2007

Case studies of trainers' and selected teachers' perceptions of an early reading intervention training program

Cynthia Dianne Calderone
University of South Florida

Case Studies of Trainers' and Selected Teachers' Perceptions of an Early Reading Intervention Training Program

by

Cynthia Dianne Calderone

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Childhood Education
College of Education
University of South Florida

Co-Major Professor: Susan Homan, Ph.D.
Co-Major Professor: Mary Lou Morton, Ph.D.
James King, Ed.D.
Robert Dedrick, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:
May 31, 2007

Keywords: emergent literacy, early literacy, professional development, staff development, teacher education

DEDICATION

This doctoral dissertation was written in loving memory of my mother, Janet Walberg, who passed away before I began my studies. She instilled in me a love for learning and the importance of pursuing educational goals. She was a great source of inspiration for me as I completed my doctoral studies and particularly as I struggled to finish writing my dissertation. I will be forever grateful to her for nurturing and encouraging my dreams and ambitions. I miss you mom.

I would also like to dedicate this dissertation to my husband, Mike, for his constant love, patience, and support. I know that it would have been very difficult for me to complete this scholarly journey without his continued faith in me. Thank you, Mike, for being such a fun-loving companion and for continuing to challenge my thinking on a daily basis. I look forward to a life full of wonderful surprises with you.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I have many people to thank for their continued support throughout the years in helping to inform and improve this dissertation. I am most grateful to my committee members, Susan Homan, Mary Lou Morton, James King, and Robert Dedrick for their expert guidance on the project. My thanks go to Drs. Homan and King for developing such an important literacy program to meet the critical needs of students who have difficulty learning to read and then allowing me to study the program. I learned how to be a better reading teacher because of you and hope to use that knowledge to help other teachers and children in the future.

I would also like to extend a warm thank you to Dr. Morton for her willingness to read my dissertation on multiple occasions and to give me helpful feedback. Also a special thank you goes to Dr. Dedrick for his feedback and assistance with finding an outside chair for my final dissertation defense. Bridget Cotner offered guidance with my analysis and formatting procedures. Thank you, Bridget, for your help, and most of all, for your friendship. Soon we will be celebrating the completion of your doctorate degree too!

I would also like to thank my participants, Susan, Stacey, and Pat for agreeing to let me study their expert instruction. I am so very grateful to all of you for your gracious kindness and patience over the years. Thank you for hosting me in your classrooms. I have great admiration for the incredible work that you are doing with your students. Merci bien.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Case Studies of Trainers' and Selected Teachers' Perceptions of an Early Reading Intervention Training Program

Cynthia Dianne Calderone

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this qualitative research study was to describe and explain the characteristics of an effective professional development model in an early intervention training program. The focus of the study was on particular aspects of literacy instruction that were emphasized during training sessions and trainer and teacher perceptions of the Accelerated Literacy Learning (ALL) program. This study examined the elements of training that two teachers chose to transfer to their classrooms, as well as modifications they chose to make, in the year following training in an effort to gain further insight into successful teacher training practices. The following research questions guided this study:

1. How do teachers who have received early intervention training for two semesters apply this knowledge in their classrooms during the following school year?
2. What do teachers choose to use and not use from the training program and why?
3. What modifications of the program do teachers make, if any, and why?
4. What are the perceptions of trainers about an early intervention training program?

To obtain answers to these research questions, I conducted individual and focus group interviews with teachers and trainers, made observations of training sessions, analyzed

course documents, and observed two teachers in their classrooms in the year following training. These data were analyzed using qualitative analysis procedures. I followed a phenomenological theoretical approach and reported my findings through descriptive case studies.

The study findings indicated that teachers chose to use many elements of training in their classrooms in the year following training. It was discovered that the elements that the teachers chose to use in training were the elements that the trainers emphasized in training sessions. The findings also indicated that teachers made modifications to the lesson format that they were taught in training. The segment of the lesson that the teachers chose to modify was one that was not as prescriptive in training as other lesson segments. The trainers did not spend as much time discussing the writing segment of the lesson format as they did the other segments and consequently the teachers made modifications.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Many teachers have reported that they do not feel adequately prepared to effectively teach reading to their students, particularly with students who struggle to learn to read (Olson, 2001). Therefore, they seek opportunities for professional development that will help remedy this problem. School districts have responded to the teachers' needs by directing a substantial amount of resources to such things as salaries for personnel who deliver staff development workshops, supervision and evaluation, substitute teachers, extra school days, and stipends for teachers (Hughes, Cash, Ahwee, & Klingner, 2002). Unfortunately, school districts have provided monies for professional development programs without actually determining whether teachers and students benefit from participation in the programs (Robb, 2000).

In the past, professional development programs typically involved training teachers at a "one-shot workshop" (Rodgers & Pinnell, 2002). These workshops would provide teachers with materials to use in their classrooms and possibly even how to use them. Sometimes this was done through demonstration and/or videotapes. Very often, however, teachers were simply expected to listen to the ideas presented by professionals who were considered experts in the field. Unfortunately, many of these "hit and run in-service sessions" were not effective in terms of changing teaching practice in the classroom (Askew, Fulenwider, Kordick, Scheuermann, Vollenweider, Anderson, & Rodriguez, 2002; National Research Council, 1998).

If an isolated workshop is not enough to improve classroom instruction, then what types of professional development can be used to do so? Research suggests that programs that offer intense levels of support are more effective (Anders & Evens, 1994; Anders, Hoffman, & Duffy, 2000; Hughes, et al., 2002; Moore, 1991). Furthermore, Hughes, et al. (2002) explains that professional development programs are effective when they incorporate supportive structures such as site-based facilitators, support groups, and coaches. In addition, Allington (2006) argues against isolated workshops and supports a broader conception of professional development that includes a long-term plan for developing teacher expertise.

An extensive amount of research has been conducted to determine the characteristics of professional development models that make them effective (Askew, Fulenwider, Kordick, Scheuermann, Vollenweider, Anderson, & Rodriguez, 2002; Hughes, et al. 2002; Rodgers, Fullerton, & DeFord, 2002; Rodgers & Pinnell, 2002). One early intervention training program, Reading Recovery, is noted as having one of the most effective staff development models (Rodgers, 2002; Lyons, Pinnell, & DeFord, 1993). The reason for this is likely to be because the model is consistent with recommendations for effective staff development such as monitoring, coaching, teacher reflection, conversation, voluntary participation, full-school participation, collaboration among role groups, and ongoing assistance in assimilating new information (Hughes, et al., 2002).

Anders and Evens (1994) suggest that when teachers are monitored and coached as they learn to implement a program in their classrooms, they are more likely to increase their skills and use what they have learned. Teachers gain confidence when they are able

to apply what they are learning in their classrooms and receive feedback from knowledgeable trainers on a regular basis. When teachers are given opportunities to communicate with trainers and other teachers in the program regularly, they develop a caring community, which is believed to positively impact the program (Jackson, Paratore, Chard, & Garnick, 1999). Teachers are more likely to utilize what they have learned when supportive structures, such as these, are in place.

Research also supports the need for teacher reflection (Bos & Anders, 1994; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993; Zeichner, 1980). When teachers are given opportunities to reflect on what they are learning and how it is working in their classrooms, they continue to process, revise, and construct new ideas and beliefs about teaching. It is especially powerful when teachers are encouraged to converse with their peers about their experiences. Through dialogue, teachers are able to learn from each other and internalize what they are learning.

In addition, teachers who volunteer to participate in professional development programs show an interest in improving their practice. They are searching for new knowledge and materials that they can put into immediate practice in their classrooms. Snow, Burns, and Griffin (1998) have reported that research-based content and systematic follow-up are required for sustainability, but that many programs don't provide these due to lack of funding and resources.

In an effort to provide sustainability, many districts are now employing teachers as coaches at school sites. For example, the Reading First initiative provides funding for professional development and reading coaches (No Child Left Behind Act, 2001). The Reading Success Network, a national network of schools operated by the U.S.

Department of Education's Comprehensive Assistance Centers, also supports the use of coaches by providing them with ongoing support, materials, and training (U.S. Department of Education, 2001).

Coaches are employed to provide training, demonstration lessons, observations, and immediate feedback to the teachers at their site. In this way, teachers have a site-based person who can mentor, coach, and assist them as they learn to implement a new innovation. In addition, teachers learn together in a collaborative setting that fosters dialogue and reflection about their teaching practices. Coaching has become a powerful way to provide teachers with the knowledge and requisite skills to improve their teaching practice (Darling-Hammond & MacLaughlin, 1995; Lyons, 2002). When teachers are able to reflect on their practice with someone more knowledgeable, a shift in their thinking about teaching may likely result. Lyons (2002) states:

> We have learned that the key to teachers' growth, development, and improved practice is the ability to reflect on one's learning, to change practice based on that reflection, and to develop a theoretical frame of reference or set of understandings that takes into account one's experiences and the experiences of students. (p. 93)

Teachers who are given regular opportunities to reflect on their learning, with a trainer or coach, are more likely to adapt and change their teaching practice because they are able to verbalize and test new ideas in a supportive environment. This notion is based upon Vygotsky's (1978) research that learning is socially constructed and that one can learn from a more knowledgeable other.

One of the ways in which to determine if a training program has an successful staff development model is by discovering if teachers utilize what they have learned in training. An early intervention training program that employs a successful professional development model is Accelerated Literacy Learning (ALL). This study focuses on the aspects of the ALL training program that teachers chose to use in their classrooms in the school year following their training. It describes how teachers applied what they had learned in training in their respective classrooms. The findings of this research study contribute to the existing research base regarding reading research, professional development models, and teacher training by examining the transfer of training knowledge to classroom practice.

Statement of the Problem

U.S. Education Secretary, Richard Riley, called for a national crusade in his State of Education address in 1996. He suggested that every American child should become a good reader by the end of third grade. The America Reads Challenge and the Reading Excellence Act were initiated during President Clinton's presidency to pursue the goal of ensuring that American children were reading on grade level by the end of third grade (U.S. Department of Education, 2001).

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 is an example of more recent legislation initiated to improve the academic achievement of at-risk students. This legislation directs a substantial amount of resources to schools to provide services to teachers and students for the improvement of reading achievement, particularly in the early grades. It is expected that teachers in the early grades will teach their students to become independent readers.

Teachers are finding that, despite their efforts to teach all of their students to become independent, fluent readers, some students continue to struggle to learn to read. A substantial amount of research has shown that early intervention is necessary to meet the educational needs of these students (Brashears, Homan, & King, 2002; Clay, 1991; 1993; 2002; Frye & Short, 1994; Johnston & Allington, 1990; McCarthy, Newby, & Recht, 1995; Short, Frye, Homan, & King, 1997; Stanovich, 1986, 1993; U.S. Department of Education, 2001; Wasik & Slavin, 1993). School districts have become increasingly aware of the need for professional development opportunities for early intervention training for teachers so that they can effectively instruct the students who are having difficulty learning to read.

In an effort to provide staff development opportunities to teachers, many districts are interested in professional development models that have been proven to be successful with teachers. Successful formats for professional development are those that utilize coaches and mentors, time for reflection, ongoing dialogue, voluntary involvement, and collaboration among university and school personnel (Hughes, et al., 2002). The Accelerated Literacy Learning (ALL) training program, offered by Drs. Susan Homan and James King at the University of South Florida (USF), was an early reading intervention program that employed these formats for professional development (Homan, et al., 2001).

The ALL Training Program was modeled after the highly successful Reading Recovery staff development model in many ways. It was an intensive yearlong teacher training program that was offered to teachers in Florida for 11 years. It was offered in Hillsborough County during the 2002-2003 school year. Teachers enrolled in the

program received six hours of graduate credit for two semesters of training. They were expected to meet for weekly training, once a week, for a period of two hours. The teachers agreed to implement the program in their classrooms with a group of three students during their training year.

Throughout their training year, teachers were observed, coached, and supported by one of a group of three trainers of the program. The trainers observed individual teachers as they conducted specialized reading intervention lessons with their ALL group of students in their classrooms. The observations occurred approximately every other week and teachers were given immediate feedback from the trainer who was assigned to work with them. In addition, one of the ALL trainers was employed as a Reading Coach at the same school as eight of the teacher participants. The training took place at this school as well. This site-based trainer provided weekly training, as well as on-site coaching, on a regular basis to the participants from her school. She was also considered to be the "expert" trainer and provided the bulk of the training to all of the participants. Her philosophy of reading education was embedded in the training.

Although teachers implemented the ALL program in their classrooms during their training year, with support from the trainers, it was not known what happened in the classroom in the years following training. What elements of the program did teachers choose to use with their students? One would expect that teachers who spent a year in training as they implemented a program, would utilize what they had learned in their literacy classrooms and make it part of their instructional repertoire.

In an effort to understand the sustaining impact of ALL training, this study describes the processes of two teachers, who received ALL training during the 2002-2003

school year, as they established a context for literacy in their classrooms, at one school, in the subsequent school year. The study was conducted at a school where eight of the teachers received ALL training. The focus of the study was on the processes of teachers as they prepared their students for literacy learning and determined which of their students were at-risk of reading failure. This study took place within two semesters, giving this study a bounded context for literacy development.

The research design incorporated in-depth individual interviews with two teachers enrolled in the program who volunteered to participate in the study, an in-depth interview with the site-based trainer, two focus group interviews with six teacher participants, one focus group interview with two support trainers, observations of two teachers' classrooms, and field notes of the ALL training sessions. The participants of this study comprised the site-based trainer, two support trainers, and six teachers enrolled in the program who agreed to participate in the study.

Prior to this study, I enrolled in the training program with the teachers, for a period of two semesters, to develop a rapport with the teachers, learn as much as possible about the ALL program, and work with a group of three students, which was expected of all of the participants of the program. I conducted a pilot study during that time to test the interview instruments. During the pilot study, I conducted individual interviews with the site-based trainer and two teachers to ascertain their perceptions of the ALL Training Program. The pilot study helped me refine the semi-structured interview protocols as I determined the questions that would be most appropriate for an understanding of the ALL program. The pilot study also contributed to the design of this research study by aiding in the development of the research questions and inductive case study design.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative research study was to describe and explain the particular aspects of literacy instruction that were emphasized during training sessions and trainer and teacher perceptions of the Accelerated Literacy Learning (ALL) program. In particular, this study investigated how two teachers applied what they had learned from their participation for two semesters in the ALL Training Program. This study examined the elements of training that two teachers chose to transfer to their classrooms, as well as modifications they chose to make, in the year following training in an effort to gain further insight into successful teacher training practices. This study contributes to the field of education by providing other educators, researchers, and change agents seeking to implement new innovations in schools with information regarding what teachers utilized from their training to improve literacy instruction for at-risk students.

Informed Assumptions

It is my belief that teachers choose what they want to use from training programs and make modifications as they see fit, in order to better meet their students' needs as well as to match their individual teaching styles. Because of this, I expected the ALL participant teachers would not implement every aspect of the ALL program, but would instead choose to use certain elements of the program that they believed would meet their own teaching needs as well as their students' learning needs. Since I was a participant-observer during the training sessions, I maintained an emic or insider's perspective (Patton, 2002) regarding the elements of ALL that were emphasized during training. It was my expectation that the elements that were emphasized during training sessions were

more likely to be applied by the teachers in their classrooms. The elements that were emphasized in training were assessment activities, reading strategies, and cueing systems.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. How do teachers who have received early intervention training for two semesters apply this knowledge in their classrooms during the following school year?
2. What do teachers choose to use and not use from the training program and why?
3. What modifications of the program do teachers make, if any, and why?
4. What are the perceptions of trainers about an early intervention training program?

The first research question guided the study, in terms of determining how teachers applied what they learned in training in their classrooms. Field notes were taken by me during the training sessions to determine the elements of training that were taught in the program. More time was spent on certain elements of the program than on others. It was found that the more emphasis placed upon an element in training, the more likely it was to be transferred to the classroom. Conversely, the less emphasis placed on an element, the less likely it was to be transferred to the classroom. Because of this, the elements of training were examined in this study.

The second research question was asked to identify the aspects of the program the teachers would choose to use as well as those they chose not to use. Explanations for their choices were also examined. The third research question was asked to determine if modifications were made by the teachers, and if so, why they were made. In order to answer these questions, individual interviews and classroom observations were conducted

with participants who volunteered and were purposefully selected to participate in the study.

The fourth research question was asked to determine the perceptions of the trainers about the early intervention training program under investigation. The focus was on discovering what the trainers perceived as the goals of the program for the teachers as well as the students. This question sought insight into the perceptions of the trainers about professional development and teacher training practices as well. An individual interview with the site-based trainer and a focus group interview with the support trainers were conducted to provide answers to this question.

The questions were asked of a small sample of teachers, participating in one early intervention training program and are not meant to be generalized. However, due to the use of purposeful sampling in this study, teachers were selected because they were thought to provide information-rich cases, which yielded in-depth understandings of the phenomena under study (Patton, 2002).

Definition of Terms

There are many terms used in this study that may require definitions. The definitions will help to clarify what is specifically meant by each term. The meanings are provided for eight terms that are frequently used in the literature on early intervention and emergent literacy and are also used in this study. The eight terms that are defined in this study are scaffolding, reading strategies, cueing systems, acceleration, running records, coaching, early intervention, and zone of proximal development.

Scaffolding

In the construction field, a scaffold is a platform that supports workers. In teaching, scaffolding refers to the support teachers give to students to help them reach the next level of learning. Scaffolding involves reaching the child at his/her level and providing help to move the learning forward. Similarly, scaffolding can be used during training with teachers. Trainers scaffold teachers and provide the appropriate level of support to facilitate their learning just as teachers do with their children. The amount of help shouldn't be too much, nor should it be too little (Bruner, 2000; Vygotsky, 1978).

Reading Strategies

These are the active cognitive and social processes that readers use to construct meaning from text (Clay, 1985; Short, 1991; Smith, 1978, 1988). They include processes such as rereading, chunking a word, looking at the pictures, reading ahead, self-monitoring, using first-letter cues, cross-checking, searching, focusing on whether or not the text makes sense, connecting to past experiences, and making predictions about what the story may be about.

Cueing Systems

There are three cueing systems that children use to monitor their reading (Clay, 1993). They are meaning cues, visual cues, and structural cues. The meaning cues are those that the student uses to determine if what they are reading makes sense. The visual cues are used to determine if what they are reading looks right, including expected letters/sounds for individual words that are read and checked. The structural cues are used by children to discover if what they are reading sounds right, in terms of the grammatical structure of the language.

Acceleration

Clay (1993) refers to acceleration as the fast progress that is needed, for students who lag behind their peers, to catch up with them. The expectation is that children will perform at an average level of proficiency in their classes. This is achieved when the child learns to work independently and takes over the process of learning.

Running Record

A Running Record is an assessment of a child's reading of text (Clay, 2002). The teacher notes reading behavior, as the child reads, and then analyzes it to determine what strategies and cues the child uses to process text meaning. It is also used to discover the level at which the child can read with 90% accuracy or better (Lyons, Pinnell, & De Ford, 1993).

Coaching

Coaching refers to working closely together in a collaborative context, engaging in problem-solving and inquiry-based conversations, and sharing information. Coaches provide support to teachers by working beside them in the classroom and by providing immediate feedback to them. Coaches are there for the teacher at the point of need. They establish trust, listen well, and select one or two coaching points to strengthen a teacher's practice (Lyons, 2002).

Early Intervention

Early intervention involves identifying and providing individualized instruction to children determined "at-risk" of school failure. This is typically done within the first two years of school. The premise is that prevention is more effective than remediation. It is a widely accepted notion that the sooner at-risk children are identified, the sooner they can

receive individualized instruction, and consequently might not need remediation in later years.

Zone of Proximal Development

The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) refers to the distance between what a child can accomplish independently and what the child can do with the help of someone more knowledgeable (Vygotsky, 1978). Teachers try to work with a child in their zone of proximal development so that they can scaffold the child to a higher level of progress. Children develop new understandings and accomplishments with the guidance of their teachers.

Chapter Summary

This qualitative research study focused on the perceptions of trainers and teachers about an early intervention training program. The study was designed to investigate how teachers applied what they had learned, through their participation for two semesters in early intervention training, in the school year following their training. It described and explained how the elements of training were used or modified in each of the classrooms. The theoretical framework for this study incorporated literature from teacher education, professional development, early intervention, and literacy instruction for at-risk students. This research study was designed to provide a rich, deep description of teachers' literacy practices and how they applied what they had learned in training in their classrooms.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

How do teachers develop the instructional skills necessary to effectively teach students at risk of reading failure in their classrooms? This literature review addresses teacher development, within the context of early intervention and literacy. To develop an understanding of how teachers gain knowledge about how to help students who struggle to learn to read, it is important to discuss successful formats of professional development. It is also important to emphasize what is expected of teachers so that they can effectively identify and provide assistance to children who are in need of additional services. Instruction for students deemed "at-risk" will also be addressed.

There are many early intervention programs that have been developed to meet the needs of students at risk of reading failure. Two programs, Reading Recovery (RR) and Accelerated Literacy Learning (ALL), will be described in detail as they are both early intervention programs with professional development models that adhere to effective training practices as well as have positive student outcomes. These areas have been chosen for the literature review because they provide information directly related to this research study.

Teacher Education and Professional Development

Few would argue the importance of teacher quality on student achievement. Strickland (2001) states that teacher quality is a crucial factor in reading and literacy achievement in children. One of the Federal Department of Education's goals is to improve student achievement by raising teacher and principal quality (Department of Education Strategic Plan, 2002). Research on teacher education and reading instruction suggests that appropriate teacher education produces higher reading achievement in students (Anders, Hoffman, & Duffy, 2000; National Reading Panel, 2000). Clearly, what teachers do affects how students perform. Educators and researchers acknowledge the need for effective teacher education and professional development opportunities for teachers because of this.

In recent years restructuring professional development and focusing on teacher development have become prominent aspects of education. Over the past decade there has been a movement away from the traditional approach to teacher-training, which mostly purported a top-down orientation. This approach typically followed the development of an innovation from a university or research center, taught by instructors, professors, or staff developers, with the goal of training teachers to implement the innovation as it was meant to be implemented. This approach, known as the fidelity approach, assumed that changes teachers made to the intended innovation would negatively impact the success of the innovation (Snyder, Bolin, & Zumwalt, 1992). Recent approaches to teacher training have purported a more collaborative orientation between university and school personnel.

Successful Formats for Professional Development

Successful formats for professional development are those that encourage collaboration among university and school personnel in an open, trusting environment where everyone is encouraged to take risks and feel supported (Lyons & Pinnell, 1999). Just as students who feel that they are in a trusting, safe environment for learning will be more willing to take risks and try something new, so too will teachers. The support structure provided to teachers as they learn and acquire new skills is an important consideration for providing effective professional development for teachers (Lyons & Pinnell, 1999; Pinnell, 2002).

Professional development should be research-based, but also connected to practice. It should be experiential so that teachers are engaged in the teaching process as they learn (Askew, et al., 2002; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995; Lyons, et al., 1993; Pinnell, 2002). When teachers are able to put new learning into practice immediately with sustained support from knowledgeable professionals, it is more likely that they will utilize the new skills (Anders & Evens, 1994). In addition, teachers who practice and implement an innovation, while they are learning about it, are able to put it in the context of their own classrooms.

One reason for the widespread failure of innovations in the classroom setting might be because certain approaches failed to acknowledge the contextual features of classrooms which might influence the use of innovations (Jacob, 1999). Some of the changes that would support contextually-sensitive approaches to innovations (Jacob, 1999) include supportive structures such as site-based decision

making, a culture of collaboration, the use of mentors and coaches, shared vision among school participants, and professional development that empowers teachers.

Research has shown that there are certain requirements of professional development models that should be considered when designing programs (Hughes, et al., 2002; Pinnell, 2002). These include monitoring and coaching, teacher reflection, conversation, voluntary participation, collaboration among university and school personnel, and assisting. When these characteristics are present in the design of a professional development program, Hughes, et al. (2002) suggest that not only will teachers receive training in reading practices, but also will develop personally and professionally into reflective practitioners who take ownership in their learning.

The United States Department of Education (2001) believes that teachers need sophisticated training. Lyons and Pinnell (1999) believe that one should approach teacher learning in the same way one approaches student learning. They offer suggestions on what to do to improve teacher quality. These include the use of teacher leaders or coaches. There is evidence that teachers' skills increase with intensive and extensive levels of support, including those of monitoring and coaching (Anders & Evens, 1994; Moore, 1991; Lyons & Pinnell, 1999; Pinnell, 2002).

It is recommended that teacher leaders or coaches support teachers by observing them regularly to gain insight into the teacher/learner situations, provide opportunities for teachers to talk about their teaching with teacher leaders and peers, select hypotheses and problem solving techniques with particular children in

mind, confirm or support a hypothesis with ongoing feedback, and reassess to discover what works and why it works (Askew & Gaffney, 1999; Lyons & Pinnell, 1999; Lyons, et al., 1993).

Conversations and ongoing dialogue are central to the learning process (Allington, 2006; Combs, 1994; Johnston et al., 1998; Lyons, Pinnell, & DeFord, 1993). Teachers who are given opportunities to talk among their colleagues about what they are observing, learning, and practicing begin to formulate or revise theories about student learning. They challenge one another's thinking and reflect on their own teaching based on what they have learned from others and well as what they have experienced themselves. According to Tharp and Gallimore (1988), when teachers are given time to reflect on what they are learning and how it relates to their teaching practice, teacher development is more effective.

