the realities of the lives of children and adolescents in our schools. In the current debates about NCLB and state policies related to reading instruction, the researchers feel strongly that the voices and rights of

students must be considered and addressed. By identifying and examining the three overarching rights for (a) a competent, caring, qualified teacher, (b) choice, and (c) individually appropriate instruction, the researchers aim to include the voices, experiences, needs, and concerns of students in the discussion about reading instruction in our schools.

The Right to a Competent, Caring Qualified Teacher

How is the right to a competent, caring, qualified teacher defined? The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) (1996) states that the educational birthright of every child is to have a "competent, caring, qualified teacher" (p. 6). Such a teacher is a skilled educator who is respectful, kind, and knowledgeable about what he/she teaches, as well as fully certified in the area where he or she teaches. According to a national poll about public attitudes toward education, 90% of Americans surveyed supported the belief that the best way to improve student achievement is to provide a qualified teacher in each classroom (Haselkorn & Harris, 1998). Although the right to a competent, caring, qualified teacher appears to be fundamental to our educational system, it is not a reality for many children and adolescents in our country's public schools (NCTAF, 2003)

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act (U.S. Department of Education, 2002) has brought the issue of highly qualified teachers to the forefront of political debate and public awareness. NCLB defines a highly qualified teacher as having "full certification, a bachelor's degree and demonstrated competence in subject knowledge and teaching" (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). Research by Ingersoll (2001) and Wayne and Youngs (2003) illustrates the positive correlation between teachers who possess certification in their teaching field and student achievement. Clearly, having certification in the field where one teaches is important, but other important attributes of excellent teachers also warrant consideration.

Simply having certification may not guarantee that a teacher possesses the types of knowledge necessary to be an effective teacher for all students. Shulman's categories of the knowledge base for teaching (1987) provide a more fine-grained view of the dimensions of teacher knowledge. Shulman's categories include content knowledge; general pedagogical knowledge; curriculum knowledge; pedagogical content knowledge; knowledge of learners and their characteristics; knowledge of educational contexts; and knowledge of educational ends, purposes, and values. In other words, teachers must develop expertise not only in their field but also in how to teach effectively. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996) supports this view of expert teachers by stating, "To be effective, teachers must know their subject matter so thoroughly that they can present it in a challenging, clear compelling way. They must know how their students learn and how to make ideas accessible so that they can construct successful 'teachable moments.' Research confirms that teacher knowledge of subject matter, student learning, and teaching methods are all important elements of teacher effectiveness" (p. 6). Specifically in the area of reading, *Standards for Reading Professionals*, published by the International Reading Association (2003), charge teachers with having expertise in the following aspects of reading instruction: foundational knowledge; instructional strategies and curriculum materials; assessment, diagnosis, and evaluation; creating a literate environment; and professional development. In summary, we argue that all students have the right to be taught by skilled teachers who possess deep knowledge of content, pedagogy, and students.

Beyond the dimensions of knowledge necessary for effective teaching, teachers must be caring and respectful in their relationships with their students. Gilligan (1982) and Noddings (1984) advocate that teaching be characterized by an ethic of care that frames education as a worthwhile human activity wherein each student is honored as competent and capable of learning, and educators take responsibility for teaching all students. In this view of education, teachers strive to create a climate of trust, respect, and mutual responsibility that promotes students' cognitive development as well as their development as whole persons. When students and their parents sense that teachers truly care about the children and adolescents in their classrooms, productive working relationships result, which are likely to lead to increases in student achievement and engagement with learning (Noddings). We argue that the right to a caring teacher is a fundamental right for each and every student in our schools.

The highly effective literacy teacher also has an additional attribute that contributes to success--he or she is a reader and writer who is passionate about helping students develop into lifelong readers and writers (Kolloff, 2002: Ray & Laminack, 2001). By sharing a love of literacy with students, teachers are able to promote a lifelong habit of reading and writing in students. We believe that all students deserve to be taught by teachers who model their love of reading and writing in and out of school so that students may become lifelong readers and writers themselves.

Why is the right to a competent, caring qualified teacher significant? Research studies on the relationship between teacher expertise and student achievement indicate that teacher quality has a significant impact on overall student achievement in schools (Darling-Hammond, 1999; Sanders & Rivers, 1996; Wayne & Youngs, 2003), as well as on reading specifically (Wharton-McDonald, Pressley, & Hampston, 1998). If we expect students to achieve academically, it is clear that we must provide highly competent teachers in each classroom.

Unfortunately, in low-income, urban and rural schools across America, many teachers possess neither the basic requirement of a teaching certificate in the field in which they teach nor the other attributes discussed previously in this section (NCTAF, 2003). Unless careful attention is paid to developing and retaining high quality teachers in schools attended by low income students, serious concerns are warranted about promoting education that is decidedly undemocratic and unequal. Such unequal education is likely to result in cultural reproduction wherein class structures are reproduced, and the poor stay poor and find themselves with few, if any, opportunities to better their economic situations or make educational and life choices that others in our country have available to them (Althusser, 1971; Bourdieu, 1991; Foucault, 1970). In other words, "Teaching quality will make the critical difference not only to the futures of individual children but to America's future as well" (NCTAF, 1996, p. 2). We can no longer apply the right to a caring, competent, qualified teacher for only some students in some schools. All children, regardless of race, linguistic background, socioeconomic status, geography, religion, or gender have the educational birthright to a "competent, caring, qualified teacher" (NCTAF, 1996, p. 6).

The Right to Choose Reading Material for Both Academic and Personal Reading Purposes

How is the right to choose reading materials defined? This right for students to select reading materials to support their learning and for recreation is viewed by researchers and literacy educators as essential for sustaining students' interest and engagement in reading and writing. Personal interests and preferences may guide choices. Monson & Sebesta (1991) differentiate the two constructs; preferences are associated with texts students might like to read while interests are associated with what they are actually selecting to read. Influencing preferences and interests are factors such as students' out-of-school experiences, efforts to take agency for one's own learning (Nieto, 2000), efforts to be successful and free from anxiety that comes from assigned texts that are too difficult for the reader (Rubenstein-Avila, 2003/2004), and building one's identity as a reader (Pajares, 1996). To support both preferences and interests, students need access to multiple genre of texts (including web based and multimedia texts), multicultural materials, popular texts (such as magazines and comic books), and multiple levels of reading materials. Researchers, such as Galda (1982), find students' reject school texts when their own expectations and preferences for reading material are not available to them.

Recognizing the power of self selection on students' reading engagement and sustained interest in reading, the Board of Directors of the International Reading Association recently asserted that students' right to choose at least some of their reading materials in school is a desired attribute of high quality instruction for children and adolescents. In two position statements, *Adolescent Literacy* (IRA, 1999) and *Making a Difference means Making it Different: Honoring Children's Rights to Excellent Reading Instruction* (IRA, 2000), the board of directors advocated for students' access to multiple forms of texts and the right to choose what they read for academic and personal purposes.

Why is the right to choose reading material significant? Researchers argue that self selection of reading materials is a requirement for instructional programs that are aimed toward sustaining engagement and interest in reading, developing strategic and independent reading habits, fostering feelings of self worth and self efficacy, and enhancing deeper processing of text ideas (e.g., Finders, 1997; Ivey & Broaddus, 2001). In many classrooms, however, students are not provided with this opportunity for choice. Instead, transmission models of teaching, prescribed curriculum and textbooks, tracking students through prepackaged leveled texts, and required lists of out-of-school reading material inhibit students' agency over their own reading selections. Recognizing the limitations of fixed curriculum on students' learning, Csikszentmihalyi (1991) warned that scripted and transmission models often produce students who choose not to read and argued that "the chief impediments to learning are not cognitive. It is not that students cannot learn; it is that they do not wish to" (p. 115). Unfortunately, this warning has not been heeded; current attempts to help "every child" pass state literacy tests is associated with higher uses of scripted and teacher-driven curriculum and fewer opportunities for student choices.

As literacy educators, we expect our students to be active and strategic learners—learners that monitor their understandings, that persist in their reading and writing efforts, that adjust their learning strategies to the demands of the text, and that make connections between their experiences and texts they read. Unfortunately, these forms of active learning and participation may not be present in all reading and writing programs. For example, as reported earlier in this paper, the students we surveyed told us they had few choices (for adjusting their reading habits)

when asked to read for academic purposes. This finding is particularly problematic when we juxtapose it with studies that identified an increase in disinterest and passivity in school reading as students progress from the elementary to middle school grades, a finding reported for both successful and less successful and reluctant readers (Bintz, 1993; Worthy and McKool, 1996).

Bintz (1993), Ivey and Broaddus (2001), and Worthy and McKool (1996) studied the reading habits of reluctant readers and concluded that lack of choice of reading materials and few opportunities to read what they *were allowed* to choose contributed to negative attitudes about reading in school. Yet as Bintz learned, those students described with negative and passive attitudes in his study, often read for pleasure and to obtain information out of school. Further, Bintz noted that these students were highly engaged, persistent, and strategic when reading out of school the materials that interested them. Finders (1997) described this activity as the "literate underground" of students—a place for reading success that may not be accessed by schools. These findings coincide with Deci's (1992) claim about the importance of interests to guide activity… "freely doing what interests them… when so motivated, their behavior is characterized by concentration and engagement; it occurs spontaneously and people become wholly absorbed in it" (p. 45).

Being "wholly absorbed" in one's reading or intentional about selections can be catalysts that spark interest in additional reading and for deepening content and world knowledge. Analyzing the development of expert readers, for example, Alexander (2003) asserts that expertise is impacted equally by the factors of knowledge acquisition, adoption of strategic actions, and interest and persistence. Similarly, Schiefele (1991) associates learning with interest and engagement—all necessary elements for deepening understandings of concepts under study.

To accommodate students' right of choice, we do not expect that all school reading materials will be chosen by the students. Rather we envision literacy instruction that is inquiry- or problem-based and that provides access to multiple texts, including both teacher and student selections. Teachers may choose to provide access to common texts for all class members; access to texts for all students can be instrumental for building shared knowledge among class members, inviting different perspectives, and for engaging in dialogic learning formats that can deepen personal knowledge. Additional texts, chosen by students to pursue their own questions and interests, can afford opportunities for students to read what they can and want to read (Fairbanks, 1998; Ivey, 1999; Tomlinson, Moon, & Callahan, 1998; Worthy, Moorman, & Turner, 1999) and opportunities to bridge across cultural and linguistic differences (Farnan, 1996).

The Right to Instruction That is Individually Appropriate

How is the right to instruction that is individually appropriate defined? Ideally, the goal of each instructional literacy event, whether implied or explicit, is to enhance an individual's ability to enjoy, construct, comprehend, and create written and oral language. Consideration of our third right, the right to instruction that is individually appropriate, is central to achieving this goal. (This phrasing is borrowed from Supporting Young Adolescents' Literacy Learning, a joint position statement of the International Reading Association (IRA) and the National Middle

School Association (IRA & NMSA, 2001). This right situates its meaning in current views of the nature of the learner.

Position statements developed by professional organizations such as the National Association for the Education of Young Children (1997), IRA and NMSA (2001) propose a multi-dimensional view of learners. Learners are perceived as individuals with different linguistic, cultural, affective, and ethnic characteristics (IRA & NMSA, 2001). Acknowledging that students possess differences is critical when planning literacy instruction not only because there is general acceptance that schools should respect each learner, but also because the foundations of literacy are formed from the learners' experiences within their home communities. Support for this assertion is found in Wells' (1999) discussion of the emergence of six modes of knowledge. Three of these modes, instrumental, procedural, and substantive, represent the knowledge individuals acquire through their day-to-day interactions with others in their home communities. This knowledge is the foundation upon which the other three modes of knowledge, aesthetic, theoretical, and meta, are built. Schools are one of the institutional settings in which the latter three modes of knowledge are constructed. For that reason, Wells' notions of knowledge suggest that ignoring the linguistic, cultural, affective, and ethnic differences among students increases the possibility for failure for those whose understandings are not evident in the school's expressions of literacy (Shannon, 1996; Wells, 1999)

Why is the right to instruction that is individually appropriate significant? Several factors support the significance of this right to students' literacy learning. First, simplistic views of reading as the acquisition of a set of discrete skills have been replaced with lifespan views which represent learning to read as a process that begins at birth and continues through life (Alexander, 2003). These broader views of literacy learning account for the multiple functions and reasons individuals use oral and written language as they expand their range of use from their home, to school, and to work.

Second, the increased cultural and ethnic diversity of the children in American schools makes it essential for teachers to use the children's embedded understandings about language and meaning-making as a bridge to institutional and school-based literacy practices. Thus, the long-held practice of using one basal reading program, delivered in one way, and at the same pace to address the reading needs of all students is inadequate for a growing diverse population.

Third, the hardest-to-teach often are the ones who are unable to "move beyond" the instruction. Clay's (1991) work demonstrates that even when a group of children share a common cultural and ethnic background, approximately 20% will require intervention beyond the typical classroom instruction. Clay suggests that although many children are able to make connections between process and practice even though they may be absent from the teachers' instruction, those designated as the hardest to teach are not able to make these connections. Their success is often contingent on a teacher's ability to identify the individual's needs and then design instruction to meet those needs.

Last, images of who we are as literate beings influence our perceptions of who we are as human beings (Bruner, 1996). Bruner asserts that there are two principal components of self: (a) the ability to initiate and participate in an event and (b) the evaluation of the success of that

participation. Further, schools are integral to children's developing conceptions of self because they are often the first institutional setting in which they get to try out and evaluate their participation. If this reasoning is applied to children's participation in literacy events, successful participation in these events has consequences not only to their developing perceptions of themselves as readers and writers but also their developing perceptions of themselves as learners.

Discussion from the Problems Court

The results of the survey of parents' perceptions of their children's rights as readers suggest that parents afforded their children more rights during free reading than academic reading. Parents, however, appeared reluctant to allow their children to skip pages during recreational reading. These findings led some attendees at the ARF Problems Court session to raise questions about the parents' reading level, socioeconomic level, and cultural background. It was pointed out that parents may not read as well as their children and that the readability of documents sent home to parents is often too high. One participant suggested that we add another right, the right to a literate home environment.

The finding that parents who responded to the survey were fairly consistent in limiting their children's rights during academic reading generated questions and comments from Problems Court participants about reading instructional approaches and materials. Although many reading approaches are implemented in the schools represented in the survey, many used the Accelerated Reader (AR) program. An attendee stated that prescriptive approaches such as AR were killing children's motivation to read. It was noted that one parent who responded to the survey indicated that the schools were ramming reading down children's throats with so much emphasis being placed on reading.

The right to a competent, caring, and qualified teacher produced discussion concerning teacher certification. Many in attendance expressed their concerns that alternative certification routes are undermining teacher educators who are trying to prepare competent, caring, qualified teachers. For example, a person in Georgia with a degree in any area can now pass Praxis II and be certified to teach for five years.

The parent survey indicated that there was limited parental support for allowing children to have much choice of material during academic reading. This finding sparked the discussion of the need for individualized instruction in today's schools. When instruction is too narrow, too many children are not reached. Teachers' judgment is critical in deciding the type of instruction needed by individual students, and teachers must be given flexibility in what they do in their classrooms, including the flexibility to encourage students' independent choices about reading selections.

Although our research into the rights of readers has produced some new understandings, questions remain. What issues stand in the way of making those rights a reality? What can we do to make these rights a reality? What rights have we omitted that are important?

References

Alexander, P. A. (2003). Profiling the developing reader: The interplay of knowledge, interest, and strategic processing. In C.M. Fairbanks, J. Worthy, J. Maloch, V. Hoffman, & D.L. Schallert (Eds.), *Fifty-second Yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 47-65). Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.

Althusser, P. (1971). *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. London: New Left Books.

Bass, J. A., Dasinger, S., Risko, V. J., Matthews, M. W., Elish-Piper, L., Johns, J. L. (2002). Students' perceptions of their rights as readers: Including students' voices in the dialogue. *Yearbook of the American Reading Forum, 22*. Retrieved January 27, 2003, from http://www.americanreadingforum.org

Bintz, W. P. (1993). Resistant readers in secondary education: Some insights and implications. *Journal of Reading*, *36*, 605-615.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Clay, M. M. (1991). *Becoming literate: The construction of inner control.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1991). Literacy and intrinsic motivation. In S. R. Graubard (Ed.), *Literacy: An overview of 14 experts* (pp. 115-140). New York: Hill & Wang.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). *Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence.* Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.

