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CHAPTER I

Purpose

The focus of this research centered on skills and strategies used to improve students’ reading achievement within the context of aesthetic literature. The practicum student was a former teacher, and was not employed at the site where this interaction took place. The school was chosen for the study because of its familiarity, the friendly and cooperative staff, the willingness and encouragement of the administrators, and its excellent reputation. The host teacher was experienced in the field of education and open to providing additional help for the students whenever possible.

The facility was located in the downtown area of a rapidly-growing, northeast Florida city. There were 525 kindergarten through fifth-grade students enrolled, 39.6% of whom receive free or reduced lunches (Manatee, 1998). There were 48 instructional personnel employed at the site. The teaching staff was composed of 89% females and 11% males. Of these teachers, 93% were White and 7% Black.

The site offered after-school daycare, Title I (United States Department of Education, 1965) services, an Alpha-Dropout Program (DOP), and classes for speech, specific learning disabilities (SLD), and the severely-emotionally disturbed (SED) students. A nearby private college was a co-partner with the school. Students from the college regularly worked with the children at the site, especially in the area of reading.

One-hundred percent of the teachers, administrators, and staff received satisfactory evaluations. The climate/parent survey indicated an overall positive
feeling toward the school and staff. The site received the Little Red School House Award and was recognized as a Red Carpet School. There was an ongoing effort to improve the status of working conditions and enhance staff morale. The administrators recognized an Educator of the Week, participated in staff and administration socials, and acknowledged Teacher Appreciation Week. The administrators carried two-way radio systems to keep in close contact with all areas of the school. They modeled expected behavior through teaching classes to students and conducting workshops for the school's staff, students, and families.

The school's improvement plan required an individualized language arts curriculum for students in the primary grades. The students were placed in achievement levels which allowed them to work at their own pace. The program was flexible, allowing for students to progress to other levels as needed. Students classified as at-risk were served through the exceptional student education (ESE) classrooms or Title I. The kindergarten program at the site followed the whole-language model. The fourth- and fifth-grade classrooms were departmentalized. Academic growth in language arts and writing for all students was measured by the Florida Writes assessment (Florida Department of Education, 1995), Stanford Achievement Test (SAT) (1996), and Basic Achievement Skills Individual Screener (BASIS) (1983) reading inventory. Teachers and administrators also made use of the Brigance (Brigance, 1977) assessment, as well as the holistic tests from the basal reading series and teacher-constructed assessments.

Technology was in use throughout the site. Each classroom had at least four computers. The media center housed 11 computers for student and faculty use. The Computer Curriculum Laboratory, developed in 1997, was used by students to
enhance their reading and mathematics skills. Students were assessed at their level and pursued practice on the recommended skills. The software used in the lab, from the Computer Curriculum Corporation (1996), had a tracking component which allowed for the recording and measurement of student growth in math and reading.

The site was recognized for its caring and safe environment. The school implemented Canter's Assertive Discipline model (Canter, 1986). Teachers were trained in the safe physical management of students. District level training included Aggression Control Techniques (ACT) and Human Relation Training.

Emphasis was placed on providing for the needs of each child. Students were placed in their language arts classes based on standardized test scores, the BASIS reading inventory, and teacher-parent recommendation. The language arts classes included reading, writing, spelling, and vocabulary. The Treasury of Literature (1995) basal series was used within the program.

Time was allocated to assist the staff in providing a professional workplace. The primary grade teachers met weekly by grade level to discuss students' needs and to design and make adjustments in the curriculum. There were monthly grade-level meetings with administrators to discuss any concerns. Teachers received regular opportunities to participate in reading, technology, math, and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) sessions. A campus-based program of professional growth and renewal activities for all staff members was in place.

Student expectations were communicated through grade-level forums, grade-level handouts, parent conferences, school newsletters, voice mail, report cards, interim reports, handbooks, telecommunications devices for the deaf (TDD),
Parent-Teacher Organization (PTO) meetings, and parent-teacher inservice nights. The School Improvement Team/School Advisory Council developed goals and objectives to increase student performance. The school climate continued to grow and improve through efforts to include parents in the education of their children. The community participated in the culture of the school, in part, through being business partners and sponsors, by volunteering in the classrooms, and supporting the school’s silent auction.

The researcher for this practicum worked in public schools, in various assignments, since 1976. The researcher’s background included 12 years of experience in teaching across the elementary grades as a generalist, in ESOL, and Alternative Education (Dropout Prevention). The most recent experiences included the implementation of Johns Hopkins’ Success for All (SFA) model for the teaching of reading in the first through third grades. The researcher had an undergraduate degree in elementary education from the University of Florida and a master’s degree in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) from Nova Southeastern University. While employed as a teacher, the researcher served on various school committees, in leadership roles for the district as a member of the Florida Teaching Profession-National Education Association (FTP-NEA), and received recognition from the local chapter of the Florida Reading Association for contributions to literacy in the classroom.

The third-grade students targeted for this research were performing below expectations in reading in accordance to district and state standards. The target group was selected based on the members’ reading scores on the 1998 Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), below grade-level performance in reading as shown by
their report cards for the second and third grades, and by the school library's circulation records. The available SAT total reading battery scores showed all of the students performed below the fiftieth percentile (Appendix A). The students also performed below grade level last school year as indicated by report card comments (Appendix A). The final academic grade for last year and the first semester's grades for this year were influenced by effort. Though the children may have had passing grades on the report cards, they were not performing on grade-level. The report cards from the previous years were primarily comprised of narratives and checklists. Therefore, their progress was denoted by checking or writing the term "performing below grade level" on the report cards. Library transaction records indicated the quantity and frequency of books checked out by students. The two lists can be compared to note the perceived reading habits of the students (Appendixes B and C). The results for the 1997-1998 school year indicated none of the students checked out books every month. The 1998-1999 results showed even less library activity than the previous year. The records denoted the students, overall, were not checking out and reading library books for pleasure.

The 1997-1998 school accountability report committee (Manatee, 1998) indicated a need for improvement in the areas of reading and writing when it established its goals for the 1998-1999 school year. In the report, goals were developed to enable the students to become lifelong readers, comprehend narrative and expository texts, and develop writing skills to express thoughts, ideas, and personal expression in written form. In order to meet these goals, those students performing below expectations required additional help and support in the language arts program.
The 14 students participating in this practicum study varied in their cultural, linguistic, and ethnic backgrounds. Six females and eight males were in the target group. Of these, three were Black, one was Asian, and ten were White. These differences represented opportunities to extend instructional practices beyond the suggestions provided in the basal readers and teacher's manuals.

The host teacher had 18 years of experience in the elementary classroom and possessed a strong background in teaching mathematics. The teacher indicated an interest in altering the curriculum as necessary to suit the differences of the students. At the time of this proposal, three students were referred for testing for exceptional student education. One student, who was previously retained, had a history of chronic absenteeism. The remaining students were regularly present in school. Therefore, attendance was not seen as a factor affecting the progress of most of the students. Fifty percent of the students in the target group participated in the free-lunch program.

One of the concerns of the teacher was that the children could do work when guided, but had difficulty with the same task when asked to work independently. The teacher also cited the students' inability to automatically identify sight words and decode new words as interfering with their reading progress. This had been noted when the students read aloud, in everyday writing, and on tests. Another problem was that the students were not engaged in reading for pleasure on a daily basis. The causes for these problems were not known. However, the researcher hypothesized the students may not have had consistent models for fluent reading, had not actively participated in individual reading for pleasure, and skills instruction may have been emphasized outside of meaningful contexts. The
students appeared passive and dependent upon the teacher’s directions and guidance in all activities. Students benefit from activities which draw on their personal knowledge, are challenging, and require more interaction with classmates as well as foster independence. Raising the expectations for the students and engaging them in the joy of reading also may increase their achievement. Students’ perceived control influences their academic performance by promoting learning engagement. Students with less knowledge and use of literacy strategies are dependent on external supports for their literacy. Lower achievers need more choices during reading and writing (Guthrie and Wigfield, 1997).

The objectives selected for the target group were integrated into aesthetic reading experiences. The aesthetic stance (Rosenblatt, 1978) is concerned with the lived-through experience during the reading. This differs from the efferent view in that it is not primarily concerned with the carrying away of information. Rosenblatt’s view of transactional theory suggests that words are merely ink on a page, and the individual’s mind is what creates meaning (Probst, 1987). Therefore, the poem, Rosenblatt’s term for a literary work, lies within the reader, and is a changeable event influenced and shaped by the reader’s social and cultural setting and personal experiences.

The emphasis during the implementation of this practicum was placed on improving the aesthetic reading skills of students through language arts strategies. The researcher agreed with the constructivist view of the learner as meaning maker as opposed to the reductionist perspective of the learner as a passive receptacle into which skills are amassed for later use (Hiebert, 1991). The teacher cannot give the student the knowledge from a text. Rather, the knowledge is created by the
learner through the act of reading and exchanges with others. The students in the
target group were encouraged to take responsibility for learning with guidance
from the teacher.

To enable the students to gain the most from their aesthetic reading
experiences, objectives were formulated to help ensure improvement in reading.
The objectives were:

1. After the 12 weeks of implementation, 80% of the target group would
improve their identification of sight vocabulary by a minimum of 5% as measured
by the pre- and posttests using the Dolch Word List (Dolch, 1936).

2. After the 12 weeks of implementation, 80% of the target group would
demonstrate 10% more positive attitudes toward reading as evidenced by pre-
and post-surveys using the Self-Anchor Attitude Scale (LaPray, 1978).