As teachers learn and test new concepts and theories about teaching, there is a shift in their thinking and beliefs about teaching. This is evidenced by their conversations about their teaching with colleagues, what they choose to do with their students, their reflections and analyses of their learning, and discussions about theory and practice (Askew & Gaffney, 1999; Lyons & Pinnell, 1999; Lyons, et al., 1993; Rodgers, 2002). When teachers are given the opportunity to have a productive dialogue about teaching with their colleagues, they refine their perceptions as well as formulate new ideas and beliefs about teaching.

The notion of teacher "buy-in" is also important to the success of professional development formats. Teachers who want to try new innovations and seek training usually will implement a new program more readily than those who do not want to learn

to try something new. In general, professional development formats that encourage voluntary participation are more successful than those that force participation (El-Dinary & Schuder, 1993).

When teachers receive professional development that is grounded in research and classroom-focused, they are apt to employ instructional practices that lead to higher reading achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Nye, Konstantopoulos, & Hedges, 2004). Teachers who are given opportunities to participate in high quality professional development are able to stay current with best reading practices (American Federation of Teachers, 1999). It stands to reason that high quality professional development leads to positive teacher development, which in turn leads to higher student achievement.

Teacher Development

Statistics by Haselkorn and Harris (2001) support the belief that there should be highly qualified, knowledgeable professionals in our nation's classrooms. Eighty-nine percent of Americans agree that a well-qualified teacher should be in every classroom. Seventy-seven percent of Americans think that it should be a high national priority to develop the skills and knowledge of teachers, which should be done on an ongoing basis throughout their careers. Sixty percent of the American public believes that our investment in teachers is the most crucial strategy for improving student achievement. Strategies such as academic standards and testing were not thought to be as critical by Americans. Teacher development is of the utmost importance in terms of improving student learning.

How do teachers acquire the complex skills required to be an effective teacher? Effective teachers are those who learn how to be responsive to the developing child. This

involves a careful decision-making process by the teacher based upon observations of children and how they learn. The teacher learns to coordinate actions to scaffold the child at the point of need (Clay, 1991; Lyons & Pinnell, 1999). The teaching process requires constant observation and evaluation during a teacher's interaction with a child or group of children. Teachers learn to focus on children, thinking about what each child needs to progress, and then readjusting and revising their instruction on the spot to facilitate student progress. This knowledge is acquired through experience and with carefully constructed guidance from knowledgeable staff developers and/or colleagues.

Teacher development is successful if teachers are provided with direct demonstrations of the skills and procedures they are expected to use as well as opportunities to converse with other members of the learning group in a supportive atmosphere. In this way, the knowledge is shared with others and teachers know that they are supported in their endeavors to improve their teaching practices for their students (Lyons & Pinnell, 1999; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). As teachers watch demonstration lessons by peers and others, they question, clarify understandings and misunderstandings, and revise their thinking about teaching.

Research has shown that teacher development is effective when specific characteristics are present during training (Lyons & Pinnell, 1999; Lyons, et al., 1993; Pinnell, 2002). Programs should be intensive and long term and should be grounded in practice. There should be a balance between demonstration lessons, analysis, and reflection. New learning occurs when the ideas are experienced, analyzed, and discussed with a knowledgeable and more experienced person. There should be opportunities for conversation about the act of teaching among peers as well. Teacher development is

most effective when it is supported by a learning community that shares experiences and conversations about teaching. Teachers learn how to analyze teaching and learning behaviors and problem solve together in an environment such as this.

Reading Recovery and Accelerated Literacy Learning are both early intervention programs that utilize successful formats for professional development. They have been proven to be successful with teachers and student outcomes are positive as well (Homan, et al., 2001; Lyons, et al., 1993; King, & Homan, 2000; Rodgers, 2002). The next section will describe these programs in depth in an effort to provide relevant information about the development of the programs as well as the expectations for teachers.

Early Intervention Programs

For the purposes of this review, "early intervention" refers to the practice of identifying and providing support to children, within the first two years of school, who struggle to learn to read and have been determined to be at-risk of school failure by their teachers (Clay, 1993). It is based upon the premise that prevention is more effective than remediation. Most of the early intervention programs target the first grade since that is the critical year for learning to read (Slavin & Madden, 1989). A high correlation has been found between low phonemic awareness at the beginning of first grade and poor reading progress by the end of first grade (Juel, Griffith, & Gough, 1986; Liberman, 1973; Share, Jorm, Maclean, & Matthews, 1984; Stanovich, Cunningham, & Feeman, 1984; Taylor, Strait, & Medo, 1994; Tunmer & Nesdale, 1985).

An extensive amount of money and resources have been made available for programs such as Reading Recovery and Accelerated Literacy Learning, to provide schools with the expertise and training necessary to deal with children who are finding it

difficult to learn to read. Research has shown that the expense and training are worth it, in terms of the gains children experience in their literacy development. Dorn, French, & and Jones (1998) suggest that if children are unable to successfully read by the end of third grade, they will continue to have difficulty reading and will lag behind their peers in later years. This knowledge emphasizes the need for interventions that work. In addition, most of the work needs to be done before third grade if children are going to become successful readers in school. This puts a tremendous amount of pressure on the teachers and especially the children, to make significant gains in reading in the early grades.

What training is provided to teachers once they have agreed to participate in an early intervention program? Reading Recovery and Accelerated Literacy Learning have specific teacher expectations, ongoing assessments, and structured lesson formats for teachers to follow that are essential to the success of each program. Learning these requires a great deal of time, commitment, and tenacity on the part of each teacher.

Reading Recovery

Clay (1993, 2002) developed a one-to-one tutoring program known as Reading Recovery (RR), which revolutionalized the teaching of reading, particularly with children considered at-risk of reading failure. Reading Recovery is a program that was developed for struggling readers in first grade. It was founded by Marie Clay, an educator and psychologist, from New Zealand. Because of the program's wide acclaim, due to the positive results of its targeted first grade sample, many areas of the United States, especially Ohio and Pennsylvania, and many nations in Europe and Asia, have implemented the

program. It was first introduced in the United States in Columbus, Ohio in 1984-85 (DeFord , Lyons, & Pinnell, 1991). Reading Recovery is described as a one-to-one tutoring model for first graders who score in the lowest 20% of their classes on an observational survey developed by Clay (2002). In this program certified teachers tutor individual students for 30 minutes each day until they reach the level of average student performance in their classrooms (Pinnell, Lyons, DeFord, Bryk, & Seltzer, 1994). If this happens, students are discontinued from the program. Should this not happen, after 60 lessons, the students are released from the program but are not discontinued (Wasik & Slavin, 1993).

The individual instruction provided in this program is critical to its success. Working one-on-one with a student provides an intensive instructional time. During this time, teachers help students monitor their own reading by employing "strategies" that will help them negotiate the meaning of texts. Clay (1991) describes the strategies readers use to process text as:

- making predictions
- looking at the pictures
- making connections to their own lives
- self-monitoring by rereading
- cross-checking information
- searching for information
- self-corrections when something isn't right
- fluency
- the ability to solve problems

Teacher Training

The Reading Recovery staff development model and teacher training program involves three levels of training: trainers of teacher leaders, teacher leaders, and teachers (Lyons, et al., 1993). All participants in the program, regardless of the training level, participate in a yearlong educational program that includes working with four children, behind-the-glass teaching observations, and discussions with peers. The behind-the-glass lessons involve bringing a child to the training site and conducting a lesson behind a one-way glass mirror. The other teachers can hear and observe the lesson on the other side of the mirror and carry on a discussion during the course of the lesson. The discussion focuses on the observed teacher's instructional decisions. They are used to aid in teachers' understandings about the procedures, effects of teacher decisions, and relationships between the observed lesson and their own teaching. These lessons are intended to stimulate a teacher's self-reflection and critical analysis of his/her own teaching (DeFord, et al., 1991). As Tharp and Gallimore (1988) suggest, teachers move along a developmental continuum of five stages as they regulate their teaching performance: (1) assistance provided by more capable others; (2) assistance by others and self-assistance; (3) self-assistance; (4) internalization and automaticity; and (5) deautomatization and recursion. In other words, as teachers become more skilled at decision-making, they move from regulation by others, to self-regulation, to automatized behaviors.

Trainers of teacher leaders. Teacher leader trainers take university courses on theories of learning, language development, reading, and writing, in addition to implementation issues. They learn how to be leaders and instructors of teachers as well

as how to provide the necessary support for the successful implementation of the project in their region. During their training, they work with children and continue their own theory building as well.

Teacher leaders. Teacher leaders participate in a yearlong educational program that includes a clinical practicum experience, theoretical seminar, supervision practicum, and district apprenticeship. The teacher leaders complete all of the training the teachers complete including behind-the-glass demonstrations, observations, and discussions. During their yearlong training they are usually in residence at a university site where they complete 21 graduate hours of university coursework (DeFord et al., 1991). Teacher leaders are required to have a Master's degree and primary teaching experience. During the training year they continue to work with four children daily to practice what they have learned. Even after the training year, the trainers continue to work with children to keep them fresh and connected to practice (Lyons et al., 1993). As they think about the ways in which they teach their children, the trainers are encouraged to think similarly about the training for teachers. Also, upon completion of the training year, the teacher leaders continue to receive support from the university trainers.

Teachers. DeFord et al. (1991) describes the rigorous training provided to teachers. Reading Recovery teachers meet weekly, in sessions typically held after school for a year. They receive nine quarter hours of graduate university course credit for their participation. The teachers should have at least three years of primary teaching experience before they participate in the program. Their training year begins in the summer with a 30 hour workshop that they attend before the start of the school year. During the year, Reading Recovery teachers work with four children in one-to-one

tutoring sessions on a daily basis. Each student works with their Reading Recovery teacher for half-hour lessons. The teachers are observed and supervised by their teacher-leader on a regular basis and provided with constructive feedback. Also during this time, teachers participate in and observe behind-the-glass demonstration lessons coupled with peer feedback, on a weekly basis. The goal of the Reading Recovery teacher training is to improve the teaching of at-risk learners (DeFord et al., 1991).

Clay (1985) suggests that effective teachers focus on the needs of individual children and design programs that will accelerate their progress. She states:

> It is not enough with problem readers for the teacher to have rapport, to generate interesting tasks and generally to be a good teacher. The teacher must be able to design a superbly sequenced program determined by the child's performance, and to make highly skilled decisions moment by moment during the lesson. (p. 53)

Reading Recovery teachers learn to do this with guided practice and support from their teacher leaders. The business of meeting each student where they are or "following the child" as it is referred to in Reading Recovery, is central to the teacher training program. In order to do this, teachers must know what children can already do.

Clay and Cazden (1990) described the Vygotskian process of helping a child do things that are almost within reach as providing a "scaffold" for children so that they can work within their zone of proximal development. Scaffolding refers to the support teachers give to their students to help them reach the next level of learning. Scaffolding involves reaching the child at his/her level and providing help to move the learning

forward. The amount of help shouldn't be too much, nor should it be too little (Bruner, 2000). Pinnell (1997) stated that Reading Recovery training provides teachers with:

- a structure that builds content knowledge
- observational data
- guidance from knowledgeable experts
- careful record-keeping
- demonstration lessons by peers, used for discussion
- collegiality
- understanding language in learning as a central focus

Program Expectations

The goal of Reading Recovery is for teachers to help their students become independent readers. Teachers help children develop a self-extending system whereby strategies "are secure and habituated" (Clay, 1993, p.43). Skillful teachers prompt students to use the Reading Recovery strategies by explicitly teaching them, modeling them, and reinforcing students when they use them (Short, 1991). Teachers must practice careful observation to determine the strategies children are using as they unlock the meaning of a text. Teachers are trained to keep anecdotal records of their student's reading progress so that they can design a program specific to their student's particular learning needs.

Dialogue is central to the Reading Recovery program as language is used to construct meaning and to learn something new. Instruction is a dialogic exchange between the teacher and the student about a text. "Natural conversation assumes that there is some telling, some demonstrating, some encouraging, some suggesting, some

praising, and all other types of human interactions" (Lyons, et al., 1993, p. 58). Tharp and Gallimore (1988) refer to these conversations as "instructional conversations". As the teacher and the student converse about the meaning of a story, they learn from each other. The teacher learns about what the child can already do and the student learns the ways in which to approach an unfamiliar text.

Dialogue is also important in a teacher's construction of knowledge. During the teacher training year and in sessions following training, teachers reflect and talk about their teaching. They observe each other teaching "behind the glass" and discuss the nuances of the observed interactions to clarify their own understandings about how children learn to read. The insights gained during these discussions inform the teachers' teaching decisions.

The heart of the program is decision-making. Teachers must be skillful at selecting appropriate materials and activities, deciding when to interrupt a child's reading to maximize instruction, and knowing when to accelerate a child to the next text level. Clay (1993) stated, "The teacher must skillfully select the activities needed by a particular child. Otherwise she will slow the child's progress further by having him complete unnecessary work, thereby wasting precious learning time" (p.19). Time is of the essence in Reading Recovery because lessons are only 30 minutes in length. There is no time to waste. Therefore, teachers must learn to be responsive to the learner (Askew & Gaffney, 1999).

Another key aspect of the program is teacher scaffolding. Askew and Gaffney (1999) described the teacher's role in the following way:

> Because the teacher is clear about a child's competencies, he or she is free to do things for the child that are not within reach, to help the child do things that are almost within reach, and to expect the child to act on things that are within reach (pp. 80-81).

Teachers who know their students well, know how to reach them and what to do to accelerate their reading progress. Working one-on-one with a child provides an ideal opportunity for a teacher to get to know how that child's mind works and what to do to actively engage the child in activities that will guarantee success in reading.

Lyons, et al. (1993) list characteristics of teachers with higher and lower student outcomes based on an analysis of videotaped Reading Recovery lessons. Teacher leaders coded the tapes and developed the list of descriptors. They did not have access to student outcome data, which makes it difficult to state with certainty that certain teacher behaviors cause higher or lower student outcomes. The teacher leaders did, however, critically evaluate the lessons as they had been trained to do with the behind-the-glass observations. The list of teacher characteristics which were associated with higher student outcomes, although not tested and therefore not rigorous from a research standpoint, was still useful in terms of reporting the teaching practices that were considered desirable for the Reading Recovery training program. Lyons, et al. (1993, p. 83) listed the following characteristics of teachers with higher student outcomes:

- allows time for independent problem-solving; knows when to be quiet
- persistent in questioning and prompting students to do what they know
- requires students to problem-solve while reading
- questions in a way that makes children think and act

- asks the child to evaluate him/herself
- asks children to be responsible for checking
- questions in a way that helps children check several different sources
- helps children discount or verify their predictions based on a closer look
- helps children use oral reading and rehearing to get a feedback system going
- uses specific praise to confirm children's strategic behavior
- provides warm and friendly interaction
- accepts the child's efforts, even those partially right
- observes and responds to the child's moves
- personalizes the story for the individual child
- sounds positive and reassuring that the child has done something good

Accelerated Literacy Learning

In Florida, Short, Frye, Homan, and King (1997) developed a program known as Accelerated Literacy Learning (ALL), which was based on the Reading Recovery model. This program, which began as a one-to-one tutoring program, has grown to a one-to-three early intervention program in the first and second grades. In this model, regular classroom teachers are trained to work with a group of three at-risk readers in their own classrooms. The difference between the two programs is that Reading Recovery is a one-to-one, pull-out, tutorial program, whereas ALL employs Reading Recovery strategies with small groups of children within the regular classroom. This model is referred to as the push-in model because the intervention takes place in the classroom (Homan, King, & Hogarty, 2001).

Teacher Training

Teachers receiving ALL training attend a two hour class, one time per week. They are trained in assessment, strategy use, accelerating reading progress, meeting individual student's needs, and lesson structure. The teachers are expected to identify a group of three struggling readers, in the bottom 10% of their classes, whom they feel will benefit from the structured lesson format. Teachers are trained to use Clay's Observation Survey (2002) with their students to determine the students for their ALL group. The teachers meet daily with their ALL group for 30 minutes during which time they apply what they have learned in training.

In the second semester of their training, the teachers videotape themselves conducting an ALL lesson and share the video with other teachers in the class. The trainers also observe the teachers periodically to provide support and feedback. The goal of the program is to accelerate the progress of children who lag behind their peers and to foster independent reading behaviors. In order to do this, teachers are trained in scaffolding techniques which can be used to better meet each child's needs.

The 30 minute lesson moves very quickly and uses a three part lesson format: Familiar Reading and Running Records, Writing, and Introducing a New Book (Homan, et al., 2001). The lesson begins with a 10 minute warm-up, for children to read familiar books. The teacher takes one or two running record assessments during the first 10 minutes of the lesson. A Running Record (Clay, 2002) is a record of a student's oral reading behaviors. This record is used to design an appropriate individualized program for each student.

The second segment of the lesson involves 10 minutes of writing time, where students learn to construct words and sentences with the goal of building writing fluency. It is important to encourage the child to write his own sentence so that the child learns how to transfer what they are thinking onto the paper. This process allows the child to begin to use letter-sound relationships to break down the sounds in the words, and then put them together again.

Finally, the last 10 minutes of the lesson are used to introduce a new book which is the book given to the students to read for the Running Record the following day. The teacher and the child begin this segment of the lesson by looking at the pictures in the entire book, known as a picture-walk (Pinnell, Fried, & Estice, 1990). As they look at the pictures, students talk about what is happening in the story, make predictions, and learn some of the challenging vocabulary in the story.

The purpose of the introduction is to familiarize the child with the story so that the child can successfully read it independently. The challenge that teachers must remember is to make sure that there is enough work for the child to do when she reads it the following day for the Running Record. If the book is too easy for the child, the Running Record will not be helpful in determining the strategies and problem-solving techniques the child uses to attack difficult text. If it is too hard, the child will become frustrated and give up. Teachers must find materials that are right at the child's instructional level to use with the child. Only then will the child accelerate her reading progress.

Teachers are encouraged to stay within the 30 minute format so that they will have time to work with other students as well. In addition, due to the intensity of the

lesson, children become exhausted if they have to work much longer than 30 minutes with their teacher. They lose interest and stop working, which makes for a very unproductive lesson.

Program Expectations

The ALL program has expectations for both teachers and students. The program goals (Short, Frye, Homan, & King, 1999) for the students include:

- accelerating the reading progress of ALL students to a level of average or above
- supporting and improving students' self-esteem by providing successful reading and writing experiences in first grade
- lowering the rate of first grade referrals for special education classes
- lowering the number of potential high school drop outs by providing successful reading and writing experiences in first grade

Accelerated Literacy Learning students are expected to become independent, strategic readers at the completion of the program. This can only happen when children develop competence in strategy use. Successful readers confidently approach texts and employ strategies when they come to a part of the text that is hard for them. Teachers train students to use strategies by explicitly modeling them and cueing students with questions like, "Does it look right?" (visual cue); "Does it sound right?" (syntactic cue); and "Does it make sense?" (semantic cue). These questions are used to reinforce strategy use as well as to encourage students to monitor their own reading.

Tharp and Gallimore (1988) emphasize the importance of instruction by the teacher:

> The instructing voice of the teacher becomes the self-instructing voice of the learner in the transition from apprentice to self-regulated performer. The noninstructing teacher may be denying the learner the most valuable residue of the teaching interaction: that heard, regulating voice, a gradually internalized voice, that then becomes the pupil's self-regulating "still, small" instructor. (p. 57)

When the ALL teachers use the same questions to cue students to use strategies on a regular basis, the students internalize those questions and begin to monitor themselves.

ALL teachers are given extensive assessment training. They learn how to administer and score Clay's Observation Survey (2002). This is done at the beginning of their training year so that the teachers can make informed decisions about student grouping and needs assessment. Teachers learn the importance of becoming keen observers of children. Lyons and Pinnell (1999) believe that observation is an ongoing part of the teaching process. Teachers learn about how children learn and process information by observing their behavior with books. Effective teachers continuously reassess and revise their lessons based upon the observed behaviors of their students.

The minute by minute decision the teacher makes about what a child will be asked to do is the key to the success of each lesson. When teachers are astute observers, they are able to determine a child's strengths and areas of confusion. Once these have been established, the teacher can provide appropriate scaffolding to the child to foster reading independence and problem-solving strategies. The teacher does this by using demonstration, explicit teaching, effective questions and prompts, and conversation with

the child about the process. Most of all, teachers are expected to be flexible and respond and adjust to the student.

Prevention in the Early Grades

There has become an increasing awareness, by educators and researchers, in recent years, of the critical importance of individualized instruction in the reading curriculum at the first grade level (Wasik & Slavin, 1993). Anderson (1993) states that children who fail to learn to read by the end of first grade tend to develop low self-esteem and are at risk for continued school failure. With this knowledge in mind then, it is extremely important for first grade teachers to teach their students the skills necessary to read first grade texts independently. Also, for those students who are having difficulty with the reading process, additional services might be needed, in the form of individual or small group instruction, to meet the needs of the students.

Intervention is most likely needed for students in first grade who are at-risk of reading failure. As the U.S. Department of Education (2001) has discovered, "without intervention, most poor readers remain poor readers, limiting their academic achievement and their potential" (p.4). It is disconcerting to note that 88 percent of children, who struggle to learn to read in first grade, continue to do so at the end of fourth grade (Juel, 1988). Research has shown that reading failure in the primary grades can be reduced to less than 1 in 10 children with early intervention (Foorman, et al., 1998; Torgeson, Wagner, & Rashotte, 1997; Vellutino, Scanlon, Sipay, & Denckla, 1996). Early intervention is crucial to helping at-risk students learn to read.

Observation

One of the ways to determine whether or not children may have future reading difficulties is to become a keen observer of children. When we document observations of children over time, we can see patterns that develop which either aid or deter growth (Clay, 1982). Clay (1979) believes that it is imperative a teacher carefully observe each child in the class, at frequent intervals, to determine each child's specific strengths and weaknesses. This requires a teacher to step away from the act of teaching to observe and think about what is being observed (Clay, 1993). The teacher should not be prompting or instructing during this time, but simply watching what a child can do with print. This is the first step to preventing reading difficulties because teachers can become responsive to children's needs when they know what their students can and cannot do.

When teachers carefully document observations of their students, they create a picture of each child that clearly shows what they already know how to do. With this knowledge, teachers can work with children from where they are and build upon their skills, through guidance and scaffolding, to increase their level of reading proficiency (Clay, 1991). The philosophy of building upon the strengths of the child, rather than the weaknesses, is an important one. When a teacher recognizes what a child already knows how to do and helps bridge the gap between what is known and unknown, through scaffolded instruction, the child can make greater gains, and accelerate his or her learning.

Diagnosis

Once teachers have a clear picture of what their students can and cannot do, they can begin the diagnostic process to design programs and tailor instruction to meet the needs of their individual students. The diagnostic process should not be rushed, but should provide children with time to orient themselves to their teacher, class, and learning expectations. This time also gives the teacher plenty of observational opportunities to find out what children already are able to do.

Clay (1993) suggests this be done no later than one year after a child enters school. This allows children additional time to develop literate behaviors they might not have come to school with, and avoids labeling them "at risk" before their skills develop. Teachers need to be cautious about labeling children, especially since children are growing and learning at a rapid rate in the primary grades. In fact nearly half of the nation's children can learn to read regardless of the way in which they are taught (Lyon, 1997). This does not mean, however, that children shouldn't receive additional help should they need it.

Although a formal diagnosis should not happen before a child's first year of schooling, certainly more informal forms of assessment should be ongoing throughout the course of the year to help meet the needs of each child. When children are actively involved in their learning through their participation in literacy tasks, they formulate ideas and deepen their understanding of concepts. Their knowledge can be assessed in many ways.

Assessment

Assessment refers to the gathering of information about what a child knows and can do. The process is ongoing and can take many forms. Caldwell (2002) believes assessment involves the following four steps (p.3):

1. Identify what to assess.
2. Collect evidence.
3. Analyze the evidence.
4. Make a decision.

Teachers have many choices for gathering reading assessment data to inform them of their students' progress including such things as standardized tests, authentic assessment, and reading inventories.

Standardized Tests

One way of determining what children already know, which is currently present in schools, is through the use of standardized tests. Do standardized tests provide specific information that present what children know or have learned in school? It has become widely recognized by educators and researchers that they do not. Armbruster and Osborn (2002) point out the problems with standardized test use in this way:

> (1) Standardized tests do not reflect a research-based understanding of reading, particularly higher-order thinking skills; (2) some teachers teach to the tests, thus "narrowing" the classroom curriculum and fragmenting teaching and learning; (3) because information about student performance on norm-referenced tests typically appears long after the tests are administered, teachers and students are made to feel like passive recipients of test

> information, rather than active participants in an ongoing assessment process; (4) dependency on standardized tests causes teachers and policymakers to rely on only one indicator of student achievement rather than on the multiple indicators that can emerge from classroom-based assessments. (p. 129)

Since the items on the standardized test have only one right answer, if children do not know the answer, they are encouraged to make a best guess. Because of this, one cannot be sure if the student really knows the answer or if they made a good guess. In fact, teachers are instructed to teach this strategy of making the best guess, through the process of elimination, to their students. What one can be sure of then is that a student who performs well on a standardized test is a good test taker. Beyond that, one cannot be certain of what a student knows. As a result, it has become necessary to reevaluate the ways in which we find out what children have learned.

Authentic Assessment

An alternative method of determining what children have learned has been termed authentic assessment. "This term is especially appropriate to signify assessment activities that represent literacy behavior of the community and workplace, and that reflect the actual learning and instructional activities of the classroom and out-of-school worlds" (Hiebert, Valencia, & Afflerbach, 1994, p. 11). In other words, it is the collection of data, in the form of real tasks that demonstrate what children have learned. Portfolio-based assessments, student self-evaluations, work/performance samples, anecdotal records, and journals are examples of authentic assessment (Armbruster & Osborn, 2002).