Deci, E.L. (1992). The relation of interest to the motivation of behavior: A self-determination theory perspective. In K. A. Renninger, S. Hidi, & A. Crapp (Eds.), *The role of interest in learning and development* (pp. 43-70). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Elish-Piper, L., Matthews, M. W., Bass, J. A., Dasinger, S., Johns, J., & Lewis, J. (2002, December). *Examining students' perceptions of reading and readers' rights in varied contexts*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Reading Forum, Sanibel Island, FL.

Elish-Piper, L., Matthews, M. W., Johns, J. L., & Risko, V. (1999). An exploration of the Reader's Bill of Rights. In R. J. Telfer (Ed.), *Literacy conversations: Family, school, community*, *19,* (pp. 95-106). Whitewater, WI: American Reading Forum.

Elish-Piper, L., Matthews, M. W., Risko, V. J., Johns, J. L., Bass, J. A., Dasinger, S. (2000). The Reader's Bill of Rights: Analysis, issues, and insights. In R. J. Telfer (Ed.), *Literacy*

transitions into the next millennium: Where have we been? Where are we going? 20, (pp. 1-15). Whitewater, WI: American Reading Forum.

Fairbanks, C. M. (1998). Nourishing conversations: Urban adolescents, literacy, and democratic society. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *30*, 187-203.

Finders, M. J. (1997). *Just girls: Hidden literacies and life in junior high*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English and New York: Teachers College Press.

Farnan, N. (1996). Connecting adolescents and reading: Goals at the middle level. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 39, 436-445.

Foucault, M. (1970). *The order of things: An archeology of knowledge*. London: Tavistock.

Gilligan, C. (1982) *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Galda, L. (1982). Assuming the spectator stance: An examination of the responses of young readers. *Research in the Teaching of English, 16* (1), 1-20.

Haselkorn, D., & Harris, L. (1998). *The essential profession: A 1998 national survey of public attitudes towards teaching, educational opportunity, and school reform.* Belmont, MA: Recruiting New Teachers, Inc.

Ingersoll, R. (2001*). Teacher quality and educational inequality*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.

International Reading Association *(1999). Adolescent Literacy.* Position statement of the International Reading Association. Newark, DE: IRA.

International Reading Association (2000). *Making a Difference means Making it Different: Honoring Children's Rights to Excellent Reading Instruction*. Position statement of the International Reading Association. Newark, DE: IRA.

International Reading Association. (2003). *Standards for reading professionals*. Newark, DE: IRA.

International Reading Association & National Middle School Association. (2001). *Supporting Young adolescents' literacy learning.* A joint position statement of the International Reading Association and the National Middle School Association. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Ivey, G. (1999). A multicase study in the middle school: Complexities among young adolescent readers. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *34* (2), 172-192.

Ivey, G., & Broaddus, K. (2001). Just plain reading: A survey of what makes students want to read in middle school classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *36* (4), 350-377.

Kolloff, P.B. (2002). Why teachers need to be readers. *Gifted Child Today, 25*, 50-54.

Matthews, M. W., Elish-Piper, L., Johns, J. L., Bass, J. A., Dasinger, S., Risko, V. J. (2001). An exploration of students' perceptions of their rights as readers. In G. B. Moorman & W. R. Trathen (Eds.), *Multiple perspective in the millennium*, *21,* (pp. 99-115). Boone, NC: American Reading Forum.

Monson, D. L., & Sebesta, S. L. (1991). Reading preferences. In J. Flood, J. M. Jensen, D. Lapp, & J. R. Squire (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching the English Language Arts* (pp. 664-673). New York: Macmillan.

National Association for the Education of Young Children. (1997). *Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs serving children from birth through age 8*. Washington, DC: Author.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996*). What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. Washington DC: Author.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (2003). *No dream denied: A pledge to America's children*. Washington DC: Author.

Noddings, N. (1984*). Caring, A feminine approach to ethics & moral education*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Nieto, S. (2000). Language, literacy, and culture: Intersections and implications. In T. Shanahan & F. V. Rodriguez-Brown (Eds.), *49 Yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 41-60). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research*, *66*, 543-578.

Pennac, D. (1999). *Better than life*. (D.Homel, Trans.). York, ME: Stenhouse. (Original work published 1992)

Ray, K. W., & Laminack, L. (2001*). The writing workshop: Working through the hard parts (and they're all hard parts)*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Rubenstein-Avila, E. (2003/2004). Conversing with Miguel: An adolescent English Language Learner struggling with later literacy development*. Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *47* (4), 290-301.

Sanders, W. L., & Rivers, J. C. (1996). *Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future student academic achievement*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee.

Schiefele, U. (1991). Interest, learning, and motivation. *Educational Psychologist*, *26*, 299-323.

Shannon, P. (1996). Critical issues: Literacy and educational policy. Part two (Poverty, literacy, and politics: Living in the USA). *Journal of Literacy Research, 28*(3), 429-449.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*(1), 1-22.

Tomlinson, C., Moon, T. R., & Callahan, C. (1998). How well are we addressing academic diversity in middle school? *Middle School Journal, 3*, 3-11.

United States Department of Education. (2002). *No child left behind*. Retrieved February 2, 2004 from http://www.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml?src=pb#

Wayne, A. J., & Youngs, P. (2003). Teacher characteristics and student achievement gains: A review. *Review of Educational Research, 73*, 89-122.

Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Toward a sociocultural practice and theory of education.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Wharton-McDonald, R., Pressley, M., & Hampston, J.M. (1998). Literacy instruction in nine first-grade classrooms: Teacher characteristics and student achievement. *Elementary School Journal, 99*(2), 101-128.

Worthy, J., & McKool, S. S. (1996). Students who say they hate to read: The importance of opportunity, choice, and access. In D. J. Leu, C. K. Kinzer, & K.A. Hinchman (Eds.), *Literacies for the 21st century: Research and practice. 45th yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 245-256). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Worthy, J., Moorman, M., & Turner, M. (1999). What Johnny likes to read is hard to find in school. *Reading Research Quarterly, 34*, 12-27.

Appendix

Reader's Bill of Rights Parent Survey

Directions for Use

The Reader's Bill of Rights Parent Survey is a quick survey of parents' perceptions of the rights their children have as readers. It consists of 20 items and takes approximately five to ten minutes to complete.

This survey is part of a research study conducted by Dr. Sheryl Dasinger at Valdosta State University. Participation is entirely voluntary and neither you nor your child will be identified in any way. This is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers. Your child's grade will not be affected by your responses. Your completion of this survey indicates your consent to participate in this study.

The first ten items are related to recreational reading, which is reading that is done during students' free time outside of school. The second ten items are related to reading during school lessons or assignments. Think carefully about each item and answer the item as honestly as possible.

If you have any comments, please make those on the last page. Please indicate if your child is a boy or a girl and his/her grade in school.

If you have additional questions, please call:

Sheryl Dasinger, Ph.D.
Department of Early Childhood & Reading
Valdosta State University
229-249-4925

PLEASE RETURN THE SURVEY BY WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2003.

Reader's Bill of Rights Parent Survey

Please complete the following information about your child and make comments if you choose to do so.

My child is   Female   Male

My child is in the _____ grade.

Comments:

Part I- Directions:

Sometimes students read during their free time just because they want to read. Mark each item according to your child's rights as a reader.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. When my child reads during their free time, they should be allowed to choose not to read.	A	B	C	D	E
2. When my child reads during their free time, they should be allowed to skip pages.	A	B	C	D	E
3. When my child reads during their free time, they should be allowed to not finish what they read.	A	B	C	D	E
4. When my child reads during their free time, they should be allowed to reread.	A	B	C	D	E
5. When my child reads during their free time, they should be allowed to read anything.	A	B	C	D	E
6. When my child reads during their free time, they should be allowed to escape from the real world.	A	B	C	D	E
7. When my child reads during their free time, they should be allowed to read anywhere.	A	B	C	D	E
8. When my child reads during their free time, they should be allowed to glance through what they're reading.	A	B	C	D	E
9. When my child reads during their free time, they should be allowed to read out loud.	A	B	C	D	E
10. When my child reads during their free time, they should be allowed not to explain their choice of reading material.	A	B	C	D	E

Part II- Directions:

Sometimes students read during their free time because they have lessons or assignments given to them by a teacher. Mark each item according to your child's rights as a reader.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. When my child reads for lessons or assignments, they should be allowed to choose not to read.	A	B	C	D	E
2. When my child reads for lessons or assignments, they should be allowed to skip pages.	A	B	C	D	E
3. When my child reads for lessons or assignments, they should be allowed to not finish what they read.	A	B	C	D	E
4. When my child reads for lessons or assignments, they should be allowed to reread.	A	B	C	D	E
5. When my child reads for lessons or assignments, they should be allowed to read anything.	A	B	C	D	E
6. When my child reads for lessons or assignments, they should be allowed to escape from the real world.	A	B	C	D	E
7. When my child reads for lessons or assignments, they should be allowed to read anywhere.	A	B	C	D	E
8. When my child reads for lessons or assignments, they should be allowed to glance through what they're reading.	A	B	C	D	E
9. When my child reads for lessons or assignments, they should be allowed to read out loud.	A	B	C	D	E
10. When my child reads for lessons or assignments, they should be allowed not to explain their choice of reading material.	A	B	C	D	E

Primary Grade Reading Instruction Empowered Through Research-Based Knowledge

Ann Sharp, Ralph E. Reynolds, Kathleen J. Brown, Amy Morris, and Susan Gunn

Introduction

What would you do if you were a member of a major school district and during a school board meeting a group of discontented parents waved Adams' (1990) book, "Beginning To Read: Thinking and Learning About Print", and asked, "What do you know about this book? And if nothing why not?" This incident actually happened. These parents were concerned that their children were not receiving the benefit of instruction based on the twenty years of theoretical and applied research explicated in the book.

This incident became the impetus for reading instruction reform within the district. Seeking counsel from an educational department of a large western university, the district put into motion a wide scale plan. Projected within that plan was a professional development reading program (PDRP) that would focus on and support scientifically based reading research. The program design was the result of a joint effort by the university reading professors, district leaders, and researchers.

Program Design

Seven components of reading acquisition were identified (six of which later became the National Reading Panel (NRP, 2000) standards: phonological awareness, explicit systematic phonics instruction, word study, fluency, comprehension strategies instruction, vocabulary instruction and writing. These components were the emphases of the program and considered core to effective reading instruction (Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998).

Three orientations or approaches to reading were identified: code-based, whole-language, and integrated. A code-based approach utilizes the phonics component with little care to the other components or reading acquisition (Diederich, 1973). A whole-language approach utilizes the component of writing with an emphasis in the use of literature and affective measures such as motivation (Bergeron, 1990). An integrated approach utilizes all seven components of reading acquisition.

Ten academic courses (30 credit hours) focusing on seminal research were created: theories and models of reading; beginning reading instruction; comprehension instruction; content area reading; diagnosis and remediation of reading difficulties; reading assessment; writing instruction; children's literature; evaluation of reading programs; and cultural diversity. Two courses a semester were offered over five semesters.

The PDRP would take a proactive stance towards understanding reading research and understanding the nature of science. This dual focus would be developed to facilitate appropriate

criteria in evaluating the quality of reading research and to encourage the use of this understanding to drive classroom practice.

Methods

To evaluate and describe changes in the teacher participants, the researchers and the professors together designed interview protocols to answer three descriptive, interpretive questions. First, how did the teachers' orientation toward teaching reading change? Second, how did their actual classroom practice change? Third, how did teachers' disposition toward reading research change?

Participants

From the 25 participants of the PDRP, interviews were reviewed and narrowed to three participants who typify differing initial orientations to teaching reading. Also, only primary grade teachers were chosen because basic reading processes are developed in the primary grades (Snow, Burns, and Griffin, 1998; Adams, 1990). A cross case comparison study was implemented to evaluate how the program was affecting the participants and provide foundational information for a future full-scale analysis. Participants all began the program unfamiliar with reading research or reading theory. They were all considered to be excellent teachers by their principals and co-workers. However, though successful, each of them spoke of being dissatisfied with classroom results. Pseudonyms are used.

Diane is a first grade teacher who initially presented herself as a code-based teacher. Jill is also a first grade teacher who initially presented herself as a whole-language teacher. Kim is a second grade teacher who initially presented herself as a whole-language teacher.

Design Limitations

Data collecting procedures produced design limitations. Data collection did not begin until after the PDRP was actually started. The pre interview was conducted towards the end of the first year. This required the teacher-participants to remember what their opinions and practices were like before the PDRP. Also, only one observation was conducted after the PDRP was completed producing heavy reliance on self-report measures. In addition, there are no outcome measures on student learning to evaluate whether the PDRP truly impacted student achievement.

Additionally, participant selection can be viewed as a design limitation. Teachers allowed to enroll in the PDRP met selection criteria of high grade point average, willingness to take risks, cross-generational professional experience, academic records, and reputation as a teacher. Perhaps a more normal sampling would not yield such strong positive results.

Procedure

A one hundred thirty question interview protocol was developed (Appendix A). It included open-ended questions that were carefully designed to reduce researcher influence on participant responses (Spindler & Spindler, 1992). It solicited demographic information as well as explicated what the participants knew about reading, reading theories, and literacy practices. It

was designed to uncover the participants' understanding of the reading process, their approach to reading instruction, and their disposition towards reading research. Example questions are: What is your definition of reading? Describe your reading block? Tell me what you know about the different approaches to reading (i.e., whole language, phonics, based instruction, etc.). Has research influenced your practice?

The interview protocol was administered to all participants during the end of the first year of the program (pre), and again at the completion (post) of the program, making possible comparison of the participant's responses. Research assistants trained in the interview process administered the protocol. All participants of the program were interviewed individually with each interview taking approximately an hour and half. All interviews were recorded on audiotape and later transcribed for analysis.

Videotaped observations of the participant's classroom practice were conducted at the completion of the program. In addition, a third videotaped interview was conducted to ascertain the participant's intentions behind the instructional actions observed. Researchers functioned as observer-participants (Merriam, 2001); they were present but did not actively participate in classroom activities.

Data Analysis

Researchers have noted that gathering data related to participants' thought processes raises a number of validity issues (Miles & Huberman, 1994). To reduce these concerns, Miles & Huberman suggest triangulation: the collection of data from multiple sources that do not share the same potential for error. Triangulation was achieved through the use of the pre and post interview protocol, videotaped classroom observations, the third videotaped interviews, and quantitative tabulations from the protocols and observations.

Data from the primary protocols were transferred to an electronic database where each question from the first and second interview could be viewed simultaneously and analyzed for change (Miles & Huberman, 1984). Graduate assistants reviewed, coded and rated the protocols for three types of change: instructional orientation, teacher practice, and research disposition. Also, they flagged any evidence of the seven components of reading acquisition. An inter-rater reliability of 88.25% was achieved.

Reduction of the data was based on questions that seemed to yield consistent change across participants. For instance, when asked to define reading, all three participants' pre and post responses yielded change in instructional orientation. Therefore, that protocol item remained a part of the analysis. However, questions that asked for theoretical information (i.e., How do you define Behaviorism?) yielded little consistent change across participants and were dropped from the analysis. Tabular materials were created (Miles, 1979) using counts of various phenomena. Data from the interviews were analyzed and compiled using content analysis process (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Developments of vignettes for the three teachers were developed out of the analysis.

Results

Findings represent changes made by the three participants studied and will be presented in the following order: first, changes in orientation toward reading instruction, followed by changes in reading instruction in the classroom, and finally, changes in disposition towards reading research. These three are demonstrated with graphs and video clips representing the participants and the changes they made. (Appendix B has written quotes from the videos.)

Shifts In Initial Orientation Towards Reading Instruction

Shift in orientation of reading instruction is demonstrated in Table I. It is based on fifteen items from the protocol that were coded consistently as self-report orientation of the preferred reading approach across the three participants. The percentages seen in the table represent how many of those fifteen items indicated one type of approach. The same fifteen items were again used in the post interview to determine if any change had been made. A definite shift for all three teachers was seen from an initial orientation to an integrated reading approach.

Table I.

Shift in Orientation

Teacher	Pre Interview	Pre Orientation	Intervention	Post Interview	Post Orientation
Diane	88%	Code Based	⟶	100%	Integrated
Jill	77%	Whole Language	⟶	87%	Integrated
Kim	86%	Whole Language	⟶	91%	Integrated

Diane's shift went from code-based to integrated reading instruction in her first grade classroom. Her pre interview showed her as a Reading Mastery teacher. She did straight decoding, reported no use of literature, and used only small reading groups. She said that her students didn't read more than two or three minutes per day even though she had a ninety-minute block dedicated to reading instruction. In contrast, Diane's post interview spoke of comprehension strategies, literature, learning theories, situated cognition, whole group instruction along with small flexible groups, phonological awareness, and teaching reading all day long as she incorporated different reading components throughout her other subjects.