3. After the 12 weeks of implementation, 80% of the target group would
increase their pleasure reading by 25% as measured by the number of pages read
and recorded in student logs (Appendix D).

4. After the 12 weeks of implementation, 80% of the target group would
increase their fluency in oral reading by 66% as measured by timed reading tests
(Appendix E). This objective was changed. New objective: After the 12 weeks of
implementation, 80% of the target group would increase their fluency in oral
reading as evidenced by a 10% reduction in time and a 50% reduction in miscues
on individual, timed reading tests (Appendix E).

5. After the 12 weeks of implementation, 80% of the target group would
increase their decoding proficiency by 10% as measured by the results of the pre-
and post administration of the Names Test (Cunningham, 1990).
The first objective aimed to improve the target group's identification of sight words. Sight words are identified as those words which a reader recognizes immediately in print. They are also described as words which do not have regular sound-symbol relationships. A sight word is not typically recognized by word parts or individual letters. Sight word recognition requires the student to listen to and select a sight word from other words similar in appearance. Sight word identification requires a student to directly read the word. (Miller, 1995).

According to Miller, although sight word identification is more difficult than sight word recognition, it is the skill that is actually required in reading. A child may need 20-140 meaningful exposures to a word before it becomes a part of the individual's sight word bank and automatically retrieved. An effective reader is able to identify sight words at the level of automaticity.

To determine a child's level of skill in identifying sight vocabulary, the Dolch Basic sight word list (Dolch, 1936) was used. According to Dolch, the list is composed of about 70% of the words most commonly found in first readers, and about 65% of those found in second and third readers. The students were given the assessment at the beginning and end of the practicum implementation. The number of words recognized in isolation were recorded and compared to a scale to determine the child's approximate instructional reading level (Miller, 1995). The list was also used to measure improvement in the identification of sight words.

There are 220 words on the Dolch list (Dolch, 1936). The correct identification of more than 210 words is considered at the level of a third-grade reader while 171-210 is at the second reader level. The researcher expected the students would be able to improve their identification of sight words by 5% by the
end of the implementation. Thus, if a student identified 95% (209 out of 220) of the words correctly on the pretest, then identified 100% (220 out of 220) words on the posttest, there would be a 5% increase in the total number of words identified.

The second objective was designed to encourage more positive attitudes toward pleasure reading. The Self-Anchoring Attitude Scale (LaPray, 1978) was given at the beginning and the end of the implementation. The scale showed differences in how students valued reading and assessed the way a student perceived reading when compared to others. The scale required the children to name and rate someone who loves to read, someone who hates to read, then rate themselves on a scale of zero to ten. The researcher expected the students would achieve at least a 10% increase in their attitudes toward reading. Thus, if a student rated a five on the scale during the pretest, then selected a six on the posttest, there would have been a 10% gain.

The third objective focused on having the students read for pleasure. According to Fractor, Woodruff, Martinez, and Teale (1993), teaching children to read is not sufficient. The importance lies in helping children value reading. At least 20 minutes per day was anticipated to have been allotted for aesthetic reading in class, and at-home reading was encouraged. Students were to have kept records of their reading. The documentation included the student's name, current date, title of the book, and the number of pages read (Appendix D). On a daily basis, the researcher collected the students' logs and recorded the number of pages read. A 25% increase in their reading was assumed to be attainable by the end of the 12 weeks of implementation since the students engaged in little or no pleasure reading at
present. Thus, if a student read eight pages during the first recorded week and increased the weekly reading by at least two pages, for a total of 10 pages, there would have been a 25% increase in the amount of pleasure reading. The students were expected to increase the number of pages read each week by at least 25%. Therefore, each week should have seen a 25% increase in the number of pages read from the preceding week. A student reading eight pages during the first week would have been expected to have read 10 pages the second week, 12.5 pages the third week, 16 pages the fourth week, and so on.

The fourth objective addressed the students' oral reading fluency. According to Durkin (1993), whenever readers have to attend to individual words, attention is taken away from understanding the meaning of the text. Repeated readings were used to improve fluency. The students read a passage comprised of 217 words. The passage was taken from a familiar basal story. The individual timed test score sheet was used to record the students' progress (Appendix E) (Gillet and Temple, 1994). This score was used as a baseline. By the end of the 12 weeks, the students were expected to decrease the amount of time taken to read the passage by 10% and decrease the number of miscues by 50%. Thus, if a student read the pretest passage in three minutes with 10 errors, then read the posttest passage in two minutes and forty-two seconds with five errors, there would have been a 10% decrease in time and 50% decrease in errors. The researcher had originally planned to listen to each child read daily from basal passages, but there was not enough time. After conferring with the host teacher, it was decided that the children would gain the most from their reading experiences if they had a variety of materials from which to choose for their fluent reading practice. The students were shown how to
use a stopwatch and a clock or watch with a second hand to time their reading. The students were to have chosen the readings from 25 preselected books on tape. The researcher placed a pencil mark on the appropriate page and place in each book indicating where the student would stop reading for timed purposes. The researcher had counted the words prior to making the books and tapes available, and knew where the 120 word passages started and stopped. All of the books and tapes used were borrowed from the Title I resource teacher and were at the second- to- third- grade reading level.

Fluency is described as the reading of 120 words per minute (WPM), based on the research of Dowhower (1989). Fluency is so often equated with speed and accuracy that appropriate intonation and phrasing are overlooked (Roller, 1998). Students often believe reading well is the same as reading fast. For this reason, the researcher emphasized attending to the understanding of what was read in addition to improving personal time and accuracy rates. During the pretesting, the researcher found the students were not able to read third-grade materials at the rate of 120 WPM. Therefore, the objective was changed to encourage more realistic advances for each child and to emphasize individual growth.

The students were pre- and posttested using a passage from their basal reader. The first reading was timed and miscues marked. The researcher expected the individual practice with other materials over the course of the implementation would carry over and influence the outcome of the posttest. The students read the same basal passage as in the pretest, and their time and miscues were marked. The times indicated for each student’ tests were converted to seconds, and the difference indicated by a percentage of reduction in time, or RT (Appendix K). The
miscues from each test were compared, and the difference between the scores was shown as a percentage in the reduction of miscues, or RM (Appendix K).

The fifth objective aimed to increase the students' proficiency in decoding unknown words. Fluent readers can immediately recognize sight words, but even proficient readers encounter words that are not familiar in print (Cunningham, 1990). Adams (as cited in Cunningham) estimated that 95% of the words students read occur less than 10 times in every million words in a text. While less proficient students may rely on context, Stanovich (as cited in Cunningham) contends good readers are able to decode words without the use of context. Therefore, the ability to decode unknown words using letter-sound relationships is important.

The students participated in a phonics assessment, The Names Test (Cunningham, 1990), to determine decoding ability. The test was administered as a pre- and posttest. Cunningham's test consisted of 25 pairs of first and last names which required decoding (converting print to sound) rather than encoding (converting sound to print) (Duffelmeyer, Kruse, Merkley, and Fyfe, 1994). The names were selected to meet these criteria: they were not common names; they were fully decodable; they were an accurate representation of the most common phonics elements; and they were balanced in their number of short and long names. The test was individually administered. The examiner explained to the students that they were to imagine themselves as the teacher. They were to read the list of names as if they were taking attendance. The examiner placed a check on the protocol sheet for the names read correctly, and marks phonetic spellings for other responses. There were 25 pairs of names, or 50 words, on the test. The researcher expected the students would increase their proficiency in decoding
unknown words by 20% by the last week of implementation. Thus, if a student achieved a score of 50% (25 correct responses) on the pretest, and made a score of 70% (35 correct responses) on the posttest, there would be a 20% increase in the scores the decoding of unknown words.
CHAPTER II
Research and Planned Solution Strategy

Aesthetic reading is the kind of reading most neglected in schools (Rosenblatt, 1982). When the emphasis on reading literature in the classroom is focused on finding answers to questions asked by the teacher, the literary experience for a student moves from listening aesthetically to listening for the purpose of gathering information (Perry, 1997). The cultivation of the genius in each child does not come from mastering information. Yet textbooks structure 75 to 90 percent of all learning that goes on in schools (Armstrong, 1998). Rosenblatt suggests that the notion a child must first cognitively understand a text before it can be responded to is a rationalization that must be rejected. Purely cognitive, or efferent, reading focuses on what is to be carried away at the end of a reading. Attention is given to ideas and meanings to be retained. The efferent stance is most often public. The aesthetic stance, however, is concerned with the private elements of a text. Students attend to the feelings and emotions derived from the reading. The text is reflected upon and experienced (Rosenblatt, 1991).

The reading of literature in the classroom is most often treated efferently. Though current basal series may be literature-based, the stories within the textbooks are read from an efferent stance. Children’s literature author, Natalie Babbitt, has voiced her concerns over real stories being used in the same ways as the stories in readers of the past. Babbitt (1990) states, “It’s as if the same recipe for stew were being followed in both cases, except that chicken has been substituted for Spam” (p. 697). Teachers often do not know the ways in which to
use the basals in nontraditional ways (Routman, 1996). The results of the attention to the efferent stance are seen in students who can identify characters’ traits and the stories’ elements, but are devoid of personal responses toward the reading itself (Spiegel, 1996). The aesthetic stance intertwines the individuals’ life experiences and the story. Students draw on personal and cultural linguistic-experiential reservoirs in a transaction with the text (Ash, 1994). Aesthetic reading requires the students to construct meanings and interpretations. Learning is not linear and does not develop within the context of a single space or event (Gavelek and Raphael, 1996).