Portfolio assessment. In recent years there has become an increasing interest in the use of portfolio assessment in classrooms. Basically, portfolios include samples of student work over time, which are used to determine what a student has learned. Teachers and students are encouraged to select pieces that will show a student's growth. Usually the selections include journals, writing samples, running records, drawings, lists of books students have read, reports, and projects.

The idea behind portfolio assessment is that the selections included in a student's portfolio will represent what the student has learned. The process of selection is one that requires teacher-student collaboration, as they work together to choose samples that will show what the child has learned. The portfolio is also an effective tool to use when reporting progress to parents, as it contains actual, specific pieces that demonstrate what their child has learned. The information provided in the portfolio is very meaningful to students, teachers and parents.

Journals. Journals and writing samples provide teachers and parents with specific information about what a child has learned, in terms of his/her writing progress. Teachers can record a student's writing growth over time as they read the writing samples and make anecdotal notes of what a student has learned about writing. This information is useful for the teacher in terms of recording student growth and reporting progress to parents. Teachers also gain information about children that might be useful in tailoring instruction to particular students to further their writing progress.

Reading Assessment

There are many different ways in which to measure a student's reading performance. Valencia (1990) suggests that the measures used be authentic and

trustworthy. That is to say the measures should assess "real reading" and use clearly defined assessment procedures. The three purposes of reading assessment identified by Caldwell (2002) are to identify good reading behaviors, determine a student's reading level, and document evidence of student progress. This is done by listening to a child read from a given text and documenting reading behaviors.

Running Records. A running record (Clay, 1993) is a way to record the reading behavior of an individual child while reading. The child is given a text to read and the teacher places a check mark on a paper for every word read correctly. Errors are recorded systematically as to type (meaning, visual, structure), and the number of errors are used to calculate the level of text difficulty. The teacher identifies and analyzes a child's errors to determine the cue systems the child employs when a difficult passage is read. Readers can use semantics or meaning, syntax or the structure of the language, and visual information provided by letter/sound relationships to identify a word. The running record indicates whether the book read was easy, appropriate, or too difficult for the student so an appropriate reading level is determined for the child.

Informal Reading Inventories (IRI). The informal reading inventory is similar to a running record in that it assesses a child's oral reading on a given text. It provides two possible scores: one for word identification accuracy and one for comprehension. These scores are then used to determine three possible levels for the student. An independent level is represented by 98%-100% word identification accuracy and 90%-100% comprehension accuracy. An instructional level is represented by 90%-97% word identification accuracy and 70-89% comprehension accuracy. A frustration level is represented by less than 90% word identification accuracy and less than 70%

comprehension accuracy. One purpose of using an IRI is to determine whether or not a student can read and comprehend grade appropriate material. A second purpose is to find a student's highest instructional level.

Grouping for Instruction

Teachers seek to meet the needs of their students as best they can. This is difficult to do in a classroom with 20-30 students. Clay (1993) believes that the best way to tailor instruction to students' needs is by individualizing instruction. If this is not possible within schools, she thinks providing instruction with small groups of children would be an appropriate alternative.

When children are organized into smaller groups, based upon their specific learning needs, teachers can focus on individual students more easily than in a large group. In this way teachers can offer instruction that is targeted to each student's needs (Caldwell, 2002). The grouping should be flexible such that students can move from one instructional group to another, as they gain skills and make progress. Teachers determine whether or not a child should be moved to a different group based upon regular, ongoing assessments.

Small group instruction makes it possible for teachers to teach students the skills necessary for each student to become independent, successful readers. Pressley, Rankin, and Yokoi (1996) studied the practices of teachers who were considered to be successful in teaching children to read. They discovered that all of the teachers used approaches that were rich in language and literature, but also included explicit skill instruction. The effective teachers provided direct instruction in the following skill areas: alphabet recognition, phonemic awareness, letter/sound relationships, phonics, decoding, and other

word attack skills such as recognizing high-frequency words, chunking words, and using context.

In recent years it has become clear that explicit instruction in decoding or phonics helps students build sound/symbol correspondence which, when coupled with opportunities to practice these skills in the context of reading, is necessary for reading fluency and success (Adams, 1990; Beck & Juel, 1995; Chall & Popp, 1996; Foorman, 1995; Honig, 2001; Share & Stanovich, 1995). Even though 60 to 70 percent of children have had the benefit of rich literary experiences at home, Honig (2001) believes that all children benefit from explicit, systematic skills instruction. Since some students are having difficulty becoming fluent readers of grade-appropriate books, an organized system of skill development is needed for these students (Liberman, Shankweiler, & Liberman, 1991; Torgesen, Wagner, & Rashotte, 1994). Researchers and educators have found that grouping students based upon need is an effective way of providing students with this necessary, specific instruction.

Teaching for Strategy Use

Those of us in the field of education have recognized for at least two decades that reading is a process that involves active thinking and the use of strategies to construct meaning from text (Clay, 1991; Goodman, 1983, Goodman, 1994; Short, 1991). Successful readers use strategies for unlocking meaning automatically. They actively search for relationships between new and prior knowledge. They operate on print by problem-solving and cross-checking their options, rather like solving a puzzle. If something doesn't make sense, they revise

their thinking and make another attempt at problem-solving. Successful readers continuously monitor their reading work (Clay, 1993).

Children who struggle to learn to read do not use strategies in this way. They often confuse themselves and have difficulty understanding what is read because they do not approach print in an orderly way. Reading is difficult for them because they have been unable to discover concepts about print and how text works. Therefore, these children often give up because the reading work is too difficult for them. Children who have difficulty learning to read will continue to struggle unless they are explicitly taught the strategies to use while reading.

"In order to prevent early reading failure we should be looking for strategies the child is using" (Clay, 1979, p. 50). Children who employ strategies for unlocking the semantic, syntactic, and graphophonetic cues in a text become more successful at learning to read. What are these strategies for processing text? Clay (1991) describes the strategies readers use to process text as:

- making predictions
- looking at the pictures
- making connections to their own lives
- self-monitoring by rereading
- cross-checking information
- searching for information
- self-corrections when something isn't right
- fluency
- the ability to solve problems

Children who have success with reading employ the above strategies, whereas children who have difficulty with reading do not. How are these strategies taught? This can be done by reinforcing the strategies as children attempt to use them. If children do not attempt to help themselves when they have difficulty decoding a word, then the appropriate strategies should be suggested and modeled for the child. The teacher should encourage children to employ reading strategies, so that their students can become self-regulating, independent readers.

Predictions

Proficient readers automatically think about what they are reading and make predictions about what will happen next in the story. As they read they try to match the text to their predictions of what the text will say (Clay, 1993). This requires attention to the text as well as to the meaning of a story. Children who have not been exposed to story structure through actively listening to stories both at home and at school, have not developed this ability to predict what will happen next. This strategy develops when children are encouraged to practice it while they listen to and read stories.

Illustrations

Illustrations are integral to the meaning of stories, particularly in picture books. Children who are in the habit of looking at the pictures to support the meaning of text, have a greater chance of being successful readers. When children are given opportunities to invent stories based upon the pictures, they learn about the ways in which pictures are used to support the story in books. This strategy

will help children develop a sense of story, make predictions about the story, and aid in meaning construction.

Connections

Readers bring their knowledge of language, the world, and how books work, to the reading task. This prior knowledge is called upon as readers approach a text. Proficient readers use this knowledge to control the reading task. They are constantly making connections between what they know and what they are learning. They use this strategy to help them assimilate new information. If a reader can make a connection between the known and the unknown, they have a greater chance of learning new information.

Self-monitoring

Proficient readers monitor their reading at all times. Self-monitoring is a skilled process that develops over time with a great deal of reading practice. As children become more proficient at reading they learn to check on their reading behaviors. If what they are reading does not look right, sound right, or make sense, they reread to check if they have made an error and then correct the error. This is a strategy students develop as they learn to process what they are reading, during the physical act of reading.

Cross-checking

Cross-checking is a behavior that readers use when they think something they have read is not right. It involves using two sources of information to check one against the other. For example, the child might use visual cues to attempt a

word, but finds that the word does not make sense. Proficient readers use this strategy to determine if their attempt at a word is correct.

Searching for Information

Children who have difficulty with a word, learn to problem-solve. This involves searching for information, or cues that will help them attempt the word. The questions that teachers can ask children to promote searching behaviors are: Does it look right?, Does it sound right?, Does it make sense? Proficient readers search for information to help them correct their errors.

Self-corrections

Proficient readers who monitor their reading, search for cues in the text, and cross-check information, will correct their own errors (Clay, 1993). When children learn to correct their own errors, they are learning to become independent readers. Teachers can encourage children to become independent readers by giving children opportunities to self-correct. Instead of telling a child what they have done wrong, teachers can place the responsibility on the child by telling them that they made a mistake and then asking them if they can find the mistake they made.

Fluency

Proficient readers read with fluency. This refers to the rate and accuracy with which they read. Readers who can recognize words automatically and group them into meaningful phrases at a rapid rate are able to read fluently (Honig, 2001). Students develop reading fluency by reading and rereading familiar texts. They also learn from exposure to fluent reading models, such as adults who read to

them, listening to stories on tape, choral reading, shared reading, and partner reading (Allington, 1983; Dowhower, 1991).

Problem-solving

When children are given an unfamiliar text to read they will more than likely engage in "reading work" (Clay, 1993). Since they are not familiar with the text, they may find parts of the text difficult to read. Proficient readers approach unfamiliar texts with confidence because they are able to use problem-solving strategies. These strategies are "in the head" operations that help readers unlock the meaning of texts.

Research by Baker and Brown (1984) has shown that the learning of strategies is successful when certain characteristics are present within learning environments. They present three factors that are critical to supporting the learning of strategies. The first factor is a focus on the learner's awareness of why it's important to learn something. The second factor is teaching for strategies while learners are actively engaged in the reading of authentic texts. The third factor is an emphasis on the interactions between the teacher and the student. Studies by Harste, Woodward, and Burke (1984) have found that interactions and demonstrations between learners can also support the learning of strategies.

Teachers support students before they actually read whole texts. When students choose a book to read, the supportive interactions occur both before and during reading. The focus of the interactions before reading is on meaning. Teachers introduce the book to students before they attempt to read it so that

students can successfully read the book, but also are challenged by the reading work presented in the text.

Comments and questions by teachers, if well-placed, can benefit students' strategy development. They should not interrupt the student's reading, unless doing so positively fosters the reading process. Clay (1985) suggests teachers ask four main questions to teach and reinforce cue use:

1. Does it make sense?
2. Does it look right?
3. Does it sound right?
4. What would you expect to see?

Teachers may choose to use any one of these questions based upon the cue systems the student is using or not using. They can be used to reinforce strategies that are habituated as well as to focus students on cue systems that students do not yet use automatically. The goal is to encourage the student to self-correct and monitor their own reading, so that they can develop independence, which leads to acceleration.

After the student has finished reading, the teacher and student discuss particular sections of the text that were difficult or where the student did some good reading work. When only one or two miscues or sections of texts are discussed, discussions between teacher and student are usually more productive (Short, 1991). Discussing all of the miscues a student makes is usually too overwhelming to the student and consequently not productive. Praise and encouragement are especially effective at reinforcing behaviors. "In the absence of

praise and encouragement, learning may be fitful and unsystematic; only with adequate praise can progress be forward moving" (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988, p. 54). The praise the teachers used in the ALL program was specific to each child. Rather than use general words of praise such as "good job", the teachers would try to reinforce appropriate reading behaviors and would praise specific behaviors by saying things like, "Good Billy. You are feeling nervous, but you shouldn't. You should feel confident because you used your strategies" (Mrs. Paterson's Observational Field Notes, February 26, 2004).

Scaffolding the Emergent Reader

In teaching, scaffolding refers to the support teachers give to students to help them reach the next level of learning. Scaffolding involves reaching the child at his/her level and providing help to move the learning forward. The help the teacher provides should be just enough to allow the child to progress toward independence. It should not be "too much help to rob the child of his or her own initiative, and not too little so that a child gets frustrated by failure" (Bruner, 2000, p. 31).

Scaffolding is a constructivist conception in that the teacher facilitates learning at a child's individual level or at the point of need, rather than assuming the traditional stance of the giver of knowledge. The teacher supports the learning, which is directed by the child rather than the teacher. As Clay (1993) states, "One simply takes the pupil from where he is to somewhere else" (p. 12). This can only be done if the teacher knows "where" the child is. Then knowledge is constructed through the interactions of the child with the teacher.

This social constructivist concept, where the student constructs knowledge with the help and guidance of the teacher, is supported by Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky, 1978). Vygotsky identified the distance between what a child can accomplish independently and what the child can do with the help of someone more knowledgeable as the Zone of Proximal Development. It is the targeted area for teachers to effectively reach with their students to maximize student progress. This is due to the fact that it is the area where new learning can take place.

The Zone of Proximal Development is the area whereby students can take in new learning with assistance. Without assistance, the new learning would be too difficult and thus might not be learned. Tharp and Gallimore (1988) refer to this scaffolded learning as "assisted performance". They identify five ways in which to assist student performance: modeling, management and praise, feedback, questioning, and cognitive structuring. The goal of assisted performance by the teacher is to support student learning. Clay (1993) believes that the goal of scaffolded instruction should be to help children develop a self-extending system. This refers to "a set of operations just adequate for reading a slightly more difficult text for the precise words and meanings of the author" (p. 39).

Chapter Summary

One of the greatest challenges our nation faces in education today is ensuring that "no child is left behind". Every child has the right to literacy, but not every child comes to school with the same language and literacy experiences that provide a successful transition from home to school (Delpit, 2002; Heath, 2002). Because of this, teachers are

finding the need for literacy interventions with their students who are struggling to become literate.

All children benefit from active engagement in literacy activities at school, much like they do from the types of activities that children participate in at home to acquire literacy, but the children who need this type of engagement the most are those who have not been exposed to them at home. For this reason, children should participate in a balanced reading program at school that includes opportunities for read alouds, practice reading familiar texts to build fluency and deepen the meaning of stories, shared readings with the teacher, and guided reading, individually or in small groups, with support from the teacher (Dorn, French, & Jones, 1998). Teachers should engage their students in conversations about stories, to model for them how meaning is constructed and connections are made between text and real life. In this way, children discover that print has meaning. They also learn how to think about what they are reading, as they are reading, to see if the context makes sense.

Another way to engage children in stories is to have them interact with them. This can be done by asking students to retell stories in their own words and/or act out stories, both of which aid in a child's construction of meaning. Once children become engaged in literacy activities, teachers can observe children to find out more about their literate behaviors.

Children who have difficulty learning to read require more time and specific guidance from their teachers. They need individualized instruction that will provide them with the specific skills needed to succeed in reading. This must

be done explicitly and directly by knowledgeable teachers who are responsive to their students.

How much time should teachers allow for their work with struggling readers? Generally, Clay (1979) suggests that teachers should allow twice as much time for their slow readers as for their good readers. Teachers sometimes plan to work with their good readers first, thinking that saving their slow readers for later will allow more time for them. Unfortunately, in doing this, teachers sometimes find that they don't get around to working with their slow readers. Working with the slow readers should take priority over working with the good readers, since they are the ones who are in need of the teacher's guidance the most.

A comprehensive review of the literature supports the view that at-risk students need explicit, individualized instruction from their teachers, if they are to become fluent, independent readers. Teachers who are knowledgeable, responsive, and skillful at selecting activities needed by the students they work with to foster this growth in reading, are crucial to the success of the program (Clay, 1993).

Therefore, intensive teacher-training is necessary to provide teachers with the necessary skills to help their students become successful readers. A study that explores the depth of a training program that supports teachers as they change their practice and apply what they have learned in their classroom as a result of training, will provide educators and researchers with pertinent information regarding effective ways to implement new teaching innovations in schools.

There is a growing body of research that supports the use of early intervention programs with at-risk students, particularly in the area of literacy, and

this study will add to the body of knowledge by describing one particular training program (ALL) and the processes of two teachers as they apply what they have learned from their participation in the early intervention training program in their respective classrooms.

CHAPTER THREE: METHOD

This chapter describes how this research study was conducted. There are five main sections in this chapter. The first section explains the purpose of the study and the research questions. The second section discusses the research design, including the theoretical research approaches of the study. The third section describes the participants and the school site, including my role as a researcher, since I was a participant-observer in this study. The fourth section reports the data collection and analysis procedures. The fifth section explains how I ensured credibility and viability by triangulating the data sources. Finally, a timeline is provided at the conclusion of the chapter to document the time I spent in the field.

The Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this qualitative research study was to describe and explain the characteristics of a successful professional development model in an early intervention training program. The focus of the study was on particular aspects of literacy instruction that were emphasized during training sessions and trainer and teacher perceptions of the Accelerated Literacy Learning (ALL) program. In particular, this study investigated how two teachers applied what they had learned from their participation for two semesters in the ALL Training Program. This study examined the elements of training that two teachers chose to transfer to their classrooms, as well as modifications they chose to make, in the year following training in an effort to gain further insight into effective teacher training practices.

The following research questions guided this study:

1. How do teachers who have received early intervention training for two semesters apply this knowledge in their classrooms during the following school year?
2. What do teachers choose to use and not use from the training program and why?
3. What modifications of the program do teachers make, if any, and why?
4. What are the perceptions of trainers about an early intervention training program?

Due to the emergent nature of this qualitative case study, broader ideas beyond the basic questions arose and were reported and explained in depth (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003).

Research Design

This qualitative study employed a case study design which was used to describe, explain, and interpret the overall processes of teacher training in literacy instruction for at-risk students. A phenomenological approach guided this study's focus on how teachers applied what they had learned from the Accelerated Literacy Learning early intervention training program in their classrooms during the school year following their training. The experiences of trainers and teachers in the program were documented during the training year in order to discover their perceptions of the training program. An examination of the elements of training was also made to determine what was taught in the program and what teachers chose to use and/or modify from the program in their classrooms, in the school year following their training. Table 2 outlines the research questions and study design.

Table 2

Research Questions and Study Design

Question	Data Collection	Analysis
How do teachers who have received early intervention training for two semesters apply this knowledge in their classrooms during the following school year?	Field notes of training sessions, interviews, focus group interviews, classroom observational field notes, training documents	Conversation Analysis (Moerman, 1988) Pattern Analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994) Interview Analysis (Hycner, 1985; Seidman, 1998) Document Analysis (Patton, 2002)
What do teachers choose to use and not use from the training program and why?	Individual interviews, focus group interviews, classroom observational field notes	Pattern Analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994) Interview Analysis (Hycner, 1985: Seidman, 1998) Content Analysis (Patton, 2002)
What modifications of the program do teachers make, if any, and why?	Individual interviews, focus group interviews, classroom observational field notes	Pattern Analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994) Interview Analysis (Hycner, 1985; Seidman, 1998) Content Analysis (Patton, 2002)
What are the perceptions of trainers about an early intervention training program?	Individual interviews, focus group interviews	Interview Analysis (Hycner, 1985; Seidman, 1998)

Theoretical Research Approaches

The design of the study was guided by two theoretical research approaches. These research approaches included phenomenology and heuristic inquiry. Patton (2002) refers to phenomenology as the study of the "lived experience" of people who directly experience the phenomenon. This requires a very close and careful study of the phenomenon as well as in-depth interviews with people who experience the phenomenon

to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon under study (Hycner, 1985; Patton, 2002). In this particular study the phenomenon I investigated was the trainers' and teachers' perceptions of the ALL training and their understanding and application of ALL concepts in their classrooms. Heuristic inquiry refers to an intense personal experience with the phenomenon (Patton, 2002). Since I immersed myself in the ALL culture for two semesters, as a participant of the Accelerated Literacy Learning training program, a heuristic research approach was also employed.

Phenomenological Research Approach

A phenomenological research approach is one that is used to report how people experience a phenomenon, including a group of people's perceived realities in a particular context (Holstein & Gubrium, 1994; Hopkins, 1994; Moustakas, 1994; Patton, 2002). Phenomenologists believe in the existence of an essence of a phenomenon and seek to report this essence through the perceptions of the participants who have experienced the phenomenon. A phenomenological approach is used to deeply examine the subjective occurrences of phenomena by providing a careful description of each person's lived experience or actual reality experiencing the phenomenon. In a sense, a person's perception is their reality and that is what phenomenologists seek to study.

The philosophical underpinnings of phenomenology are largely based upon a system of subjective openness developed by Edmund Husserl (1859-1938). He believed that personal understanding comes from experience. His philosophy stressed conscious awareness through reflection on the core meaning (essence) of experience. Husserl believed a person's consciousness is developed through the interactions of individual

perceptions and knowledge of the world. In this regard, Husserl maintained that knowledge is founded in a person's perceptions of an experience.

Researchers who choose to use a phenomenological approach seek to understand the phenomenon under investigation by immersing themselves in the natural setting. They conduct interviews with participants and observe participants' interactions in the setting to gain an understanding of the participants' experiences. The field notes and transcripts from the interview data are analyzed as well as pertinent documents collected from the setting. All of these data sources are analyzed in an effort to describe and interpret the phenomenon under investigation.

Phenomenological analysis involves something known as *epoche*. Epoche is a Greek term that means to refrain from judgment. This entails suspending judgment until all of the evidence has been collected (Moustakas, 1994, Patton, 2002). Once all of the data have been collected, then a researcher can begin phenomenological reduction, which involves *bracketing*. Bracketing is a term coined by Husserl (1913), which refers to the analytical process of taking the phenomenon out of the natural world and dissecting its elements for thorough inspection (Denzin, 1989; Patton, 2002). After a deep phenomenological analysis of the data, the researcher chooses to report the findings in a way that accurately depicts the participants' experiences with the phenomenon.

Heuristic Inquiry

Heuristic inquiry refers to an intense personal experience with the phenomenon (Patton, 2002). Although heuristics is a form of phenomenological inquiry, it differs to the extent that the personal experiences of the researcher are at the forefront, rather than

excluded (Douglass & Moustakas, 1985). Heuristic inquiry differs from phenomenology in the following four ways outlined by Douglass and Moustakas (1985):

1. Heuristics emphasizes connectedness and relationship, while phenomenology encourages more detachment in analyzing an experience.
2. Heuristics leads to "depictions of essential meanings and portrayal of the intrigue and personal significance that imbue the search to know," while phenomenology emphasizes definitive descriptions of the structures of experience.
3. Heuristics concludes with a "creative synthesis" that includes the researcher's intuition and tacit understandings, while phenomenology presents a distillation of the structures of experience.
4. "Whereas phenomenology loses the persons in the process of descriptive analysis, in heuristics the research participants remain visible in the examination of the data and continue to be portrayed as whole persons. Phenomenology ends with the essence of experience; heuristics retains the essence of the person in experience" (p. 43)

The fact that I personally experienced the phenomenon, by working with children and directly engaging in the program as a participant, makes the heuristic inquiry approach an appropriate one to use in this study. I shared in the intensity of the phenomenon with the participants of the study and therefore have a voice in the study. My interpretations are influenced by my personal perceptions and experiences with the program.

Descriptive Case Study

Stake (1995) defines case study as a detailed study of a single case to understand its inherent complexities. Case studies are often employed in qualitative research to provide particular, exacting accounts of specific situations (Merriam, 1988; Yin, 1989). According to Patton (2002), well-constructed case studies are "holistic and context sensitive" (p. 447). Cases can be programs, groups, cultures, or individuals. They are units of analysis. There are multiple case studies, or units of analysis, in this study. Each case in this particular study constitutes an individual's perceptions of the phenomenon under investigation.

Descriptive case studies lend themselves to answering "how" and "why" research questions (Yin, 1989). This study sought answers to questions about how teachers used what they had learned in a training program in their classrooms and why they chose to use certain elements of training and make modifications to others. Interviews and observations of the participants in this study informed the development of each detailed, descriptive case study.

Participants and School Site

The participants in this study comprised a site-based trainer, two support trainers, and six participant teachers in the ALL Training Program. Purposeful sampling (Patton, 2002) was used to identify two extreme cases at one school site, in an attempt to yield information-rich cases about how two teachers applied what they had learned from the ALL Training Program. This provided a more focused understanding of what elements of training teachers chose to use and/or modify in their classrooms. The sampling was done during the training year. One teacher was chosen because she reported that she was

using what she had learned in training and intended to use it the following year. In fact, she stated that she had included ALL in her professional development plan for the following school year. Another teacher was chosen because she reported that she was not using certain elements of the ALL program. Subsequent observations confirmed the teachers' self-reports. Both teachers agreed to participate in the study and signed written consent forms. Choosing one confirming and one disconfirming case in this study helped to elaborate the findings, adding richness, depth, and interest to each descriptive case study.

Participants

The participants in this study included one 50 year old white female site-based trainer, Ms. Hazlett, and two teachers. One 47 year old black female first grade teacher, Mrs. Paterson, and one 27 year old white female first grade teacher, Ms. Stone, were purposefully selected from the participating teachers to be systematically observed and individually interviewed to provide a deeper understanding of how each teacher used the elements of training provided during the training sessions in their respective classrooms in the year following their training.

One of the developers of the ALL program, who is a professor at the University of South Florida, also participated in this study. Dr. K provided guidance during the training sessions to teachers and trainers. He was trained to be a teacher trainer in Reading Recovery at Richardson, which was the first site outside of Ohio State University. He was trained by Billie Askew in her first training class. Dr. K questioned, probed, and provided comments during the training sessions, as we watched the teachers' videotapes to guide our understanding of ALL concepts.