Jill's shift went from whole language to an integrated reading instruction approach in her first grade classroom. During her pre interview she speaks of reading a lot of literature, writing stories using literature, having books of choice, and embedded phonics. Her reading instruction was a ninety-minute block. The post interview showed her still reading an abundance of literature, writing on a daily basis, and having books of choice, but she was now using explicit

systematic phonics instruction, phonological awareness activities and teaching reading throughout the entire day.

Kim's shift was from an initial whole language approach in her second grade classroom to an integrated reading approach. In her pre interview she indicated that phonics was not needed as part of a reading instruction. She placed her instructional focus on writing using real literature to provide models, and on having children read books of personal interest (these books were not necessarily at their reading level). She read a lot to her students and had a ninety-minute reading block. Revealing her shift, Kim's post interview showed she felt phonics was critical for reading instruction. She was still using real literature to model writing, but reading materials were now suited to reading levels of individual students. She incorporated reading instruction throughout the instructional day rather than using the ninety-minute block.

Shifts In Classroom Reading Instruction

Protocols and video observations were examined for evidence of inclusion of the seven components of reading acquisition within the participant's instructional practice. Findings showed shifts in classroom practice and changes in reading instruction. Table II indicates how many of the three teachers were using each of the seven components of reading acquisition in their classroom instruction before and after the PDRP. Edited video segments of actual teaching moments illustrate the seven components.

Table II.

Seven Components of Reading Acquisition

Component	Teachers using: Pre	Teachers using: Post	Link to video
Phonological Awareness	0	3	Video link
Explicit Systematic Phonics Instruction	1	3	Video link
Word Study	1	3	Video link
Fluency	3	3	Video link
Comprehension Strategies Instruction	0	3	Video link
Vocabulary Instruction	2	3	Video link

| Writing | 2 | 3 | Video link |

Shifts In Disposition Towards Reading Research

Findings in changes of disposition towards research were evidenced throughout the protocol as participants voiced their opinions about research. During the pre interview, statements like the following were common: "Didn't influence my practice" and "Hadn't read it." During the post interview statements shifted to: "Totally influences", "Read it a lot", "Understand it", "Supported my teaching", and "Tells me why." A quote from Diane characterizes pre-intervention attitudes towards reading research and the post-intervention shift in attitude.

Discussion

Despite a predictable resistance toward change (Berliner, 1987), participants experienced shifts in orientation and disposition towards research. Their reading instruction became consistent with implications derived from scientifically based research. Why did this program promote this degree of change? The authors think it is a multi-dimensional interactive process incorporating the sustained, intense involvement of the participants over a two-year period. During this process they were required to become knowledgeable, critical consumers of research. They were able to apply this research concurrently in the classroom. They were able to reflect, receive feedback, and change their classroom practices in a supportive environment.

Implications

Successful, effective professional development must have the following components: sustained, intense involvement; active participation; opportunity for processing and application; support from professors and fellow participants; and access to up-to-date research information.

References

Adams, M.J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. Cambridge, MS: The MIT Press.

Bergeron, B. (1990). What does the term whole language mean? Constructing a definition from the literature. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 22,* 301-329.

Berliner, D.C. (1987). Knowledge is power: A talk to teachers about a revolution in the teaching profession. In D.C.Berliner & B.V. Rosenshine (Eds). *Talks to teachers* (pp. 3-33). New York: Random House.

Diederich, P.B. (1973). *Review 1960-1970 on methods and materials in reading* (TM Report 22), Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Services.

Miles, M.B. (1979). Qualitative data as an attractive nuisance: The problem of analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24*, 590-601.

Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1984). *Analyzing qualitative data: A source book for new methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *An expanded sourcebook: Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Merriam, S.B. (2001). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

National Reading Panel (NRP). (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

Snow, C.E., Burns, M.S., & Griffin, P. (Eds.) (1998). *Preventing difficulties in young children*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Spindler, G. & Spindler, L. (1992). *Cultural process and ethnography: An anthropological perspective; the handbook of qualitative research in education*. London/New York: Academic Press.

Appendix A: Interview Protocol

ID # _____

I. DEMOGRAPHICS

        Name:
        Address:
        Phone:
        Where did you receive your certification?
        What is your certification/degree?
Education: (highest degree held)
College GPA--Bachelors:
GPA--Master's:
Number of years teaching:
List the schools and grades in which you have taught and number of years in each grade.
Number of years teaching experience in current grade:

II. INTERVIEW

1. What is your definition of reading?
2. What is your definition of writing?
3. What do you think happens when students read?
4. Do you think your own experiences in learning to read have influenced your teaching?
5. Do you think reading and writing relate?
        5. a. How?
6. Every teacher approaches reading differently. These questions are not an evaluation, but to see how you teach. I am going to ask you about your Reading / Language Arts block and I want you to just go through each component. I am going to take notes, and then we will come and talk about each component individually. Right now, I just want you to name the components off for me in a list form. Ready? What do you do when you teach Reading / Language Arts?
6.a. How long is your block?
7. Let's go back and talk about each individual component. I want you to tell me why you include what you include, and what you hope it accomplishes. Let's talk about...
8. If you could change anything in your R / LA block, if you could create the R / LA block of your dreams, what would it look like? What would you do differently?
9. What grade level do you teach?
10. What goals do you have for your students with regard to reading?
11. In your own language, how would you describe yourself as a reader? Why?
        On a scale of 1 - 10 how would you rate yourself?
12. How would you rate yourself as a reading teacher? Why?
        How would you rate yourself on a scale of 1 - 10?
13. How would you rate yourself in comparison to other teachers? Why?
        Would you consider yourself below average, average, or above average?
14. Who do you consider an exemplary reading teacher? What makes them exemplary?

15. How much control do you have over what you teach in your Reading / Language Arts block?

        Now rate the control you have on a scale of 1 - 10.

16. Has your feeling of control changed over time? With different principals or in different schools or districts?

17. Now that you have been through the Co-op, do you feel that your principal or that the district would listen to advice from you about the teaching of reading in your classroom?

18. Over the years, different approaches of teaching reading have been developed. What can you tell me about the different approaches?

19. I am going to ask you about some other approaches. Can you tell me what you know about then, and what you think the advantages and limitations are about each approach? Ready?

        A. Whole Language.

        B. Phonics.

        C. Decoding by Analogy.

        D. Direct Instruction.

        E. Explicit Instruction.

        F. Explicit Instruction.

        G. Balanced Literacy Approach.

        H. Cuing Systems.

        I. Basal Series.

        J. Comprehension Strategies Instruction.

        K. Literature Based Instruction.

20. What are the major influences on how you teach reading in your classroom? Prompts (How do you decide on the materials you use? Do you use a commercial program? Which one? How long have you used it? Have you taken any inservice on it? What else has influenced how you teach reading?)

21. Who do you consider the nations leading experts in reading? Why?

After they have recalled all they can, prompt for the rest.

        A. Marilyn Adams

        B. Pat Alexander

        C. Richard Anderson

        D. Nancy Atwell

        E. Isabell Beck

        F. Maria Carbo

        G. Lucy Caulkins

        H. Jean Chall

        I. Maire Clay

        J. Pat Cunningham

        K. Linea Ehri

        L. Ken Goodman

        M. Phil Gough

        N. Jerome Harste

        O. David Pearson

        P. Chuck Perfetti

        Q. Gay Sue Pinell

R. Michael Pressley
S. Ralph Reynolds
T. Reggie Routman
U. Connie Weaver

22 Has the way you teach reading ever changed? Tell me about it.
23. What caused you to change the way you teach reading?
24. Has research influenced your practice?
     a. -How do you define scientific research?
     b. -Where do you go to find it?
     c.-What books, articles, journals do you read?
     d.-Of those, which has been the most influential?
25. Who are the people that influence your practice the most? How?
     -How are you familiar with these people?
26. Has your basic philosophy of teaching reading ever changed? If yes, how and why?

III Theoretical Knowledge

27. Now we are going to talk about the theories of learning. Once again, I just want you to name them off and then we will go and talk about each theory individually. Ready? O Kay, What do you know about the theories of learning?
28. I'm going to list a few theories. Just tell me if you are or are not familiar with it, and like I stated earlier, we will talk about each one in isolation.
     -Behaviorism
     -Connectionism
     -Constructivism
     -Human Information Processing
     -Schema Theory
     -Situated Cognition
     -Social Perspective Theories

Now I am going to ask you more specific questions about the theories with which you are familiar enough with to discuss. Ready?

29. You stated that you knew about Behaviorism.
     A. How would you define Behaviorism?
     B. What influence do you think this theory has on our understanding of the reading process?
     C. Has this theory influenced your own teaching of reading? How?
     D. Do you think this theory has application to instruction? How?
     E. What do you think this theory assumes about learning?
     F. Do you think this is a good theory in terms of how students learn? Why?
     G. Could you rate this theory on a scale of 1 - 10 in terms of how students learn?
30. You stated that you knew about Connectionism.
     A. How would you define Connectionism?
     B. What influence do you think this theory has on our understanding of the reading process?

C. Has this theory influenced your own teaching of reading? How?
D. Do you think this theory has application to instruction? How?
E. What do you think this theory assumes about learning?
F. Do you think this is a good theory in terms of how students learn? Why?
G. Could you rate this theory on a scale of 1 - 10 in terms of how students learn?

31. You stated that you knew about Constructivism.
    A. How would you define Constructivism?
    B. What influence do you think this theory has on our understanding of the reading process?
    C. Has this theory influenced your own teaching of reading? How?
    D. Do you think this theory has application to instruction? How?
    E. What do you think this theory assumes about learning?
    F. Do you think this is a good theory in terms of how students learn? Why?
    G. Could you rate this theory on a scale of 1 - 10 in terms of how students learn?

32. You stated that you knew about Human Information Processing.
    A. How would you define Human Information Processing?
    B. What influence do you think this theory has on our understanding of the reading process?
    C. Has this theory influenced your own teaching of reading? How?
    D. Do you think this theory has application to instruction? How?
    E. What do you think this theory assumes about learning?
    F. Do you think this is a good theory in terms of how students learn? Why?
    G. Could you rate this theory on a scale of 1 - 10 in terms of how students learn?

33. You stated that you knew about Schema Theory.
    A. How would you define Schema Theory?
    B. What influence do you think this theory has on our understanding of the reading process?
    C. Has this theory influenced your own teaching of reading? How?
    D. Do you think this theory has application to instruction? How?
    E. What do you think this theory assumes about learning?
    F. Do you think this is a good theory in terms of how students learn? Why?
    G. Could you rate this theory on a scale of 1 - 10 in terms of how students learn?

34. You stated that you knew about Situated Cognition.
    A. How would you define Situated Cognition?
    B. What influence do you think this theory has on our understanding of the reading process?
    C. Has this theory influenced your own teaching of reading? How?
    D. Do you think this theory has application to instruction? How?
    E. What do you think this theory assumes about learning?
    F. Do you think this is a good theory in terms of how students learn? Why?
    G. Could you rate this theory on a scale of 1 - 10 in terms of how students learn?

35. You stated that you knew about Social Perspective Theories.
    A. How would you define Social Perspective Theories?
    B. What influence do you think this theory has on our understanding of the reading process?
    C. Has this theory influenced your own teaching of reading? How?

D. Do you think this theory has application to instruction? How?
E. What do you think this theory assumes about learning?
F. Do you think this is a good theory in terms of how students learn? Why?
G. Could you rate this theory on a scale of 1 - 10 in terms of how students learn?

36. Is there anything else you would like to say about reading or the teaching of reading?

IV. QUESTIONS ABOUT THE CO-OP

37. How did the co-op change your teaching? In other words, how does your practice that you implement today, differ from what you were doing before you started the co-op?
38. What kinds of new ideas did you get from the co-op?
39. What courses did you find most useful in the co-op, and what courses did you find the least useful in the co-op? Are there any suggestions you have for Dr. Reynolds and or Dr. Brown?

Is there anything else you would like to add about the co-op?

O Kay, we are all finished. Thank You.

Appendix B: Quotes for the videos

Diane's quote:

"We did reading mastery, which was pretty much just a straight decoding, not literature based at all…I've come to realize how much there is with the comprehension strategies. And you know the literature things that you do. As well as all the decoding things you do. It's pretty all-encompassing…"

Jill's quote:

"…[the cooperative master's program] has just helped in the evolution of the kind of teacher that I am and the way I teach…a good reading teacher would be someone who would teach their children to really love reading. To pick books of their own choice …They would have time to read in a guided reading group..One thing Open Court does is it has a really great progression of sounds. It teaches the sounds systematically which I think a good reading teacher would also do. …and they would also be given time to write on a daily basis."

Kim's quote:

"I think phonics is critical for beginning reading. Kids have to know their letters, they have to, know the alphabetic principles, they have to move systematically through so they can start blending, looking at chunks, making sense of the words themselves. All kids really need that."

Diane's second quote

"Has the way I teach reading ever changed? Oh, yea. I think it's a very dynamic thing. If it doesn't change I think you're in trouble because they're always coming up with new research and new strategies… The research has influenced me. Oh, this is another thing. When I went into this I said, "I don't care about this research stuff, I don't care about this theory. Just tell me what to do and I'll do it. That was my attitude. And now, I just go like, That was so neat to know like why and what went into that. You know?… In fact, my friend and I were talking, can you believe that we are sitting down and reading this stuff and liking it? I'm like picking up a reading journal. It's interesting how things change…I love the research stuff now! Now instead of reading novels, I'm reading journals. Reading journals.

Primary Grade Reading Instruction Empowered Through Research-Based Knowledge

Ann Sharp, Ralph E. Reynolds, Kathleen J. Brown, Amy Morris, and Susan Gunn

Introduction

What would you do if you were a member of a major school district and during a school board meeting a group of discontented parents waved Adams' (1990) book, "Beginning To Read: Thinking and Learning About Print", and asked, "What do you know about this book? And if nothing why not?" This incident actually happened. These parents were concerned that their children were not receiving the benefit of instruction based on the twenty years of theoretical and applied research explicated in the book.

This incident became the impetus for reading instruction reform within the district. Seeking counsel from an educational department of a large western university, the district put into motion a wide scale plan. Projected within that plan was a professional development reading program (PDRP) that would focus on and support scientifically based reading research. The program design was the result of a joint effort by the university reading professors, district leaders, and researchers.

Program Design

Seven components of reading acquisition were identified (six of which later became the National Reading Panel (NRP, 2000) standards: phonological awareness, explicit systematic phonics instruction, word study, fluency, comprehension strategies instruction, vocabulary instruction and writing. These components were the emphases of the program and considered core to effective reading instruction (Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998).

Three orientations or approaches to reading were identified: code-based, whole-language, and integrated. A code-based approach utilizes the phonics component with little care to the other components or reading acquisition (Diederich, 1973). A whole-language approach utilizes the component of writing with an emphasis in the use of literature and affective measures such as motivation (Bergeron, 1990). An integrated approach utilizes all seven components of reading acquisition.

Ten academic courses (30 credit hours) focusing on seminal research were created: theories and models of reading; beginning reading instruction; comprehension instruction; content area reading; diagnosis and remediation of reading difficulties; reading assessment; writing instruction; children's literature; evaluation of reading programs; and cultural diversity. Two courses a semester were offered over five semesters.

The PDRP would take a proactive stance towards understanding reading research and understanding the nature of science. This dual focus would be developed to facilitate appropriate

criteria in evaluating the quality of reading research and to encourage the use of this understanding to drive classroom practice.

Methods

To evaluate and describe changes in the teacher participants, the researchers and the professors together designed interview protocols to answer three descriptive, interpretive questions. First, how did the teachers' orientation toward teaching reading change? Second, how did their actual classroom practice change? Third, how did teachers' disposition toward reading research change?

Participants

From the 25 participants of the PDRP, interviews were reviewed and narrowed to three participants who typify differing initial orientations to teaching reading. Also, only primary grade teachers were chosen because basic reading processes are developed in the primary grades (Snow, Burns, and Griffin, 1998; Adams, 1990). A cross case comparison study was implemented to evaluate how the program was affecting the participants and provide foundational information for a future full-scale analysis. Participants all began the program unfamiliar with reading research or reading theory. They were all considered to be excellent teachers by their principals and co-workers. However, though successful, each of them spoke of being dissatisfied with classroom results. Pseudonyms are used.