Social interactions support the growth of learning. Learning is a social phenomenon (Smith, 1989, 1992). Thirty years ago, behaviorists shaped the way teachers taught reading. B.F. Skinner (as cited in Tompkins, 1997) suggested that students learn to read by learning a series of sequenced, discrete skills. Since then, the constructivist, interactive, sociolinguistic, and reader response theories have influenced reading instruction.

The constructivist theories, influenced by Piaget (as cited in Tompkins, 1997), define children as active and motivated learners, relating new information to prior knowledge and experiences. The learners organize information in schemata. This view of learning presents the role of the teacher as one who assists students in organizing and constructing their own knowledge.

The interactive theories of Rumelhart and Stanovich (as cited in Tompkins, 1997) emphasize the interconnection between what is known and what is presented in the text. Students use word-identification skills and comprehension strategies. Fluent reading for the purpose of constructing meaning is stressed.
The sociolinguists, Heath and Vygotsky (as cited in Tompkins, 1997), view social interaction as important to learning. They believe language helps to organize thought. Both theorists define the teachers’ positions as those of assistants, providing scaffolding for children as needed. Vygotsky recommends instruction is to be planned based on each child’s zone of proximinal development, that is, the range between actual development and the potential development.

Reader response theories, most often associated with Rosenblatt (1982), are concerned with the ways in which learners create meaning as they read. The theories suggest readers are responsible for making their own meaning which is created as a text is read. Children read for efferent or aesthetic purposes or for a combination of both. The main goal of instruction is for students to enjoy literature and become lifelong readers, though Calkins (1994) prefers to think of it as life-wide literacy, the love of reading and writing throughout the children’s lives today.

The United States Department of Labor’s Secretary’s Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills report (SCANS) (1992) told of the importance in the proficiencies of speaking, listening, and interacting to the workplace of the next century. However, discussion is often pushed aside in the average school day. Talking, alone, is not favorably viewed, yet teachers are in quandary when students are ill at ease when asked to publicly speak (Schmoker, 1996). Some schools have taken note, and adopted a change in their strategies. Programs, such as Mortimer Adler’s Paideia Proposal, emphasize Socratic, or maieutic, teaching (Adler, 1984). The Paideia teachers of English focus on language and literature and evoke the aesthetic, intellectual, and emotional experiences from the students. The Paideia Program holds as a belief that literacy, the acquisition of knowledge, and the ability to think are interdependent.
When reading aesthetically is practiced, and responses are encouraged, students participate in conversations, learn questioning, opinion-giving, and argument. Growth, vision, and discovery are elements teachers aspire to develop in their students. Cognitive, affective, and behavioral growth does not occur solely within the self, but during the interaction with others. Vision emphasizes innovation, change, and awareness. Discovery contains tools of learning, such as reasoning and critical thinking. At its heart is imagination. The imagination is what drives students to think in fluid ways. It allows for the search for a manipulation of ideas in personal experiences and knowledge (Litterst and Eyo, 1993). The aesthetic stance allows discussion to come from the students, extracts the best from their thinking, and frees the teacher from being the focus of interactions.

As students take control of their learning, they are provided with the power of knowing they already possess valuable knowledge. Aesthetic reading reinforces this power by valuing the process of thinking. The exploration and journey through the reading of a book is regarded as highly as the outcome (Smagorinsky and O'Donnell-Allen, 1998a). Teaching reading aesthetically helps to develop students' images by placing them at the controls. It is through literacy that thinking flourishes (Smith, 1989).

Social interaction brings literature alive. Through democratic social interactions, interpretive communities arise. These communities share experiences during reader-response times which give support to students' ideas and provide the basis for trust and support (Spiegel, 1996). For students who have perceived themselves as failures in reading, reader-response reinforces the notion that they can create a story from a text (Ash, 1994). The sharing of literature helps
communities build common ground and develops intertextuality, the kind of construction and reconstruction of meaning that takes place between readers and writers (Cairney, 1990, 1992). As students read, they internalize structures and conventions of literary forms (Atwell, 1987). Their writings are often reflections of the texts they have read. In a study with African Caribbean adolescent girls, Henry (1998) found students engaged in self-expression through response journals and discussions. The students exemplified the notion that how individuals relate to a text is influenced by their prior experiences and social world. Lensmire (as cited in Henry) explains stories as representations of a privileged version of how the world should be and how we would like the world to be. In the retelling of stories, cultural narratives are drawn upon, and these narratives are twisted in ways that express our idiosyncratic worlds.

Creating an environment which fosters risk taking is crucial to the development of higher psychological processes (Gavelek and Raphael, 1996). Fear in the classroom thwarts learning. Parker (as cited in Litterst and Eyo, 1993) suggests that performers do not want to be seen as weak, stupid, or clumsy. The classroom environment and the subcultures existing within influence the dynamics of interactions. Engagement is affected by prior experiences and those in the classroom setting (Smagorinsky and O'Donnell-Allen, 1998a). Henry (1998) suggests being aware of not only cultural differences in the classroom environment and the literature, but also the gender differences. Both culture and gender influence the degree to which students may participate in responses.

Transactions which involve responding affectively and aesthetically, as well as summarizing, predicting, visualizing, making associations, problem solving, and
monitoring, are intended to produce successful readers who independently engage in these processes. This is consistent with Vygotsky's theory of social learning (Brown, El-Dinary, Pressley, and Coy-Ogan, 1995). Schuder (1993) and the staff in a large public school system made use of transactional strategies instruction with at-risk students. The strategies-based program, Students Achieving Independent Learning (SAIL), combined direct explanation, explicit instruction, reader response, and teacher-student-text interactions. Emphasis was placed on ensuring the success of the students by starting at their proficiency levels. The strategies included wait time, non-evaluative judgments about the content of responses, elaboration on responses, and repetition of teacher-modeled responses if the students were unable to respond on their own. All students responded, none could fail, and any response was acceptable because it was a starting point. The researchers combined the strategies within an integrated, meaning-based reading and language arts curriculum and found the students participated in literate discussions beyond expectations. As with the Paideia Program (Adler, 1984), the researchers assumed no student deficits, only that the students had the capacity to learn. Schuder (1993) found a devastating situation during the earlier implementations of the program. Teachers believed the program was appropriate for the gifted and talented students, but required too many skills for the low achievers.

Further studies with the SAIL program suggest that this type of instruction reflects the processes to promote memory and comprehension, as well as aesthetic appreciation (Pressley, El-Dinary, Gaskins, Schuder, Almasi, and Brown, 1992). Pressley et al. describe SAIL as constructivist in nature, but not relying upon rote
memorization. Researchers in the past relied upon quantified measures of memory which were based on the assumption that a text has a particular, objective meaning. The interpretive strategies were not given focus, and attention was diverted to low-level questions or the abstraction of main ideas. These ideas are in opposition to more contemporary theorists, such as Rosenblatt (1978, 1995).

In transactional strategies instruction, many of the concepts are similar to those found in whole language practices. Teachers make decisions about instruction based on students' needs, and make adjustments along the way (Bergman, 1992). Basals or tradebooks can be used, and ample time is given for reading for pleasure. Regular writing is used as a means to respond to reading. The teachers and students conference to ascertain the students' needs and to provide any additional instruction. The children are made aware of how their comprehension is affected by the story structure and make use of metacognition. Grouping is varied, and may consist of whole-class or small groups or pairings of students. The teachers are enthusiastic, and the children feel safe in taking risks (Pressley, El-Dinary, Gaskins, Schuder, Bergman, Almasi, and Brown, 1992). El-Dinary and Schuder (1993) do not see transactional strategies instruction as a quick fix, but one that takes place over time, with teachers receiving modeling, coaching, and problem-solving, just like the students.

The strategy of repeated reading (RR), which can be included within the transactional strategies approach, has been found to be equal to or better than more complicated strategies such as summarization, notetaking, or outlining when students are requested to recall information. For high and low ability students, RR increases factual retention and faster reprocessing of the text. The initial reading of
unfamiliar or technical material usually requires an efferent stance, or more rote learning. Rereadings help students to recall structural information and terms and improve problem solving (Dowhower, 1989). Repeated oral readings encourage deeper thinking about the text, help the student’s story comprehension, and result in more talk.

Chomsky, et al. (as cited in Dowhower, 1989) tells us that rereading the same passage increases the reading rate (number of words per minute) and accuracy (number of words read correctly). Comprehension gains on a practiced text carry over to a new unpracticed text. Dowhower found that after students read a series of five practice stories written at the second-grade level, students had a comprehension increase of 66% to 88% on pretest and posttest unfamiliar passages.

Fluent reading can be supported in the classroom by other strategies as well. The modeling of fluent reading provides students with representations of good reading. Less proficient readers are often assigned to classes with other disfluent readers and are least likely to see positive models. Teachers, or other fluent readers, can model reading daily (Rief and Barbieri, 1995). Tape recorded passages provide models of fluent reading and serve as support for children as they read along. Weiss (as cited in Rasinski, 1989) suggested giving attention to phrase boundaries, such as in poems, by focusing on chunks of words and marking them with a penciled slash.

As children read and are read to, they become familiar with authors’ styles and the rhythm of language. Siemens (1996) read poetry to students and engaged them in frequent writing. Students discovered patterns without being told the qualities of
poetry. Siemens would quick write on the overhead, modeling writing for the students before having them begin. During mini-lessons, the researcher gradually included direct instruction in the elements of poetry. The students, ages six to eight, began the year barely being able to write their names and identify their letters. Through guided imagery and attention to viewing everyday objects and occurrences aesthetically, the students progressed in their achievement.