Pseudonyms were given to the participants in this study to protect their identities and maintain confidentiality. I asked the site-based trainer and the selected teachers for their input on creating pseudonyms for each of them. One teacher joked that if she could choose an identity for herself, then she would like to be known as Sharon Stone. This participant teacher's name became Ms. Stone for the purposes of this study. The site-based trainer and the other teacher gave me permission to create pseudonyms for them. I chose the name Ms. Hazlett to refer to the site-based trainer and the name Mrs. Paterson to refer to the other first grade teacher. Dr. K was the pseudonym chosen for the university professor and developer of the ALL program.

School Site

All of the study participants were at the same school site. The school site was chosen because it was the site where the training took place, where the site-based trainer was employed, and where eight of the participant teachers were employed. In addition, the researcher had established a rapport with the principal and teachers prior to the study and therefore had no difficulty in obtaining approval for the study. The school site was in an urban, low socio-economic area of Florida and all students at the site qualified for free and reduced school lunch. There were 889 students enrolled in the school. The ethnicity of the students is reported in Table 1.

Table 1

Ethnic Enrollment at School Site

	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Indian	Multiracial
Enrollment	889	128	379	331	5	1	45

Researcher's Role

I was a participant observer in this study. Having established relationships with the teachers as a participant enrolled in the program with them the previous year, all of the teachers gave their consent to participate in the study. The teachers were also mindful of my role as an observer, as I took scripted field notes during the second semester of the training program and conducted focus group and individual interviews. Therefore, teachers were accustomed to my presence as an observing participant. Scripted field notes refer to notes that are taken that capture as much of the dialogue as possible between the teacher and her students during instruction in the classroom. I was trained to use scripted field notes when I collected data for the National Longitudinal Evaluation of Comprehensive School Reform (NLECSR) for the David C. Anchin Center at the University of South Florida (USF) and the American Institutes of Research (AIR) in the 2002-2003 school year.

Two teachers, who were purposefully selected from the school site to participate in the study, were accustomed to my role as a researcher due to the fact that I collected data during the second semester of the training program. These teachers therefore had experience with a participant observer. Since this research study commenced during a new school year, however, the children were not accustomed to the presence of a researcher. Because of this, I began the data collection at the beginning of the school year, so the students would immediately come to expect my presence during the literacy period.

Pre-study Involvement

I enrolled in the Accelerated Literacy Learning Training Program with the teachers participating in this study, during the previous school year. I attended the classes with the participants for two semesters and worked with a group of three students from one participant's classroom. During the first semester of the program, I developed a rapport with the teachers and worked with students at the school site. I pulled out three students from one participant teacher's classroom, as the training required, and worked with them in the site-based trainer's portable because the teacher was not comfortable with the idea of me working in her classroom at that time. During the second semester, I approached the participant teacher, who also happened to be the teacher of the students in my ALL group, and asked if I could work with my group in the teacher's classroom. The teacher agreed and I met with my ALL group of students two times per week in the teacher's classroom, for an entire semester. During that time, the teacher and I shared information about our students as well as materials, and the teacher agreed to participate in the research study.

Also during the second semester, I began to take field notes of the ALL training sessions and conducted a pilot study with six teachers from the site-based trainer's school. This was done to test the interview protocol. All of the teachers at the site agreed to participate in the study and signed consent forms at that time. The teachers who participated in the ALL training at the school site were very cooperative and willing to talk with me about the Accelerated Literacy Learning program, their experiences with the training, and its use in their classrooms.

Data Collection

Field notes were taken during the ALL training sessions in Spring 2003. Full-day observations in each of the participating teacher's classrooms were made in August, 2003. During this time, I took field notes of the literacy practices each teacher used with students throughout the school day, to gain a comprehensive understanding about literacy learning in each teacher's classroom. Subsequent observations took place during each teacher's guided reading lesson time in Fall 2003 and Spring 2004. Field notes were taken at that time to determine elements of the ALL training that teachers used in their literacy lessons. Individual phenomenological interviews (Patton 2002) were conducted with the site-based trainer in Spring, 2003 and with two teachers in Spring 2003 and Spring 2004. Two focus group interviews were conducted in Spring 2003 with a total of six ALL participating teachers. In addition, one focus group interview was conducted in Spring 2003 with the two support trainers.

Data Sources

Data collected for this study were from numerous sources. Data collected by me during the training sessions in Spring, 2003 included such things as field notes of training classes, agendas, handouts, and other pertinent documents about the program. Other data included (1) transcriptions of individual interviews, (2) transcriptions of focus group interviews, and (3) field notes from classroom observations. All data were transcribed by me. Data triangulation of these various sources strengthened the study (Patton, 2002).

Observational Field Notes

I took field notes during the ALL training classes for a period of 11 weeks. The field notes provided detailed information about the content, support structures, and

expectations of the training program. I also took 22 days of observational field notes in two teachers' classrooms in the year following training. These data were analyzed to ascertain the elements of training they were using as well as to document any modifications they chose to make in their classrooms.

Interviews

One individual phenomenological interview (Seidman, 1991) of approximately 30 minutes was conducted with the site-based trainer to obtain in-depth information from her about her perceptions and experiences with the ALL Training Program and her decisions about what to emphasize in training. An interview protocol (Appendix B) was used with the site-based trainer. I transcribed the audiotape and analyzed the transcript as well as the training transcripts to prepare a case study with the information gathered from these data.

Teachers who volunteered to participate in the study were purposefully selected based upon data obtained from focus group interviews conducted by me during Spring, 2003. At that time one teacher reported that she planned to use the ALL model in her classroom and another said that she would not. The two teachers were interviewed for approximately 30 minutes, in Spring, 2003 and Spring, 2004. Interview protocols were used with each teacher (Appendices A and B). The interviews were conducted to determine what elements of ALL training the teachers had chosen to use and not use in their classrooms as well as any modifications that they chose to make and the reasons for their individual choices.

A semi-standardized interview protocol (Appendices A and B) was used with the ALL participants and site-based trainer in an attempt to be consistent with the questions.

However, due to the emergent nature of this study, questions were adapted and changed, based on the participants' responses, when appropriate. In this way data were captured that might not have been, had only pre-determined questions been asked. The teachers were also observed during their regularly scheduled literacy block, for a period of four weeks in Fall 2003 and four weeks in Spring 2004 to determine the elements of the ALL program that they had incorporated into their literacy lessons.

ALL Course Documents

Pertinent course documents were collected from the ALL Training Program to determine the elements of training that were taught in the program. These documents included a course syllabus (see Appendix C), sample agendas (see Appendix H), a tentative course schedule (see Appendix D), and anecdotal record forms (see Appendix F and Appendix G). These documents were collected in an effort to understand the Accelerated Literacy Learning course content.

Data Analysis

The analysis of the data involved a careful review of data gathered from trainer interviews, teacher interviews, focus group interviews, and observations of classrooms. Since this qualitative case study employed a naturalistic design, the categories for analysis emerged from the data. Due to the development of multiple cases in this study, the constant comparative method was used to analyze the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Patton, 2002). The data were coded case by case. The analysis process involved reading the transcripts for each case carefully several times to gain a holistic sense of the data for each case. The data were then analyzed line by line and units of meaning were identified. Constructs developed from the emerging data. Data were coded with a Construct Key

(see Appendix E) for elements of ALL training that were used in each teacher's classroom during literacy instruction.

The analysis of the data required qualitative analysis procedures. Hycner's (1985) and Seidman's (1998) suggestions for interview analysis guided the analysis of data obtained from individual interviews and focus group interviews. Patton's (2002) guidelines for content analysis and Moerman's (1988) suggestions for conversation analysis guided the analysis of field notes and transcripts of interviews. In addition, Miles and Huberman's pattern analysis (1994) was used to code data and look for emerging patterns.

Analysis Procedures

My first task involved typing the field notes from the ALL training sessions and observations of classrooms to "cook" the data (Hubbard & Power, 1993). I also transcribed the audiotapes of the teacher and trainer interviews to remain close to the data (Wolcott, 1994). Once these tasks were accomplished I began the difficult task of reading and analyzing all of the transcript data.

First, I read the field notes from the ALL training sessions through twice to gain a holistic sense of the data. I then read each line of the ALL transcripts and highlighted units of meaning (Patton, 2002). Construct names emerged from these data. The construct names came directly from the data. One example that illustrates how this was done was from one support trainer when she commented, "We want to be supportive", in the training transcript. This sentence was highlighted and the paragraph was bracketed with the construct name, *Support*. This step was repeated when I read the transcript from the interview with the ALL trainer. I read through the transcript twice for a holistic sense

of the data. I then read each line of the interview transcript and highlighted units of meaning. Construct names emerged from these data.

I employed the same procedures with the support trainers' interview data. After coding all of the observational training data and trainer interview data, I discussed the constructs with the site-based trainer for confirmation. I did this to determine the elements of the training that were taught in the ALL Training Program. I then created a Construct Key (see Appendix E) with construct headings, construct names, and descriptions for each construct to be utilized for coding purposes with the data collected from the teachers.

The next step involved reading through the field notes of the 22 observations from Mrs. Paterson's classroom through twice. I read each line of the transcripts and highlighted units of meaning. I used the Construct Key (see Appendix E) to be consistent with construct names from the emerging data, but also added any new emerging constructs from Mrs. Paterson's data to the Construct Key. Following this, I read through the transcripts of the interviews with Ms. Paterson through twice. I read each line of each of the transcripts and highlighted units of meaning. I applied the same procedures with the interview data as I had with the observational data. I then discussed the constructs with Mrs. Paterson for confirmation. After this, I added these constructs and descriptions for each construct to the Construct Key (see Appendix E).

The next step involved reading the field notes of the 22 observations of Ms. Stone's classroom through twice. I read each line of each of the transcripts and highlighted units of meaning. I used the Construct Key (see Appendix E) to be consistent with construct names from the emerging data, but also added any new emerging

constructs from Ms. Stone's data to the Construct Key. I then read the transcripts from the interviews with Ms. Stone through twice. Following this, I read each line of the interview transcripts and highlighted units of meaning. I applied the same procedures with the interview data as I had with the observational data. I then discussed the constructs with Ms. Stone for confirmation. Once this was done, I added these construct and descriptions of the constructs to the Construct Key (see Appendix E).

Next, I read the transcripts from the focus group interviews through twice. I then read each line of each of the transcripts and highlighted units of meaning. I used the Construct Key (see Appendix E) to be consistent with construct names from the emerging data, but also added any new emerging constructs from the data to the Construct Key.

After all of the data were analyzed once, I analyzed these data again with the finalized construct key. I discussed the construct key with a qualitative researcher. I sent a transcript from a classroom observation to be analyzed by the researcher. I compared her analysis to my own. We continued to discuss the construct key and analysis procedures and analyzed transcripts until we reached agreement on the meanings and descriptions of the constructs, which helped to clarify the analysis procedures. The following subsections specify the analysis procedures used for each of the data sources.

Field Notes from ALL Training

Field notes of the ALL training sessions were coded session by session to discover emerging themes from each session and across sessions. These data were used to describe the expectations of the ALL training program, which was helpful in comparing what was expected of the teachers receiving training with what teachers actually did in their classrooms. Data were analyzed to determine the elements of

training and the emphasis placed upon each of the elements. After the elements were identified and assigned construct names, they were grouped according to type under a construct heading. The frequency for which each element occurred in the data determined whether or not the element was emphasized in training.

Interview with Site-based Trainer

The transcript of the audiotape from the interview with the site-based trainer was analyzed line by line. Constructs emerged from the data. These data informed the researcher about the site-based trainer's perspectives on the ALL training program and the particular elements of ALL she felt should be emphasized for the success of the program.

Focus Group Interviews and Individual Teacher Interviews

Transcripts of audiotapes from two focus group interviews with six of the participating teachers were analyzed using Hycner's (1985) guidelines for interview analysis. In addition, two individual interviews (during and after training) from each of the two teachers were analyzed. They were carefully studied to determine what elements of training teachers used from the program and the reasons for their choices.

Field Notes from Observations of Classrooms

Transcripts from observations of two teachers' reading lessons were analyzed using Moerman's (1988) conversation analysis. The recorded data captured as much of the conversation as possible between the teacher and her students to determine patterns of teacher/student interaction. Conversational elements, such as interrupting, pausing, and discussing meaning were noted in the field notes. This allowed for a careful, detailed

examination of teacher/student interaction. Constructs emerged from these data and were added to the construct key as well.

ALL Agendas and Course Documents

Document analysis (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998) informed the way in which the agendas and course documents were analyzed. The ALL agendas and documents provided specific information regarding what was taught during the ALL training sessions. Please refer to Appendix C for a copy of the ALL Course Syllabus. Please refer to Appendix F for a copy of the anecdotal record form that Mrs. Paterson used daily with her Reading groups and to Appendix G for a copy of the anecdotal record form that Ms. Stone used daily with her Reading groups.

Ensuring Credibility

This section is devoted to addressing the issues of credibility in this study. Data triangulation, analysis checks with another qualified researcher, as well as member checks with the study participants helped to ensure the quality and credibility of the study. Credibility ensures the accuracy of the data. It is my responsibility as the researcher to ensure the truthfulness of the findings and to carefully report these findings correctly to ensure the quality of the study.

Data Triangulation

The term *triangulation* brings to mind a common geometric shape – the triangle. The form of the triangle is strong and is used to construct geodesic domes (Patton 2002). In research, triangulation is used to strengthen the findings of a study. Data triangulation refers to the use of multiple methods of inquiry, such as interviews, observations, and document analysis to obtain in-depth understandings of phenomena (Bogdan & Biklen,

2003; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). In this study I employed data triangulation by collecting data from three sources: interviews, observations, and course documents. I collected these data from multiple sources as well: site-based trainer, support trainers, and six teachers to add further rigor, breadth, and depth to my investigation of an early intervention training program and to strengthen the credibility of the study (Berg, 2004).

Analysis Checks

A qualitative researcher employed at the David C. Anchin Center at the University of South Florida for five years, and the project manager for the National Longitudinal Evaluation of Comprehensive School Reform (NLECSR) read several transcripts. She analyzed the data using the Construct Key (see Appendix E) and confirmed the constructs and construct headings. This process aided in developing specific definitions for the constructs, which in turn helped with the analysis procedures.

The qualitative researcher was given a construct key developed by me for coding purposes. The construct key included the constructs with descriptions of each element of training. She was given several transcripts of field notes from a typical reading group lesson from one teacher to analyze for elements of training. Her coded transcript was compared to the same transcript coded by me to determine the clarity of the constructs and definitions. We discussed any areas of disagreement and reworded descriptions presented in the construct key that were unclear for a better understanding of the elements of ALL training.

Member Checks

Phenomenologists provide participants with access to their data (Hycner, 1985; Moustakas, 1994). The constructs and emerging themes from the field notes of the ALL

training sessions were shared with Ms. Hazlett, the site-based trainer. She provided her perspectives on the emerging data and confirmed the constructs and themes. Since she had conducted the training, she had a deep understanding of the training context. By confirming the emerging themes, the site-based trainer informed the finalized constructs and helped me avoid any potential bias issues. I also shared Ms. Hazlett's written case study with her. She confirmed the themes and agreed with the presentation and findings of her case study.

Case studies of two teachers were shared with the respective teachers as well. Upon completion of each case, the transcripts and themes were shared with each teacher to determine if they agreed with them. Both teachers agreed with the presentation of the case and the findings of the study.

Timeline

An IRB was approved prior to this study for the pilot study conducted at one of the school sites and a continuation was filed and approved until November 2004. A letter of approval from the county was obtained and submitted as well as a letter from the principal at the school site. In addition, the teachers at the school site signed their consent forms and agreed to participate in the study. Data collection began in Spring 2003 and continued until Spring 2004. The following procedures were used in this study:

1. I participated in the ALL Training Program from August 2002 – April 2003.
2. I took field notes of the ALL training sessions for 11 weeks in Spring 2003.
3. I conducted two focus group interviews, with three teachers in each group, in Spring 2003.
4. I purposefully selected two teachers to interview and observe based upon information

gleaned from the focus group interviews.

5. I individually interviewed the selected two teachers twice (Spring 2003 and Spring 2004), and the site-based trainer and two support trainers once in Spring 2003.
6. During the first week of school, in August 2003, I made a full-day observation to obtain information about literacy instruction and practices in the context of each classroom.
7. Twenty-two observations were made in each classroom during guided reading time, which is the period of time when teachers meet with small groups of students, and during their literacy period.
8. I held an exit meeting with each teacher and the site-based trainer upon the completion of the data collection process in Spring 2004.
9. I transcribed, organized, analyzed, and interpreted the data from Spring 2004 – Spring 2007.
10. I conducted a member check with each of the participants in the study to confirm the findings of the study in Spring 2007.

Table 3 presents the timeline for this qualitative case study.

Table 3

Study Timeline

Date	Procedures
Aug. 2002-April 2003	I participated in the ALL Training Program.
Jan. 2003-April 2003	I took 11 weeks of field notes of the ALL Training Program.
Feb. 18, 2003	I conducted a focus group interview with two trainers.
Feb. 19, 2003	I conducted a focus group interview with three teachers.
	I interviewed Ms. Hazlett.

Study Timeline (continued).

Date	Procedures
Feb. 26, 2003	I conducted a 2nd focus group interview with three teachers.
April 2, 2003	I interviewed Ms. Stone.
April 10, 2003	I interviewed Mrs. Paterson.
Aug. 8, 2003	I made a full day observation and took field notes of literacy instruction in each teacher's classroom.
Aug. 12-Sept. 12, 2004	I made daily observations and took field notes of literacy instruction in each teacher's classroom.
Feb. 24-Mar. 18, 2004	I made daily observations and took field notes of literacy instruction in each teacher's classroom.
Mar. 19. 2004	Exit meeting with each teacher and site-based trainer.
Mar. 2004-Mar. 2007	I transcribed, organized, analyzed, and interpreted the data.
Feb. 2007	I conducted a member check with each of the participants in the study to confirm the study findings.

Chapter Summary

This chapter described how this research study was conducted. I explained the purpose of the study and the research questions. I discussed the research design, including the theoretical research approaches of the study and the rationale for employing a qualitative case study design. I also described the selection of participants and the school site, including my role as a researcher, since I was a participant-observer in this study.

The data collection and analysis procedures were also included in this chapter. I explained how I took field notes of observations of training sessions and teacher's classrooms, conducted interviews with trainers and teachers, and collected and analyzed course materials. I also shared how I ensured credibility and viability by triangulating the

data sources in this study and conducting analysis checks, including my collaboration with a qualitative researcher and member checks with participants. Finally, I provided a timeline to document the time I spent in the field and the sequence of procedures used in this study.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

This chapter provides an in-depth look at the ALL Training Program by offering detailed information regarding the background and perceptions of the trainers, participant teachers, and school site. Descriptions and interpretations will be presented involving the first and second semester experiences within the ALL Training Program. An analysis of data collected from observational field notes of two participant teachers who received a year of ALL training will also be presented and explained in an effort to determine what elements of training teachers used and/or modified in their classrooms a year after their training. In an attempt to present the data as accurately as possible, direct quotes from trainers and participant teachers will be provided.

Due to the case study design of this study (Patton, 2002), this chapter is devoted to presenting an analysis of the data within individual cases. Case studies of the trainers and two teachers of the Accelerated Literacy Learning (ALL) Training Program are presented to offer a focused understanding of professional development in early intervention. The phenomenological data, including interviews and observations, collected from trainers and teachers were analyzed separately, followed by a cross-case analysis. This was done to determine the major themes for each case as well as those across cases. The constructs and themes that emerged from the data were useful in answering the research questions that guided this study.

The research questions this study sought to answer were:

1. How do teachers who have received early intervention training for two semesters apply this knowledge in their classrooms during the following school year?
2. What do teachers choose to use and not use from the training program and why?
3. What modifications of the program do teachers make, if any, and why?
4. What are the perceptions of trainers about an early intervention program?

Since I was a participant in the ALL Training Program, I felt it would be appropriate to include my thoughts and experiences with the training as well. The italicized paragraphs document my feelings and experiences with the program, in an effort to further illustrate the lived experience (Hycner, 1985; Patton, 2002) of being a participant in the ALL Training Program. This heuristic approach supported my knowledge of and ability to comment on what was taught and emphasized during the training sessions.

In-depth case studies of two first grade teachers who participated in the ALL Training Program are included in this chapter to provide a focused understanding of how teachers applied what they learned in training in their classrooms, one year after completing the training program. The individual case studies of teachers will be presented in an effort to demonstrate the way in which teachers with different instructional styles assimilated knowledge and made it part of their teaching repertoire. The case studies presented are of two teachers who were purposefully selected to be interviewed and observed based on their responses to focus group interview questions. Extreme case sampling was used to select these teachers.

Although both teachers spoke highly of the training program, they each claimed they would use the knowledge they had gained in different ways. One teacher claimed she planned to write the program into her Professional Development Plan for the following school year and would implement the program as she had been taught to do in training. The other teacher reported that she was not planning to use the program in exactly the same way she had during training. She was the only teacher in the program who admitted that she would probably modify the program, which was the reason she was selected as a participant in the study. Choosing a teacher with a differing perspective than the other participant teachers would normally enrich the study by providing a broader contextual view about training, but in the case of this study, that was not found to be true. The findings of this study indicated that the selection factors were less important than the effect of the training.

It is important to note that the data for this study were from a small sample of teachers and therefore are not generalizable. Data from the other teachers in the study could be characteristically impatterned differently. In fact, it is probable that other manifestations of the ALL program were present in other teachers' classrooms at the school site as well as in classrooms offsite.

Accelerated Literacy Learning Training Program

As soon as I found out about the Accelerated Literacy Learning Training Program, I knew that I wanted to become involved in some way with the program and to learn more about it. Approximately five years earlier the Department of Defense Dependent School System (DODDS) had embraced Reading Recovery and was looking for interested teachers to volunteer to receive training. At that time I was a first grade

teacher with DODDS, but was unable to make the commitment necessary to receive training, as I was getting married and did not yet know whether or not my husband and I would be living in the same area of England where the training was taking place. In the end, we were able to move to that area, but the offer to train teachers no longer applied. In retrospect, I wish I had volunteered to participate in the Reading Recovery training program.

Because of my interest in teaching reading, I attended Reading Recovery workshops that were held after school for first grade teachers. I found the philosophy to be in line with my own philosophy of how children learn to read and how to best teach reading, particularly for at-risk students. As I learned more about the program, I became even more interested in using Reading Recovery strategies with my first grade students.

Within a few months of becoming a doctoral student at the University of South Florida (after 17 years of elementary school teaching), I became aware of the Accelerated Literacy Learning Program. I began to enthusiastically pursue an active involvement with the program at that time. My major professor suggested that I take the training for credit as part of my doctoral studies, and I enthusiastically agreed to do so. I attended the training program for two semesters, which began in Fall 2002 and ended in Spring 2003.

Trainers

The ALL Training Program had three trainers who were assigned to provide training to 14 teachers who had volunteered to participate in the training program. The

site-based trainer, Ms. Hazlett, who provided the bulk of the training, was a Reading Coach at one of the participating schools. The other two trainers were doctoral students at the University of South Florida (USF). They had more of a support role in that they handled administrative tasks such as scheduling, paperwork for graduate credit, and providing teachers with agendas and handouts. They also had a more active support role with such things as guiding discussions, coaching, observing, and providing feedback to teachers.

Site-based Trainer

Ms. Hazlett was the teacher-trainer who provided the majority of the training in the program. She was a Reading Coach at the school site where eight of the participating teachers worked. Ms. Hazlett had been working for the school system for about 20 years. She spent five years as a paraprofessional and, after completing her teaching degree, continued working as a teacher. She became involved with the ALL program in 1992. Ms. Hazlett was completing a Master's Degree in Early Childhood and teaching in an early childhood center at that time. She saw an ad for the position in the district's Administrative Bulletin and decided to apply. As Ms. Hazlett stated:

> It was geared towards a first grade program and I had just been teaching first grade prior to that for a number of years and felt very strongly about first grade and the importance of it. So when I saw a program directed at first grade kids who are struggling with Reading, I was very, very interested. So, kind of on a whim, I applied for a teacher position and a trainer position, and was very surprised to be called in for an interview for the trainer, and ended up being selected. So I was one of the first trainers in the county when it was implemented

> at USF. So that's how I got started with it. I stayed with the program for the five years that it was really active in the county and I trained three different cadres of teachers. For three years we were bringing in new teachers. Then the remaining two years I spent continuing to support the teachers in the program. We were in a transition at that point with funding, and so on, but I stayed for five years until things sort of fizzled out here in the county. I went back in the classroom, and then I worked with another grant, a staff development grant, where we actually implemented very much the same strategies for classroom teachers, the use of running records, the strategy talk, even the lesson components we worked on. I did that for two years. So then at the beginning of this school year, I was approached again about participating in the final year of the grant, and my situation was that I could do that. And the teachers here at my school were invited to participate, which was very important, since I was here already, it really made a lot of sense. (February 19, 2003)

Support Trainers

The other two trainers attended an ALL trainer class and an ALL teacher class at the same time, as part of their doctoral studies at USF. They received training for one year (two semesters) and were in their second year as trainers for the ALL program. They provided training to the teachers for the final year of the grant as well. The training took place between August 2002 and May 2003.

ALL Participants and School Site

There were 14 participants in the ALL Training Program. Of the participants in the program, eight were teachers at the site-based trainer's school, two were teachers at a

university charter school, three were teachers at other elementary schools, and I was a doctoral student. The two teachers who worked at the university charter school dropped out of the training program after the first semester, leaving only 12 participants in the program. All 12 participants in the training program gave written consent to participate in the study, but only six teachers attended the focus group interview.