Diane is a first grade teacher who initially presented herself as a code-based teacher. Jill is also a first grade teacher who initially presented herself as a whole-language teacher. Kim is a second grade teacher who initially presented herself as a whole-language teacher.

Design Limitations

Data collecting procedures produced design limitations. Data collection did not begin until after the PDRP was actually started. The pre interview was conducted towards the end of the first year. This required the teacher-participants to remember what their opinions and practices were like before the PDRP. Also, only one observation was conducted after the PDRP was completed producing heavy reliance on self-report measures. In addition, there are no outcome measures on student learning to evaluate whether the PDRP truly impacted student achievement.

Additionally, participant selection can be viewed as a design limitation. Teachers allowed to enroll in the PDRP met selection criteria of high grade point average, willingness to take risks, cross-generational professional experience, academic records, and reputation as a teacher. Perhaps a more normal sampling would not yield such strong positive results.

Procedure

A one hundred thirty question interview protocol was developed (Appendix A). It included open-ended questions that were carefully designed to reduce researcher influence on participant responses (Spindler & Spindler, 1992). It solicited demographic information as well as explicated what the participants knew about reading, reading theories, and literacy practices. It

was designed to uncover the participants' understanding of the reading process, their approach to reading instruction, and their disposition towards reading research. Example questions are: What is your definition of reading? Describe your reading block? Tell me what you know about the different approaches to reading (i.e., whole language, phonics, based instruction, etc.). Has research influenced your practice?

The interview protocol was administered to all participants during the end of the first year of the program (pre), and again at the completion (post) of the program, making possible comparison of the participant's responses. Research assistants trained in the interview process administered the protocol. All participants of the program were interviewed individually with each interview taking approximately an hour and half. All interviews were recorded on audiotape and later transcribed for analysis.

Videotaped observations of the participant's classroom practice were conducted at the completion of the program. In addition, a third videotaped interview was conducted to ascertain the participant's intentions behind the instructional actions observed. Researchers functioned as observer-participants (Merriam, 2001); they were present but did not actively participate in classroom activities.

Data Analysis

Researchers have noted that gathering data related to participants' thought processes raises a number of validity issues (Miles & Huberman, 1994). To reduce these concerns, Miles & Huberman suggest triangulation: the collection of data from multiple sources that do not share the same potential for error. Triangulation was achieved through the use of the pre and post interview protocol, videotaped classroom observations, the third videotaped interviews, and quantitative tabulations from the protocols and observations.

Data from the primary protocols were transferred to an electronic database where each question from the first and second interview could be viewed simultaneously and analyzed for change (Miles & Huberman, 1984). Graduate assistants reviewed, coded and rated the protocols for three types of change: instructional orientation, teacher practice, and research disposition. Also, they flagged any evidence of the seven components of reading acquisition. An inter-rater reliability of 88.25% was achieved.

Reduction of the data was based on questions that seemed to yield consistent change across participants. For instance, when asked to define reading, all three participants' pre and post responses yielded change in instructional orientation. Therefore, that protocol item remained a part of the analysis. However, questions that asked for theoretical information (i.e., How do you define Behaviorism?) yielded little consistent change across participants and were dropped from the analysis. Tabular materials were created (Miles, 1979) using counts of various phenomena. Data from the interviews were analyzed and compiled using content analysis process (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Developments of vignettes for the three teachers were developed out of the analysis.

Results

Findings represent changes made by the three participants studied and will be presented in the following order: first, changes in orientation toward reading instruction, followed by changes in reading instruction in the classroom, and finally, changes in disposition towards reading research. These three are demonstrated with graphs and video clips representing the participants and the changes they made. (Appendix B has written quotes from the videos.)

Shifts In Initial Orientation Towards Reading Instruction

Shift in orientation of reading instruction is demonstrated in Table I. It is based on fifteen items from the protocol that were coded consistently as self-report orientation of the preferred reading approach across the three participants. The percentages seen in the table represent how many of those fifteen items indicated one type of approach. The same fifteen items were again used in the post interview to determine if any change had been made. A definite shift for all three teachers was seen from an initial orientation to an integrated reading approach.

Table I.

Shift in Orientation

Teacher	Pre Interview	Pre Orientation	Intervention	Post Interview	Post Orientation
Diane	88%	Code Based	⟶	100%	Integrated
Jill	77%	Whole Language	⟶	87%	Integrated
Kim	86%	Whole Language	⟶	91%	Integrated

Diane's shift went from code-based to integrated reading instruction in her first grade classroom. Her pre interview showed her as a Reading Mastery teacher. She did straight decoding, reported no use of literature, and used only small reading groups. She said that her students didn't read more than two or three minutes per day even though she had a ninety-minute block dedicated to reading instruction. In contrast, Diane's post interview spoke of comprehension strategies, literature, learning theories, situated cognition, whole group instruction along with small flexible groups, phonological awareness, and teaching reading all day long as she incorporated different reading components throughout her other subjects.

Jill's shift went from whole language to an integrated reading instruction approach in her first grade classroom. During her pre interview she speaks of reading a lot of literature, writing stories using literature, having books of choice, and embedded phonics. Her reading instruction was a ninety-minute block. The post interview showed her still reading an abundance of literature, writing on a daily basis, and having books of choice, but she was now using explicit

systematic phonics instruction, phonological awareness activities and teaching reading throughout the entire day.

Kim's shift was from an initial whole language approach in her second grade classroom to an integrated reading approach. In her pre interview she indicated that phonics was not needed as part of a reading instruction. She placed her instructional focus on writing using real literature to provide models, and on having children read books of personal interest (these books were not necessarily at their reading level). She read a lot to her students and had a ninety-minute reading block. Revealing her shift, Kim's post interview showed she felt phonics was critical for reading instruction. She was still using real literature to model writing, but reading materials were now suited to reading levels of individual students. She incorporated reading instruction throughout the instructional day rather than using the ninety-minute block.

Shifts In Classroom Reading Instruction

Protocols and video observations were examined for evidence of inclusion of the seven components of reading acquisition within the participant's instructional practice. Findings showed shifts in classroom practice and changes in reading instruction. Table II indicates how many of the three teachers were using each of the seven components of reading acquisition in their classroom instruction before and after the PDRP. Edited video segments of actual teaching moments illustrate the seven components.

Table II.

Seven Components of Reading Acquisition

Component	Teachers using: Pre	Teachers using: Post	Link to video
Phonological Awareness	0	3	Video link
Explicit Systematic Phonics Instruction	1	3	Video link
Word Study	1	3	Video link
Fluency	3	3	Video link
Comprehension Strategies Instruction	0	3	Video link
Vocabulary Instruction	2	3	Video link

Writing	2	3	Video link

Shifts In Disposition Towards Reading Research

Findings in changes of disposition towards research were evidenced throughout the protocol as participants voiced their opinions about research. During the pre interview, statements like the following were common: "Didn't influence my practice" and "Hadn't read it." During the post interview statements shifted to: "Totally influences", "Read it a lot", "Understand it", "Supported my teaching", and "Tells me why." A quote from Diane characterizes pre-intervention attitudes towards reading research and the post-intervention shift in attitude.

Discussion

Despite a predictable resistance toward change (Berliner, 1987), participants experienced shifts in orientation and disposition towards research. Their reading instruction became consistent with implications derived from scientifically based research. Why did this program promote this degree of change? The authors think it is a multi-dimensional interactive process incorporating the sustained, intense involvement of the participants over a two-year period. During this process they were required to become knowledgeable, critical consumers of research. They were able to apply this research concurrently in the classroom. They were able to reflect, receive feedback, and change their classroom practices in a supportive environment.

Implications

Successful, effective professional development must have the following components: sustained, intense involvement; active participation; opportunity for processing and application; support from professors and fellow participants; and access to up-to-date research information.

References

Adams, M.J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. Cambridge, MS: The MIT Press.

Bergeron, B. (1990). What does the term whole language mean? Constructing a definition from the literature. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 22,* 301-329.

Berliner, D.C. (1987). Knowledge is power: A talk to teachers about a revolution in the teaching profession. In D.C.Berliner & B.V. Rosenshine (Eds). *Talks to teachers* (pp. 3-33). New York: Random House.

Diederich, P.B. (1973). *Review 1960-1970 on methods and materials in reading* (TM Report 22), Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Services.

Miles, M.B. (1979). Qualitative data as an attractive nuisance: The problem of analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24*, 590-601.

Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1984). *Analyzing qualitative data: A source book for new methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *An expanded sourcebook: Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Merriam, S.B. (2001). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

National Reading Panel (NRP). (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

Snow, C.E., Burns, M.S., & Griffin, P. (Eds.) (1998). *Preventing difficulties in young children*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Spindler, G. & Spindler, L. (1992). *Cultural process and ethnography: An anthropological perspective; the handbook of qualitative research in education*. London/New York: Academic Press.

Appendix A: Interview Protocol

ID # _____

I. DEMOGRAPHICS

    Name:
    Address:
    Phone:
    Where did you receive your certification?
    What is your certification/degree?
Education: (highest degree held)
College GPA--Bachelors:
GPA--Master's:
Number of years teaching:
List the schools and grades in which you have taught and number of years in each grade.
Number of years teaching experience in current grade:

II. INTERVIEW

1. What is your definition of reading?
2. What is your definition of writing?
3. What do you think happens when students read?
4. Do you think your own experiences in learning to read have influenced your teaching?
5. Do you think reading and writing relate?
        5. a. How?
6. Every teacher approaches reading differently. These questions are not an evaluation, but to see how you teach. I am going to ask you about your Reading / Language Arts block and I want you to just go through each component. I am going to take notes, and then we will come and talk about each component individually. Right now, I just want you to name the components off for me in a list form. Ready? What do you do when you teach Reading / Language Arts?
6.a. How long is your block?
7. Let's go back and talk about each individual component. I want you to tell me why you include what you include, and what you hope it accomplishes. Let's talk about...
8. If you could change anything in your R / LA block, if you could create the R / LA block of your dreams, what would it look like? What would you do differently?
9. What grade level do you teach?
10. What goals do you have for your students with regard to reading?
11. In your own language, how would you describe yourself as a reader? Why?
        On a scale of 1 - 10 how would you rate yourself?
12. How would you rate yourself as a reading teacher? Why?
        How would you rate yourself on a scale of 1 - 10?
13. How would you rate yourself in comparison to other teachers? Why?
        Would you consider yourself below average, average, or above average?
14. Who do you consider an exemplary reading teacher? What makes them exemplary?

15. How much control do you have over what you teach in your Reading / Language Arts block?

         Now rate the control you have on a scale of 1 - 10.

16. Has your feeling of control changed over time? With different principals or in different schools or districts?

17. Now that you have been through the Co-op, do you feel that your principal or that the district would listen to advice from you about the teaching of reading in your classroom?

18. Over the years, different approaches of teaching reading have been developed. What can you tell me about the different approaches?

19. I am going to ask you about some other approaches. Can you tell me what you know about then, and what you think the advantages and limitations are about each approach? Ready?

         A. Whole Language.

         B. Phonics.

         C. Decoding by Analogy.

         D. Direct Instruction.

         E. Explicit Instruction.

         F. Explicit Instruction.

         G. Balanced Literacy Approach.

         H. Cuing Systems.

         I. Basal Series.

         J. Comprehension Strategies Instruction.

         K. Literature Based Instruction.

20. What are the major influences on how you teach reading in your classroom? Prompts (How do you decide on the materials you use? Do you use a commercial program? Which one? How long have you used it? Have you taken any inservice on it? What else has influenced how you teach reading?)

21. Who do you consider the nations leading experts in reading? Why?

After they have recalled all they can, prompt for the rest.

         A. Marilyn Adams

         B. Pat Alexander

         C. Richard Anderson

         D. Nancy Atwell

         E. Isabell Beck

         F. Maria Carbo

         G. Lucy Caulkins

         H. Jean Chall

         I. Maire Clay

         J. Pat Cunningham

         K. Linea Ehri

         L. Ken Goodman

         M. Phil Gough

         N. Jerome Harste

         O. David Pearson

         P. Chuck Perfetti

         Q. Gay Sue Pinell

R. Michael Pressley
S. Ralph Reynolds
T. Reggie Routman
U. Connie Weaver

22 Has the way you teach reading ever changed? Tell me about it.
23. What caused you to change the way you teach reading?
24. Has research influenced your practice?
        a. -How do you define scientific research?
        b. -Where do you go to find it?
        c.-What books, articles, journals do you read?
        d.-Of those, which has been the most influential?
25. Who are the people that influence your practice the most? How?
        -How are you familiar with these people?
26. Has your basic philosophy of teaching reading ever changed? If yes, how and why?

III Theoretical Knowledge

27. Now we are going to talk about the theories of learning. Once again, I just want you to name them off and then we will go and talk about each theory individually. Ready? O Kay, What do you know about the theories of learning?
28. I'm going to list a few theories. Just tell me if you are or are not familiar with it, and like I stated earlier, we will talk about each one in isolation.
        -Behaviorism
        -Connectionism
        -Constructivism
        -Human Information Processing
        -Schema Theory
        -Situated Cognition
        -Social Perspective Theories

Now I am going to ask you more specific questions about the theories with which you are familiar enough with to discuss. Ready?

29. You stated that you knew about Behaviorism.
    A. How would you define Behaviorism?
    B. What influence do you think this theory has on our understanding of the reading process?
    C. Has this theory influenced your own teaching of reading? How?
    D. Do you think this theory has application to instruction? How?
    E. What do you think this theory assumes about learning?
    F. Do you think this is a good theory in terms of how students learn? Why?
    G. Could you rate this theory on a scale of 1 - 10 in terms of how students learn?
30. You stated that you knew about Connectionism.
    A. How would you define Connectionism?
    B. What influence do you think this theory has on our understanding of the reading process?

C. Has this theory influenced your own teaching of reading? How?
D. Do you think this theory has application to instruction? How?
E. What do you think this theory assumes about learning?
F. Do you think this is a good theory in terms of how students learn? Why?
G. Could you rate this theory on a scale of 1 - 10 in terms of how students learn?

31. You stated that you knew about Constructivism.
    A. How would you define Constructivism?
    B. What influence do you think this theory has on our understanding of the reading process?
    C. Has this theory influenced your own teaching of reading? How?
    D. Do you think this theory has application to instruction? How?
    E. What do you think this theory assumes about learning?
    F. Do you think this is a good theory in terms of how students learn? Why?
    G. Could you rate this theory on a scale of 1 - 10 in terms of how students learn?

32. You stated that you knew about Human Information Processing.
    A. How would you define Human Information Processing?
    B. What influence do you think this theory has on our understanding of the reading process?
    C. Has this theory influenced your own teaching of reading? How?
    D. Do you think this theory has application to instruction? How?
    E. What do you think this theory assumes about learning?
    F. Do you think this is a good theory in terms of how students learn? Why?
    G. Could you rate this theory on a scale of 1 - 10 in terms of how students learn?

33. You stated that you knew about Schema Theory.
    A. How would you define Schema Theory?
    B. What influence do you think this theory has on our understanding of the reading process?
    C. Has this theory influenced your own teaching of reading? How?
    D. Do you think this theory has application to instruction? How?
    E. What do you think this theory assumes about learning?
    F. Do you think this is a good theory in terms of how students learn? Why?
    G. Could you rate this theory on a scale of 1 - 10 in terms of how students learn?

34. You stated that you knew about Situated Cognition.
    A. How would you define Situated Cognition?
    B. What influence do you think this theory has on our understanding of the reading process?
    C. Has this theory influenced your own teaching of reading? How?
    D. Do you think this theory has application to instruction? How?
    E. What do you think this theory assumes about learning?
    F. Do you think this is a good theory in terms of how students learn? Why?
    G. Could you rate this theory on a scale of 1 - 10 in terms of how students learn?

35. You stated that you knew about Social Perspective Theories.
    A. How would you define Social Perspective Theories?
    B. What influence do you think this theory has on our understanding of the reading process?
    C. Has this theory influenced your own teaching of reading? How?

      D. Do you think this theory has application to instruction? How?
      E. What do you think this theory assumes about learning?
      F. Do you think this is a good theory in terms of how students learn? Why?
      G. Could you rate this theory on a scale of 1 - 10 in terms of how students learn?
36. Is there anything else you would like to say about reading or the teaching of reading?