Hammond (1993), in research with third-grade students, made use of a strategy called the internal screen. This screen, a perceptual base, is the place inside the head from which writing emerges. Hammond explained that writers talk about the five senses, the only routes for getting information into the body. The sensory doors are to be open for the reader to understand the images from the writer's screen. The point of the writing lies in the reader discovering the images, and sharing the same moment or idea. Hammond believes students can write better if teachers show them how to get inside themselves and encourage them to pay attention to their own exact moments. Writing can help to process their experiences. Calkins (1994) discussed the concern for rightness in second and third graders. Calkins suggested this is due to the children becoming more able to distance themselves from their work, and see it through the eyes of others. The concern for rightness often inhibits students' writing and use of figurative language. Their writing is typically limited to trite subjects of someone else's invention. Calkins advised teachers to be aware of the children's focus on procedures, especially when attempting to conduct flexible, intuitive strategies.

The enhancement of vocabulary and comprehension can be achieved through the use of close-captioned television and video (Koskenen, Wilson, Gambrell, and
Captions are similar to the subtitles found in foreign films. Teachers can use close-captioned technology to develop literacy skills. The captioned text, which appears across the bottom of the screen, helps students to engage in guided reading activities. Though captions were originally intended for hearing-impaired and deaf viewers, teachers have discovered the audio and video context is helpful in assisting students in understanding unknown words in print and in vocabulary development. Neuman and Koskinen (as cited in Koskinen et al.) found that bilingual students who viewed close-captioned programming performed better on word meaning, content learning, and word identification assessments than students who viewed the same programs without the captions. Captioned video may also be purposeful in developing character analysis, prediction, and sequencing. Students can read along with the displayed captions and increase their fluency. Since all new televisions sold in the United States since 1993 have built-in closed-captioned capability, many of the students can also take advantage of this feature at home.

Prior knowledge is a critical component of reading comprehension (Spires and Donley, 1998). In a study with high-school students, Donley and Spires conducted research using a prior knowledge activation (PKA) strategy. The students were encouraged to make spontaneous connections between their personal knowledge and informational texts. The researchers believed the informational, or expository, text requires no less personal engagement than narrative texts aesthetically read. In essence, Spires and Donley believed the reader can bring in a full continuum of responses when reading an informational text. This is in keeping with Rosenblatt’s (1978, 1995) view that the reader may approach a reading either efferently or
aesthetically, but will, invariably, make use of both stances. Many (as cited in Spires and Donley) found when comparing efferent and aesthetic responses to literature, the aesthetic responses included higher levels of understanding of the literature. Students made more frequent use of abstract generalizations, analogies, and inferences, and were more varied and creative in their answers when given permission to use their prior knowledge. Overall, the students thought at a higher level about the text. The students’ attitudes were also more positive. This was attributed to the idea that personal knowledge is inherently more motivating than simply retrieving main ideas from an informational text. Schiefele (as cited in Spires and Donley) suggested this as significant because of the positive role intrinsic interest plays in cognitive engagement with learning.

Though teachers, especially those in the elementary schools, may have flexibility within their reading programs, there exists the reality of completing materials, such as end-of-the unit tests. In an effort to reduce the amount of time spent on reading skills within the context of the basal program, Taylor, Frye, and Gaetz (1990) conducted research to investigate the effects of pretesting students on the skills thereby reducing the amount of time spent in their teaching. Even within current literature-based texts, skills are present. The researchers found that when students were engaged in the instruction of skills they already knew, time was taken away from activities, such as the reading of actual books. Taylor et al. discovered that primary through intermediate students, in three different studies, could safely skip 70-90% of the basal reader skills based on the scores from the pretests. This study aimed at reducing the amount of time on indirect skills, not direct instruction. Word-level literacy strategies, in context, are encouraged (Hiebert, 1991).
Morrow (1992) identified classroom characteristics that nurture aesthetic, voluntary reading. During investigations of classrooms where students were frequently engaged in reading by choice, it was found that, characteristically, teachers allotted time and opportunities to self-select books, integrated voluntary reading programs with instruction, had attractive and accessible library areas within the room, and provided literature-related activities. Bissett (as cited by Fractor et al., 1993) found students read 50% more books in classrooms with literature collections. Data collected from 183 classrooms by Fractor et al. showed that as the grades progressed, from K-5, the percentage of classrooms with libraries decreased. Of the classrooms observed, only 10 out of 183 (4.8%) were rated as having good or excellent libraries.

Morrow (1992), in a study of second-grade classes in a literature-based program, found the implementation of regularly scheduled literacy activities and the creation of literacy centers with time for pleasure reading and writing led to an increase in children's literacy performance on several measures. The children, from diverse backgrounds, succeeded in spite of research which is concerned with the lack of direct instruction found in most literature-based programs (Delpit, 1991; Strickland, 1994). Morrow found that when students worked in groups and the teacher held high expectations, modeled, facilitated, and participated in literature activities, there was success. The program made use of literature from cultural backgrounds which made up the target group. This may have made the children more comfortable and receptive to the genres. Other researchers have stressed the importance of including diverse texts in their classroom selections with respect to the learners. Sensitivity and attention to the depictions of characters within the
texts as well as the approach are necessary (Athanasues, 1998; Rasinski and Padak, 1990).

The results of this research echo the importance of classroom libraries. Applebee, Langer, and Mullis (as cited in Fractor et al., 1993) suggested that well-designed libraries promote interaction among children with books. The children develop more positive attitudes toward reading, spend more time engaged in reading, and have higher levels of reading achievement. The role of choice in student engagement was studied by Schraw, Flowerday, and Reisette (1998). In their research with college students, it was found that when students were allowed to self-select reading, the greater perceived autonomy resulted in higher levels of enjoyment and intrinsic motivation. Opportunities for developing self-management and self-regulatory strategies are a part of learning responsibility (Kohn, 1993).

Learners require choices to make connections and develop their own courses for learning (Berghoff and Egawa, 1991). Schraw et al. believe choice may reduce anxiety. Reader response theory suggests that choice promotes aesthetic reading, characterized by a greater sense of pleasure in reading and empathy for the characters. Choice may increase short-term interest in a topic, as well as deeper cognitive processing.

The reading of books aloud offers the opportunities to include strategy instruction in a meaningful context. Daily read aloud sessions stimulate language development, a sense of story structure, and metacognitive awareness. Reading alone may not be sufficient for maximum literacy growth, but the discussion and responses which surround the activity may be the key (Morrow, 1992). Students read and respond aesthetically to books in a variety of ways. Rowe (1998) found
that dramatic play, experiencing books in affective and kinesthetic ways, was an important part of young children's literacy interactions. Wolf (1998) studied remedial readers as they moved from a round robin reading situation to the dramatic forum of a classroom theatre to interpret literary texts. These students had positive results in decoding and comprehending through strategies that included voice, art, and personal experiences. Wynn (1994) offered strategies to teach elements of stories by setting the elements to the tunes of familiar songs. Similarly, stories could be retold using this method. Smagorinsky and O'Donnell-Allen (1998b) studied high school seniors and their process of collaborative multimedia composing as a means of interpreting a text. They found that reading and writing are influenced by prior situated processes and continue to influence future representations. Throughout the reading, mediation is taking place, and their perceptions are influenced by social contexts as well as the written word. Stubley (1995) connected the relation of the musical performance to literary reading. The researcher contends the performer adopts different stances, efferent or aesthetic, in the reading, practicing, and performance of works. The musical performance is the discovering and shaping of musical meaning for others, and is the experience required to bring the individual, musical self to its fullest potential.

The first objective aimed to improve the students' achievement in identifying sight words. The rereading of tradebooks with a high percentage of high-frequency words can provide practice in calling students' attention to the words in a meaningful context (Dowhower, 1989). The researcher placed the high-frequency Dolch (1936) words on bookmarks (Tompkins, 1998). This was intended to keep the students focused on the words and help them to save their places when
reading. Mini lessons were used to emphasize the most frequently used words, using a recite and spell-out strategy (Tompkins, 1997). Students had word cards available to practice word building. The cards were kept in a clear storage bag and placed in the literacy/library area of the room. The students could practice building their sight words and other vocabulary which exemplified spelling patterns or particular phonics from their basal stories, either independently or with a partner (Tompkins, 1998).

The second objective sought to increase positive attitudes toward reading. The researcher enhanced the teacher's literacy center with books appropriate for the reading levels and interests of the children (Morrow, 1992; Fractor et al., 1993). Students had opportunities to select their own readings and were to have been given time in class to read for pleasure (Morrow, 1992; Fractor et al.; Schraw et al., 1998). The target group was encouraged to actively respond to texts, drawing on prior knowledge and experiences (Rosenblatt, 1978; Litterst and Eyo, 1993; Spires and Donley, 1998).

An increase in pleasure reading was the third objective. By making books more available to the children in a classroom library, the researcher expected the students to engage in more reading (Routman, 1996). The researcher encouraged the host teacher to pretest the students on the basal skills found at the end-of-the unit tests. If a significant number of children passed the tests, time could be saved and spent on reading (Taylor, Frye, and Gaetz, 1990). In response to books of various genres read by the teacher and students, the target group expressed their thoughts and feelings through music, art, and drama (Hammond, 1993; Wynn, 1994; Stubley, 1995; Siemens, 1996; Rowe, 1998). The researcher read to the
students during each session, and the host teacher began to give the students opportunities to order books through a mail-order book club.

The fourth objective focused on improving the oral reading fluency of the target group. Repeated readings (Dowhower, 1989) have been proven effective in improving fluency. The students were to practice rereading selected texts in class. There were books on tape and tape recorders and players for use in class. Students were encouraged to listen and read along with the books, as well as record their readings. Listening to fluent reading helps readers to become fluent. Rereading into the tape recorder can help them to notice the expression and speed of their voices. They can also monitor their own growth by listening to the changes in each reading (Rasinski, 1989).