Participant Teachers

Of the six teachers who participated in the focus group interview, only two teachers were purposefully selected to be observed in their classrooms and individually interviewed. Extreme case sampling was used to select these teachers. Mrs. Paterson and Ms. Stone were the two teachers who were selected for an in-depth study. Both teachers taught first grade.

One 27 year old white female first grade teacher, Ms. Stone, was selected because I had worked closely with her and two students in her classroom. Since I had worked in Ms. Stone's classroom already, she was accustomed to my presence. We had developed an easy rapport, which was probably why she agreed to participate in the study. Ms. Stone had been teaching for five years. All of her teaching experience was at the school site.

One 47 year old black female first grade teacher, Ms. Paterson, was also selected to participate in the study. Ms. Paterson was chosen because she stated that she would probably not use what she had learned from the ALL training in the same way in which she had been trained. Since she was the only participant in the training program with a differing view on how she might use what she had learned from training, she was chosen

in an effort to add depth and interest to the results of the study. Ms. Paterson had been teaching for nine years. All of her teaching experience was at the same school site.

School Site

During the first semester, the training was conducted at an inner-city elementary school where two of the teachers worked. After the first semester, the trainers decided to change the training site to that of the site-based trainer's elementary school because she and eight of the participating teachers worked there. This inner-city elementary school was the site selected for the research study for several reasons. First, it was selected because it was the site where the training took place during the time when I was collecting data. Secondly, the teachers who participated in the research study as well as the site-based trainer worked at the school site. Lastly, the school site was chosen because it was the site where I conducted my ALL lessons during training, and therefore I had full access to the site. The principal and faculty members were accustomed to my visits, which made obtaining approval for data collection purposes much easier.

First Semester Experiences

Before I enrolled in the ALL Training Program, I had decided that I would study the program for my dissertation. I had not yet determined what the purpose of the study would be, but I knew that I would use the information from the training sessions in some capacity in my doctoral dissertation. Therefore, the training served two professional purposes for me. I hoped to become a better reading teacher as a result of the training, as well as to design a study for my doctoral dissertation. Since I was the only doctoral student participating in the program, who was not providing training, and who was not

currently teaching at the elementary level, I had the difficult task of establishing a rapport with the other participants.

I realized early on that it was important to define my role in the program as "student", which was a humbling position to be in, considering my teaching and educational background. I was used to being in the role of "teacher", but I found that the other teachers were more comfortable around me when I played the "student" role. I soon discovered that the role suited me, as I indeed was a student at the University of South Florida (USF), and was learning so much from the other teachers in the ALL Training Program. Also, it helped that I had developed and taught ALL lessons to a group of three students, just as the teachers were expected to do.

Ms. Stone was kind enough to allow me to work with three of her students, during the first semester of training. She was not comfortable with the four of us working in her classroom, however, so we conducted our ALL lessons in Ms. Hazlett's classroom. I met with the students two times per week, for 30 minute lessons, during the first semester of training.

ALL Training Course Requirements

The ALL Training Program was designed as a college course and participants could receive college course credit for their participation in the program. Participating teachers received the required materials for the course at no additional cost them. The following required texts for the course were provided to the participants by the local school district:

Clay, Marie M. (1993). *An observation survey of early literacy achievement.*

Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Clay, Marie, M. (1993). *Reading Recovery: A guidebook for teachers in training.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

A course syllabus was also given to the participants, providing a description of the course, objectives, requirements, and a tentative schedule from August 14, 2002 - December 4, 2002 (see Appendix C). Participants met once a week for two hours of training. There were a total of 16 training sessions in the first semester. Therefore, participants received a total of 32 hours of training in the first semester. These training sessions were primarily devoted to training teachers how to systematically observe their students and administer Marie Clay's *Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement* (2002).

The course objectives were to "conduct systematic observation of students, administer instruments appropriate for determining student literacy functioning status, select books at the appropriate level for individual students, plan and implement a daily 30 minute ALL lesson, and to make decisions to facilitate acceleration of students" (RED 6540 Course Syllabus, University of South Florida, 2002). All of these objectives were met in the course, but the teachers needed additional time to familiarize themselves with the *Observation Survey*. There was a lot to learn about assessment and record keeping that was new to the teachers, and they were struggling with keeping the other students in their classes engaged while they completed the assessments.

Even though a tentative schedule (see Appendix D) and timeline were developed for the course, the trainers were very flexible and adjusted the schedule according to the teachers' needs. That meant that the bulk of the training in the first semester was devoted to learning how to assess students using the *Observation Survey* and how to take Running

Records. Videotapes were presented of ALL lessons to illustrate the lesson format and all of the nuances associated with developing and implementing an ALL lesson. Some of the teachers had begun to teach, but the majority of the teachers were still struggling with completing the assessments, because they were asked to assess all of the students in their classes.

The trainers provided numerous examples, through the use of videotapes and modeling, as well as opportunities for practice during the training sessions, to familiarize the teachers with systematic observation and assessment procedures. By the end of the first semester of training, the teachers had completed the class assessments, identified their group of three students for instruction, and had begun instruction. The trainers supported the teachers by conducting observations and providing them with constructive feedback on a regular basis.

Second Semester Experiences

During the second semester of training, I had decided that I wanted the focus of my doctoral study to be on how teachers use what they have learned during training in their classrooms, upon completion of training. Since I had made this decision, I knew that I would have to situate myself as "researcher" for the second semester of training. This was a very comfortable role for me since I was collecting data for the David C. Anchin Center at USF at that time. I found that it was also an easy transition to make from the role of "student", since both roles require astute observation and active listening.

I was learning from the trainers and teachers, with the added responsibility of taking copious field notes. I think the fact that I was taking notes probably was very

distracting to both the teachers and the trainers at first, but I chose to sit at the back where I could easily see and hear everything that was taking place during training, as well as position myself somewhat apart from the group. Although this position was successful in situating me as "researcher", this also removed me from the group. I found that I rarely participated in the discussions. Perhaps this was because I was still learning how to take field notes and found it difficult to take field notes and actively participate at the same time.

Another exciting development took place during the second semester of training. By this time I had developed an excellent rapport with Ms. Stone. I continued to meet with three of her students, until one of the students moved away. When this happened, I talked with Ms. Stone about the possibility of changing the meeting place from Ms. Hazlett's classroom to her classroom. I wanted to meet with the remaining two students in her classroom for several reasons. First, I believed that we could provide a more consistent program to the students if we met in her classroom because the students would see that Ms. Stone and I talked and shared ideas. I also wanted to offer the two boys in my group an opportunity to read the books from their classroom for a more seamless approach to teaching reading. I wanted them to be able to read the books that they read with their teacher as well as with me. I thought it would also save time because we wouldn't have to walk to and from Ms. Hazlett's room each day. Also, I could work individually with the boys more easily if we were in their classroom. If one boy needed more time, I could dismiss the other boy and work individually with him. Of course, I also had another underlying agenda, related to my doctoral dissertation, and that was

that I hoped to engage Ms. Stone's participation in my study for the following year. Thankfully, Ms. Stone was a willing participant and for that I will be eternally grateful.

The second semester of training took place between January, 2003 and April, 2003. Since I had attended the training sessions, conducted ALL training lessons with two students, typed the transcripts taken from the field notes from training, and read through the training transcripts, I had a deep understanding of the ALL Training Program and its precepts. This contextual knowledge was instrumental in helping me analyze and interpret the data.

In this section, excerpts from training transcripts will be presented in an effort to provide support for the interpretations of the data. Direct quotes will be used as often as possible to present the data as accurately as possible. For a better understanding of the context of the training sessions, background information and information regarding who was speaking will be provided as well. Descriptions, explanations, and interpretations of the training sessions will also be provided as much as possible for further clarification.

Videotapes

During the second semester of training, the teachers had begun teaching ALL lessons with a group of three students in their classrooms and were fully implementing the ALL program. Each teacher was videotaped during their presentation of an ALL lesson with their group of students at some time during the semester. One videotape was shared at each training session. The trainers would deconstruct the lesson in the videotape and use it to reinforce ALL training concepts. This section will describe what was presented and emphasized during the second semester of ALL training, when the videotapes were shared with the participant teachers.

The month of January was devoted to preparing teachers for videotaping a lesson to share at a training session. Each session in the second semester began with a videotape of one of the teachers. The teacher would provide a little background about the students in her group and then the teachers and trainers would watch the video. During this time, one trainer would continuously point out important aspects of the ALL lesson by questioning the teachers as they watched each videotape. The trainer would talk through the lesson as the teachers watched, and used the videotape to teach and reinforce ALL concepts. Ms. Hazlett explained, "the purpose of this is to use instruction we see to open up to the group. Always bring comments to the group" (Training Transcripts, Jan. 22, 2003). One teacher would be asked to write down questions that the teachers wanted to ask the videotaped teacher, as we watched the video, so that the teacher in the video could answer them following the video. Once the video ended, a discussion began about the lesson and teachers would ask the videotaped teacher about the decisions she had made for instruction.

At the beginning of each training session, the teachers and trainers watched a videotape of one teacher as she conducted an ALL lesson in her classroom with her ALL group. The following excerpt is an example of how the trainers reinforced ALL concepts by using a teacher's videotape: [R is one of the support trainers. T refers to the teachers. H is Ms. Hazlett, the site-based trainer. Dr. K. is one of the developers of the program and a university professor.]

R: What's going on? What section of the lesson is this?

T: Familiar read

R: Can you tell which child is the focus?

T: Closest to her

R: Have you noticed what the teacher does to show that she's listening to a child?

H: I heard some strategy talk.

T: Does she have different bags for each kid for the familiar read?

Dr. K: I'm impressed with her teaching point with one kid and the other kids are still reading.

R: What's going on here?

T: Reinforcing strategies.

R: How long do you do this?

T: Until they can do it by themselves. (Training Transcripts, Feb. 5, 2003)

It is interesting to note that the trainers, university professor, and teachers had different purposes in mind for viewing and discussing the videotapes. The trainers focused on the lesson structure and the sequence of teaching events during an ALL lesson. They seemed to want to reinforce the lesson format. The university professor commented on the teacher's decision to make a teaching point and student engagement. The teachers were more interested in practical, procedural information regarding the routines they had established with their groups. Here is another example from the same training transcript that further illustrates this point:

R: What are we moving into now?

T: Running Record

R: What are the other two doing while she does the Running Record?

T: I would like to know what "word work" is.

T: Are the kids writing with pens?

R: They are gel pens. What do you think about the time? If you have a long book, about how many words should it be?

T: 100

R: What comes next?

T: Teaching Point

R: How many teaching points should there be?

T: 2 or 3

T: Why are they folding the paper? (referring to paper in student notebooks)

T: Are the children putting the focus child's initials on everything?

(Training Transcripts, February 5, 2003)

The teachers answered the trainers' questions regarding lesson format, but seemed to be more interested in the decisions the videotaped teacher made regarding the practical procedures the teacher had developed with the students before teaching the ALL lessons. They had learned the lesson structure and demonstrated that they knew the proper sequence by answering the trainers' questions, but when they had an opportunity to question the teacher it was usually regarding the routines the teacher had established with her ALL students. Each teacher's individual practical procedures that they had developed for their ALL group of students differed, while the lesson format remained the same. That was probably why the teachers were more interested in questioning each other about procedures and routines.

Although the ALL program has a definite format and time structure with 10 minutes of reading familiar books, 10 minutes of writing, and 10 minutes of reading an unfamiliar book, teachers were given the flexibility to develop lessons within each of the

time segments based on each child's needs. This meant that not all teachers were doing exactly the same thing. There were many variations within each segment of the lesson, which was probably another reason why the teachers were so interested in watching their colleagues' videotapes.

The teachers learned what worked best for their students and developed a program suited to them, but they were also always searching for ways to improve their teaching. They were fascinated by the videotapes because they were so different. Each teacher infused her own personality and established procedures and routines within her ALL lessons, which contributed to the variation in lessons. Also, the personalities and abilities of the students varied, which also contributed to the differences among ALL groups.

Another reason why I believe the teachers were so enthralled with the videotapes was because teachers do not have opportunities to watch other teachers teach. Much of the ALL Training Program was devoted to providing opportunities for teachers to watch each other, to have a dialogue about the decisions they made regarding instruction, and to reflect on their teaching practice. The teachers learned from each other as well as from the trainers in the training program.

Decision-making

Teachers are faced with making thousands of decisions on a daily basis in their classrooms. They have to make decisions regarding their instructional practices, grouping children, lesson planning, in addition to many administrative decisions. The teachers found that decision-making was extremely important in the ALL program as well. Teachers had to make decisions about how to form reading groups, individualize instruction, and particularly how to monitor their teaching behaviors to maximize each

student's reading potential. They also were trained to monitor their pacing, which required that they make decisions about how they could best use the time they had in each segment of their ALL lesson. As Ms. Hazlett stated, the 10-10-10 format:

> …was to force the teacher into making better decisions and to not get bogged down on unnecessary details or to over dwell on something that wasn't essential to the literacy process. By forcing people to do a 10-10-10, it really made teachers go okay, I've got two minutes left, what's really important here in this segment of the lesson and what can I do with it and what should I do with it? It forces a different kind of decision-making. (February 19, 2003)

Decision-making was emphasized during the ALL training sessions, as each teacher made decisions about what to do during the 30 minute lesson and how to make the most productive use of the time with their students.

Decisions were made based on the individual needs of the ALL students. The following excerpt from the training transcripts exemplifies the importance of decision-making to the program: [M and R are support trainers, T refers to the teachers, and Dr. K refers to the university professor and program developer]

> M: Is she keeping track of what all three children are doing? What do you think she's getting ready for now?
>
> T: Running Records
>
> M: How did she take care of the other children?
>
> T: Put her hand out
>
> M: Was that a good choice? Give it a try or move on? He gave it a try. Would you say he is a confident reader? He's really not making many

appeals even though he's using wait time. How do you think the child felt about the Running Record?

T: Positive

M: That's important…what do you think about the word "caught" for him? Yes, that word is not a good word for boxes. [this refers to drawing a box for each of the letters in the word "caught" and asking the student to use letter sounds to determine each of the letters in the word].

Dr. K: A is doing a lot of talk about what to do next. I wonder what would happen if she pulled out and said, "What will we do next?" and had them start monitoring themselves. What do you think of the independence she's allowing? They are doing the book walk on their own. Do you think "sweater" is a good word to be looking for? Do you think they're going to be ready for the vocabulary in this book?

R: What do you think about the teacher choosing to read the book with them?

M: You make the best decision you can, in the time you have.

(Training Transcripts, February 26, 2003)

The trainers were constantly questioning and probing to make teachers aware of the importance of their decisions regarding the ALL lessons.

Teachers had to make decisions regarding the appropriate teaching points to make with each child, without overwhelming the children. They had to make decisions regarding pacing and how much time to devote to each segment of the lesson. Although teachers tried to stay within the 10-10-10 format, they had the flexibility to make changes based on their students' and their respective needs. The program follows the child and

therefore is not dictated by the teachers. Teachers also had to decide the appropriate reading levels for their students and choose books that were at their instructional, rather than frustrational level. They made decisions about when to accelerate their students, based on student assessment data. Finally, teachers were constantly making decisions about how they could best foster reading independence in their students.

Teaching points. Teachers in the ALL Training Program had to make decisions about what they chose to teach to each child in their ALL group. These are referred to as "teaching points" in the ALL program. The decisions they made about what would be the focus of their teaching that day were based upon student responses. The teachers were trained to follow each child and their particular learning needs for the day. When a child made an error, the teacher had to decide whether to ignore the error or to make it the focus of their teaching for that child. The goal was to choose two or three teaching points for the focus child each day. The reason there was a limit to the teaching points was so that the child was not overwhelmed by teaching points. One of the support trainers explained the purpose of using teaching points in the following way:

> M: For instance, one of the things that you do is you look for the positives and you build on the strengths. When you observe them doing something right, you reinforce it. Then you discuss the things that you think are most crucial that need help. Like your teaching point. You do the same thing when you're in an observation. You know that this new teacher, especially first semester, is going to be overwhelmed and is going to have many things that they are not yet implementing, so you reinforce the positive things that they are doing and then you look for those teaching points that are going to best help them be the

kind of teacher, independent, reflective, observing teacher that they need to become. (Trainer Focus Group Interview, February 18, 2003)

Once again, the trainers brought teaching points to the attention of the teachers during training through the use of videotapes. The following excerpts from training demonstrate how the videotapes were used to reinforce the use of teaching points: [R is a support trainer and T refers to individual teachers]

R: What comes next?

T: Teaching point.

R: How many teaching points should there be?

T: Two or three. (Training Transcripts, February 5, 2003)

R: After watching this, think of teaching points that you would do. Let's see if you would do the same teaching points. In her teaching points did she have a focus?

T: Visual

T: Looking at the pictures

R: Who's in control of the sentence generation here?

T: Child (Training Transcripts, February 12, 2003)

The decisions teachers made about teaching points for their individual students usually directly related to the reading strategies and cueing systems that were taught in ALL training. For example, in the above transcript, the teachers discussed the videotaped teacher's decision to focus the attention of the child she was working with on meaning cues by prompting the child to look at the pictures. Teachers in the ALL program practiced astute observation, and in this case, the teacher noticed that the student was not

attending to the pictures to help construct meaning from the text. That might have been the reason she chose to make meaning cues one of the teaching points with her child on that particular day.

The notion of teachers becoming careful observers of children and responding to children at the point of need with an appropriate teaching point was one of the goals for the teachers in the ALL Training Program. Ms. Hazlett described this program goal in the following way:

> It's to shift their thinking and to look at the way kids learn to interact with reading and writing in a more informed way. My hope is that they begin to see the power that they have in terms of guiding the instruction in reading and writing and being able to be better observers of the little things that really matter that we learn from Clay in using the assessments, the Observation Survey, the use of the Running Records, and just becoming very data-based observers with knowledge to know what they're seeing. So I hope that by doing that, they're really helping kids to progress faster than they would normally without that kind of input. (February 19, 2003)

In the ALL program a teacher's decision to make a particular teaching point is critical to the accelerated literacy learning process for children. Teachers identify individual student's areas of strength and weakness in reading, build on their strengths by reinforcing the problem-solving strategies that they employ, and scaffold instruction to meet their reading needs. As Ms. Hazlett stated, "You have to go where the child is" (February 19, 2003).

Pacing. One of the biggest challenges facing teachers in the ALL program is managing the time that they have with their ALL group of students. The ALL lesson is divided into three 10 minute segments, with 10 minutes of reading familiar books, 10 minutes of writing, and 10 minutes of reading an unfamiliar book. Consequently, pacing is a very important component of the ALL program. Teachers are trained to use the 30 minutes wisely, which means that they have to monitor the time as well as the activities that they decide to do with their students during each 10 minute segment of the 30 minute lesson. Teachers found this to be a very difficult task, but thought that it was aiding them in making better decisions on how to use their time efficiently, as the following transcript suggests: [C is the interviewer, P is Ms. Paterson, M is a Reading Coach and participant teacher]

C: What is your view of the 10-10-10 format?

P: I think it's great, 10-10-10, my only problem is sticking with it, but I think it's a good way to monitor ourselves so we don't go over and we have more time to spend with the other children because you know you are working with just a small group of children. In order to meet all the children, I think it's a good concept, it's just hard to stick to it. I just always want to give more and give more.

C: How do you stop yourself from doing that if you want to give more?

P: Believe it or not I'm constantly watching the clock. I don't know if that's a good thing to do or not, but I'm constantly watching it. I'm running out of time.

M: Well it's been good for me because it's making me more structured and

> making better decisions for my small group. I've always been trained with the Guided Reading, which is similar to the ALL structure, but the Guided Reading is a little bit more unraveling what the kids need and going with, following up with what we've done with the whole class in shared reading, so it's a much different structure than what I'm used to, so it's helping me shift my thoughts on how to do certain things and be a little bit more flexible. (Teacher Focus Group Interview, February 19, 2003)

Although the teachers in the focus group were discussing pacing and the ALL lesson structure, the construct of decision-making emerged once again. It is interesting to note that in every discussion with the teachers and trainers, both in training and during interviews, the topic of decision-making would inevitably arise. Most of the excerpts from training were related to the decision-making process for teachers, which is why *Decision-making* became one of the three main themes that emerged from the ALL training data.

In the second semester of training, the issue of pacing and time management came up during the viewing of teachers' videotapes. The trainers wanted to reiterate the importance of pacing, particularly with regard to time spent working with young children. The ALL program is a response-based program, which means that teachers are constantly responding to students by prompting, questioning, and probing them. Because of this, children who are the focus of the teacher's attention and instruction for the 30 minute lesson might grow fatigued and start to withdraw or completely shut down. The following excerpts from training transcripts exemplify this: [R is a support trainer, T refers to the teachers, Dr. K is a university professor, Ms. Hazlett is the site-based trainer]

R: What do you think about the time? If you have a long book, about how many words should it be?

T: 100

R: This is the read through, is it first read or second read?

Dr. K: These are push-in lessons, is that correct? So I could send them back to their seats to read the book.

R: We're at 32 minutes. We'll stop here. Questions?

(Training Transcripts, February 5, 2003)

R: What do you think about the length of the new book session?

T: It is too long.

R: Is it okay to do the whole book? This is productive. You have to make choices about time for each section.

Ms. Hazlett: The book introduction is the perfect place to see the Zone of Proximal Development. He had looked through the book independently.

R: They are working so hard.

Ms. Hazlett: First graders do get tired. That's why it is only a 30 minute lesson.

(Training Transcripts, March 5, 2003)

Ms. Hazlett: …It is okay to step in and finish the book with the child. Those are the things you have to do for timing.

(Training Transcripts, April 23, 2003)

Acceleration. Another difficult task for teachers, related to decision-making in the ALL program, was to choose appropriate levels of books for their students. Teachers

were encouraged to scaffold instruction for each child to accelerate their progress to higher levels of reading proficiency, which was referred to as "acceleration" in the ALL program. Although the teachers were aware of the importance of acceleration in the program, the focus of moving children up in reading levels was primarily prevalent near the end of the second semester, which is when it was hoped that the children would graduate from the program.

There were two occasions during training when acceleration was discussed. The following excerpt was taken from the second semester of training regarding acceleration: [T refers to teachers, M is a support trainer]

> T: With three kids, if they have 100% [on the running record], is it time to go up? (Training Transcripts, January 22, 2003)
>
> M: If he had this rate for a couple of days, then he could move up a level. He was using strategies and not appealing. (Training Transcripts, April 9, 2003)

During each ALL lesson session, the teacher would assess at least one child (who was referred to as the "focus child") by taking a Running Record of the child's reading errors. The data that were collected by the teacher were then analyzed to determine the instructional reading level. The teacher made decisions regarding whether or not to accelerate the students based upon these data. If a child read a book at his/her instructional level and consistently employed reading strategies when attacking difficult text, the teacher might choose to accelerate the child to the next reading level.

Reading Strategies

The ALL Training Program was designed to train teachers to implement the ALL early intervention program within the classroom setting. The focus of the training was on

learning systematic observation for assessment purposes, and strategies for struggling readers (RED 6540 Course Syllabus, University of South Florida, 2002). The second semester was primarily devoted to teaching specific reading strategies to the teachers so that they could, in turn, teach and reinforce them with their students. At every session of the second semester of ALL training, the reading strategies were stressed, which is why *Strategy Talk* and *Strategy Use* became major constructs in this study. *Strategy Talk* referred to what the teachers said to remind students to use reading strategies, and *Strategy Use* referred to when the children used reading strategies (See Appendix E).

Teaching the teachers each of the reading strategies and how to teach and reinforce them with their students was a major focus of the second semester of ALL training. This was done both explicitly and implicitly during the course of training. The reading strategies were taught explicitly by the trainers by presenting them and modeling them for the teachers. The following strategies were taught to the teachers: making predictions, looking at the pictures, making connections, self-monitoring, cross-checking, searching for information, self-corrections, fluency, and problem-solving. Strategies were taught and reinforced implicitly through the use of the teachers' videotapes.

An analysis of the data revealed three constructs with regard to reading strategies. These constructs were *Strategy Talk*, *Strategy Use*, and *Cueing Systems*. Although the constructs *Strategy Talk* and *Strategy Use* were similar in that they referred to how reading strategies were employed, distinctions were made regarding who was using them. *Strategy Talk* was a construct that emerged from the data regarding what teachers said to children to remind them to use the reading strategies. In contrast, *Strategy Use* was a construct that emerged from the data regarding when children used reading strategies to

attack challenging text. Finally, *Cueing Systems* was a construct that emerged from the data which referred to the three cueing systems (meaning, visual, and structure) that teachers used to encourage students to employ appropriate strategies for attacking texts.

Strategy talk. An analysis of the data revealed that modeling, teaching, and reinforcing strategies was emphasized during ALL training sessions. The construct that emerged from the data was labeled *Strategy Talk.* This construct was one of the three major constructs that emerged from the ALL training data. The following excerpts from field notes were taken with regard to discussing Strategy Talk:

> 3:45-4:25 pm
>
> Ms. Hazlett shared overheads of quotes from Marie Clay, Regie Routman, and Fountas and Pinnell about helping struggling readers. She then gave examples of strategy talk to use with the children with the goal of promoting independence.
>
> 4:25-4:45 pm
>
> In groups we were given examples of strategy talk and had to order them from broad to specific. Then we put them on a large paper funnel to illustrate the movement from very broad to more specific strategy talk. (Training Transcripts, January 29, 2003)

The following excerpt illustrates how the trainers used the videotapes to highlight strategy talk [Dr. K is the program developer and a university professor, T refers to the teachers, Ms. Hazlett is the site-based trainer]:

> Dr.K: I'm wondering why same kind of strategy talk is not being used now that was being used in the lesson.
>
> Ms. Hazlett: We're so focused on strategy talk. Don't not talk about the story.