IV. QUESTIONS ABOUT THE CO-OP

37. How did the co-op change your teaching? In other words, how does your practice that you implement today, differ from what you were doing before you started the co-op?
38. What kinds of new ideas did you get from the co-op?
39. What courses did you find most useful in the co-op, and what courses did you find the least useful in the co-op? Are there any suggestions you have for Dr. Reynolds and or Dr. Brown?
Is there anything else you would like to add about the co-op?
O Kay, we are all finished. Thank You.

Appendix B: Quotes for the videos

Diane's quote:

"We did reading mastery, which was pretty much just a straight decoding, not literature based at all…I've come to realize how much there is with the comprehension strategies. And you know the literature things that you do. As well as all the decoding things you do. It's pretty all-encompassing…"

Jill's quote:

"…[the cooperative master's program] has just helped in the evolution of the kind of teacher that I am and the way I teach…a good reading teacher would be someone who would teach their children to really love reading. To pick books of their own choice …They would have time to read in a guided reading group..One thing Open Court does is it has a really great progression of sounds. It teaches the sounds systematically which I think a good reading teacher would also do. …and they would also be given time to write on a daily basis."

Kim's quote:

"I think phonics is critical for beginning reading. Kids have to know their letters, they have to, know the alphabetic principles, they have to move systematically through so they can start blending, looking at chunks, making sense of the words themselves. All kids really need that."

Diane's second quote

"Has the way I teach reading ever changed? Oh, yea. I think it's a very dynamic thing. If it doesn't change I think you're in trouble because they're always coming up with new research and new strategies… The research has influenced me. Oh, this is another thing. When I went into this I said, "I don't care about this research stuff, I don't care about this theory. Just tell me what to do and I'll do it. That was my attitude. And now, I just go like, That was so neat to know like why and what went into that. You know?… In fact, my friend and I were talking, can you believe that we are sitting down and reading this stuff and liking it? I'm like picking up a reading journal. It's interesting how things change…I love the research stuff now! Now instead of reading novels, I'm reading journals. Reading journals.

Family Literacy in the Context of Welfare Reform

Ray Wolpow
Eunice N. Askov

Let us start our discussion of family literacy with a look back to January 1931, at which time the National Education Association provided American business leaders with "carefully thought-out predictions of material and social changes in this country" that would be "probabilities" by the year 1950 ("*What shall we be like in 1950?*" 1931, p. 43-44). On the material side, probable achievements included:

1. A system of health and safety that will practically wipe out preventable accidents and contagious diseases.

2. A system of housing that will provide for the masses homes surrounded by beauty, privacy, quiet, sun, fresh air, and play space.

3. A flat telephone rate for the entire country at moderate cost.

4. Universal air transportation at low cost.

5. A system of paved, beautiful highways will connect every part of the nation.

6. The further development of school buildings and playfields until they will exceed in nobility the architectural achievements of any other age.

7. The organization of industry, business and agriculture to minimize uncertainty and depression.

8. The perfection of the insurance system to give universal protection from disaster, unemployment, and old age.

9. The extension of national, state, and local parks to provide convenient recreation areas for all people.

10. The perfection of community, city, and regional planning to give to all surroundings increasingly beautiful and favorable to the good life.

11. The shorter working week and day, so extended that there will be work for all.

On the social side the probable achievements listed included:

12. Hospitalization and medical care will be available for all who need them.

13. There will be a quickened appreciation of the home as a center of personal growth and happiness.

14. Educational service, free or at small cost, will be available from the earliest years of childhood throughout life.

15. The free public library will grow in importance, leading the way toward higher standards in maintained intelligence.

16. The nation will achieve an American standard of citizenship which means wholesome community life and clean government.

17. Crime will be virtually abolished by transferring to the preventive processes of the school and education the problems of conduct which police, courts and prisons now seek to remedy when it is too late.

18. Avocational activities will become richer, leading to nobler companionships and to development of the creative arts.

19. Ethical standards will rise to keep pace with new needs in business, industry, and international relations.

20. The religious awakening will grow in strength until most of our citizens will appreciate the importance of religion in the well-ordered life.

We Americans have yet to realize all of the ambitious possibilities listed above. Nonetheless, with the benefit of 72 years of historical perspective one could argue that we are making substantive progress towards most. With this in mind, the authors of this paper wish to revisit predictions 11 and 14, especially as these may be related to efforts made in the last ten years to improve economic self-sufficiency and literacy development of families consisting of low-income/low-literate parents and their young children.

First, through a review of the literature, the impact of current welfare and educational reform legislations on the educational performance of children of low-income families will be discussed. Then, keeping in mind the importance of federal programs designed to give children an "even start", the most beneficial instructional and programmatic "ingredients" of family literacy programs, as revealed through current research studies conducted by the Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy at Penn State, will be discussed. Finally, implications and points of interest raised by the audience during the ARF 2003 Panel will be summarized.

The Impacts of Welfare and Educational Reform

The United States has embraced two important policy shifts in the past ten years—one in welfare and the other in education—both inspired by political movements advocating increased personal and institutional accountability. These goals include reducing economic dependency on the State among adults and increasing educational attainment for children. The literature reveals

that demands created by these policies often clash with potential consequences for low-income parents and their children.

We have known for some time that parents play a critical role in both their children's academic achievement and their children's socio-emotional development. Most contemporary educators are aware of the various influences as well as the many barriers to parent involvement in their children's schooling (Eccles & Harold, 1996). Whereas finding time to realize the potentials of this role is a challenge for most parents, recent welfare reform programs have added to the challenge faced by America's working poor. In 1998, 5.3 million low-income children between the ages of 6 and 12 had either two parents or a single parent working after school (Halpern, 1999). There is an estimated 20 - 25 hour per week gap between parents' work schedules and students' school schedules (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 1998).

Inadequate income, irregular shifts, overcrowded schools, and uneven quality in after-school care burden many low-income families, many of whom are working increased hours. These same parents, many of whom are themselves poorly educated and low in literacy skills, are expected to help meet the greater accountability goals of the education reform movement by monitoring homework, helping children organize time, and assisting student learning by reinforcing basic skills taught during the school day. Thus some argue that the increasing number of hours that poor parents, particularly single mothers, spend in the workplace is having a negative impact on parental capacity to help their children over the increasingly challenging hurdles of elementary school. (Newman and Chin, 2003)

Although there is considerable discussion in the literature on how schooling affects students as well as about the role families may play in the success of schooling (Gamoran, 1996), scientific studies of how school and welfare reform is affecting children in these families are first coming to the fore. In their comprehensive examination of findings from six separate evaluations of recent welfare and employment programs, Morris, Huston, Duncan, Crosby and Bos (2001) report:

1. Programs with mandatory employment services, which required parental employment without also increasing income, had "mixed" effects on children. "Only one of the six programs affected test scores at all…The pattern of impacts appeared to be more closely associated with particular sites than with program characteristics…." (p. 44-48)

2. "All of the programs that provided earnings supplements without mandatory employment services improved children's school achievement…Children in the program group had an average score that was 4 percentage points higher than the average score of children in the control group." (p. 20-21)

3. Programs that included earning supplements that increased *both* parental employment *and* income also produced "reduced behavior problems, increased positive social behavior, and/or improved…[the] overall health" of elementary school-aged children. (p. ES-4).

4. "The positive effects of earnings supplement programs on children were most pronounced for the children of long-term welfare participants." (p. 33-34)

5. Even the programs "with the most benefits to children left many families in poverty and many children at risk of school failure and behavior problems. These programs do not eliminate the need for child-focused interventions and reforms that promote school achievement and reduce behavior problems." (p. ES-5)

In summary, requiring parents to work without increasing their income above welfare payments seemed to affect their children's achievement negatively. This finding makes sense in that the parents are now absent from the home without additional means of providing alternative childcare. The most positive effects were obtained when parents were able to earn more income through work. However, child-focused intervention programs, like family literacy, were still necessary.

Two of the studies examined in the Morris et al. (2001) monograph considered the effect of welfare program reform on adolescents in low-income families. Both indicated that parents' transition from welfare to work may decrease adolescents' school achievement. In a subsequent study of four major welfare programs Gennetian et al. (2002) concluded:

1.   "Adolescents' school progress was affected adversely by a variety of welfare and work policies targeted at single parents. Averaged across studies, the impacts are small, but any harm to these high-risk youth is noteworthy…;" and that

2. …adolescents who had younger siblings experienced the most pervasive and troubling negative effects as a result of the programs.

The average impacts in these programs on "grade repetition and receipt of special educational services for emotional, physical or mental conditions" were also unfavorable. Adolescents with younger siblings experienced the "most troubling effects on school performance and were most likely to be suspended or to drop out." They were more likely to have substantial responsibilities to care for their younger siblings, while those who did not have younger siblings were more likely to either work to help support the family, or to participate in "unstructured out-of school activities." (Gennetian et al., 2002, p. 45-49)

One study of a program that encouraged employment among single-parent welfare recipients revealed, alongside benefits for elementary school-aged children, that the adolescent children of parents in this program were more likely than their control group counterparts to engage in minor delinquency and to use tobacco, alcohol, or drugs. (Morris & Michalopoulos, 2000).

Nonetheless, holding school children and their lower-income parents to high standards hasn't lost much of its appeal. President Bush (2002) caught the public mood when he argued that softening standards results in the soft tyranny of "low expectations" and further warned, "children are segregated by low expectations, illiteracy and self-doubt." Given the current political and economic climate, what role can family literacy programs play in helping poor families realize these expectations? What research can best guide the implementation of these programs so that they are able to serve low-income and low-literate families?

Family Literacy Programs

Family literacy programs operate under the assumption that the parent can and should be the child's first teacher and with an inherent "value added" dimension not associated with other early childhood education programs. Through their participation, low-income, low-literate parent/teachers receive both valuable adult education and the tools and training necessary to play a critical role in their children's future academic achievements. (Philliber, Spillman, & King, 1996; Wasik, Dobbins, & Herrmann, 2001) Family literacy, as defined by the William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy programs (Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I as reauthorized by the *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001), typically includes four instructional components: Adult basic and literacy education, parenting education, structured interactive literacy time between parent and child, and early childhood education.

The National Even Start Association or NESA (2002) reports that the population served under the Even Start Act includes 80% of the families having an income below $15,000, more than 40% of whom have incomes below $6000. NESA also reports that participants have low levels of education (86% have not completed high school, as compared to 27% of Head Start parents). What is more, dependence upon public assistance, which supports families of unemployed adults, has now become time-limited, as was described in the previous section.

Family literacy programs are typically conducted during the day. With the passage of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act or PRWORA (US Congress, 1996), the National Center for Family Literacy (NCFL)(2002) became concerned because the large numbers of parents attending these programs who are welfare recipients. Therefore it was deemed important to incorporate work-related activities as part of the adult education component of family literacy programs. In fact, NCFL reported in *Momentum* (November 2000) that the number of parents expressing employment-related goals at the time of entry into family literacy programs dramatically increased with the passage of PRWORA (1996) from 1% in 1991 to 37% in 1999. NCFL (2002) also reported that the percentage of families receiving public assistance at entry ranged from 81% in 1991 to 45% in 1999, showing that parents have moved into the workforce during that time period.

Thus, adults coming to family literacy programs now have two needs: To improve their literacy and employability skills and to foster their young (birth – age 8) children's literacy skills for academic success in school. How effectively can this be done? How valid is the assumption that participation in adult/family literacy education will improve the ability of the parent to serve as the child's first teacher? And in light of this, is it fair to assume that as adults improve their own literacy and language skills they will, in turn, foster the development of children in various developmental domains?

The Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy at Penn State decided to test these assumptions using an existing database. The database was derived from the Pennsylvania Statewide Evaluation of Family literacy conducted by the Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy (ISAL) at Penn State, which is affiliated with the Goodling Institute. Since 1998, the ISAL has been conducting the statewide evaluation to track the performance of adults and their

children in all of the family literacy programs in Pennsylvania.   The research question was: What are the effects of parental participation in a family literacy program on children's developmental skills as measured by early childhood assessments?

A quasi-experimental design was used to test the research question.   Data were collected from families who participated in Pennsylvania's family literacy programs between July 1, 2001 and June 30, 2002 (2001-2002 program year). It had been established in prior research (Kassab, Askov, Weirauch, Grinder, & Van Horn, 2004) that greater participation in adult education was associated with significantly greater outcomes on adult education tests. The next question that is addressed here is whether or not increased participation in adult education would be associated with significant gains in early childhood developmental measures.

To assess children's growth and development, the family literacy programs chose from among three criterion-referenced assessment instruments to assess children who ranged in age from birth to 5 years of age. The instruments for children age three to five (inclusive) included the High/Scope Child Observation Record (COR) and the Learning Accomplishment Profile-Revised (LAP-R). For children who ranged from birth to 3 years of age programs were able to use the Early Learning Accomplishment Profile (ELAP). Not all children were administered each domain of the COR, LAP-R, and ELAP. Across the different analyses for the COR, sample sizes ranged from 194 to 198. For the LAP-R, sample sizes ranged from 431 to 444, while for the ELAP, sample sizes ranged from 450 to 498.

Each of these instruments measures essentially the same developmental skills using a slightly different definition for each depending upon the methodology of the instrument. The developmental skills the COR measures include initiative, social relations, creative representation, music and movement, language and literacy, logic and mathematics, and the average across these domains. The LAP-R and ELAP both measure the following domains: gross motor, fine motor, cognitive, language, and self-help. Slight differences exist with these two instruments where the LAP-R measures personal/social and pre-writing while ELAP measures social/emotional and no writing domain.

In order to test the research question, a series of models were estimated that included variables indicating whether hours of parental participation in a particular component of the family literacy program influenced the children's developmental skills, as measured by the COR, LAP-R, and ELAP. The following variables were controlled in all analyses: Age of the child at the time of the assessment, whether the child had participated in an educational program prior to his/her enrollment in the family literacy program, and whether special services needs was identified for the child since the child enrolled in the family literacy program (Grinder, Kassab, Askov, & Abler, 2004).

Results

Results indicate that intensity of participation in adult education, that is the number of hours of parental participation in adult education, had a significant effect on most of the developmental skills measured by the ELAP, which is administered to children less than three years of age. Specifically, greater parental participation in adult education was associated with

children's higher fine motor (p<0.06), cognitive (p<0.06), self-help (p<0.01), and social/emotional (p<0.001) posttest scores on the ELAP. Furthermore, greater participation in parenting education was associated with higher ELAP language posttest scores (p<0.05) as would be predicted in the family literacy model.

For the LAP-R, preschool children in families with more interactive literacy between parents and children hours had higher posttest scores on the cognitive domain (p<0.001). Participation in adult education, parenting education, or interactive literacy did not seem to result in higher posttest scores for the other domains on the LAP-R.   In addition, greater participation in parenting education was associated with higher COR creative representation posttest scores (p<0.05). Participation in adult education, parenting education, or interactive literacy was not related higher posttest scores for the other domains on the COR.

The finding that adult education and parenting education (in the case of language skills) were associated with ELAP posttest scores has important implications. Parents' participation in family literacy appears to have the greatest impact on the very youngest children's developmental skills which do relate to later literacy acquisition.   This result may have occurred because these components (adult and parenting education) led to increased self-esteem or self-confidence among adult participants, and this in turn may lead to more positive interaction with their very young children. Darling and Lee (2003) speculate that adult education provides two functions to parents by attending family literacy programs. First, by increasing their education, parents are able to provide a more economically stable environment for their children. Second, through family literacy programs, parents may "change their perspective on literacy, recognizing and capitalizing on their role as their child's first and most important teacher" (p. 383).

This research, furthermore, supports the efficacy of the family literacy model. As parents develop their own literacy skills, they are better equipped to foster the literacy and language growth in their very young children. This relationship is most clearly evident in very young children (ages birth to 3 years old) where the parents are not only the primary teachers but also the greatest developmental influence. This study demonstrates the important linkage that exists between the parents' education and children's literacy and language development. It reaffirms the assumption of family literacy programs that parents can and should be the child's first and most important early teacher.

Implications Brought Forth During Panel Discussion

Reaction to, and subsequent discussion of, the information presented by the panel included, but was not limited to comments/concerns about the 72 year-old goals, the crushing demands placed on welfare families, the need for more research to guide the use of limited funding, the current climate demanding "scientific research," and the "value- added" of family literacy programs.