The fifth objective aimed to improve the students' efficiency in decoding. The researcher embedded minilessons throughout the implementation to address the individual and group needs of the students. Phonics lessons were presented within meaningful contexts.
CHAPTER III

Method

Fourteen third-grade students participated in the implementation of the practicum. The researcher embedded the teaching of strategies within the activities. The classroom teacher, the researcher, and the students made use of word walls, charts, word games, recorded texts, technology (for additional research and writing), journals, and tradebooks. Supplementary print materials were placed in the room, and charts held the titles of books, authors, illustrators, and information from minilessons. The students were encouraged to bring print materials from home as they related to the class themes. The implementation plans do not include the individual or small-group minilessons which took place as the researcher observed and interacted with the students and during teachable moments. Phonics instruction was embedded within the context of reading and writing. Connections to phonics were also made in print throughout the room, in tradebooks, on charts, and in students’ names. The close-captioned feature on the television was expected to be used to assist in vocabulary development, decoding, and reading comprehension.

As the students became confident and fluent in their reading, they were given the opportunity to share familiar books and their own written works with another class. The students were also given support to present dramatic retellings to their first-grade book buddies with whom they met on Fridays. The researcher worked collaboratively with the host teacher in planning for the fifth day of instruction. Four days per week were illustrated in the following plans. Approximately 50
minutes per day were to have been made available to the researcher for the implementation of the practicum proposal. The researcher spent 12-16 hours per week engaged in the implementation as well in responding to journals, organizing materials, and conferencing with the host and grade-level teachers about reading instruction and practices.

**Week one.**

The implementation of the practicum took place over 12 weeks, beginning February 16, 1999, and ending on June 4, 1999. The schedule was adapted to fit the needs of the host teacher and the students with regard to field trips, spring vacation, standardized testing, and other school-wide commitments. During the first week, the researcher gathered information about the students. A teacher-made survey was used to find out about the students' perceptions of themselves as readers (Appendix G). The Self-Anchororing Attitude Scale (LaPray, 1978) was also administered. The Names Test (Cunningham, 1990) was given to determine if the children could decode unfamiliar words. The Dolch Word List (Dolch, 1936) was used assess the students' knowledge of sight words. The students orally read a researcher-selected basal passage as a pretest for reading fluency. To assess the students' familiarity with books, and to check if they have recently read on their own, the researcher requested that the students write down the names of their favorite book authors and the titles of favorite books.

**Weeks two through eleven.**

**Session 1**

The students wrote in their dialogue journals. The students participated in writing each morning when they entered the room. The researcher or the teacher
responded to the students' entries before the following day. The purposes of the
journals were to create a context for genuine writing, allow for interaction,
promote the sharing of personal expressions and reflection on topics, and for
practice in written language for communication. The teacher and researcher noted
patterns and changes in writing which could serve to help guide instruction for
individual students. (Note: The journals were not intended to be graded or edited
by the teacher or researcher.) The children were given prompts, but were always
couraged to choose their own topics and create a dialogue with the researcher
and host teacher.

The theme of caring and sharing was the focus of the second and third weeks of
implementation. This theme was previously established by the classroom teacher.
Prior to reading aloud to the class, the researcher presented a minilesson on the
use of visualization while reading or listening to a story. The researcher read a
tradebook aloud to the whole group using the Directed Listening-Thinking
Approach (DLTA), a procedure developed by Stauffer (as cited in Tompkins,
1998). The DLTA approach was used throughout the implementation for
unfamiliar books.

The purpose of a word wall was discussed, and the researcher and students
participated in its construction. Words were added to the wall as books were read
by both the researcher and the students. The words were used, as needed, in
meaningful phonics teaching as well as other activities. The students were to have
kept a folder of words they knew and wanted to learn throughout the
implementation. This was begun, but the researcher later found that it was not
regularly used by the students or favored by the host teacher. Therefore, after two
weeks, the words were placed on large, laminated posterboards for reference. The words were categorized in columns with an alphabetical-letter heading. The lists were added to regularly with a wipe-off pen. They were placed on the wall in view of most of the class. However, children on the far side of the room had to get out of their seats to observe them.

A book talk was conducted by the researcher (Tompkins, 1998). Several books related to the theme of caring and sharing were introduced to the students. The researcher briefly discussed the titles, authors, genres or topics, and plots of the books to encourage the students’ interests in their reading.

Recorded books were available in the literacy center to enhance the aesthetic reading experiences. The students were asked to document the date, title of book, and number of pages read for pleasure.

Session 2

Students wrote in their journals. Prior to introducing the day’s tradebook, the researcher demonstrated a quickwrite and quickdraw, strategies used to help the students focus on the exploration and development of ideas (Tompkins, 1998). (The strategies were used after the students had heard the story.) The researcher read a tradebook aloud to the class.

The students used quickwrites and quickdraws to respond to the day’s book, then shared them with the class. They were to have kept their quickdraws, quickwrites, charts, lists, and other useful information in reading notebooks. This procedure did not always take place, and the host teacher often collected papers instead of having the students add them to their notebooks. Following the activity, the students were to have read for pleasure.
Session 3

The students wrote in their journals. The students viewed a videotaped version of the previous day’s tradebook. The captioned feature on the television was expected to have been used. However, the media specialist confirmed the television in the host teacher’s room did not have the captioned feature, and the teacher expressed a preference for using an alternative method for presenting the program.

The researcher had initially planned for the class to participate in a tea party (Tompkins, 1998) and read teacher-selected excerpts from the tradebooks from the first two lessons. Copies were made of selected excerpts from the story. The students were to have received a copy of an excerpt. Next, they would have moved around the room, reading and sharing the excerpts with others. However, the researcher’s time was shortened, and the activity was canceled. Additional time for aesthetic reading was forefeited.

Session 4

The students wrote in their journals. Following an introduction, the researcher read aloud from a tradebook related to the theme of caring and sharing. Next, the students engaged in quickwrites related to the story.

The researcher conducted a minilesson on word building, an activity in which letter cards are arranged to spell words. According to Cunningham and Cunningham (as cited in Tompkins, 1998), the students can practice spelling and phonics concepts as they build words.

The students constructed words from cards the researcher had prepared for the activity. The words represented those found in their current basal story. These
words were kept in plastic (Ziploc) bags for future use in the literacy area of the classroom. This activity was continued throughout the implementation as the class read their basal stories. The students were to have read for pleasure.

**Week three.**

**Session 5**

The students engaged in writing in their journals. The researcher introduced a new tradebook to the students and read it aloud. The students discussed the book within the story circle. The theme of caring and sharing continued throughout the week.

A minilesson was conducted with the researcher modeling sketch-to-stretch, an activity suggested by Harste, Short, and Burke (as cited in Tompkins, 1998), and used to develop deeper understandings of the characters, theme, story elements, and author’s craft. The students focused on what the story meant, not on particular characters or events. Symbols, shapes, and colors were used to express interpretations and feelings. Prior to the students’ participation in this collaborative activity, the researcher modeled the process. The activity continued into the next day’s session.

The researcher asked the students to think about topics of interest for the purpose of helping them to select library books the next day. The students were to have completed this brainstorming/writing activity at home, and return the list the following day. The students read, briefly, for enjoyment.

**Session 6**

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher introduced and shared a tradebook aloud with the students. Following the reading, the students responded orally to the book.
The researcher discussed how to select books from the class, school, or public library. The Goldilocks strategy (Ohlhausen and Jepsen, 1992) for the selection of books was presented and adapted to the students' needs. The strategy was placed on a chart and displayed in the room. The researcher asked the students to share some of the topics they wrote down on their lists from the previous night. A minilesson on locating books in the library was to have followed in the classroom, but was changed to take place in the media center.

The students visited the school's library and selected books of interest for pleasure reading. When the students returned to the classroom, they completed their sketch-to-stretch projects. Those who finished early read their library selections.

**Session 7**

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher introduced and shared a tradebook aloud with the students. The students responded orally to the book, sharing their feelings and opinions.

The students were asked to think about the books read during the past two weeks related to the theme of caring and sharing. The authors, illustrators, and titles were reviewed from a chart where they had been recorded. The students had their choice of mini-projects to do as a culminating activity. They chose from the following: select a book, read either by the researcher or silently, and create a story box; make a poster advertising a favorite book; dramatize the story with a small group; record a fluent reading of the book; or write a retelling of the story. The students selected a mini-project and began. After working on their projects, the students were encouraged to read for pleasure.
Session 8

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher reread the students’ favorite tradebook aloud. The students continued to work on, and complete, their projects. The researcher photographed the students’ projects and displayed the pictures for others to see. The students wrote captions for the photos. Those choosing to share projects did so. The students then read for pleasure.

Week four.

Session 9

The students wrote in their journals. Poetry, the theme for the next two weeks, was introduced. The theme was linked to the basal theme related to learning about oneself. The researcher posted a class K-W-L chart. The strategy, developed by Ogle (as cited in Tompkins, 1998), was used to encourage the students to brainstorm what they knew about poetry. Their responses were placed under the K. Next, the students generated questions for the W column. This column contained what they wanted to know, and what they were wondering, about the subject. As questions were answered throughout the unit, the last column was to be completed. This third column was headed by and L, representing what the children had learned.

The researcher shared a book of poetry aloud with the students. The students were asked to respond to the reading. Following the reading, the researcher presented a booktalk for the books of poetry available throughout the unit.