The point is the story. Let's talk about strategy talk.

T: I had a better question. I have my papers with me to remind myself.

(Referred to handouts given in training about strategy talk)

T: I tried your suggestion of covering up a word and asked what they think goes there.

T: D and I have been doing team-teaching and we've been using strategy cards.

T: Those strategy cards. We should all have them. Big strategy cards.

Ms. Hazlett: That's from the same company as DRA. I'm going to show you some snippets of strategy talk.

[She showed a video of someone using strategy talk and one of herself.]

Ms. Hazlett: Bite your tongue once in awhile and give kids a chance to self-correct.

(Training Transcripts, February 5, 2003)

There was also some discussion about spending too much time teaching and reinforcing strategies with the students in their groups. The teachers wanted to know if they might not be overusing them.

All of the teachers were using the strategies with their ALL groups, which was certainly a goal of the program. Sometimes when we learn something new, however, we have a tendency to overuse it as we make it a part of our teaching repertoire. The teachers were concerned that this was happening to them. The following transcript illustrates this point [T refers to the teachers, Ms. Hazlett is the site-based trainer, R is a support trainer]:

T: M is the focus child. I focused on strategies and reinforcing strategies…I'm afraid I might have over focused on it.

Ms. Hazlett: I think it's interesting that she does the strategy talk here, after the book

walk, but before they read.

R: Is this an appropriate time for strategy talk and teaching points? T is very good at finding the strengths of the child and reinforcing them. We do need to incorporate wait time during the writing. (Training Transcripts, February 12, 2003)

There were 18 examples of *Strategy Talk* from the Training Transcripts over the course of 11 weeks. These examples occurred during six of the ALL training sessions. Table 4 provides examples of *Strategy Talk* from the ALL training transcript data.

Table 4

Strategy Talk Construct

Date	Examples from Training Transcripts
Jan. 22, 2003	I like the way she reinforced "you get your mouth ready." …strategy talk in the writing section, can you do it? Yes!
Jan. 29,2003	She then gave examples of strategy talk to use with the children…
	We were given examples of strategy talk and had to order them from broad to specific. Then we put them on a drawing of a large paper funnel to demonstrate the order to the class.
Feb. 5, 2003	I heard some strategy talk.
	…reinforcing strategies
	Do you notice strategy cards?
	I'm wondering why same kind of strategy talk is not being used now that was being used in the lesson.
	We're so focused on strategy talk, don't not talk about the story. The point is the story. Let's talk about strategy talk.
	D and I have been doing team teaching and we've been using strategy cards…Those strategy cards. We should all have them. Big strategy cards.
	I'm going to show you some snippets of strategy talk.

Strategy Talk Construct (continued).

Date	Examples from Training Transcripts
Feb. 12, 2003	I focused on strategies and reinforcing strategies… I'm afraid I over focused on it. I think it's interesting that she does the strategy talk here, after the book walk, but before they read. Is this an appropriate time for strategy talk and teaching points?
Feb. 19, 2003	Good strategy talk. Did you notice? She was real explicit. So, is it better to give a "told" than to say, "get your mouth ready"?
Apr. 23, 2003	I heard strategy talk right there. Seeing the connection between strategy talk and cueing systems helps you see what the child can do and still needs to work on.

Strategy use. Teachers modeled and reinforced the use of reading strategies with their students. When students employed the reading strategies to attack and create meaning from unfamiliar texts this was referred to as *Strategy Use* within the context of this study. There were 10 examples of *Strategy Use* in the Training Transcript data over 11 weeks of training. Table 5 presents examples of *Strategy Use* from these data.

Table 5

Strategy Use Construct

Date	Examples from Training Transcripts
Jan. 22, 2003	He's using a lot of strategies. I'm impressed.
Jan. 29, 2003	We watched a video of one teacher's ALL lesson with her three students and discussed the components of her lesson and the choices she had made about teaching points and strategy use.

Strategy Use Construct (continued).

Date	Examples from Training Transcripts
Feb. 19, 2003	[T used strategy cards with her students. She asked her children what strategies they could use to help themselves when reading.] That happens though. What possible reason could she have for choosing the books for them? T: to check strategies
Feb. 26, 2003	…Try to show the positives to reinforce strategies that children are using. Some children work it out aloud.
Mar. 19, 2003	What do you notice about their reading? Do you notice any strategies? …What strategies did you see coming out? Self-correction went on.
Apr. 9, 2003	If he had had this rate for a couple of days, then he could move up a level. He was using strategies and not appealing. <u>Strategy Use</u> -chunk -pictures -searching -get mouth ready -read ahead -prior knowledge -think aloud -reread -monitor -cross-check
Apr. 23, 2003	…Another thing you can do is have them find a place where they used a strategy to solve a problem and share it with the group…

Cueing systems. Ms. Hazlett explicitly taught cueing systems and reading strategies again on April 9, 2003. During the first half of the training session we watched a videotape of a teacher and then we regrouped to review cueing systems and reading strategies. Ms. Hazlett used this time to assess our knowledge by listing the cueing systems and then asking us to name the reading strategies. She made a chart on the white board for us to copy as we relayed the information to her. The field notes from the session are below:

Ms. Hazlett: …We are going to practice our use of cues and strategies. Strategies

are kind of mental actions, with beginning readers they are more visual. [She then began to write the cueing systems on the board.]

Cueing Systems – Cues are like sources of information.

Meaning	Structure	Visual
Reread	Reread	Reread
Read Ahead	Read Ahead	Read Ahead
Monitor	Monitor	

(Training Transcripts, April 9, 2003)

Ms. Hazlett shared her expertise with the teachers during training. The following excerpt from training is an example of this:

I've been doing this for 10 years and can share this with teachers. Seeing the connections between strategy talk and cueing systems helps you see what the child can do and still needs to work on. Build on strengths.

(Training Transcripts, April 23, 2003)

Ms. Hazlett stressed the importance of understanding and employing the cueing systems and strategies with students in the classroom.

Independence

The goal of the ALL program was to foster independence in young readers so that they would develop the problem-solving skills necessary to approach texts with confidence, rather than depending on other more proficient readers to help them, or simply giving up. Children who are at-risk of reading failure struggle to learn to read and often do not want to work at improving their reading skills because it is hard work. The ALL program's systematic approach to teaching a child how to read was intensive for

children because they were working one-on-one or in small groups with very focused attention for 30 minutes.

The children worked very hard because they were expected to make progress and were encouraged and pushed to do so. One of the support trainers of the ALL Training Program stated that the goal of the program was "to teach children to be self-extending, to develop independent self-extending systems so that they can attack any reading and be successful at it" (Trainer Focus Group Interview, February 18, 2002). This required decision-making on the teacher's part as well. Teachers were constantly monitoring their teaching and deciding what to do and say to the students in their ALL group, to foster each student's reading independence.

Much time was spent in training on how to foster reading independence in children. The trainers provided examples through the use of videotapes and modeling. It was clear from the training sessions that one of the most important goals of the program was to encourage children to be independent readers. The trainers reinforced this message at every session. The following excerpts from training illustrate how the trainers chose to do this: [T refers to the teachers, Ms. Hazlett is the site-based trainer, R is a support trainer, C is the teacher who was sharing her videotaped lesson, Dr. K is one of the program developers and a university professor]

Ms. Hazlett: How independent is he?

T: He's using a lot of strategies. I'm impressed.

T: When they keep trying and trying and they don't know the word, should I tell?

Ms. Hazlett: We'll talk about that….when do you give a told? Momentum

is an important point. You want them to be able to figure out the word.

T: We're really not supposed to do many "tolds".

Ms. Hazlett: A lot of us foster dependency instead of independence. If the book is too easy, let them read it and then pick a harder book next time.

(Training Transcripts, January 22, 2003)

R: What is the purpose of the writing segment? Our goal is always independence.

(Training Transcripts, February 5, 2003)

Ms. Hazlett: How would you have changed the intro to the new book?

C: I would have backed out a little more.

Ms. Hazlett: Knowing the materials is so important to deciding how much support to give.

R: What could we do when we pull back? What does that mean?

C: I didn't let them turn the page on their own.

(Training Transcripts, February 12, 2003)

Ms. Hazlett: What do you think of the independence level? Are they doing the work, is she doing the work, or are they sharing the work?

(Training Transcripts, February 19, 2003)

Dr. K: A is doing a lot of talk about what to do next. I wonder what would happen if she pulled out and said, "What will we do next?" and had them start monitoring themselves. What do you think of the independence she's allowing? They are doing the book walk on their own.

(Training Transcripts, February 26, 2003)

R: Is there frustration on the first read?

T: No

Ms. Hazlett: There's very little teacher telling.

R: Is this authentic book talk?

T: Yes

R: She acknowledged what they already knew.

Ms. Hazlett: When you tell them to go on and try it, then they have to decide if it was right. Did it help to go on? It did help. How do you think they are going to do tomorrow on the running record?

(Training Transcripts, March 5, 2003)

Although 24 constructs emerged from the data from training transcripts, there were three main themes that were the impetus of the ALL Training Program. *Decision-making, Reading Strategies, and Independence* were emphasized more than any of the other concepts in the ALL training program. The training sessions were developed around these three themes, which is why they became the focus of the entire program. Table 6 presents the constructs from training transcript data. These constructs are organized by theme.

Table 6

Constructs from Training Transcript Data by Theme

Decision-making		Independence		Reading Strategies	
Construct	Frequency	Construct	Frequency	Construct	Frequency
Pacing	8	Support	1	Strategy Use	11
Leveling	10	Familiar Read	3	Strategy Talk	18
Lesson Structure	5	Independence	18	Cueing Systems	7
Teaching Points	6	Control	4		

Constructs from Training Transcript Data by Theme (continued).

Decision-making		Independence		Reading Strategies
Decision-making	14	Engagement	7	
Scaffolding	5	Fluency	9	
Push-in Model	1	Self-monitoring	3	
Acceleration	4	Problem-solving	1	
Assessment	6	Helping Kids	1	
Focus Child	2	Child-centered	1	
		Meeting Child	1	
Total	61		49	29

The themes emerged after a thorough analysis of the data. These data were analyzed holistically by reading through the transcripts at least three times. The above constructs emerged from the transcript training data and were tabulated for frequency and then categorized by theme. For a description of the constructs, please refer to the Construct Key in Appendix E.

Trainer Data Analysis

The phenomenological data that were collected and coded from the three trainers consisted of one 30 minute trainer focus group comprised of the two support trainers and one 30 minute interview with the site-based trainer. The focus group interview took place on February 18, 2003. The site-based trainer was interviewed on February 18, 2003 as well. These interview data were used to determine the beliefs and perceptions of the trainers about the ALL Training Program and to explain what they believed to be the goals of the program.

After reading the interview transcripts from the trainers through twice to gain a holistic view of the data, I coded each page for units of meaning and bracketed the meaningful chunks with an assigned construct name that emerged from the interview data. The construct name that was assigned to each meaningful unit of text came from the text itself. For example, one of the support trainers mentioned the following as one of the goals of the ALL program, "to teach children to be self-extending, to develop independent self-extending systems so that they can attack any reading and be successful at it" (Trainer Focus Group Interview, February 18, 2003). The two constructs that emerged from the data were *Self-extending Systems* and *Independence*. The construct names were assigned to each meaningful unit and then organized into categories. The frequency of each construct was tallied and themes emerged from these data. After coding all of the data, the constructs fell under two themes. The themes were Decision-making and Support. In order to systematically analyze the data, I coded the data from the support trainers and those of the site-based trainer separately before completing a cross-case analysis.

Support Trainer Data Analysis

One of the support trainers offered to observe and provide feedback to me during a lesson with my ALL group. Although we were both doctoral students, we had never taken a course together, as she was further along in the doctoral program than I was at that time. Additionally, I had had the pleasure of working with her on another project as a graduate student, so I felt comfortable working with her. Despite that fact, I was feeling very uncomfortable with the prospect of being observed by her.

I think most of us assume that when we are observed, we are also being judged, and I felt that way too. It was an extremely awkward situation. The truth is, however, that she handled the situation very well and put me at ease immediately. She was very supportive and took an active interest in my students. Her feedback was very constructive and nonjudgmental as well. She was extremely helpful in scaffolding my instruction and making it better for my students. How did she do this? I believe she did this by offering help at the point of need, but not pushing it upon me. She said she would be available should I need her guidance. I was the one who decided to invite her in. And that made all the difference.

There were 21 constructs that emerged from the support trainer focus group interview data. Table 7 specifies the constructs that emerged from these data. Please refer to Appendix E for a description of the constructs.

Table 7

Constructs from Support Trainer Focus Group Interview Data

Decision-making		Support	
Construct	Frequency	Construct	Frequency
Pacing	4	Support	5
Self-extending System	2	Flexibility	3
Independence	2	Push-in Model	2
Teaching Point	2	Helping Kids	1
Decision-making	2	Building on Strengths	1
Observation	1	At-risk Students	1
Reflection	1	Strategy Use	1
Fluency	1	ZPD	1

Constructs from Support Trainer Focus Group Interview Data (continued).

Decision-making		Support	
Construct	Frequency	Construct	Frequency
Connections	1	Understanding Kids	1
Writing	1		
Child Progress	1		

Although 21 constructs emerged from the support trainer focus group data, there were two prevalent themes. Decision-making and Support were the two main themes that emerged throughout the focus group interview. For the purposes of this study, support can refer to the support that trainers provide to the teachers as well as the support that teachers provide to their students. The data indicated a preponderance of support in the ALL program.

Support

The support trainers suggested that the techniques teachers are trained to use with their students are the same techniques the trainers use with the teachers to provide a supportive structure in the program. As one trainer explained:

> Some of the same techniques that you use with students when you're working with the children, you have to use with the teachers. For instance, one of the things that you do is you look for the positives and you build on the strengths. When you observe them doing something right, you reinforce it…you know that this new teacher, especially first semester, is going to be overwhelmed and is going to have many things that they are not yet implementing, so you reinforce the positive things that they are doing and then you look for those teaching points

> that are going to best help them to be the kind of teacher, independent, reflective, observing teacher that they need to become. (Trainer Focus Group Interview, February 18, 2003)

The support trainers reported that the ALL program was multilayered in its support structure, with "supports all along the way, from the child, to the teacher, to the trainer, to the county, to the state" (Trainer Focus Group Interview, February 18, 2003). They further explained that the goal of the program was to observe the teachers every other week. They were not always able to meet that goal, due to the fact that the teachers sometimes were not available or did not want them to come in for various reasons. But that is yet another example of how supportive the trainers were because they responded to the needs of the teachers. As one support trainer suggested, "I leave it up to the teacher a lot because I'm not there to be a critical analyzer. I'm there to be a support system…the goal for us is to be a support" (Trainer Focus Group Interview, February 18, 2003). Another support trainer gave an additional example of how she was flexible in providing support to her teachers. She said:

> Well, I'm usually at the school every other week for that teacher, but sometimes, like this last Thursday, I went to observe one of the teachers, and because of illness, another teacher's illness, not that teacher's, she had seven extra kids in her classroom and her reading table that she normally does her reading group at, was full of extra kids because of an illness of another teacher. She had 29 students in her class, seven of which were not her own. She had coming and going as far as people taking students out, and it just wasn't an appropriate time. It would not have been a valid observation and so I just told her I would come back this week.

> Sometimes circumstances like that come up. I think the goal is to try to see them every two weeks and sometimes you observe and sometimes like that situation, we just talked a little bit. (Trainer Focus Group Interview, February 18, 2003)

Decision-making

Decision-making was another common theme that emerged from the support trainer focus group interview data. Decision-making refers to the decisions that teachers are constantly faced with in terms of what they choose to teach to their students as well as how to best meet individual student needs. Although there is a certain structure that is taught during ALL training, with 10 minutes reserved for reading familiar books, 10 minutes for writing, and 10 minutes for introducing a new book, teachers were faced with decisions regarding what to do during each 30 minute lesson. These decisions were usually made during the lesson itself, as teachers responded to students at the point of need. As one support trainer explained:

> …time is important, so that you don't press them to the point that they are getting more and more fatigued. For that reason, it is good if you can do the 10-10-10. Now sometimes in the group situation you have to make decisions on the time. Like maybe you would have done a more extensive teaching point, and you just had to spend just this amount of time on it and you hope that as that pattern reoccurs, which it usually does, you will take it further. (Trainer Focus Group Interview, February 18, 2003)

Pacing is only one aspect of decision-making that teachers face when they are working with their students. They also have to make decisions about what the focus of their teaching will be that day with each student. This focus referred to the teaching point

the teacher chose with her student. Teaching points were given by the teacher based on identified areas of weakness in individual student performance. There were usually only two to three teaching points selected for each lesson, so that students were not overwhelmed with information from teachers. As one support trainer suggested:

> I mean if we would have made ten goals for you, it may have been overwhelming, but just to pick one teaching point, and it may or may not have been the point you would have chosen as a trainer, but just a starting place and to build on them. So that's kind of the program in action. (Trainer Focus Group Interview, February 18, 2003)

Site-based Trainer Data Analysis

I had come to know the site-based trainer, Ms. Hazlett, as a person who was completely committed to the principles and philosophy of the Accelerated Literacy Learning Program. Not only was Ms. Hazlett knowledgeable and experienced, she was also highly spirited and engaging. Her enthusiasm for the program and devotion to its precepts influenced each of the participants of the training program. Ms. Hazlett heartily shared her expertise with us and had a profound influence on the success of the training program.

There were 28 constructs that emerged from the site-based trainer data. Table 8 specifies the constructs that emerged from these data. Please refer to Appendix E for a description of the constructs.

Table 8

Constructs from Site-based Trainer Interview Data

Decision-making		Support	
Construct	Frequency	Construct	Frequency
Decision-making	4	Small Groups	3
Observation	2	Coaching	3
Independence	2	At-Risk Students	2
Lesson Structure	1	Support	2
Reading Strategies	1	Teacher Preparation	2
Running Record	1	Helping Kids	2
Child Progress	1	Flexibility	2
Assessment	1	Push-in Model	2
Student Selection	1	Feedback	2
Discontinuing Children	1	Dialogue	2
		Response-based Teaching	2
		Guided Reading	1
		Problem-solving	1
		Meeting Child at His Level	1
		Scaffolding	1
		Strategy Use	1
		Teacher Change	1

There were two themes that emerged from the site-based trainer interview data. *Support* and *Decision-making* were again the two main themes. Decision-making was discussed during Ms. Hazlett's interviews, with regard to the decisions teachers make regarding instruction. The support that Ms. Hazlett discussed during her interviews referred to the support that she provided to the participant teachers in the form of coaching.

Decision-making

Ms. Hazlett began her discussion of the program with the student selection process. She explained that teachers were faced with decisions regarding the selection of three students who would work with the teacher for intensive ALL instruction. The following excerpt from her interview data explains this process:

> In the push-in model? It's a little more subjective. I think here the teachers were told to survey their entire class and then to look at not the most struggling kids, because the teachers were in their own learning curve. We didn't want them to end up working with ESOL kids who had no English, or children who were obviously having Special Education difficulties, but kids who looked like they had lack of opportunity or developmental issues that made them be a little more behind. So the teachers kind of made their own decision there, based on that parameter. (February 19, 2003)

The teachers administered Clay's *Observation Survey* (2002) to the students in their classes to determine which students would benefit most from the individualized, prescribed ALL program.

Ms. Hazlett further explained the necessity of decision-making in the program when she discussed the ALL lesson structure. She particularly focused on the 10-10-10

format of the lesson. She felt that the format compelled teachers to consider pacing. The following excerpt clarifies what she believed to be one of the goals of the program and the reason behind using the 10-10-10 format:

> Well, originally, with the one-on-one model, it was to, I believe, it was to force the teacher into making better decisions and to not get bogged down on unnecessary details or to over dwell on something that wasn't essential to the literacy process. By forcing people to do a 10-10-10, it really made teachers go okay, I've got two minutes left, what's really important here in this segment of the lesson and what can I do with it and what should I do with it? It forces a different kind of decision-making. (February 19, 2003)

Ms. Hazlett also discussed the purpose behind videotaping teachers during their ALL lessons. The videotapes were used during the training sessions to reinforce the ALL concepts. They also gave teachers a context for which to have a purposeful dialogue about their instruction. Ms. Hazlett described the process in the following way:

> They have a weekly class where we come together and we are using the videotape model. Teachers are required to tape themselves with a lesson. That is a huge component of the training, where they have to sit, and we have a sort of prescribed way of using the teaching on the tape to help us be better at making decisions. Every moment you're making decisions, decisions. (February 19, 2003)

Decision-making was essential in the ALL program. Ms. Hazlett explained that to reach the goal of "really helping kids to progress faster than they would normally" and fostering each child's reading independence, teachers had to constantly make appropriate

decisions based on their individual student's needs. She stated, "…I suppose there's a continuum of decisions that some are more in the direction of the philosophy that we're trying to promote. There's a definite philosophy of child-centered, response-based teaching" (February 19, 2003).

Support

Ms. Hazlett discussed the importance of supporting teachers in the ALL training program. She explained that her role had developed over the course of the training from observer to coach due to the needs of the teachers. She described this role change in the following way:

> I've taken a different tactic. In my original training, it was strictly observational, and I was trained to take down the data of what I saw happening in the lesson. Then to provide feedback and have a conversation with the teacher afterward and answer questions. Really a dialogue about what happened and clarify confusions, and try to keep people on track with the general direction that we're trying to go in these lessons. But now I have done a little bit more of the coaching model here, what has been, I think, a good thing, where we almost work through the lesson together. We sit side by side, and say….teachers would stop in the middle and say, "okay, I don't know about this part, should I do this, should I do that?" and we actually have a little talk and then we go or I may step in and show them something, if they're interested in that model. (February 19, 2003)

Ms. Hazlett continued to explain that the reason that this happened was because the teachers were nervous about being videotaped and wanted Ms. Hazlett to come into their

classrooms to coach a lesson before they had to make their videotapes. She suggested:

> The anxiety level goes up with that. They tend to seek out more support because they feel their weaknesses or perceived weaknesses, whether they're really there or not, but they want to be, they're more on their toes. They want to be sure that they're understanding things better before they have to display themselves in front of everybody. (February 19, 2003)

Each teacher was required to make one videotape of an ALL lesson with their students to share with the teachers and trainers in the ALL training program. Ms. Hazlett was available to support and coach eight of the teachers in the program. These eight teachers also worked in her school, which made it easier for her to support them.

When asked how often she was able to observe and/or coach the teachers in the program, she responded in the following way:

> I try to see two teachers a week of the eight. It's difficult because it's not my main job here, but I've been allowed to maintain that in this position. I try very hard to see them, so teachers probably get seen once a month by me, but there are ad hoc moments all the time because they stop me and say, "Can you help me videotape?" or ask me about a Running Record, or things like that. (February 19, 2003)

Ms. Hazlett explained that she tended to approach the teachers, rather than waiting for them to approach her, because she saw it as her responsibility to do so. She scheduled the classroom visits with the teachers and provided side-by-side coaching to them if they expressed an interest in her offer to coach them. This model worked best for both the teachers and Ms. Hazlett.

ALL Participant Teacher Data Analysis

The phenomenological data that were collected and coded from the two selected participant teachers consisted of one 30 minute teacher focus group comprised of five ALL participant teachers, including the two selected participant teachers, and two 30 minute interviews with each of the selected participant teachers. The focus group interview took place in Spring, 2003. The two teachers were interviewed in Spring, 2003 and then again in Spring, 2004. These interview data were used to determine the beliefs and perceptions of the teachers as to what they had learned in the ALL training program and what they chose to use in their classroom from the ALL training.

The two teachers, Mrs. Paterson, and Ms. Stone, were also observed during Fall, 2003 and Spring, 2004. Observational field notes from each teacher's classroom, during their regularly scheduled Reading time, were collected daily over a period of one month in Fall, 2003 and over a period of one month in Spring, 2004. There were a total of 22 days of observational field notes collected in both Mrs. Paterson's and Ms. Stone's classrooms during that time.

After reading the observational field notes from the teachers through twice to gain a holistic view of the data, I coded each page for units of meaning and bracketed the meaningful chunks with a construct name that emerged from the observational data. The construct name that was assigned to each meaningful unit of text came from the text itself. After coding all of the data, the constructs fell under three construct headings. The headings were Program Goals, Instruction, and Professional Development (see Construct Key in Appendix E). In order to systematically analyze the data, I coded the data from Mrs. Paterson and Ms. Stone separately before completing a cross-case analysis.

Mrs. Paterson

Background Information

During the 2003-2004 School Year, Mrs. Paterson was a 47 year old black female in her 9th year of teaching. All of her years of teaching took place at the same school site. She was a first grade teacher at that time. Mrs. Paterson was very interested in improving her teaching, particularly the teaching of reading, and would seek out opportunities for professional development. She mentioned that she did a lot of reading on the subject to become a better informed reading teacher and took classes when she could. She described her reading training in the following way:

> …In the beginning I did a lot of reading. I took some Goals 2000 training. That was a training that I took up and it was a wonderful training. It might have been in 1998, which was really kind of based off the ALL training that we used to have. It was kind of modeled after the ALL teachers. It was done in the classroom, and they got a grant to do this training, Goals 2000. Ms. Hazlett, she and a couple of other people, they did that training also….I think we had grant money for two or three years. It started out during the summer. We went to class four days a week, or was it one day a week? Then the other days we were in school, we worked during the summertime because they had summer school then and what we were allowed to do, the teachers that were in the Goals 2000 training, we were allowed to work in the schools during the times we were not in training, pulling groups of children, and working specifically with those children. So it was like three or four from each school, so we had a classroom like this, but we didn't have a class. We would pull the students we wanted to

> work with and just solely do that. We were all there together so we were there to help each other. And Ms. Hazlett was here and the other teachers would come out and help and then we'd go back to class one day a week and share things that we had been doing. That went on that whole summer and then they followed through during the year when we incorporated it in our classrooms and they came and modeled and observed. We had to do the video, like we have to do for ALL. We critiqued the video and then discussed it in class. So it's almost the same training except it was stretched over a period of three years until the grant money ran out. It was almost like the ALL except that it didn't incorporate all of the writing like ALL does now. And a lot of the strategies and the way they say to start out the groups, that wasn't really done, but a lot of the stuff is the same as ALL. (April 10, 2003)

Ms. Paterson took her teaching job very seriously. She had a strong desire to understand and help her students. She was especially interested in helping the students in her class who were at risk of reading failure. For this reason, she volunteered to take intensive reading training. In her nine years of teaching, she took intensive reading training for four years. That certainly showed her commitment to reading instruction and her desire to improve her own teaching for the sake of her students.