How optimistic we educators must have been in 1931! We believed, with passion, that in but twenty years we could and would accomplish incredible goals, thus truly make a difference. Now, some 72 years later such sanguine confidence is seen mostly in the eyes of students entering the field.   Is it that we family literacy veterans have been sobered by the crushing

realities of the low-income, low-literate families with whom we work? Or is it that we are frustrated by the implementations of a decade of education and welfare reform policy shifts, many of which have served to further devastate the lives of low-income parents and their children?   Or is it that we have come to realize that the goals of family literacy programs are intergenerational and therefore need be measured longitudinally over generations? Would longitudinal research meet the current demand for "scientific research" and if it did, how could we possibly construct control groups?

   Whether veterans or newcomers, participants agreed that we need research to help us focus our resources on those programs that do "make a difference." Herein, the Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy at Penn State provides us with data affirming that parents can and should be the child's first teacher and that family literacy programs do provide an inherent "value added" dimension not associated with other early childhood education programs by providing low-income, low-literate parent/teachers both valuable adult education and the tools and training necessary to play a critical role in their children's future academic achievements. Referring to the study of four major welfare programs by Gennetian et al. (2002), and noting the harmful effect of current welfare policies on the academic achievement of adolescents, one participant asked, "Is there not yet another 'valued-added'?" He added, " I can't help but wonder how many of the low-income, low-literate adolescents who are currently dropping out of high school are future mothers/participants in family literacy programs?" The participant was told that participation in teen family literacy programs has, indeed, been on the rise. Interventions that break the intergenerational cycle of low literacy and poverty are very much needed, especially in the context of welfare reform where everyone is expected to work regardless of their family commitments.

References

Annie E. Casey Foundation. (1998). *Childcare you can count on: Model programs and policies*.
        Baltimore: Author.

Bush, G. (2002). Education bill of 2002. Retrieved December 2002, from
        www.ed.gov/offices/oese/esea/nclb/part1.html

Darling, S., & Lee, J. (2003). Linking parents to reading instruction. *The Reading Teacher*,
        57(4), 382-384.

Eccles, J., & Harold, R. (1996) Family involvement in children's and adolescents' schooling.
        In A. Booth & J. Dunn (Eds.) Family-School links: How do they affect educational
        outcomes (pp. 3-31). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Gamoran, A. (1996). Effects of schooling on children and families. In A. Booth & J. Dunn
        (Eds.), *Family-school links: How do they affect educational outcomes* (pp. 107 – 113).
        Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Gennetian, L., Duncan, G., Knox, V., Bargas, W., Clark-Kaufman, E., & London, A. (2002).
        How welfare and work policies for parents affect adolescents: A synthesis of research.
        New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Grinder, E.L., Kassab, C., Askov, E.N., & Abler, D. (2004). *Testing the assumption: The impact*
        of family literacy on children's development. University Park, PA: Penn State, Goodling
        Institute for Research in Family Literacy.

Halpern, R. (1999). After-school programs for low-income children: Promises and challenges.
        In *The future of children: When school is out.* Retrieved February 25, 2004, from
        http:www.futureofchildren.org/usr_doc/vol9no2Art8done.pdf

Kassab, C., Askov, E.N., Weirauch, D., Grinder, E.L., & Van Horn, B. (2004). Adult
        participation related to outcomes in family literacy programs. *Family Literacy Forum*,
        3(1), 23-29.

Morris, P., Huston, A., Duncan, G., Crosby, D., & Bos. J. (2001). *How welfare and work*
        policies affect children: A synthesis of research. (MDRC report). New York:
        Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Morris, P., & Michalopoulos, C. (2000). *The self-sufficiency project at 36 months: Effects on*
        children of a program that increased parental employment and income. Ottawa: Social
        Research and Demonstration Corporation.

National Center for Family Literacy. (2000, November). *Momentum.* Louisville, KY: Author.

National Center for Family Literacy. (2002). [Trend analysis of primary family literacy research database]. Unpublished raw data. Louisville, KY: Author.

National Even Start Association (2002). *Even Start Family Literacy Program.* Fact sheet distributed at the annual conference. San Diego, CA: Author.

Newman, K., & Chin, M. (2003). High stakes: Time poverty, testing, and the children of the working poor. *Qualitative Sociology, 26*(1), 3-34.

Philliber, W.W., Spillman, R.E., & King, R.E. (1996). Consequences of family literacy for adults and children: Some preliminary findings. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *39*(7), 558-565.

United States Congress, Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (1996). *Public Law 104-193*. Washington, DC.

United States Department of Education (September, 2003). *Policy guidance for the William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs, Part B, Subpart 3 of Title I of the Elementary Secondary Education Act*, Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/programs/evenstartformula/legislation.html

Wasik, B.H., Dobbins, D.R., & Herrman, S. (2001). Intergenerational family literacy concepts, research, and practice. In S.B. Neuman & D.K. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook of early literacy research*. New York: Guilford Press.

What shall we be like in 1950. (1931, January 10). *The Literary Digest*, 43-44

Family Literacy in the Context of Welfare Reform

Ray Wolpow
Eunice N. Askov

Let us start our discussion of family literacy with a look back to January 1931, at which time the National Education Association provided American business leaders with "carefully thought-out predictions of material and social changes in this country" that would be "probabilities" by the year 1950 ("*What shall we be like in 1950?*" 1931, p. 43-44). On the material side, probable achievements included:

1. A system of health and safety that will practically wipe out preventable accidents and contagious diseases.

2. A system of housing that will provide for the masses homes surrounded by beauty, privacy, quiet, sun, fresh air, and play space.

3. A flat telephone rate for the entire country at moderate cost.

4. Universal air transportation at low cost.

5. A system of paved, beautiful highways will connect every part of the nation.

6. The further development of school buildings and playfields until they will exceed in nobility the architectural achievements of any other age.

7. The organization of industry, business and agriculture to minimize uncertainty and depression.

8. The perfection of the insurance system to give universal protection from disaster, unemployment, and old age.

9. The extension of national, state, and local parks to provide convenient recreation areas for all people.

10. The perfection of community, city, and regional planning to give to all surroundings increasingly beautiful and favorable to the good life.

11. The shorter working week and day, so extended that there will be work for all.

On the social side the probable achievements listed included:

12. Hospitalization and medical care will be available for all who need them.

13. There will be a quickened appreciation of the home as a center of personal growth and happiness.

14. Educational service, free or at small cost, will be available from the earliest years of childhood throughout life.

15. The free public library will grow in importance, leading the way toward higher standards in maintained intelligence.

16. The nation will achieve an American standard of citizenship which means wholesome community life and clean government.

17. Crime will be virtually abolished by transferring to the preventive processes of the school and education the problems of conduct which police, courts and prisons now seek to remedy when it is too late.

18. Avocational activities will become richer, leading to nobler companionships and to development of the creative arts.

19. Ethical standards will rise to keep pace with new needs in business, industry, and international relations.

20. The religious awakening will grow in strength until most of our citizens will appreciate the importance of religion in the well-ordered life.

We Americans have yet to realize all of the ambitious possibilities listed above. Nonetheless, with the benefit of 72 years of historical perspective one could argue that we are making substantive progress towards most. With this in mind, the authors of this paper wish to revisit predictions 11 and 14, especially as these may be related to efforts made in the last ten years to improve economic self-sufficiency and literacy development of families consisting of low-income/low-literate parents and their young children.

First, through a review of the literature, the impact of current welfare and educational reform legislations on the educational performance of children of low-income families will be discussed. Then, keeping in mind the importance of federal programs designed to give children an "even start", the most beneficial instructional and programmatic "ingredients" of family literacy programs, as revealed through current research studies conducted by the Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy at Penn State, will be discussed. Finally, implications and points of interest raised by the audience during the ARF 2003 Panel will be summarized.

The Impacts of Welfare and Educational Reform

The United States has embraced two important policy shifts in the past ten years—one in welfare and the other in education—both inspired by political movements advocating increased personal and institutional accountability. These goals include reducing economic dependency on the State among adults and increasing educational attainment for children. The literature reveals

that demands created by these policies often clash with potential consequences for low-income parents and their children.

We have known for some time that parents play a critical role in both their children's academic achievement and their children's socio-emotional development. Most contemporary educators are aware of the various influences as well as the many barriers to parent involvement in their children's schooling (Eccles & Harold, 1996). Whereas finding time to realize the potentials of this role is a challenge for most parents, recent welfare reform programs have added to the challenge faced by America's working poor. In 1998, 5.3 million low-income children between the ages of 6 and 12 had either two parents or a single parent working after school (Halpern, 1999). There is an estimated 20 - 25 hour per week gap between parents' work schedules and students' school schedules (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 1998).

Inadequate income, irregular shifts, overcrowded schools, and uneven quality in after-school care burden many low-income families, many of whom are working increased hours. These same parents, many of whom are themselves poorly educated and low in literacy skills, are expected to help meet the greater accountability goals of the education reform movement by monitoring homework, helping children organize time, and assisting student learning by reinforcing basic skills taught during the school day. Thus some argue that the increasing number of hours that poor parents, particularly single mothers, spend in the workplace is having a negative impact on parental capacity to help their children over the increasingly challenging hurdles of elementary school. (Newman and Chin, 2003)

Although there is considerable discussion in the literature on how schooling affects students as well as about the role families may play in the success of schooling (Gamoran, 1996), scientific studies of how school and welfare reform is affecting children in these families are first coming to the fore. In their comprehensive examination of findings from six separate evaluations of recent welfare and employment programs, Morris, Huston, Duncan, Crosby and Bos (2001) report:

1. Programs with mandatory employment services, which required parental employment without also increasing income, had "mixed" effects on children. "Only one of the six programs affected test scores at all…The pattern of impacts appeared to be more closely associated with particular sites than with program characteristics…." (p. 44-48)

2. "All of the programs that provided earnings supplements without mandatory employment services improved children's school achievement…Children in the program group had an average score that was 4 percentage points higher than the average score of children in the control group." (p. 20-21)

3. Programs that included earning supplements that increased *both* parental employment *and* income also produced "reduced behavior problems, increased positive social behavior, and/or improved…[the] overall health" of elementary school-aged children. (p. ES-4).

4. "The positive effects of earnings supplement programs on children were most pronounced for the children of long-term welfare participants." (p. 33-34)

5. Even the programs "with the most benefits to children left many families in poverty and many children at risk of school failure and behavior problems. These programs do not eliminate the need for child-focused interventions and reforms that promote school achievement and reduce behavior problems." (p. ES-5)

In summary, requiring parents to work without increasing their income above welfare payments seemed to affect their children's achievement negatively. This finding makes sense in that the parents are now absent from the home without additional means of providing alternative childcare. The most positive effects were obtained when parents were able to earn more income through work. However, child-focused intervention programs, like family literacy, were still necessary.

Two of the studies examined in the Morris et al. (2001) monograph considered the effect of welfare program reform on adolescents in low-income families. Both indicated that parents' transition from welfare to work may decrease adolescents' school achievement. In a subsequent study of four major welfare programs Gennetian et al. (2002) concluded:

1. "Adolescents' school progress was affected adversely by a variety of welfare and work policies targeted at single parents. Averaged across studies, the impacts are small, but any harm to these high-risk youth is noteworthy…;" and that

2. …adolescents who had younger siblings experienced the most pervasive and troubling negative effects as a result of the programs.

The average impacts in these programs on "grade repetition and receipt of special educational services for emotional, physical or mental conditions" were also unfavorable. Adolescents with younger siblings experienced the "most troubling effects on school performance and were most likely to be suspended or to drop out." They were more likely to have substantial responsibilities to care for their younger siblings, while those who did not have younger siblings were more likely to either work to help support the family, or to participate in "unstructured out-of school activities." (Gennetian et al., 2002, p. 45-49)

One study of a program that encouraged employment among single-parent welfare recipients revealed, alongside benefits for elementary school-aged children, that the adolescent children of parents in this program were more likely than their control group counterparts to engage in minor delinquency and to use tobacco, alcohol, or drugs. (Morris & Michalopoulos, 2000).

Nonetheless, holding school children and their lower-income parents to high standards hasn't lost much of its appeal. President Bush (2002) caught the public mood when he argued that softening standards results in the soft tyranny of "low expectations" and further warned, "children are segregated by low expectations, illiteracy and self-doubt." Given the current political and economic climate, what role can family literacy programs play in helping poor families realize these expectations? What research can best guide the implementation of these programs so that they are able to serve low-income and low-literate families?

Family Literacy Programs

Family literacy programs operate under the assumption that the parent can and should be the child's first teacher and with an inherent "value added" dimension not associated with other early childhood education programs. Through their participation, low-income, low-literate parent/teachers receive both valuable adult education and the tools and training necessary to play a critical role in their children's future academic achievements. (Philliber, Spillman, & King, 1996; Wasik, Dobbins, & Herrmann, 2001) Family literacy, as defined by the William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy programs (Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I as reauthorized by the *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001), typically includes four instructional components: Adult basic and literacy education, parenting education, structured interactive literacy time between parent and child, and early childhood education.

The National Even Start Association or NESA (2002) reports that the population served under the Even Start Act includes 80% of the families having an income below $15,000, more than 40% of whom have incomes below $6000. NESA also reports that participants have low levels of education (86% have not completed high school, as compared to 27% of Head Start parents). What is more, dependence upon public assistance, which supports families of unemployed adults, has now become time-limited, as was described in the previous section.

Family literacy programs are typically conducted during the day. With the passage of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act or PRWORA (US Congress, 1996), the National Center for Family Literacy (NCFL)(2002) became concerned because the large numbers of parents attending these programs who are welfare recipients. Therefore it was deemed important to incorporate work-related activities as part of the adult education component of family literacy programs. In fact, NCFL reported in *Momentum* (November 2000) that the number of parents expressing employment-related goals at the time of entry into family literacy programs dramatically increased with the passage of PRWORA (1996) from 1% in 1991 to 37% in 1999. NCFL (2002) also reported that the percentage of families receiving public assistance at entry ranged from 81% in 1991 to 45% in 1999, showing that parents have moved into the workforce during that time period.

Thus, adults coming to family literacy programs now have two needs: To improve their literacy and employability skills and to foster their young (birth – age 8) children's literacy skills for academic success in school. How effectively can this be done? How valid is the assumption that participation in adult/family literacy education will improve the ability of the parent to serve as the child's first teacher? And in light of this, is it fair to assume that as adults improve their own literacy and language skills they will, in turn, foster the development of children in various developmental domains?

The Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy at Penn State decided to test these assumptions using an existing database. The database was derived from the Pennsylvania Statewide Evaluation of Family literacy conducted by the Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy (ISAL) at Penn State, which is affiliated with the Goodling Institute. Since 1998, the ISAL has been conducting the statewide evaluation to track the performance of adults and their

children in all of the family literacy programs in Pennsylvania.   The research question was: What are the effects of parental participation in a family literacy program on children's developmental skills as measured by early childhood assessments?

A quasi-experimental design was used to test the research question.   Data were collected from families who participated in Pennsylvania's family literacy programs between July 1, 2001 and June 30, 2002 (2001-2002 program year). It had been established in prior research (Kassab, Askov, Weirauch, Grinder, & Van Horn, 2004) that greater participation in adult education was associated with significantly greater outcomes on adult education tests. The next question that is addressed here is whether or not increased participation in adult education would be associated with significant gains in early childhood developmental measures.

To assess children's growth and development, the family literacy programs chose from among three criterion-referenced assessment instruments to assess children who ranged in age from birth to 5 years of age. The instruments for children age three to five (inclusive) included the High/Scope Child Observation Record (COR) and the Learning Accomplishment Profile-Revised (LAP-R). For children who ranged from birth to 3 years of age programs were able to use the Early Learning Accomplishment Profile (ELAP). Not all children were administered each domain of the COR, LAP-R, and ELAP. Across the different analyses for the COR, sample sizes ranged from 194 to 198. For the LAP-R, sample sizes ranged from 431 to 444, while for the ELAP, sample sizes ranged from 450 to 498.

Each of these instruments measures essentially the same developmental skills using a slightly different definition for each depending upon the methodology of the instrument. The developmental skills the COR measures include initiative, social relations, creative representation, music and movement, language and literacy, logic and mathematics, and the average across these domains. The LAP-R and ELAP both measure the following domains: gross motor, fine motor, cognitive, language, and self-help. Slight differences exist with these two instruments where the LAP-R measures personal/social and pre-writing while ELAP measures social/emotional and no writing domain.