The researcher displayed a poem written on chart paper. After a reading of the poem by the researcher, the students read the poem in different ways. The students echo read, small-group read, and cumulatively read. The students were to have read for pleasure.
Session 10

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher conducted a minilesson on the sounds of feelings (Brewer and Campbell, 1991). The students explored the voice as a mode of expression. Long vowel sounds were used to express and explore emotions.

The students integrated their minds and bodies and activated their brain centers by stimulating their total visual fields in preparation for listening and responding to poetry. The students stood, each with one arm straight out. A fist was made with the thumb pointing up. The arm moved, making a figure eight, horizontally. As the arm moved, the eyes followed the thumb, with the head slightly moving (Brewer and Campbell, 1991).

The researcher introduced another poetry book to students and read it aloud. The students participated in image streaming to explore the scientific process of observation and inquiry, build language skills, encourage the ability to produce imagery, and expand awareness (Brewer and Campbell, 1991). The students listened to relaxing background music, and worked in pairs. One student closed his or her eyes and described all the images that came to mind, as detailed as possible. After three minutes, the students switched roles. The other student imaged for three minutes. When the second student was done, the pair got new partners. They continued for one more imaging session.

The researcher and the students talked about their experiences in imaging, and how the process may influence prewriting and reading. The students read for pleasure, silently and in pairs, and practiced their reading for fluency. The students thought about subjects to explore to guide their book selections in the library the
following day. The host teacher included this as a part of the homework assignment.

**Session 11**

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher provided an introduction to a poetry book, then read it aloud. The students shared their thoughts and feelings about the poetry. The researcher had planned to present overhead transparencies of copies of other children's poems and have the class talk about them, noting their choice of words and rhythm. However, there was a change in the schedule and this activity did not take place. The students and the researcher visited the library to check out new books. After returning to the classroom, the students read for pleasure.

**Session 12**

The students wrote in their journals. After an introduction, a book of poetry was read aloud. The students shared their reactions to the book. The researcher conducted a minilesson on the writing of poetry, modeling the writing of word pictures (free-verse) (Cecil, 1994), writing a group poem on the board, and then had the students compose their own. The students shared their poems with others. The host teacher had the students publish the poems using the computer. When the students were finished with their activity, they were to have read for pleasure. The writing and typing, though, comprised the remainder of class time. The researcher discussed the importance of having time for the students to read in class with the host teacher. The decision to encourage the students to have books at their desks and have the freedom to move about to retrieve books from the class collection was agreed upon and put into practice. The students could read during
any break, such as after journal writing. An effort was made to put reading for aesthetic purposes at the beginning of the period as well as at the end.

Week five.

Session 13

The students wrote in their journals. The poetry theme continued throughout the week. After an introduction, a poetry book was read aloud and discussed. The researcher conducted a minilesson on various types of poems and had planned to model the writing of apology poems (Cecil, 1994). The students were to write apologies to inanimate objects, then dramatize their works. The host teacher decided to have the students do diamante poems instead. The class continued with this substitution.

Session 14

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher introduced and read from a book of poetry. The students responded to the book. A minilesson was presented on alliteration numbers (Cecil, 1994). The researcher modeled the poem, read examples, provided group practice, and had the students write their own. The class shared after their writing was completed. The students read for pleasure. Outside of class, the students were to have generated a list of books or topics they would like to pursue in the library the next day. This activity was assigned by the host teacher as homework.

Session 15

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher read aloud from a book of poetry, and the students offered their responses. Volunteers read familiar poems aloud to the class. Next, the students visited the school’s library and selected books. Upon their return from the library, the students read, briefly, for pleasure.
Session 16

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher shared a poetry book aloud. The students continued to read their favorite poems for the class. The researcher modeled the writing of a color poem, a poem that describes one or several colors (Cecil, 1994). After modeling the process and creating a group poem, the students were to have written their own. Not enough time was available for them to write. The researcher later recopied the group poem and displayed it on the class bulletin board.

Week six.

Session 17

The students wrote in their journals. The next week focused on the basal theme of adventure. The researcher read adventure/survival/mystery stories. After introducing the theme and book, the researcher read aloud. The students responded orally to the reading.

The researcher presented a booktalk for the books related to the current theme. Following the booktalk, a minilesson on the elements of adventure, survival, and mystery stories were given.

The students discussed adventures they experienced. The students were asked to listen to the news, read newspapers, and talk to others for information about people or animals that had adventures, survived against the odds, or had something mysterious occur in their lives. As they discovered these stories, they could share them with the class, write about them, or have people (and their animals) visit the class. Following the minilesson, the students read for pleasure and practiced reading for fluency.
Session 18

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher read aloud from the current tradebook. After a grand conversation, the students watched a video featuring a mystery book. The viewing was followed by a discussion. The students were asked to brainstorm books or topics to aid in their selection of the following day’s library books. The host teacher wrote this on the board as a part of the students’ homework.

Session 19

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher read aloud from a tradebook related to the theme. After modeling the process, the students and the researcher created a five-senses cluster related to the day’s book (Tompkins, 1997). The students visited the school’s library and checked out books. Upon their return, the students did not have time to read for enjoyment before preparing to leave for their next class.

Session 20

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher read aloud from a tradebook related to the current theme. Next, the students were to have shared mysteries or adventures they had discovered outside of school. These were to have been listed and posted for the students to use for further research and future writing. Their remarks were few, and the researcher added to the discussion and list. The students then created open mind portraits (Tompkins, 1998), reflecting on the (day’s) story events from the characters’ viewpoint. Following the activity, the students read for pleasure.
Week seven.

Session 21

The students wrote in their journals. A new theme was introduced for the next two weeks. The researcher focused on folklore. The students participated in a grand conversation following the reading. The researcher presented a booktalk for the books related to the current theme. After the booktalk, the researcher discussed the elements of folklore as they related to the day's book. (The students discussed the elements and themes of folklore as the unit progressed and as a part of the regular discussion following the reading of the books.)

The researcher conducted a minilesson on variants of folktales with the students. Variants were read and others recommended for reading. Following the minilesson, the students read for pleasure.

Session 22

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher read folktales to the students, followed by a grand conversation. The researcher conducted a minilesson on folksongs and work songs. Recordings were to have been played for the students with the students dramatizing selected songs. A change in the schedule required this activity to be omitted. The recordings were, instead, placed in a listening center, along with poetry on tape. The researcher reminded the children to brainstorm the topics they would like to pursue, and be ready for a visit to the school's library on the following day. This was written on the board as a homework assignment by the host teacher.

Session 23

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher presented and read folklore
to the students. Oral responses followed. The researcher presented a minilesson on the author’s use of exciting, descriptive language. Following the lesson, the students visited the library and selected books. After their return, the students had approximately five minutes for pleasure reading.

Session 24

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher read aloud from a tradebook. The students responded to the reading through a grand conversation. Following the discussion, the students constructed a story map for a selected tale (Routman, 1994). The researcher demonstrated the process and had the students copy the map as they participated in its construction. After the completion of the map, the students read for pleasure.

Week eight.

Session 25

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher read aloud tales from tradebooks related to the current theme and held a discussion on the role of illustrations in conveying the theme of a picture book. The students and the researcher constructed a comparison chart (Routman, 1991) for the two tales. When the chart was completed, the students were to have been given time to read.

Session 26

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher read aloud from a tradebook. The students made quickdraws and quickwrites in response to the book. When done, volunteers shared with the class. The students were to assume the identity of a character from the day’s story and write a simulated letter in the friendly letter form (Tompkins, 1998). This was not done, and the host teacher
chose to conduct a letter-writing activity at another time. The students were reminded to consider the kinds of books they would like to check out from the library on the following day. The reminder was placed on the board as a homework assignment.

Session 27

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher read aloud to the students from a tradebook. A grand conversation followed the reading. The students were to have resumed the writing of their simulated letters from the prior day. The host teacher chose to conduct another lesson the day before, and that lesson was completed. The students visited the library and selected books.

Session 28

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher revisited previously read books and stories from the unit. The students were to have had a tea party, moving around, sharing and reading excerpts from the selections, but the schedule was shortened. The students viewed a video presentation focusing on a theme-related book. Following the video and discussion, the students read for pleasure.

Week nine.

Session 29

The students wrote in their journals. The basal theme, the great outdoors/animals/unusual pets, was introduced to the students. The accompanying literature included both fiction and nonfiction. The teacher read aloud to the students. The researcher presented a booktalk, sharing books related to the current theme. The students constructed their own K-W-L charts related to animals. They focused on particular animals of interest to pursue in their reading and writing.
The students and the researcher generated a list of the names of animals. Next, a list of words with the same initial sound was dictated. The students worked together to construct tongue twisters. (Ex.- Jolly jaguars juggled jugs of jelly in Japan.) These were placed on the bulletin board. The students read for pleasure after the activity was completed.

**Session 30**

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher shared tradebooks with the students and several examples of haiku poetry. After a discussion, the researcher presented a minilesson on composing a haiku poem (Cecil, 1994). The students participated in a class haiku. Next, they worked in pairs to construct their own. Following the writing and sharing of the poetry, the students read for pleasure.

**Session 31**

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher read aloud to the students. A discussion followed the reading. The researcher presented a minilesson and modeled a beginning-middle-end story map for a familiar book. The students then worked together to construct their own story maps. After the completion of the maps, the students read for pleasure and recorded the pages read. The students were reminded to consider the kinds of books they’d like to check out from the library the next day.