Description of Class

There were 22 students in Mrs. Paterson's first grade class. Her class comprised 13 females and nine males. There were 15 black children, four white children, and three Hispanic children in her class. Table 9 presents the gender and ethnicity of the students in Mrs. Paterson's class.

Table 9

Mrs. Paterson's First Grade Class Demographic Information

Race	Females	Males	Total
Black	11	4	15
White	1	3	4
Hispanic	1	2	3
Total	13	9	22

Description of Classroom

The physical layout of Mrs. Paterson's classroom was developmentally appropriate for first grade students (Bredekamp, 1987). There were four round tables situated on the left side of the room, away from the door, and near the white dry-erase board at the front of the room. There was a mix of five to six children at each table. Seated at the first table, in the front left-hand corner of the room, there were three black females, one white female, and one black male. Seated at the table to their right were three black females, one white male, one Hispanic male, and one black male. Seated at the table behind them were two black females, one Hispanic female, one black male, and one white male. Seated at the table to their left (behind the first table) were three black females, one black male, one Hispanic male, and one white male. The children had assigned seats in Mrs. Paterson's classroom. There were times during the course of the day when the students would move to a large area on the floor designated for shared reading times or to various learning centers in the room, but when the students were working individually they remained in their seats at their assigned tables.

Mrs. Paterson had learning centers in her classroom. At the front of the classroom, in the far left corner of the room was a large table where Mrs. Paterson met

with her Reading groups. Along the wall, behind this table were shelves of books. Also, along the wall by the shelves of books was the Listening Center with a tape recorder, headsets, and books. To the left of the Listening Center, along the same wall, was the Reading Center with shelves of books and little chairs. At the back of the room, along the same wall, was the Computer Center, with one computer. There was also a hanging pocket chart with sentence strips next to the Computer Center, where children could practice reading poems, stories, etc. from the sentence strips. Behind the pocket chart were two closets for storage.

Along the back wall of the room were storage cabinets, a sink, and a bathroom, which was situated next to the door of the classroom. Mrs. Paterson's desk was in front of the cabinets at the back of the room. There was also a table and a painting easel set up next to her desk, which could potentially function as an Art Center.

Along the front wall of the classroom was a large white dry-erase board. Above this, Mrs. Paterson had hung a number line. On the white board, she had hung a Reading poster that read: Making Connections: Text to Text, Text to Self, Text to the World. In the far right corner of the front of the room Mrs. Paterson had made a large monthly calendar to use to teach calendar skills with her students. In front of the white board was an overhead projector. There was a television and VCR kept on a stand in the front corner of the room near the large meeting area. In the shared reading area, Mrs. Paterson had a rocking chair for herself and an easel that could be used to write on.

On the far right wall of the classroom Mrs. Paterson had created a Word Wall with letters of the alphabet evenly spaced across the wall. She had hung index cards with color words and had placed them in alphabetical order on the Word Wall. There was

room to add more words under each of the letters of the alphabet. Next to the Word Wall was a bulletin board with environmental print. On this bulletin board Mrs. Paterson had hung signs, like a STOP sign, and other examples of signs one would find in the environment.

In the back right corner of the classroom, to the right of the classroom door was a Writing Center. There was a small desk there. Along the wall, behind the desk was a shelf with various types of paper, markers, and other writing utensils. This Writing Center was situated diagonally from the opposite corner where Mrs. Paterson usually taught.

Personal Teaching Style

Mrs. Paterson showed genuine care and concern for her children and wanted them to show respect for her and each other. At the beginning of the year, she worked at building a strong rapport with her students. She developed a respectful community of learners in her classroom. The way in which she chose to do this was often with taped stories and songs about cooperation and friendship. One example that illustrated how Mrs. Paterson developed a caring community took place on August 13, 2003, at the beginning of the school year. She had gathered the class in the shared reading area and was sitting on the rocking chair. The following transcript was taken from the observational field notes on that day:

> T: "I Care Cat" whispered to me that you are learning so fast. He said that you are the best class I've ever had. And you know what? I think he's right.
>
> [T played a tape with a song by "I Care Cat" about being a family under one sky. The children swayed back and forth as they listened to the song. Then T played

another tape with the song, “I am precious, so are you.” “I Care Cat” sang about how eyes, ears, mouth, hands, nose, and feet are precious. He explained how wonderful the brain is. Then all the students sang the “I am precious” song again. T brought out a stuffed cat and referred to a chart in the room with the Class Rules. T and S and “I Care Cat” went over the classroom rules together.] (August 13, 2003)

While the children listened to the tapes, they were actively engaged by rocking and singing along with the chorus. They showed great interest in the songs and the class discussions with the teacher. Mrs. Paterson was teaching the children classroom rules and expected behavior in this way. The atmosphere was very positive and both the teacher and her students seemed to genuinely enjoy these moments.

Mrs. Paterson was very firm with her children and would not tolerate inappropriate behavior. At times she would raise her voice, but she would always be respectful to the children. They knew she expected them to behave and work hard. Mrs. Paterson would often engage them in conversations about their families and home lives. She asked many questions and seemed to want to get to know each and every child well. The children also asked many questions and were conversational with her. Mrs. Paterson treated her students like family members. The following is an example of how she developed a strong rapport with her students [T refers to Mrs. Paterson, S refers to individual students]:

T: Let’s get ready for family time.

[T turned on soft classical music and sat in the rocking chair in the meeting area. S quietly walked to the area and sat down by their teacher].

T: I can tell you are going to have a fantastic Friday. You all came up so quietly. Let's see what "I Care Cat" wants to tell us today.

[T turned on the tape, "Let's Sing a Song About Feelings". S whistled when "I Care Cat" whistled.]

S: I can't whistle.

T: That's okay. I can't whistle either, so I just rock.

[T played "Thumbs Up, Thumbs Down" song. S followed the directions that the tape suggested. "Shoulders up, shoulders down, I show how I feel".]

T: I'm looking for good listeners. I see good listeners. [Tape said, "What do you do when you're afraid? S sang a song, "When you're afraid and you know it, tell a friend".]

T: How can you make scary feelings go away?

S: Sing a song.

T: What do you <u>do</u>?

S: I get close to mommy.

S: When I'm scared, I get on my two sisters' bed and I hold them tight.

S: When I'm afraid, I go get my teddy bear.

S: I go under the blankets.

S: I sneak in my sister's bed when she's asleep.

T: Do you sing or hum along with her to make you feel better?

S: We're gonna get a flashlight.

T: That's what I did with my boys. I gave them a flashlight at night. Fridays are sharing time, so everybody will get a chance to share, but let's finish

listening to “I Care Cat”. (August 15, 2003)

Mrs. Paterson continued to play the tape and the children discussed other feelings they had experienced. After the discussion, she told the children that they could write about something that had frightened or made them sad. In general, Mrs. Paterson tried to connect curricular content to her student’s lives as much as possible. This served two purposes; not only were she and her students getting to know each other, but the students were also making meaningful connections between curricular content and their lives.

In terms of control, Mrs. Paterson had a teacher-centered classroom. She was in charge. She controlled the students’ behavior with stickers, praise, and with her voice. The children were not allowed to do anything without her permission. She had a traffic light in her room that she used to control the noise level in the classroom. She would set the decibel level on the machine. If it was quiet, the light remained green. If the noise level in the classroom started to increase, the traffic light would flash yellow. The light would turn red and a loud siren noise would go off if the noise level was too loud. As you might expect, this only worked for a couple of weeks. Once the novelty of it had worn off the students started to ignore it and Mrs. Paterson had to raise her voice to call attention to it. She would put it away for awhile and then bring it out again in a month or two when it would work with the students again. Although her classroom was teacher-centered, she had a genuine concern for her students and she tried to encourage her students to care for each other as well.

Reading Group Time

Mrs. Paterson formed Reading groups by administering Marie Clay's *Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement* (2002) to each of the students in her class at the beginning of the school year. She wanted to determine which of the students in her class were at-risk of reading failure. She stated, "I try to observe them while I'm doing it to see just what they seem to be struggling at, which things come easy for them, and then I go from them" (March 17, 2004). Mrs. Paterson explained that she tried to meet with the students who were having difficulty with reading at least four times per week:

> I pull them. I try to see them at least four times a week. I started out trying to see them five and then I was neglecting the other children. Using this in the classroom, it's hard, with all of the interruptions and everything, and I was neglecting my kids who I thought were average, so I cut them back to four times per week. I just started trying to implement some of the procedures and some of the things that I had done in the ALL program….the cut-up story, the pulling out sight words and writing them and stretching them and the interactive writing, shared reading. That's how we started out. (March 17, 2004)

Reading routine. Mrs. Paterson met with her Reading groups at a table at the front of the classroom. She had developed a routine with the children so that each child knew what was expected of them when they met with their teacher. Mrs. Paterson would call a small group of children up to the table with her. Each student would immediately choose a book to read from a basket of books on the table. They would read their individual books aloud while the teacher observed and listened to them read. The books

in the basket were all familiar books that the students had read before, but occasionally students would have difficulty with a particular word which would interrupt their reading fluency. At these times the teacher might intervene, as she did in the following scenario:

T: Why couldn't it be "like"?

S: It has two "o".

T: Read it again.

[S self-corrects.]

[Another student had difficulty with a word.]

T: What can you do to help yourself?

S: sss-search (attempts the word)

T: When I'm reading I see the "s", but in "search" I hear an "r". Is there an "r"?

S: No

T: Try again.

[S rereads and self-corrects.]

[Another student had difficulty with a word and said, "They"]

T: That word looks like "They", but what is missing? What does "They" start with?

S: Th

T: Right.

[S rereads and self-corrects.] (February 24, 2004)

In the above excerpt, Mrs. Paterson used visual cues with her students, and in each instance the students were able to correct their errors. Mrs. Paterson typically would use

either meaning or visual cues with her students when they had difficulty reading an unfamiliar word.

After the students warmed up with the familiar books, Mrs. Paterson would meet with one student to take a Running Record. The other students in the group would pair up and were sent to another area in the room to read familiar books together. Mrs. Paterson would remind students of the reading strategies they could employ if they came to an unfamiliar or difficult word before she would begin the Running Record as the following excerpt illustrates:

T: What do good readers do when they come to words they don't know?

S: Get your mouth ready.

T: What else?

S: Look for chunks.

[S reads *My House*. T records miscues.]

T: Go on.

[S reads and skips the last word. T points to the word and S reads it.]

T: You did an excellent job. Like on this page. I was looking to see if you were using any strategies. On this page, you got your mouth ready.

S: And on the word, "pirate".

T: I bet you understand the story too. What was the story about?

[S retells story.] (February 24, 2004)

Mrs. Paterson often checked for comprehension by asking the children to retell the story. Sometimes she did this with individual children after a child completed a Running Record, but she also checked comprehension with groups of children after they read a

story and again the following day to determine what they remembered from the story they had read the day before. Mrs. Paterson wanted the children to focus on the meaning of the story and would often have conversations with her students about the sequence of events.

Typically, Mrs. Paterson would engage her students in conversations about texts. She would often ask her students questions about the stories and would encourage retellings, but more often than not she would relate reading texts to the students' lives. She tried to help the students make connections to their own lives in an effort to make learning more meaningful. She also felt that it was extremely important for children to use language as much as possible to further develop their conversational skills. She explained how she did this with her students in the following way:

> We do a familiar read. I basically do the same thing with all of my kids, not just with the children I thought need that extra help. I do a familiar read. I try to talk with my kids, try to bring in some language because a lot of these children don't have language. Sometimes we just sit and just talk. Then I'll do a Running Record. For the children at higher levels, there were some I didn't do a Running Record, but for the most part I try to do a Running Record. Once they started reading with my shared reading, that group that I didn't…we just kind of talked about the book, tried to pull out language and we did lots of repeated readings with them. That's what I started out doing…
>
> (March 17, 2004)

When Mrs. Paterson was asked what a typical reading lesson was like in her classroom, she responded, "typical is familiar read, running record, introduce the new book, I try to

put in some language and I try to activate prior knowledge. I just try to see what they already know. That's typical" (March 17, 2004).

Mrs. Paterson would introduce a new book by activating students' prior knowledge and by building background for the story. She did this by questioning students about what they already knew about a topic or questioned them about the pictures in the story. She would ask them to make predictions about what they thought the story would be about. She and the children often would have a conversation about the book before they began to read it. Mrs. Paterson stressed the importance of talking about the story in the following excerpt from her interview:

> …I try to talk to them. I hope I am because like I say I think these children don't have the language. They don't have the experiences that a lot of children have. They miss a lot. I found that some of these children had never been to the beach when I read a story about the beach. So it gives me knowledge as to what they know and as to how much help I need to give them when they're reading the book. Because see if they don't know these things, then it's hard for them to get an unknown word. Because I've had children who have used the strategies, they got their mouth ready, they looked for chunks, and they got the word, but they still don't know they had the word. They didn't know they were right because they had no clue what the word was. That's why I try to talk with them a lot and probably I love to talk. (March 17, 2004)

Mrs. Paterson developed a routine for introducing a new book to the children as well. She would engage the children in conversation about the topic of the book and

what it might be about. Then she allowed the students to preview the pictures and make predictions about the story. As the children previewed the story, Mrs. Paterson would talk with her students about what they thought the story would be about. She tried to use the vocabulary words in the story that she thought the children might have difficulty reading and/or understanding. She explained how she did this in the following way:

> ...We talk about the new book. I try to pull out some of the vocabulary in the book, and what I try to do, I try to pull out where, a lot of it I don't want to point it out to them. So I just try to use it in conversations. We're talking about the pages to see if they realize what I've said, and some of them actually do. I've had students say, "Oh Ms. Paterson, you said the exact same thing on this page", you know as they're reading. So some of them have really started catching on that I use the vocabulary. So I try not to pull out too much, because I want them to, when they come to it, remember that we discussed that page and find it for themselves. (April 10, 2003)

Mrs. Paterson wanted her students to experience success when they were reading, so she set them up for success. Using the vocabulary in the book, in a conversational way, was one way to do this. She would anticipate which words might be difficult for the students, and would deliberately use them when she introduced a book to the students so that when the children encountered the word, they might have a greater chance of reading it. The conversations Mrs. Paterson had with her students about texts helped build vocabulary for the new book, which was helpful to her students as they attempted to read unfamiliar words.

Fostering reading independence. In the beginning of the year, Mrs. Paterson would model reading for her students and chorally read with them to provide further support for student success. The following excerpt from Mrs. Paterson's observational field notes exemplifies how she introduced a new book:

T: We're going to read a new book. Since we've been talking about friends, I thought you'd like this book.

S: Monkey friends!

T: Do you think this story is about monkey friends? Why?

S: Because they climb like monkeys.

[Students talked about how the friends were acting like monkeys.]

T: The title of this story is *Things I Do With My Friends*. What do you like to do with your friends?

S: Play babydolls.

S: I wanted him to let me ride his bike. He has a scooter.

S: Me and my brother we go get a friend and we have a clubhouse.

T: Do you have some rules for your clubhouse?

S: No messing up.

S: My daddy rides a bicycle.

T: I have a friend too. I go shopping with my friend. Sometimes we go to lunch. I don't see her very much because we're both very busy. We're gonna read. Open your book. I'll read first then you read. [T read page.] Let's read this page together. [T and S read page chorally.]

T: I see CC and CD pointing to the words. Good pointing.

S: I think they're going to the store.

T: They could be.

[S made predictions about what the page would be about, looking at the pictures.]

T: Have you ever jumped rope? Hot Potato, Hot Potato, with a long rope?

S: Yea.

T: I'm gonna read this page as it's written. It says "skip" because jumping rope is kind of like skipping. You have to read the words on the page, even if you think it might say something else. (September 12, 2003)

In this example, Mrs. Paterson encouraged her students to make predictions about the story. She allowed them to preview the pictures before they read the story. She also read each page first, to provide a model of fluent reading, and prompted students to point to the words as she read them. Although she wanted students to attend to the pictures to gain meaning from the story, she also wanted them to attend to the print on the page. She wanted students to be able to match the words they were hearing with the words they were seeing. This was the routine she had developed with her students when she introduced a new book to them.

At the beginning of the school year, Mrs. Paterson would often model reading for her students. She modeled reading when she read stories to her students in the shared reading area of her classroom. She also would model reading to students in small groups when she introduced a new book. By February the students had become more independent and fluent in their reading, so she no longer needed to do this. The following excerpt from the observational field notes is an example of an introduction to a new book (Level 13) in February:

T: What's the title of the book?

S: *Pizza for Dinner*

T: Look at the pictures a little bit.

[S looked at pictures.]

T: What do you think they're doing?

S: Making cookies.

T: Cookies? It looks like cookies but when I remember the title of the story….

S: Pizza!

T: Yes, I think they're making pizza because the title is *Pizza for Dinner*. Let's look at the next page. What are they putting on the pizza?

S: Sauce.

T: They're putting tomato sauce on the pizza. What do you like on your pizza?

S: Mushrooms.

T: Mushrooms. I like sausage on my pizza.

S: And Cheese.

T: Go on. Let's see if they put what we like on their pizza.

S: Pineapple!

T: See if you can find the word "pineapple".

[S framed word on page.]

T: Go on. What do you think Dad's thinking? Look at Dad's face. He's letting her know that she's okay. Whose pizza do you think they're eating?

S: Dad's

S: The girl's.

T: Read the book and see if it tells whose pizza they're eating.

(February 25, 2004)

In the Spring, Mrs. Paterson was no longer reading a page first and then asking students to read after her. The students were independently reading the books with little teacher intervention because they had become more fluent in their reading. The reading routine had changed because the children were more independent readers. She did continue to question students about the meaning of the texts and would provide meaning and visual cues as they were needed.

Data Analysis

The phenomenological data collected from Mrs. Paterson included one 30 minute focus group interview, two individual 30 minute interviews, and 22 classroom observations. The focus group interview took place on February 19, 2003. The individual interviews with Mrs. Paterson took place on April 10, 2003 and again nearly one year later on March 17, 2004. There were 11 classroom observations made in Fall, 2003 and 11 classroom observations made in Spring, 2004.

There were 34 constructs that emerged from Mrs. Paterson's interview data. The constructs were tabulated to determine the frequency of each construct in the data. Table 10 specifies the four constructs that emerged from these data with the highest frequency. Please refer to Appendix E for a description of the constructs.

Table 10

Constructs from Mrs. Paterson's Interview Data

Construct	Frequency
Running Records	11
Assessment	7
Conversation	6
Reading Strategies	8

The goals for the participant teachers of the ALL program were:

> ….being able to be better observers of the little things that really matter that we learn from Clay in using the assessments, the *Observation Survey*, the use of Running Records, and just becoming very data-based observers with knowledge to know what they're seeing. So I hope that by doing that, they're really helping kids to progress faster than they would normally without that kind of input. (Hazlett Interview, February 19, 2003)

Mrs. Paterson met these goals and, in theory, could have been a model for the ALL program. She was very systematic in her observations of each individual student and kept thorough records of each child's reading progress. Her goal was to help her students to become better readers and she did this by teaching and reinforcing reading strategies.

There were 29 constructs that emerged from Mrs. Paterson's classroom observational data. Table 11 specifies the 11 constructs with the highest frequency that emerged from these data. Please refer to Appendix E for a description of the constructs.

Table 11

Constructs from Mrs. Paterson's Observational Data

Construct	Frequency
Reading Strategies	64
Meaning Cues	64
Visual Cues	55
Hearing Sounds	21
Connections	18
Teaching Points	17
Running Records	13
Choral Reading	12
Familiar Read	11
Writing	11
Assessment	6

There were three themes that emerged from Mrs. Paterson's interview and classroom observational data. They were developed after a thorough analysis of the data, which included reading through the data at least three times for a holistic sense of the data, analyzing the data for meaningful units, developing constructs from the emerging meaningful units, and tallying the constructs for frequency. The themes that emerged were *Individual Assessment, Teaching and Reinforcing Reading Strategies,* and *Conversation for Language Development and Meaning Construction.* These themes encompassed the essence of Mrs. Paterson's teaching of reading. Table 12 presents these

themes and the frequency with which they occurred in the data collected from Mrs. Paterson.

Table 12

Themes from Mrs. Paterson's Data

Theme	Frequency
Individual Assessment	37
Teaching and Reinforcing Reading Strategies	72
Conversation for Language Development and Meaning Construction	88

Individual Assessment

Mrs. Paterson wanted comprehensive and very specific knowledge about each of her student's reading ability. She felt that she could better help her students with their reading skills if she had this knowledge. In an effort to gain as much information as possible about each student she would actively observe them as they read, and individually assess each of her students by administering Marie Clay's *Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement* (2002) to each of the students in her class at the beginning and end of the school year. During the year, Mrs. Paterson would individually assess each student using a district-adopted reading assessment, the Developmental Reading Assessment (Beaver, 1999). She would also take Running Records of each of her students on a regular basis and would use the information gained from the assessments to determine each student's strengths and weaknesses. She also used the information from the Running Records to make decisions about the appropriate reading level for each student.

Mrs. Paterson developed a routine of assessing one student within each of her reading groups every day. Her reading groups usually met for approximately 30 minutes, which meant that she would individually assess at least three students every day during her regularly scheduled reading time. Because of this, Mrs. Paterson's reading groups changed frequently. Students would move up to other levels and would join other groups of children as needed.

Although Mrs. Paterson had established reading groups of no more than five children, her groups were flexible and constantly changing. She explained the flexibility of her grouping in the following way:

> My biggest group, I think I have five. My smallest group I have one. I've had some groups where I just have one because I've had some children that just went whew! and then I would just have to take that as children caught up and came maybe within one level of them and then I kind of joined them together….
>
> My groups have changed constantly. Even my ALL groups. The group that you saw here, only two of the children were original and one of them could actually move if he wasn't such a problem. Because of his behavior sometimes I have to send him away. He can't progress. The little girl back at the computer, she was one that was also in the original group, and my God, she has just flown. So she's left them far behind, so it has changed. I pull children from here and there and it constantly changes….(April 10, 2003)

Her program was actually more of an individualized program than a group program because of her focus on each individual child's progress.

Teaching and Reinforcing Reading Strategies

Mrs. Paterson spent the majority of her reading group time teaching and reinforcing reading strategies. She felt that if the children were taught the reading strategies and would utilize them when they were reading, they would become independent readers. Mrs. Paterson focused on the reading strategies with each and all of her students because of this. The following excerpt from one of her interviews explains why she focused on teaching and reinforcing reading strategies:

> I think, well since I started using the reading strategies, I've noticed that that is what I do when I read. I didn't know that before I knew anything about reading strategies. I realized I'm doing that so that must be a good thing to help you read. I think it helps the children, so that's why I really focus on them. Now a lot of times I think the children don't understand them. But I still wonder sometimes if the children understand them. They can recite them to you, but I wonder sometimes if they get it. But I'm hoping if you continue they'll get it because I tell them all the time. That is what I do even if I'm reading to them and let them know, hey you know what I just did? I read on because I wasn't sure about that word. You know and now, hey, I can think about what makes sense so I can get my mouth ready and help me figure out the word. (March 17, 2004)

There were 64 examples of teaching and reinforcing reading strategies in Mrs. Paterson's classroom observation data. A chart was posted at the front of the room that listed six behaviors of good readers. They were: 1. Point to the words. 2. Look at the pictures. 3. Look at the word. 4. Think, "What fits?" 5. Make a guess. 6. Check it. There were also seven strategy cards posted in the room. They were: 1. Look at the

pictures. 2. Get your mouth ready. 3. Does it sound right? 4. Does it look right? 5. Does it make sense? 6. Chunk words. 7. Try it again. There was also a poster hanging in the group area with a Reading Strategies Song: Look at the pictures. Still no clue? Read it again all the way through. When you get to the place where you are stuck. Get your mouth ready and the word pops up! The children had visuals of the strategies and would sing the song to remind them of the reading strategies to employ when they encountered unfamiliar words.

Mrs. Paterson and her students reviewed the strategies many times during the course of the day. She routinely reminded her students to use the strategies before she would take a Running Record with a student. The following example illustrates this point:

T: I love the way I see you glance up to make sure you're looking at the pictures.

[T sends two students away to read together on the floor. She prepares to take a Running Record.]

T: Tell me what you do to help yourself when you're reading.

S: Look at the picture. Get your mouth ready.

T: You do those things. Good for you.

[S reads and doesn't know the word "koala".]

T: Read that again. Do you remember what that is? [T points to the picture.] It's called a koala.

[S finishes book.]

T: The only thing I want to bring your attention to is this page. You said

"mice" here. [T points to the word "mouse".]