In order to test the research question, a series of models were estimated that included variables indicating whether hours of parental participation in a particular component of the family literacy program influenced the children's developmental skills, as measured by the COR, LAP-R, and ELAP. The following variables were controlled in all analyses: Age of the child at the time of the assessment, whether the child had participated in an educational program prior to his/her enrollment in the family literacy program, and whether special services needs was identified for the child since the child enrolled in the family literacy program (Grinder, Kassab, Askov, & Abler, 2004).

Results

Results indicate that intensity of participation in adult education, that is the number of hours of parental participation in adult education, had a significant effect on most of the developmental skills measured by the ELAP, which is administered to children less than three years of age. Specifically, greater parental participation in adult education was associated with

children's higher fine motor ($p<0.06$), cognitive ($p<0.06$), self-help ($p<0.01$), and social/emotional ($p<0.001$) posttest scores on the ELAP. Furthermore, greater participation in parenting education was associated with higher ELAP language posttest scores ($p<0.05$) as would be predicted in the family literacy model.

For the LAP-R, preschool children in families with more interactive literacy between parents and children hours had higher posttest scores on the cognitive domain ($p<0.001$). Participation in adult education, parenting education, or interactive literacy did not seem to result in higher posttest scores for the other domains on the LAP-R. In addition, greater participation in parenting education was associated with higher COR creative representation posttest scores ($p<0.05$). Participation in adult education, parenting education, or interactive literacy was not related higher posttest scores for the other domains on the COR.

The finding that adult education and parenting education (in the case of language skills) were associated with ELAP posttest scores has important implications. Parents' participation in family literacy appears to have the greatest impact on the very youngest children's developmental skills which do relate to later literacy acquisition. This result may have occurred because these components (adult and parenting education) led to increased self-esteem or self-confidence among adult participants, and this in turn may lead to more positive interaction with their very young children. Darling and Lee (2003) speculate that adult education provides two functions to parents by attending family literacy programs. First, by increasing their education, parents are able to provide a more economically stable environment for their children. Second, through family literacy programs, parents may "change their perspective on literacy, recognizing and capitalizing on their role as their child's first and most important teacher" (p. 383).

This research, furthermore, supports the efficacy of the family literacy model. As parents develop their own literacy skills, they are better equipped to foster the literacy and language growth in their very young children. This relationship is most clearly evident in very young children (ages birth to 3 years old) where the parents are not only the primary teachers but also the greatest developmental influence. This study demonstrates the important linkage that exists between the parents' education and children's literacy and language development. It reaffirms the assumption of family literacy programs that parents can and should be the child's first and most important early teacher.

<center>Implications Brought Forth During Panel Discussion</center>

Reaction to, and subsequent discussion of, the information presented by the panel included, but was not limited to comments/concerns about the 72 year-old goals, the crushing demands placed on welfare families, the need for more research to guide the use of limited funding, the current climate demanding "scientific research," and the "value- added" of family literacy programs.

How optimistic we educators must have been in 1931! We believed, with passion, that in but twenty years we could and would accomplish incredible goals, thus truly make a difference. Now, some 72 years later such sanguine confidence is seen mostly in the eyes of students entering the field. Is it that we family literacy veterans have been sobered by the crushing

realities of the low-income, low-literate families with whom we work? Or is it that we are frustrated by the implementations of a decade of education and welfare reform policy shifts, many of which have served to further devastate the lives of low-income parents and their children?   Or is it that we have come to realize that the goals of family literacy programs are intergenerational and therefore need be measured longitudinally over generations? Would longitudinal research meet the current demand for "scientific research" and if it did, how could we possibly construct control groups?

Whether veterans or newcomers, participants agreed that we need research to help us focus our resources on those programs that do "make a difference." Herein, the Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy at Penn State provides us with data affirming that parents can and should be the child's first teacher and that family literacy programs do provide an inherent "value added" dimension not associated with other early childhood education programs by providing low-income, low-literate parent/teachers both valuable adult education and the tools and training necessary to play a critical role in their children's future academic achievements. Referring to the study of four major welfare programs by Gennetian et al. (2002), and noting the harmful effect of current welfare policies on the academic achievement of adolescents, one participant asked, "Is there not yet another 'valued-added'?" He added, " I can't help but wonder how many of the low-income, low-literate adolescents who are currently dropping out of high school are future mothers/participants in family literacy programs?" The participant was told that participation in teen family literacy programs has, indeed, been on the rise. Interventions that break the intergenerational cycle of low literacy and poverty are very much needed, especially in the context of welfare reform where everyone is expected to work regardless of their family commitments.

References

Annie E. Casey Foundation. (1998). *Childcare you can count on: Model programs and policies*. Baltimore: Author.

Bush, G. (2002). Education bill of 2002. Retrieved December 2002, from www.ed.gov/offices/oese/esea/nclb/part1.html

Darling, S., & Lee, J. (2003). Linking parents to reading instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, *57*(4), 382-384.

Eccles, J., & Harold, R. (1996) Family involvement in children's and adolescents' schooling. In A. Booth & J. Dunn (Eds.) Family-School links: How do they affect educational outcomes (pp. 3-31). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Gamoran, A. (1996). Effects of schooling on children and families. In A. Booth & J. Dunn (Eds.), *Family-school links: How do they affect educational outcomes* (pp. 107 – 113). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Gennetian, L., Duncan, G., Knox, V., Bargas, W., Clark-Kaufman, E., & London, A. (2002). *How welfare and work policies for parents affect adolescents: A synthesis of research*. New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Grinder, E.L., Kassab, C., Askov, E.N., & Abler, D. (2004). *Testing the assumption: The impact of family literacy on children's development.* University Park, PA: Penn State, Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy.

Halpern, R. (1999). After-school programs for low-income children: Promises and challenges. In *The future of children: When school is out.* Retrieved February 25, 2004, from http:www.futureofchildren.org/usr_doc/vol9no2Art8done.pdf

Kassab, C., Askov, E.N., Weirauch, D., Grinder, E.L., & Van Horn, B. (2004). Adult participation related to outcomes in family literacy programs. *Family Literacy Forum*, *3*(1), 23-29.

Morris, P., Huston, A., Duncan, G., Crosby, D., & Bos. J. (2001). *How welfare and work policies affect children: A synthesis of research.* (MDRC report). New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Morris, P., & Michalopoulos, C. (2000). *The self-sufficiency project at 36 months: Effects on children of a program that increased parental employment and income*. Ottawa: Social Research and Demonstration Corporation.

National Center for Family Literacy. (2000, November). *Momentum.* Louisville, KY: Author.

National Center for Family Literacy. (2002). [Trend analysis of primary family literacy research database]. Unpublished raw data. Louisville, KY: Author.

National Even Start Association (2002). *Even Start Family Literacy Program.* Fact sheet distributed at the annual conference. San Diego, CA: Author.

Newman, K., & Chin, M. (2003). High stakes: Time poverty, testing, and the children of the working poor. *Qualitative Sociology, 26*(1), 3-34.

Philliber, W.W., Spillman, R.E., & King, R.E. (1996). Consequences of family literacy for adults and children: Some preliminary findings. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *39*(7), 558-565.

United States Congress, Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (1996). *Public Law 104-193*. Washington, DC.

United States Department of Education (September, 2003). *Policy guidance for the William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs, Part B, Subpart 3 of Title I of the Elementary Secondary Education Act*, Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/programs/evenstartformula/legislation.html

Wasik, B.H., Dobbins, D.R., & Herrman, S. (2001). Intergenerational family literacy concepts, research, and practice. In S.B. Neuman & D.K. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook of early literacy research*. New York: Guilford Press.

What shall we be like in 1950. (1931, January 10). *The Literary Digest*, 43-44

Exploring Relationships between Spelling and Word Identification Using an Informal Word Inventory

Jerry Zutell, Ohio State University

Objectives

This study explored relationships between reading and spelling by examining the spelling and word identification behaviors of elementary students when the same words were used in both spelling and word identification tasks. It expands on the author's earlier work by including different grade levels and a school with a more typical urban student population. In addition, a closer examination of word difficulty for spelling and identification was included.

Perspective

For most of the last century researchers and practitioners tended to focus on the differences between spelling skill and reading ability. More recently, many have recognized that spelling accuracy and word reading (both in and out of context) are closely related manifestations of underlying word knowledge. (e.g., Bear, 1992; Morris & Perney, 1984; Templeton & Morris, 2000; Zutell & Rasinski, 1989). Perfetti (1992) has hypothesized that spelling accuracy is a good measure of complete underlying knowledge of a word's form, and so should be directly related to its easy, accurate, and automatic recognition. While several studies have discovered high correlations between these variables, few have provided in-depth analysis using the same set of words for both reading and word identification so as to fully examine this relationship. (See, however, Zutell & Fresch, 1991 for an exception.)

Methods

Sixty-one students in grades two through four in an urban elementary school were the subjects of the study. They provided 80 instances at which data was collected for both reading and spelling. The McGuffey Qualitative Spelling Inventory (Bear, Invernizzi, Templeton, & Johnston, 2000) was used as the source of words for both spelling and word identification tasks. This inventory provides eight lists of words gradually decreasing in word frequency and increasing in word complexity with each successive list.

For Spelling, lists were administered in traditional classroom format over a series of days. Testing was discontinued if a student spelled less than 50% of the words correctly on any given list. Instructional Level for Spelling was operationally defined as the highest (most difficult) list on which a student scored 50% or above.

For Word Identification, students were tested individually. Each list was typed in a single column on a single sheet of paper. The tester used index cards to cover all but the word in question. The tester moved down the list of words in a fluid motion as the student attempted to identify each word, leaving each visually available for approximately one second. If the student identified the word accurately and fluidly with this exposure, the tester moved on. If not, the

cards were opened to provide the student with an opportunity to attack the word. Percent Correct scores were generated for flashed or Immediate Accuracy and un-timed or Total Accuracy.

Testing was discontinued when students scored less that 50% correct for the Immediate score and less than 50% for the Total. In all but two cases students were last tested on a Word Identification list equal to or of greater difficulty than their instructional spelling list.

Instructional Level for Immediate Word Identification Accuracy level was defined as the highest list on which a student scored 50% or better. Instructional Level for Total Word Identification Accuracy was scored in two ways: Following many informal reading inventories, it was defined as the highest list on which the student scored 70% or better. To be consistent with the scoring for the other two word variables, a second Instructional Level was determined using 50% as the criterion. In order to gain more precision in measuring performance on all three measures, the percent of words correct was added as a decimal to the instructional level. This helped differentiate between students with varying percentages of words correct within an Instructional Level.

Data Analysis

The resulting data set was analyzed in several ways. Means and standard deviations for word identification and spelling variables were calculated, as were correlations between these variables. One-way ANOVAs were used to compare pairs of variables for the whole sample and the individual grade levels

At a more detailed level, subjects were regrouped by spelling instructional level. For that list and one list beyond, performance on each word was categorized according to six possible combinations of spelling and word identification accuracy in order to examine the hypothesis that accurate word identification consistently precedes spelling accuracy, as developmental theory predicts. Those combinations are presented in the table below.

Table 1. Possible Combinations of Spelling and Word Identification Accuracy

Category	Spelling Accuracy	Immediate Accuracy	Total Accuracy
One	0	0	0
Two	0	0	1
Three	0	1	1
Four	1	0	0
Five	1	0	1
Six	1	1	1

In addition, for individual words accuracy scores across subjects were calculated for spelling, immediate identification and total identification. Then correlations were generated between spelling and the word identification scores to explore whether words were similarly easy or difficult for spelling and word identification. Correlations for the three tests that had a sufficient number of students at spelling instructional and/or frustration levels were calculated. For each word on these lists accuracy scores for each measure were then transformed to generate relative distances from the mean by subtracting individual scores from the mean and dividing by the standard deviation for each set.

Results

For the whole sample there were significant differences in means for Spelling and the three Word Identification variables. However, only one difference between means at the individual grade levels was significant (Spelling vs. Total 50%, Grade Three, $p<.05$). This lack of significance, even when the differences in means seem reasonably large, is due most probably to a combination of reduced sample sizes and large standard deviations.

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations for Spelling and Word Identification Variables Across Grades

Grade	Spelling Level	Immediate Level	Total Level (70%)	Total Level (50%)
ALL N=80	2.44 (1.89)	4.15 (2.45)	4.29 (2.43)	4.78 (2.62)
TWO N=27	1.45 (1.47)	2.20 (2.02)	2.42 (1.77)	2.68 (1.89)
THREE N=37	2.74 (1.78)	4.76 (1.91)	4.98 (2.09)	5.68 (2.37)
FOUR N=16	3.39 (2.12)	6.01 (2.10)	5.86 (2.28)	6.26 (2.08)

Correlations among Spelling and the Word Identification variables were all significant ($p<.05$) and high, from .74 to .86, indicating a strong relationship between spelling and word identification variables, as found in other studies.

**Table 3. Correlations Between Spelling and
Word Identification Variables
Across Grades**

Grade	Spelling by Immediate	Spelling by Total (70%)	Spelling by Total (50%)
ALL N=80	0.79	0.81	0.80
TWO N=27	0.81	0.86	0.81
THREE N=37	0.74	0.74	0.75
FOUR N=16	0.74	0.77	0.78

An examination of the frequency counts for the possible combinations of accurate identification and spelling shows that across specific word lists and for the sample as a whole, only a very small percentage of words were spelled correctly but not identified correctly, the condition that would be counter to developmental expectations. These percentages remain low even when the extreme cases of either no accuracy in any case or accuracy in all three conditions are removed from the counts and percentages.

**Table 4. Frequency Counts of Spelling (S), Immediate
Identification (I) and Total Identification (T)
Combinations Across Subjects (N=128)**

S I T	Number	Percent of Total	Percent Eliminating *000* and *111*
0 0 0	417	13%	
0 0 1	222	7%	13%
0 1 1	1225	38%	77%
1 0 0	59	2%	4%
1 0 1	100	3%	6%
1 1 1	1185	37%	

Correlations for relative word ease/difficulty across measures on selected lists are also significant (p<.05) high, and positive. This suggests that, over all, the same words that are easy/difficult to identify are the same words that are easy/difficult to spell.

Table 5. Word Difficulty Correlations For Spelling, Immediate Identification, And Total Identification

Instructional Level:	None	Two	Two
List:	1	2	3
N:	26	23	23
Spelling by Immediate:	0.813	0.765	0.622
Spelling by Total:	0.852	0.692	0.663

Conclusions

Findings from this study support earlier work that established high correlations between spelling and word identification variables when the same lists are used for both. Frequency counts of possible spelling and word identification combinations confirm the direction of relationships predicted by developmental theory. Word ease/difficulty correlations and comparisons indicate close relationships, not only overall, but also at the word level.

Further, these connections were found using a sample of students with different demographic profiles and somewhat different performance patterns on these measures than those used in earlier studies, thus strengthening the case for viewing spelling and word identification as closely related manifestations of underlying word knowledge.

Differences among spelling instructional level and word identification levels increased as grade level increased (Table 2). This makes sense because as words become less frequent, they also tend to become longer. This makes them easier to identify using partial cues, but harder to spell because there are more letters to get right, at least one of which may represent an unaccented vowel or silent consonant. (e.g., is it *sep**e**rate* or *sep**a**rate*?). Thus readers without full word representations gain more quickly in identification than they do in spelling. But at the same time, correlations between spelling and word identification remained quite high (Table 3), an indication that these aspects of word knowledge are still closely related, that is, better word readers are better spellers.

These results have significant implications for instruction. Traditionally phonics/word identification and spelling instruction are treated as separate, unrelated parts of the literacy curriculum. They are often taught at different parts of the day with different materials and/or programs. Furthermore, phonics instruction may be organized according to reading groups, providing some differentiated instruction, but spelling is very often taught as a whole-class activity, with all students studying the same lists regardless of their reading levels. These results support a more comprehensive approach to word study in which words are compared and examined for patterns and regularities that connect pronunciation and spelling. And, since very few words were spelled correctly if they were not identified accurately (especially identified quickly and easily), it also stands to reason that spelling lists and patterns should be governed by the nature and extent of a student's sight vocabulary - it is unreasonable to expect students to spell a large number of words that they still struggle to pronounce. Word study instruction should be developmentally based and organized for both reading and spelling.

References

Bear, D. (1992). The prosody of oral reading and stages of word knowledge. In S. Templeton & D. Bear (Eds.), *Development of orthographic knowledge and the foundations of literacy.* (pp. 137- 190). Hillsdale: NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bear, D.R., Invernizzi, M., Templeton, S., & Johnston, F. (2000). *Words their way: Word study for phonics, vocabulary, and spelling instruction.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Morris, D., & Perney, J. (1984). Developmental spelling as a predictor of first-grade reading achievement. *The Elementary School Journal*, *84*(4), 441-457.