**Session 32**

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher read aloud to the students, and then held a grand conversation. The researcher conducted a minilesson and modeled the construction of a plot profile for tracking the excitement or tension in the story by using a previously read book (Lane, 1993). The students then plotted
the day's story together. Following the activity, the students visited the library to check out books. When the students returned to the classroom, they did not have time to read for pleasure as previously planned.

**Week ten.**

**Session 33**

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher introduced the students to children's book authors, the theme for the week. The researcher shared tradebooks from featured authors followed by a grand conversation.

The students made a class acrostic poem using the name of the author from the day's books. The students read for pleasure and practiced their fluent reading.

**Session 34**

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher shared several tradebooks aloud from a featured author. Additional books from the author were presented in a booktalk. After the booktalk, the students reread the books read aloud, and read unfamiliar books from the same author. When done, they chose a book as a basis for making a mobile depicting the story's elements, title, author, and illustrator, and a favorite quote or line. The students worked in small groups to complete the project. The students were to have read for pleasure when they were done with the construction of the mobile. The researcher reminded the students to be ready to check out books from the library the following day.

**Session 35**

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher read tradebooks aloud from a featured author. Following the reading, a grand conversation was held. A booktalk was given and other books by the author were discussed. The students
watched a video containing a book by the day's author. The researcher had planned for the students to begin making book jackets, but the plan was changed to the theme of junk art, making use of wires and found objects. The host teacher had the students take the project home to finish.

**Session 36**

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher read tradebooks from a featured author aloud. A grand conversation followed. The students shared their completed art from the prior day with the class, and projects were displayed in the school library. The students visited the library and checked out books for the final time for the current year. The students were given time to read their books for pleasure upon returning to the room.

**Week eleven.**

**Session 37**

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher introduced the roles of art and artists in children's literature. Tradebooks featuring a selected artist were read. Background information on the artist was shared. A grand conversation followed. After a minilesson on the elements of art, including line, shape, texture, color, design, media, and technique, the students began a comparison chart for the theme's artists. The first row on the chart represented the day's featured illustrator. The chart included the aforementioned elements of art. The researcher provided examples of art from the past and present and compared the styles (Impressionistic, etc.). The researcher was to have presented and modeled the artist's technique, but the lesson had to be changed because of time. The students would have chosen a section or quote from a selected book to interpret in the
same medium. Media investigated throughout the week included collage, watercolors, woodcuts, pastels, scratchboard, and conte pencil.

Session 38

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher focused on another important children's book illustrator's life and work. After selected readings and a grand conversation, the researcher had the students generate information for the comparison chart. The students began creating their autobiographies in the picture book format. The researcher presented examples prior to their construction, and provided a format for the books. The students were to have continued with the projects the next day. However, the host teacher decided it was better to assign them as homework. The students read for pleasure after working on their autobiographies.

Session 39

The students wrote in their journals. The day's featured illustrator was introduced. Books which featured the illustrator were shared and read. The students responded to the books, added to the comparison chart, and shared their projects from the previous day. The students were given time to read for enjoyment and for practicing fluent reading.

Session 40

The students wrote in their journals. The researcher presented a new illustrator. Books illustrated by the artist were read and shared. The students completed the comparison chart. The students were to have viewed a video on the life and work of one of the theme's selected artists, but watched a video with the artwork featured instead. When done, the contents of the video were discussed, and time was given for pleasure reading.


Week twelve.

During the twelfth week of implementation, the researcher administered the post assessments. A list was received from the library to note changes in the frequency of books checked out by the target group (Appendix J). All of the researcher's tradebooks were left in the room for the children's use until the end of the school year.

Equipment and Materials

The students were given notebooks in which to keep personal goal sheets, special writing, and any other work done as a part of the implementation process. At the end of the implementation, they were permitted to keep the notebooks. The researcher had tradebooks that were appropriate for the target group's classroom library, and purchased and checked out additional books from the school's library. The school's media specialist and media assistant were very helpful in granting requests for library circulation records, books, and display areas for student projects. They also encouraged the researcher to take discarded materials for classroom use. The materials included children's magazines which were given to the students.

An overhead projector, screen, and pens were made available for demonstrations and modeling of activities. The researcher also brought in dry-erase boards for use during minilessons. An author's chair, laminated book jackets from featured books, puppets, a camera and film, index cards, clear storage bags (Ziploc), a stop watch (for timed readings), and art supplies were provided by the researcher. The host teacher had tape players, recorders, and books-on-tape available for use. The present classroom library needed additional shelving and display units. These were provided by the researcher.
CHAPTER IV

Results

After the 12 weeks of implementation, 80% of the target group were expected to have improved their identification of sight vocabulary by a minimum of 5% as measured by the pre- and posttests using the Dolch Word List (Dolch, 1936). This objective was not achieved. Twenty-nine percent of the target group made at least a 5% improvement. During the initial week of implementation, the researcher met with each child and had him or her read the words aloud from individual lists of 20 words each. The lists contained the Dolch words in descending order of frequency of use (Miller, 1995). There were 11 lists and a total of 220 words. Each list received a score. The presentation of the individual lists prevented the children from being overwhelmed from seeing too many words at once, and permitted the researcher to focus on specific lists with ease. The total number of words identified were compared to a reading scale to determine the reading level and to document the sight words known to the students (Miller, 1995). During pretesting, the researcher found that all but four of the students performed at the third-grade level. Seventy-one percent of the students tested already had scores that fell within the third-grade range before the implementation (Appendix F). The scores on the pre- and posttests indicated 29% of the target group showed a gain in the total number of sight words identified. Therefore, expecting a 5% increase in the number of words correctly identified by 80% of the class was not possible because only 29% needed 5% or more improvement.
After the 12 weeks of implementation, 80% of the target group were expected to have demonstrated 10% more positive attitudes toward reading as evidenced by pre- and post-surveys using the Self-Anchoring Attitude Scale (LaPray, 1978). This objective was not met. Sixty-four percent of the target group achieved a gain of at least 10%. The second objective made use of the Self-Anchoring Attitude Scale (LaPray, 1978). The scale ranged from zero as the lowest ranking to ten as the highest. The student was asked to name someone who hates to read. This person's name was placed at the bottom of the scale, along with the reason. Next, the student was asked to name someone who loves to read. This person's name was placed at the top of the list with the supporting response. The last rating on the scale was reserved for the student. The child was asked to think about where he or she would fall on the scale, with zero representing the lowest and ten the highest. This assessment was given during the first and the twelfth weeks of implementation to determine changes in attitude of reading. The results of the pre- and posttests Appendix H) show 29% (four students) made less than a 10% gain in improving their attitudes toward reading while 64% (nine students) made a 10% or higher gain. One student did not lose or gain, keeping the same score as on the pretest. The researcher is not sure what affected the students whose scores reflected a loss in their positive attitudes toward reading. All of the students who responded negatively may have been experiencing conditions which were affecting how they felt about themselves in general. In class, they always seemed enthusiastic. The researcher, therefore, believes the ways students feel about themselves in regard to their reading may be influenced by conditions outside of the classroom as well as the environment within.
After the 12 weeks of implementation, 80% of the target group were expected to have increased their pleasure reading by 25% as measured by the number of pages read and recorded in student logs (Appendix D). This objective was not met. The results proved not to be valid in measuring progress as anticipated. The researcher and the students were to monitor the number of pages read for pleasure. This information was kept on log sheets (Appendix D). The students were asked to write their names on the first line, the date the pages were read on the second line, the title of the book on the third line, and the number of pages read on the fourth line. The researcher checked the logs daily, and kept a record of the students' progress on a class chart. This objective was difficult to measure due to the design and time schedule. Not all of the students were able to read each day as planned. The researcher had expected at least 20 minutes per day would be devoted to having the students read for pleasure. Some days, the students had no or very little time, while other days, they had up to 30 minutes. This was an issue which greatly affected their success in meeting the objective. Additionally, some students read, but did not remember to write down the information. The validity of their experiences was also questionable. Several students appeared to be genuinely reading, while their classmates flipped pages. The researcher found all of this terribly frustrating. The intention was to encourage reading for pleasure, not as work or as an assignment. While the students did increase their interaction with books and all read and recorded their reading at some time during the implementation, the consistent, exponential growth expected by the researcher did not take place.
The results of the students' independent readings have been reported by comparing their readings during the first week of implementation with the number of pages read over the course of the 12 weeks (Appendix I). Since none of the students reported reading for pleasure during class time prior to the implementation, all of the participants showed a gain. However, the breakdown of the number of pages, by week, does not show consistent growth for all students (Appendix I). Therefore, the students did not increase their pleasure reading, as indicated by the number of pages read, by 25%. Better use of individually-developed student goals for each week, and consistent time allotted for reading, would have helped the children to see and monitor growth.

The researcher also received a printed copy of the students' library activity during the twelfth week of implementation. The increased borrowing of library books was used as assessment tool. The circulation records from before and after the implementation were compared (Appendix J). The results illustrate the class increased their exploration of literature as evidenced by the number of books checked out as compared to the months prior to implementation.