Perfetti, C. (1992). The representation problem in reading acquisition. In P. Gough, L. Ehri, & Treiman (Eds.), *Reading acquisition.* (pp. 145-174). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Templeton, S., & Morris, D. (2000). Spelling. In M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research volume III.* (pp. 255-544). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Zutell, J., & Fresch, M.J. (1991, May). *A longitudinal study of reading and spelling connections for third and fifth grade students*. Paper presented at the IRA Annual Convention, Las Vegas.

Zutell, J., & Rasinski, T. (1989). Spelling and reading connections in third and fifth grade students*. Reading Psychology*, *10*, 2, 137-155.

Comparing Performance on Two Word Identification Inventories: The *Qualitative Inventory of Word Knowledge* and the *Analytical Reading Inventory*

Jerry Zutell, Ohio State University

Perspective/Background

Informal Reading Inventories typically include a series of word lists to test word identification in isolation. These lists are usually organized according to word frequency, with an attempt to correlate strongly with the difficulty of the reading passages also included in the inventory. Performance on word lists is then often used to determine initial placement for testing in inventory reading selections. In a further use, students are assigned instructional levels for word identification in isolation, word identification in context, and comprehension, using criteria similar to those suggested by Betts (See Gillet & Temple, 2000, pp. 107-108). Discrepancies in instructional levels across tasks are sometimes used to suggest strengths and/or weaknesses in particular areas, so that that plans for individualized instruction are informed by such results. Spelling inventories may or may not be included, and even if included, rarely contain the same words as those on the word identification inventories.

One limitation to most word identification inventories is that the words are typically selected based on word frequency, with minimal attention to word patterns and little interest in the information that performance on such inventories might provide about students' underlying word knowledge. In contrast, several recent spelling inventories have been constructed from a developmental perspective with the dual purpose of determining student instructional level and/or developmental stage, and of providing information about student control over specific word features (e.g., Ganske, 2000; Schlagal, 1989).

A significant advantage to using the same developmentally constructed set of lists for both word identification and spelling assessment is that performance on word identification and spelling inventories can then be compared to provide a more detailed understanding of student word knowledge. (The results of the author's assessment activities in reading clinic at a large mid-western university have supported this advantage.) However, if such a set of lists is not comparable in difficulty to the one constructed to match the difficulty of the reading passages being used for informal assessment, then the primary purposes of the word identification inventory (placement, determining relative strengths and weaknesses) are no longer served.

Objectives

Thus the purpose of this study was to compare the performance of students on the word identification lists of a well-respected and widely-used informal reading inventory, the Analytical Reading Inventory (ARI) (Woods & Moe, 2002) with their performance when the word lists from a developmental spelling inventory, the Qualitative Inventory of Word Knowledge (QI) (Schlagal, 1989) were used for word identification.

Methods

The subjects in this study were 25 students participating in a summer reading clinic, ranging in age (7-13) and grade level (2-8). They also ranged considerably in their reading ability and source of reading difficulties. Each was tested using the two word identification inventories during the last two weeks of clinic activities. (Order of administration was counter-balanced across the sample).

Each list was typed in a single column on a single sheet of paper. The tester used index cards to cover all but the word in question. The tester moved down the list of words in a fluid motion as the student attempted to identify each word, leaving each visually available for approximately one-half second. If the student identified the word accurately and fluidly with this exposure, the tester moved on. If not, the cards were opened to provide the student with an opportunity to attack the word. Percent Correct scores were generated for flashed or Immediate Accuracy and untimed or Total Accuracy for each list on each inventory. Testing ceased when students scored less than 50% for Immediate Accuracy and less than 70% for Total accuracy.

Data Analysis

Students were assigned instructional levels for each inventory using a 50% correct criterion for Immediate Accuracy. Then, in order to check for a better fit between inventories, scores were readjusted using a 60% criterion. Following the directions in the ARI, a 70% correct criterion for Total Accuracy was used for both inventories. Statistical measures included: means and standard deviations for each inventory and scoring procedure, correlations between inventories, and t-tests to test for differences in performance. In addition, differences between scores on the two inventories were computed and frequency counts made of these differences. A more conservative analysis was done by running the same statistics, but by removing the scores of those students who scored at the top level on all measures. This was done to control for ceiling effects.

Results

Results are reported in the two tables below. For the Immediate scores, for both the full sample and when controlling for ceiling effects, correlations are all very high, above .9 (p<.05). Further, Student T tests indicate no significant differences between means. This strongly supports the idea that the inventories are measuring the same ability at similar levels, and can be seen as comparable in this regard. Frequency counts (even controlling for ceiling effects) show that 90% of comparisons are within one grade level (half of these are at the same level).

The results for the Total scores are somewhat different. Although correlations are high, differences in means are significant (p<.05). Frequency counts show a wider distribution, with higher instructional levels clearly favoring the QI. This would suggest that the words on the QI are more easily attacked and solved than those on the ARI. A closer examination indicates that these discrepancies are focused at the higher levels of the inventories.

**Table 1. Comparisons of Performance on the Qualitative Inventory
and the Analytical Reading Inventory**

Inventory	N	Means*	SD	Corr.	Student T
ARI Imm. 50%	25	4.60	2.42	0.924	0.207
QI Imm. 50%	25	4.84	2.32		
ARI Imm. 60%	25	4.32	2.50	0.945	0.233
QI Imm. 60%	25	4.52	2.35		
ARI Total	25	4.68	2.41	0.853	0.009
QI Total	25	5.40	2.25		
Controlling for Ceiling Effects:					
ARI Imm. 50%	20	4.00	2.34	0.901	0.209
QI Imm. 50%	20	4.30	2.30		
ARI Imm. 60%	20	3.65	2.35	0.922	0.234
QI Imm. 60%	20	3.90	2.22		
ARI Total	20	4.10	2.36	0.831	0.009
QI Total	20	5.00	2.36		

* Scores reflect a plus one adjustment to account for Primer lists

Table 2. Frequency Counts of Differences in Levels Between QI and ARI

Differences in Levels*	Immediate, 50%	Immediate, 60%	Total (70%)
Four	0	0	1
Three	1	0	1
Two	1	2	5
One	5	5	3
Zero	14	14	14

Minus One	4	4	0
Minus Two	0	0	1
Minus Three	0	0	0

Controlling for Ceiling Effects:

	Immediate, 50%	**Immmediate, 60%**	**Total**
Four	0	0	1
Three	1	0	1
Two	1	2	5
One	5	5	3
Zero	9	9	9
Minus One	4	4	0
Minus Two	0	0	1
Minus Three	0	0	0

*Positive Scores = Higher on QI: Negative Scores = Higher on ARI

Conclusions

Results suggest that using the QI as a word identification inventory is a reasonable alternative to using the ARI lists, especially as a measure of immediate identification, although one must recognize that the two inventories will not always yield exactly the same grade placements. (On the other hand, alternate form and/or retest results within the ARI are also likely to yield less than a perfect match.)

Teachers and clinicians should consider the trade-offs and their purposes in deciding which approach to use, and should consider that using the developmentally-based inventories like the QI for both spelling and word identification provides the advantage of being able to compare identification and spelling performance to get a more complete picture of student word knowledge. This information can be used to plan for appropriate word study, a crucial element in the individualized instruction needed by struggling readers.

When planning the revision of current IRIs and creating new ones, developers would do well to consider the advantages of selecting words based on pattern and conceptual difficulty as well as frequency. The results of this study suggest that it is possible to create lists whose words both fall within appropriate frequency ranges for estimating level of word identification ***and*** can be organized to provide more detailed understanding of student word knowledge.

Teachers, clinicians, and teacher trainers might also consider the value of measuring immediate identification as well as untimed identification in assessing student abilities. Using the flashed

presentation method has become less popular in recent years. In fact, few informal reading inventories, including the ARI, currently recommend or provide directions for this procedure. Yet the results of this study indicate more consistent relationships (i.e. higher correlations) between inventories for the flashed condition. And immediate identification scores are particularly useful because they serve as measures of automatic word recognition ability, which clearly contributes to reading speed and fluency, important factors in determining instructional level.

One limitation of this study was that direct comparisons between performance on the word identification inventories was not compared to performance on ARI reading passages or other placement approaches. This would clearly be a worthwhile topic for further study.

References

Ganske, K. (2000). *Word journeys*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Gillet, J., & Temple, C. (2000). *Understanding reading problems.* New York: Longman.

Schlagal, R. (1989). Constancy and change in spelling development. *Reading Psychology*, *10* (3), 207-232.

Woods, M., & Moe, A. (2002). *Analytical reading inventory (6th ed.).* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Comparing Performance on Two Word Identification Inventories: The *Qualitative Inventory of Word Knowledge* and the *Analytical Reading Inventory*

Jerry Zutell, Ohio State University

Perspective/Background

Informal Reading Inventories typically include a series of word lists to test word identification in isolation. These lists are usually organized according to word frequency, with an attempt to correlate strongly with the difficulty of the reading passages also included in the inventory. Performance on word lists is then often used to determine initial placement for testing in inventory reading selections. In a further use, students are assigned instructional levels for word identification in isolation, word identification in context, and comprehension, using criteria similar to those suggested by Betts (See Gillet & Temple, 2000, pp. 107-108). Discrepancies in instructional levels across tasks are sometimes used to suggest strengths and/or weaknesses in particular areas, so that that plans for individualized instruction are informed by such results. Spelling inventories may or may not be included, and even if included, rarely contain the same words as those on the word identification inventories.

One limitation to most word identification inventories is that the words are typically selected based on word frequency, with minimal attention to word patterns and little interest in the information that performance on such inventories might provide about students' underlying word knowledge. In contrast, several recent spelling inventories have been constructed from a developmental perspective with the dual purpose of determining student instructional level and/or developmental stage, and of providing information about student control over specific word features (e.g., Ganske, 2000; Schlagal, 1989).

A significant advantage to using the same developmentally constructed set of lists for both word identification and spelling assessment is that performance on word identification and spelling inventories can then be compared to provide a more detailed understanding of student word knowledge. (The results of the author's assessment activities in reading clinic at a large mid-western university have supported this advantage.) However, if such a set of lists is not comparable in difficulty to the one constructed to match the difficulty of the reading passages being used for informal assessment, then the primary purposes of the word identification inventory (placement, determining relative strengths and weaknesses) are no longer served.

Objectives

Thus the purpose of this study was to compare the performance of students on the word identification lists of a well-respected and widely-used informal reading inventory, the Analytical Reading Inventory (ARI) (Woods & Moe, 2002) with their performance when the word lists from a developmental spelling inventory, the Qualitative Inventory of Word Knowledge (QI) (Schlagal, 1989) were used for word identification.

Methods

The subjects in this study were 25 students participating in a summer reading clinic, ranging in age (7-13) and grade level (2-8). They also ranged considerably in their reading ability and source of reading difficulties. Each was tested using the two word identification inventories during the last two weeks of clinic activities. (Order of administration was counter-balanced across the sample).

Each list was typed in a single column on a single sheet of paper. The tester used index cards to cover all but the word in question. The tester moved down the list of words in a fluid motion as the student attempted to identify each word, leaving each visually available for approximately one-half second. If the student identified the word accurately and fluidly with this exposure, the tester moved on. If not, the cards were opened to provide the student with an opportunity to attack the word. Percent Correct scores were generated for flashed or Immediate Accuracy and untimed or Total Accuracy for each list on each inventory. Testing ceased when students scored less than 50% for Immediate Accuracy and less than 70% for Total accuracy.

Data Analysis

Students were assigned instructional levels for each inventory using a 50% correct criterion for Immediate Accuracy. Then, in order to check for a better fit between inventories, scores were readjusted using a 60% criterion. Following the directions in the ARI, a 70% correct criterion for Total Accuracy was used for both inventories. Statistical measures included: means and standard deviations for each inventory and scoring procedure, correlations between inventories, and t-tests to test for differences in performance. In addition, differences between scores on the two inventories were computed and frequency counts made of these differences. A more conservative analysis was done by running the same statistics, but by removing the scores of those students who scored at the top level on all measures. This was done to control for ceiling effects.

Results

Results are reported in the two tables below. For the Immediate scores, for both the full sample and when controlling for ceiling effects, correlations are all very high, above .9 (p<.05). Further, Student T tests indicate no significant differences between means. This strongly supports the idea that the inventories are measuring the same ability at similar levels, and can be seen as comparable in this regard. Frequency counts (even controlling for ceiling effects) show that 90% of comparisons are within one grade level (half of these are at the same level).

The results for the Total scores are somewhat different. Although correlations are high, differences in means are significant (p<.05). Frequency counts show a wider distribution, with higher instructional levels clearly favoring the QI. This would suggest that the words on the QI are more easily attacked and solved than those on the ARI. A closer examination indicates that these discrepancies are focused at the higher levels of the inventories.

**Table 1. Comparisons of Performance on the Qualitative Inventory
and the Analytical Reading Inventory**

Inventory	N	Means*	SD	Corr.	Student T
ARI Imm. 50%	25	4.60	2.42	0.924	0.207
QI Imm. 50%	25	4.84	2.32		
ARI Imm. 60%	25	4.32	2.50	0.945	0.233
QI Imm. 60%	25	4.52	2.35		
ARI Total	25	4.68	2.41	0.853	0.009
QI Total	25	5.40	2.25		
Controlling for Ceiling Effects:					
ARI Imm. 50%	20	4.00	2.34	0.901	0.209
QI Imm. 50%	20	4.30	2.30		
ARI Imm. 60%	20	3.65	2.35	0.922	0.234
QI Imm. 60%	20	3.90	2.22		
ARI Total	20	4.10	2.36	0.831	0.009
QI Total	20	5.00	2.36		

* Scores reflect a plus one adjustment to account for Primer lists

Table 2. Frequency Counts of Differences in Levels Between QI and ARI

Differences in Levels*	Immediate, 50%	Immediate, 60%	Total (70%)
Four	0	0	1
Three	1	0	1
Two	1	2	5
One	5	5	3
Zero	14	14	14

Minus One	4	4	0
Minus Two	0	0	1
Minus Three	0	0	0

Controlling for Ceiling Effects:

	Immediate, 50%	**Immmediate, 60%**	**Total**
Four	0	0	1
Three	1	0	1
Two	1	2	5
One	5	5	3
Zero	9	9	9
Minus One	4	4	0
Minus Two	0	0	1
Minus Three	0	0	0

*Positive Scores = Higher on QI: Negative Scores = Higher on ARI

Conclusions

Results suggest that using the QI as a word identification inventory is a reasonable alternative to using the ARI lists, especially as a measure of immediate identification, although one must recognize that the two inventories will not always yield exactly the same grade placements. (On the other hand, alternate form and/or retest results within the ARI are also likely to yield less than a perfect match.)

Teachers and clinicians should consider the trade-offs and their purposes in deciding which approach to use, and should consider that using the developmentally-based inventories like the QI for both spelling and word identification provides the advantage of being able to compare identification and spelling performance to get a more complete picture of student word knowledge. This information can be used to plan for appropriate word study, a crucial element in the individualized instruction needed by struggling readers.

When planning the revision of current IRIs and creating new ones, developers would do well to consider the advantages of selecting words based on pattern and conceptual difficulty as well as frequency. The results of this study suggest that it is possible to create lists whose words both fall within appropriate frequency ranges for estimating level of word identification ***and*** can be organized to provide more detailed understanding of student word knowledge.

Teachers, clinicians, and teacher trainers might also consider the value of measuring immediate identification as well as untimed identification in assessing student abilities. Using the flashed

presentation method has become less popular in recent years. In fact, few informal reading inventories, including the ARI, currently recommend or provide directions for this procedure. Yet the results of this study indicate more consistent relationships (i.e. higher correlations) between inventories for the flashed condition. And immediate identification scores are particularly useful because they serve as measures of automatic word recognition ability, which clearly contributes to reading speed and fluency, important factors in determining instructional level.

One limitation of this study was that direct comparisons between performance on the word identification inventories was not compared to performance on ARI reading passages or other placement approaches. This would clearly be a worthwhile topic for further study.

References

Ganske, K. (2000). *Word journeys*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Gillet, J., & Temple, C. (2000). *Understanding reading problems.* New York: Longman.

Schlagal, R. (1989). Constancy and change in spelling development. *Reading Psychology*, *10* (3), 207-232.

Woods, M., & Moe, A. (2002). *Analytical reading inventory (6th ed.).* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.