After the 12 weeks of implementation, 80% of the target group were expected to have increased their fluency in oral reading by 66% as measured by timed reading tests (Appendix E). This objective was changed. New objective: After the 12 weeks of implementation, 80% of the target group were to have increased their fluency in oral reading as evidenced by a 10% reduction in time and a 50% reduction in miscues on individual, timed reading tests (Appendix E). This objective was not met. Only 50% of the students decreased their time by 10% or more. Seventy-nine percent decreased the number of miscues by 50% or more.
Oral reading passages from the current basal were used in the assessment. As the students read, the researcher monitored the fluency of the readings, marking any miscues on the (researcher’s) copy of the story. A stopwatch was used to time the students' readings. The time was recorded on the timed test score sheet (Appendix E). The reading of the same passage was also done at the end of the 12 weeks. The results of the timed readings indicate 100% of the participants increased their fluent reading rate (Appendix K). However, only 50% decreased their time, while 79% decreased the number of miscues. Therefore, the class did not meet the objective. A more accurate measure of their success may have been measured with the students practicing a passage with a buddy, recording on paper the three timed readings, then reading the passage to the researcher. The researcher could have obtained more samples of the students' progress over time and observed miscues. The modeling of marking miscues could also have been done so that students could monitor each other during oral reading. If this activity was done in the researcher's regular classroom, a component to also check for comprehension would be added. This would not necessarily have to be a formal test, but could be in the form of a booktalk with a group of children who have read the same book. Comprehension may be checked using anecdotal records written during the discussions.

The fourth objective was also difficult to implement because of the element of time. Since consistent time (20 minutes) was not given to the children to read on a daily basis, they did not have regular opportunities to practice reading for fluency. The host teacher was cooperative and caring, but getting the commitment to change the schedule to include regular reading was not achieved during the implementation.
After the 12 weeks of implementation, 80% of the target group were expected to have increased their decoding proficiency by 10% as measured by the results of the pre- and post administration of the Names Test (Cunningham, 1990). This objective was not met. Fifty-seven percent of the students increased their decoding proficiency. The Names Test (Cunningham, 1990) was a brief test used to assess students' abilities to decode names. The procedure for implementing the assessment began with the researcher explaining to the children that they were to pretend to be a teacher who must read the names on the list as if taking attendance. The child could not receive help, but should guess, if possible. On a separate copy of the list, the researcher placed a check by each word read correctly. Phonetic spellings for words pronounced incorrectly were written above each word. The responses were deemed correct if all the syllables were pronounced regardless of the accent. When the student was finished with the test, the researcher analyzed the responses, noting patterns which indicate decoding strengths and weaknesses. This test was also given as a posttest. The results of the test showed 57% of the students increased their decoding proficiency by 10% or more, 14% increased by less than 10%, 21% showed no change, and 7% displayed a loss (Appendix L). (The student experiencing a loss is being retained, at the parents’ request, and will be in the third grade again next year.) The results of the test also indicate that while there were gains by 57% of the students, only one student scored 100%. This suggests to the researcher that decoding skills are still needed as a part of instruction in the classroom.

The researcher feels that expecting 80% of the target group to achieve the objectives in 12 weeks may not have been a realistic goal. Considering there were
only 14 students in the class, a goal of 50% would have been a more reasonable expectation. The class, overall, made improvements. However, the researcher believes too many of the objectives required major changes in routine of the host teacher and the students. Implementing such enterprises early in the school year could have made a greater difference.

Variables affecting the success of the program

During the implementation, the host teacher suffered extreme stress due to the prolonged illness and subsequent death of a fellow teacher. There were days when the host teacher was emotionally and physically exhausted. The teacher’s routine had been profoundly changed with the implementation of the practicum, and the loss of a close friend drastically altered another very familiar part of life. Therefore, the researcher always remained flexible in making adjustments, and acknowledged the challenges in modifying patterns and schedules. In this situation, the stability of an unchanging class environment may have been a need for the host teacher.

The most significant variable affecting the outcome of the practicum in a negative manner was the management of time for the students to read for enjoyment and practice fluent reading. While this was an obstacle to overcome, the host teacher recognized the importance of making time for reading. The teacher has already made plans to set aside reading time next year, add to the selections in the class library, and borrow more books from the school’s media center for class use.

The activities which seemed to have the most positive impact on influencing aesthetic reading were the researcher’s daily oral reading, the sharing of books and discussions of authors and illustrators, and visiting the library each week. The students liked to reread the books that had been read aloud, and would check them
out from the media center when given the opportunity. One student, the only nonnative English speaker in the class, consistently sought books by a favorite author and illustrator discussed and shared in class. The child nearly always had one of the books at his desk, and it would be open as soon as other tasks were done. This outcome, though not shown or measured by the objectives, was evidence of the power of introducing children to literature and making it readily available to them.
CHAPTER V

Recommendations

This project would be of use as a resource for teachers who are looking for ways to enhance the aesthetic reading in their classes. The ideas presented in this practicum are not limited to third-grade use. Many of the plans and research have their place throughout the curriculum and across the grades. Administrators may also find the project helpful in that it poses the challenges of including aesthetic reading in the classroom. In situations, such as the one in which this practicum took place, the departmentalization of language arts contributed to a constrained environment for the host teacher. Integration of literature in other subjects was difficult since the teacher did not have all of the same students for the remainder of the day, and activities had to be tightly scheduled to avoid running late.

The researcher is hopeful the practicum could continue to encourage educators to make time for aesthetic reading, and to make the language arts class a place where students are actually engaged in the act of reading. The activities and strategies presented in the practicum are feasible and can realistically be implemented throughout the year in a classroom. In order to integrate new strategies, teachers may have to reexamine their philosophy of education and the teaching of reading in order to make necessary changes to facilitate the implementation. During the practicum, the students simply did not have enough time, on a daily basis, to read. After conferring with other grade-level teachers, this was viewed as an area of need. All of the teachers expected the students to do
pleasure reading outside of the classroom, reserving class time for "work." The teachers were eager to learn ways to enhance their reading classes, and felt unprepared to adequately address the needs of all students. The researcher discussed the benefits of self-reflection in teaching and the understanding of personal beliefs about the teaching of reading. The DeFord Theoretical Orientation to Reading Profile (TORP) (DeFord, 1987) was suggested as a means of helping the individuals gain this insight.

The project could be expanded to be used as a resource to share with parents. The research and results could offer parents ideas for connecting home and school. Parents can be a part of the classroom in a variety of ways, such as being participants in read aloud enterprises. Just as Fridays were designated as book buddy times, other days could be scheduled for parents (and other community members) to actively read with the students for pleasure.

The project's findings and research are to be shared with the teachers and administrators in a resource guide. Teachers may share the findings with parents during conferences or as resources for their own classrooms. The administrators may choose to disseminate the sections of the information as a part of the school's newsletter. The notebook can also be made available as a resource to student teachers from the nearby college.
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Appendix A

Criteria for Placement in Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>Below grade level</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Nat. PR SAT= national percentile rank on Stanford Achievement Test ; NA= not available.
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# Appendix B

## Student Library Transactions for 1997-1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** NA = not available.
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## Appendix C

### Student Library Transactions for 1998-1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** NA = not available.
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Appendix D

Reading Log

My name is ____________________________.
Today's date is ________________________.
The title of the book I read was ____________________________.
I read ________ pages.

My name is ____________________________.
Today's date is ________________________.
The title of the book I read was ____________________________.
I read ________ pages.

My name is ____________________________.
Today's date is ________________________.
The title of the book I read was ____________________________.
I read ________ pages.

My name is ____________________________.
Today's date is ________________________.
The title of the book I read was ____________________________.
I read ________ pages.

My name is ____________________________.
Today's date is ________________________.
The title of the book I read was ____________________________.
I read ________ pages.
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Timed Test Score Sheet for: (Title of book)  # of words in passage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Pretest Time</th>
<th># of errors</th>
<th>Posttest Time</th>
<th># of errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Dolch Sight Words Pre- and Posttest Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>GL</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>GL</th>
<th>Gain</th>
<th>Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. NC = No change.
GL = Grade level.
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Appendix G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circle your response.</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I think I am a good reader.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reading is my best subject.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Even if someone tells me a book is too hard for me to read, I’ll try to read it anyway.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When something interests me, I’ll read more about it.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My parents tell me when I’m doing a good job with reading.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My parents always ask me about my grades and work in school.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I think it’s important to get done in class before anybody else.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My teacher thinks I am doing a good job in reading.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am always excited to get my grades on tests and on report cards.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I like to read.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Self-anchoring attitude scale pre- and posttest results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Gain</th>
<th>Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. NC = No change.
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Pages of Students’ Pleasure Reading for the First Through Twelfth Weeks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2</th>
<th>W3</th>
<th>W4</th>
<th>W5</th>
<th>W6</th>
<th>W7</th>
<th>W8</th>
<th>W9</th>
<th>W10</th>
<th>W11</th>
<th>W12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. W = Week.
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**Comparison of Student Library Transactions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** NA = not available

Tot. 1 = Total number of books checked out prior to implementation.

Tot. 2 = Total number of books checked out during implementation.
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**Timed Test Pre- and Posttest Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Times Pretest</th>
<th>Times Posttest</th>
<th>RT</th>
<th>Miscues Pretest</th>
<th>Miscues Posttest</th>
<th>RM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3:38</td>
<td>3:22</td>
<td>7.34%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2:31</td>
<td>2:19</td>
<td>7.95%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2:56</td>
<td>2:20</td>
<td>20.45%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4:37</td>
<td>3:44</td>
<td>19.13%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2:07</td>
<td>2:07</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3:16</td>
<td>2:40</td>
<td>18.37%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2:18</td>
<td>2:16</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2:58</td>
<td>2:01</td>
<td>32.02%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2:54</td>
<td>2:26</td>
<td>16.09%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>2:39</td>
<td>11.67%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>2:38</td>
<td>2:18</td>
<td>12.66%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>3:59</td>
<td>3:38</td>
<td>8.79%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3:22</td>
<td>3:21</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>2:24</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** RT = Percent reduction in time.
RM = Percent reduction in miscues.
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The Names Test Pre- and Posttest Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Gain</th>
<th>Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. NC = No change.
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