T: If this said, "mice", what letter would you see here [T points to "ou"]

S: i

T: Yes, mice says "i" and means more than one mouse. Look at the picture. How many?

S: one

T: Just one mouse. Read this for me.

[S rereads and self-corrects.] (March 4, 2004)

In this example, Mrs. Paterson asked her student to list the strategies he might employ before he began to read. The student was able to list a couple of strategies, but also showed that he understood how to use them, by employing them during the Running Record. Mrs. Paterson also provided meaning and visual cues to help her student decode an unfamiliar word.

Mrs. Paterson usually began her group time by reviewing the reading strategies with her students. She also would typically use visual and meaning cues to help her students as the following example demonstrates:

T: What do good readers do when they have trouble with a word?

S: They look at the pictures.

T: What else?

S: Look for chunks.

S: Go back.

T: If it doesn't make sense, go back and read it again. Good.

[S read book and T took a running record. When S encountered "pair of overalls",

T pointed to words.]

T: You're doing fine.

[S finished reading.]

T: Good Billy. You are feeling nervous, but you shouldn't. You should feel confident because you used your strategies. Let's go back to this page. You read, "It was a present of ____ and then you stopped because you knew that wasn't right. Let's look at this word "pair".

[T writes p air on a white board.]

T: Remember when we talked about the sound "ai" makes? How do you say air?

S: pppp

T: Don't worry about the "p" right now. What does this say?

S: air

T: Then put the "p" at the front.

S: pair (February 26, 2004)

In the above example, Mrs. Paterson used a visual cue to help her student decode the word "pair". She began by separating the word and pointing out the air chunk, but her student still didn't understand, so she reminded him about the sound for /ai/, which was something that he knew. She took him from the known (/ai/) to the unknown (pair), by chunking the word and working with the sounds as well as the visual cue to figure out the word "pair".

Mrs. Paterson often would use meaning cues as well as visual cues to help her students with unfamiliar text. The following excerpt from her classroom observational field notes was an example of this:

T: What did they do when they were on the computer?

S: typed it.

T: What do you think he will do?

[S told a story about experiences with moving. T and S discussed the pictures.]

T: And then what happened?

S: Dad came home.

T: Read the sign. Get your mouth ready. How did you know that was "home"?

S: Because of the "h".

T: Let's read Hello Dad. Look at the pictures. What is she doing? What is another word for putting a picture up? Get your mouth ready. When I say the word "hold", I hear an "o" and a "d" and when I look at this word I don't see those letters. Does it look right? No.

T: What are you going to do? How are you going to get your mouth ready for the word? Show me the word. You need to be looking at the word. Now is that word "we"? Why? Why can't it be "we"? Good readers don't just say anything. That doesn't help you. Good readers use the strategies. Look at that chunk there. [T covers first part of the word "violin" and just shows "in".] Look at the word again.

[S rereads and corrects word.] (March 3, 2004)

When Mrs. Paterson asked her student to look at the pictures and preview the story, she was focusing on the meaning of the story. She wanted to encourage her student to think about the meaning of the story before and during the reading of the book. She also asked her student to attend to the print by using visual cues. She reinforced the use of reading

strategies with her student by reminding her to get her mouth ready, which meant to look at the letter and attempt to match the sound with the letter, as well as to look at the pictures to check to see if what she was reading was making sense and matched what was happening in the story.

Conversation for Language Development and Meaning Construction

Mrs. Paterson wanted her students to become fluent readers. She believed that the reason some of her students had difficulty learning to read was because of their lack of language. Many of her students simply were not able to understand what they were reading because they did not understand the vocabulary used in the story or because they lacked rich language experiences at home. This apparent lack of language development was more than just a second language issue (which was also a problem), but rather was a result of children not conversing with their family members at home, let alone conversing about books. Mrs. Paterson believed that children could improve their reading and language ability through the use of conversation.

Conversation. There are many ways to engage children in conversation. Mrs. Paterson demonstrated that she cared about her children by asking them questions about their lives. She also asked them questions about their lives to encourage them to make connections between their lives and texts. The following excerpt from her classroom observational field notes is an example of how Mrs. Paterson encouraged text-to-self connections through conversation with her students:

T: We've been talking a lot about family and friendship. Who can tell me something that left an impression on you?

S: If somebody says, "I'm not going to be your friend." That's rude.

T: What do you think you should do if somebody says, "I'm not going to be your friend."?

S: You could talk to another friend.

S: You could walk off.

S: We could tell our moms.

T: Yea, but first I would want to know why they didn't want to be my friend. So I would ask the person if I had done something to make them not want to be my friend. It's much better to be friends. Everybody should try to be friends. I'm going to read you a story called, *Two Can Do It.* What do you think it will be about?

S: Kids doing things together.

T: Does this story remind you of anything?

S: It's text-to-self because of the title.

T: You made a text-to-self connection, very good. Tell me what it is.

S: My friend rides her bike with me.

T: I saw this and I remembered *Bo and Peter*. Why did I think of that?

S: Because they're two friends.

T: How can we make a connection to *Bo and Peter*?

S: They almost do the same things.

T: In *Bo and Peter,* they both read together and ate together. Do you think it's a good thing that friends get along and do things together? [T showed the book *Ten Greedy Bears.*] Do you think they will get along?

S: No.

T: How can you tell?

S: Their faces are getting mad.

[T read the story. S asked what "burst" meant.]

T: Popped open.

[T continued to read and stopped to ask questions.]

T: What do you think is going to happen next? Who can tell me what happened to the cheese?

S: The fox ate it.

T: Why?

S: He wanted it to be equal.

T: But why?

S: Because they kept fighting over the cheese.

T: What do you think would have happened if they had not been fighting over the cheese?

S: They would have had more cheese.

T: It is better to share. (September 10, 2003)

In the above excerpt, Mrs. Paterson encouraged her students to think about the meaning of the stories and to make connections between stories (text-to-text) as well as between the stories and the students' lives (text-to-self). She prepared the students to comprehend the stories by building a background for the stories, previewing the pictures, and encouraging the students to make predictions about the stories. Mrs. Paterson was in charge of the conversation. Her students were not conversing with each other, but all

conversation was directed through her. This technique was effective in engaging students and monitoring their understanding of the meaning of the stories.

Meaning construction. Whether Mrs. Paterson worked with a whole group, small group, or an individual student, she would typically begin her reading lesson by asking the students to preview the pictures and tell her what was happening in the story. The students were actively engaged, from the start of the lesson, in the meaning of the story. The conversations she had with her students, in addition to the questions she posed, would be about story sequence and overall meaning of texts. The following excerpt from observational field notes, from Mrs. Paterson's work with an individual student, is an example of how she encouraged students to focus on the meaning of texts:

T: We're gonna work on those strategies so that this book won't be too hard.

[T pulls one black female to the reading table. T gives the book *Shoe Boxes* to S. T gives a little background on the story.]

T: Look at the pictures and tell me what's happening on every page, just like when we do a book walk.

[S looks at pictures and tells what is happening.]

T: Let's read to see what Mandy, her brother, and her sister did with their shoe boxes.

[S reads. T takes a Running Record.]

T: Very good. Tell me what happened in the story from the beginning.

[S retells the story.]

T: What kind of games? [S answers.]

T: Who tried on the baseball shoes? [S answers.]

[T continues to ask comprehension questions and S answers correctly.]

(March 10, 2004)

The above example is one of 64 examples that emerged from Mrs. Paterson's classroom observational data indicating a pattern of reinforcing meaning construction. She would begin most of her reading lessons in the above manner and would check for understanding before, during, and after a student read a given text.

The following excerpt from Mrs. Paterson's classroom observational data indicates how Mrs. Paterson focused on meaning with her students when she was working with a small group of children:

[T passes out the book *On Our Street*]

T: What do you see on the cover? [S list items.] This story is about different things that are on our street. What have you seen on your street?

S: Kids.

S: Bicycles.

T: What do you live in?

S: Go with my mom.

T: When you go home, are you in a house, an apartment, a trailer?

S: Boat.

T: You live in a boat?

[S nods.]

T: I'm going to ask your grandmother if you live in a boat.

[T and S preview the pictures and discuss the story sequence.]

(February 25, 2004)

Once again, Mrs. Paterson encouraged her students to make connections between what they were reading and their lives. She also focused on the meaning of the story by previewing the pictures with her students and discussing what might have happened. She would do this with her students before they read the story on their own, to prepare them for success. Because of this, her students were able to read with confidence and fluency.

Lesson Modifications

Mrs. Paterson used the ALL lesson structure with a slight modification. She would begin her reading group lessons with an opportunity for students to read familiar books and would take a Running Record of at least one student during this time. She also introduced a new book at each group time. In terms of the writing portion of the lesson structure, however, she made modifications. She would sometimes plan to have students generate and write sentences, but not on a consistent basis. Instead, she would teach comprehension strategies and discuss the meaning of texts with students during this time. She taught writing with her whole class of students and would encourage them to write more than one sentence, using invented spelling, but this was not done during small group instruction. Mrs. Paterson explained why she chose not to include the writing portion in her lesson structure. She said:

> A lot of times, though, I do change the 10-10-10 because sometimes I think that one aspect needs more time with a certain group that the other, like my highest group. They don't need 10 minutes of writing because they're writing wonderful stories now. So to me they need more time with comprehension because not only do I do comprehension, I talk about other aspects of reading with my high groups, like story mapping…so I kind of incorporate all of that and to me they need more

> of that now than the writing because they have the writing down so I kind of pick and choose as to how much time I spend with each one as to what their needs are in that particular group. (April 10, 2003)

Summary of Results for Mrs. Paterson

Mrs. Paterson believed that she would not use what she had learned in the ALL Training Program in exactly the way she had been taught to use it. After a thorough analysis of the data, however, I found that Mrs. Paterson did use many concepts from training in her teaching. Her focus was on helping students accelerate, which is one of the goals of the ALL program. She met with students individually and in small groups, as she had been trained to do, in order to better observe her students and determine the appropriate course of action to help them become better readers. She used Clay's *Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement* (2002), in which she had received training on how to administer during ALL training.

Many of the concepts taught in ALL training had become a part of Mrs. Paterson's teaching repertoire. She taught and reinforced reading strategies, which were emphasized in ALL training. The data collected from her also indicated that she employed the cueing systems, with a particular emphasis on meaning and visual cues. Mrs. Paterson would engage her students in conversations about texts to encourage them to focus on the meaning of the text and would often help them connect textual information with their own lives. Mrs. Paterson did not, however, use the ALL lesson structure as she had learned to do in ALL training. She made modifications to the writing section of the lesson and would focus on comprehension strategies rather than sentence

construction. In general, Mrs. Paterson used much of what she had learned in training. In fact, she would be an excellent model for the ALL program in action in the classroom.

Ms. Stone

Background Information

During the 2003-2004 School Year, Ms. Stone was a 27 year old white female in her 5th year of teaching. All of her years of teaching took place at the same school site. She was a first grade teacher at that time. Ms. Stone had earned a B.A. in Early Childhood Education from the University of South Florida. She volunteered to enroll in the ALL Training Program because she wanted to learn how to help the children in her class who were at risk of reading failure. She explained, "….it's a big concern getting those struggling readers up, so it seemed like a program that would benefit a lot of our children" (Teacher Focus Group, February 26, 2003).

Ms. Stone had attended other Reading trainings in the past because she wanted to learn how to help her students who were having difficulty learning to read. All of her previous training had helped her to develop a reading program, but she was interested in furthering her knowledge on how to help individual students make continuous reading progress. She explained:

> I've been to workshops on phonics and literacy centers and all kinds of things like that, but this has given me more insight. I've been to workshops on guided reading. This though, has given me more insight than anything, because it really specifically told you about teaching guided reading. Everything is kind of fluff in a lot of ways it seems, and you hear oh, if you're doing this for phonics, and if you're doing this, and all these la-dee-da project things, but when you really get

> down to it, it's teaching those strategies and implementing those. Something that has been beneficial and I've had training on are strategy cards. Using those to teach the entire class as a whole group and you're talking about the strategies and what can you do if you come to a word and you only see the beginning of it? How can that help you? Do you see that little word in there? And then taking from what you do from the whole group into the guided reading group and saying, Don't you remember when we came to that word and we couldn't figure it out, what did we do?, and get them thinking. Those cards are very beneficial and that was a good training. Our reading coach two years ago got those for us. (April 2, 2003)

Ms. Stone had some previous experience with teaching and reinforcing reading strategies and found training regarding reading strategies very helpful. The ALL Training Program validated what she was already doing in terms of reinforcing strategies, but gave her more specific information that she could apply in the classroom with individual students.

Description of Class

There were 21 students in Ms. Stone's first grade class. Her class comprised 11 females and 10 males. There were 10 black children, four white children, and seven Hispanic children in her class. Table 13 presents the gender and ethnicity of the students in Ms. Stone's class.

Table 13

Ms. Stone's First Grade Class Demographic Information

Race	Females	Males	Total
Black	6	4	10
White	1	3	4
Hispanic	4	3	7
Total	11	10	21

Description of Classroom

The physical layout of Ms. Stone's classroom was developmentally appropriate for first grade students (Bredekamp, 1987). There were four round tables situated near the front of the room, near the white dry-erase board. There was a mix of four to five children at each table. At the back of the room was a large round table where Ms. Stone met with her reading groups. There was also a rectangular table where two boys were seated, near the shared reading area.

The children had assigned seats in Ms. Stone's classroom. Seated at the first table, in the front left-hand corner of the room, there were two white males, one black female, one Hispanic female, and one black male. Seated at the table to their right were two black males, one black female, one Hispanic male, and one Hispanic female. Seated at the table behind them were two black females, two Hispanic females, and one Hispanic male. Seated at the table to their left (behind the first table) were two black females, one white male, and one white female. There was one black male and one Hispanic male seated at the rectangular table at the back of the room. There were times during the course of the day when the students would move to a large area on the floor designated

for shared reading or to various learning centers in the room, but when the students were working individually they remained in their seats at their assigned tables.

At the front of the classroom, next to the door, in the far left corner of the room was a Word Wall. Next to the Word Wall was a large white dry-erase board. There were class rules posted on a chart at the front of the room and a calendar, where students would practice learning calendar skills at the beginning of each day. There was also a large graph posted with information regarding how the students traveled to school that day.

Ms. Stone had learning centers in her classroom. Along the right wall of the room there was a Reading Center with a bulletin board with a "Get Hooked on Books!" poster. There were five shelves of children's books, big books (oversized instructional texts), and three rugs in the Reading Center, where children could sit comfortably on the rugs and read either alone or with partners. A "Reading Strategies" chart was posted as well as charts for "Compound Words", "Sight Words", "Word Families", "Vowels", "Rhyming Words", and "Colors". In addition, the Reading Center had an easel set up and shelves with magnetic letters, where the children could practice letter recognition and spelling words. In the same area of the Reading Center there was an alphabet bingo game and individual chalkboards. Next to the Reading Center was a Listening Center with books and headsets. Next to the Reading and Listening Centers, along the same wall, was a shared reading area with a rocking chair and easel, where Ms. Stone met with her class to read to them. There was a "Chunk Chart" and "Alphabet Chart" hanging on the wall.

Along the back wall of Ms. Stone's classroom was a Computer Center. There was a pocket chart hanging at the back of the room. There was a television on a

moveable stand, and another bookshelf in the back of the room for supplies. There was also a door to another classroom in the back of the room.

Ms. Stone's teacher's desk was on the left side of the room, near the door. She had a table with writing folders near her desk. Behind her desk were closets and cabinets for storage. Along the same wall, in the back of the room, there was a single bathroom for her students.

Personal Teaching Style

Ms. Stone wanted her students to learn and follow the classroom rules that were posted in her classroom. At the beginning of the year she read the rules to the students and explained what each of the rules meant. She also asked the students to chorally read the rules as she pointed to each one. She would refer to these rules throughout the day to remind the students of them, often asking students to list a rule for her. The following excerpt from observational field notes taken in her classroom was an example of this [T refers to the teacher, S refers to individual students]:

> T: Let's see those good listeners. A good listener's eyes are open. A good listener's ears are open. A good listener's lips are closed. A good listener's hands are still. A good listener's feet are quiet. [T referred to a poster on the board with pictures of what good listeners do.]
>
> T: Put away your crayons and pencils. Please put your books away. Please put your heads down. Please put the book basket in the middle of the table. Just waiting for a few people to put away their pencils and their papers. I want you to be thinking about a rule that we have in our classroom. If you are a girl in the classroom, can you tell me about a rule we have in the classroom?

S: Look at you.

T: Okay, you need to be looking at me when I am talking. Are you doing that? What is another rule? If you are a boy in this classroom, tell me a rule.

S: You need to be quiet.

[Students took turns telling their teacher a rule and T reviewed them by pointing to each one listed on a poster on the board.] (August 8, 2003)

Ms. Stone had a teacher-centered classroom. In the above example, the students were telling their teacher the rules that she had established for them. There was not any discussion between the teacher and her students about the reasons for having rules, or any indication that the students had any ownership of the rules. They were simply expected to memorize and follow them.

Ms. Stone expected her students to behave and would not tolerate inappropriate behavior. She controlled her students by using her voice and by giving explicit directions for their every move. She expected her students to follow her directions and would wait until every student had followed a given direction before she would continue with her lesson. It was a common practice of hers to ask her students to put their heads down on their table after they had followed her directions, so that they would not talk to each other or become distracted as they waited for every student to do what the teacher had asked them to do. This was a typical practice of Ms. Stone's during whole group lessons. The children did have more autonomy when they were allowed to work in the various centers that were set up in the classroom.

The students in Ms. Stone's classroom worked in Literacy Centers while she met with small groups and individual students during Reading time. The centers were set up

at the beginning of the school year and Ms. Stone spent the first week of class introducing each center and explaining what the students should do at each of the centers.

T: We need to continue talking about things we can do at Center time. In the next week or so we are going to start those Reading groups. In the Reading Center, you can read to yourself, you can read a big book, you can read to a buddy, you can read a book the class wrote. At the Poem Center, you can read a poem from the pocket chart, you can mix up sentences in the little pocket chart. What is something you can do in the Writing Center?

S: Draw a picture.

T: Yes, but it's a Writing Center, not a Drawing Center, so you have to write words under the picture.

S: You can write spelling words.

T: I would love to see that.

S: You can find vowels in the words that you write.

S: You can look for words that you know.

S: You can practice writing ABCs.

S: You could write names.

T: How about writing sentences with words that you know?

[T wrote each suggestion on a chart.]

T: Names always start with what kind of a letter?

S: A capital.

T: As you get better and better, you can write stories. We've talked about our "Read and Write the Room" Center. You need a pointer and walking around

the room pointing to words that you know and reading them. What do we do to "write the room"? Maybe you decide to walk around the room and find all the "is" words in the room and make a tally mark or check mark every time you see the word. Or maybe you want to write all the words that you see that start with the letter "j".

T: Someone donated these nice lunch boxes to us. This lunch box says, "letter tiles". [T showed the letter tiles to S.] You can sit down and make your spelling words. This one is called, "word tiles". With word tiles you can make sentences. This one says, "after", and this one says, "play". Here's a spelling word, "is". I can take the words "the", "dog", "is", "big" and make a sentence, "The dog is big". You can write them down and make a sentence. What do you have at the beginning of the sentence?

S: The

T: What kind of letter?

S: Capital.

T: These are magnet letters. There are two places where you can use magnet letters. You can take these magnets and you can get a tray and you can put them down. [T puts letters down on a cookie sheet.] You can make words, spelling words, or words that you know. These magnets will stick on my desk. It's not just playtime with the magnets. You need to make words.

T: This lunch box has cards that rhyme. Here's the word "top". I'm going to show you another word…thumbs up if it rhymes, thumbs

down if it doesn't rhyme. [T says a word and children show thumbs.]

T: I have another rhyming game. You can see if you can find some matching cards. [T played game with S to model for them how the game was played.]

T: These cards have part of a picture and a letter. You would have to find the "f" card, "o" card, and "x" card to spell "fox". When you line them up next to each other, you will spell the word "fox" and there will be a picture of a fox. You can use these pieces to make words. I am thinking of a word that starts with an "f" and it rhymes with "hog". Raise your hand.

S: Frog.

T: You are right.

[T showed children how to put puzzle pieces together.] (August 25, 2003)

Ms. Stone spent time each day reviewing the Literacy Centers and gave very explicit directions and modeled for the children what to do at each of the centers. The students were assigned to one Literacy Center each week. Ms. Stone told the children, "we're working on getting to stay at our centers. You can't go to another center. By the end of the week you will have visited all of the centers" (August 25, 2003). The students enjoyed working at the centers and were highly engaged during this time. It was a bit noisy, but it was productive noise which did not seem to bother Ms. Stone or the students. She was able to effectively work with her Reading groups without interruptions from the other students in the class.

Reading Group Time

Ms. Stone formed her Reading groups very early in the school year. She was working with small groups and individual children by September 10th. She spent the first few weeks of school surveying all of the children in her class to determine the appropriate Reading level for each of her students. She administered part of Marie Clay's *Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement* (2002) to each student.

There was a basic sight word check section on the *Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement* (2002), which was what Ms. Stone used to ascertain the sight vocabulary for each of her students. During the ALL training, the teachers were expected to administer the whole survey to each of their students. Ms. Stone chose not to do this, but rather chose selected sections from the survey to administer to her students. She also met with each of her students and had them read to her and would take a Running Record to help her decide on the appropriate Reading level for each of them. Ms. Stone explained that she used Running Records, the *Observation Survey*, and the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) on a regular basis with her students to determine the appropriate placement for her students:

> I continuously do observations and Running Records. I refer to the *Observation Survey* if there is a really struggling child at a much lower level, but just throughout the year as far as reading goes by looking at their Running Records to see how they are progressing, through the Developmental Reading Assessment test, and just conferencing with them and observing their work on a daily basis and keeping notes of what I'm seeing this year with writing. I've been keeping track, as I see them, daily or weekly, writing what I'm observing. I can use

that to then determine if they're at an appropriate level or not. (March 17, 2004)

During the ALL training, the participants were given a form that teachers could choose to use when they worked with the students in their Reading groups (see Appendix F and G). This was the form that Ms. Stone referred to in her interview. On the form, teachers could note the date, the students that were in the group, the book that the students reread, the new book that was introduced, and the skill or concept that was taught. In addition, there was a place at the bottom of the form for a Running Record. She explained why she chose to use the form:

> For myself to keep track of what it is that we do every day, who's there in the group on the day that we're meeting, keep track of what books we've read, that helps when I go to do that Running Record, then I know what the book is that we've previously just introduced. If we're focusing on something specifically, if we focus on "ing" words, and then the next day they're having trouble finding those "ing" words, to go back and talk about what we've talked about. Also, to show parents, it can be used for either to show parents during conferences or administrators to show, here's...if we're talking about a particular child, here's from this day, this day, this day, obviously I'm working daily with this child, or just kind of a back-up mainly just to keep track for myself of what it is that goes on every day, kind of like a mini lesson plan for guided reading. (March 17, 2004)

Ms. Stone chose to use this form with her Reading groups, in an effort to keep an accurate record of what she and the students accomplished during their group time together. This form was used for anecdotal information as well as for planning purposes.

Ms. Stone wanted to ensure that each of her students was working at an appropriate level, which meant that she had to observe and informally assess her students on a regular basis. She would rearrange her Reading groups as her students progressed to higher levels. Because of this, her groups were flexible and constantly changing, based on the reading abilities and needs of her students. She explained how she formed Reading groups in the following way:

> With the grouping, again it depends on the assessments that I'm getting back from them. Try to keep, usually with reading, keeping them all at a level, working at the same level. If I see that one child is progressing, I would move them to another group. If they're progressing quicker that the other children in the group, or if someone has fallen behind, I kind of rearrange and you just need to look weekly pretty much to see where each child individually is at and where the best spot would be for them. (March 17, 2004)

Reading routine. Ms. Stone met with her Reading groups at a table at the back of the classroom. She had developed a routine with the children so that each child knew what was expected of them when their teacher met with groups. The children who were not meeting with their teacher were engaged in Literacy Centers during group time. The children who were meeting with their teacher knew what was expected of them as well.

Ms. Stone would call a small group of children to sit with her at the table. Each student was given a bag of books full of several books that the child had read before. They would choose a familiar book to read aloud while the teacher observed and listened to them read. Even though the children were reading simultaneously, they were not necessarily reading the same book. While the children were reading, Ms. Stone would

choose a student to read to her and would take a Running Record of that student's reading. Following the Running Record, Ms. Stone would typically introduce a new book with each of her groups of students. Ms. Stone described a typical reading lesson in the following way:

> Every child has a bag of books that they have been working on and the first thing that they do is they'll take out their bag of books and read a familiar book for them as sort of a warm-up. Usually during this time I'll do a Running Record with one of the children while the others are still reading. Then depending on the level, with my higher level kids, we'll then go into looking at a new book and discussing a new book. With my lower levels, some of them I've used the ALL program in which we'll do some sort of writing or word building, going over sight words, something in between and then we'll introduce and do the new book…and then even with some of the advanced groups, to maybe do a follow-up lesson, if there was a lot of compound words. For example, maybe have them write a sentence with compound words or make a little book that shows compound words. With some of my higher groups, I'm having them write down unknown words and then work together to figure them out. You know maybe someone else in the group knew that word that they didn't know, but they keep a little list of things that they're reading through cause they don't need me to sit there and go through everything. They can maybe read the whole book except for two words, so they're writing down those words and then talking to each other to help solve the word. But the main thing is the familiar read,

the Running Record, and then the new book. (March 17, 2004)

In the above excerpt, it is interesting to note that Ms. Stone modified the structure of the ALL lesson format. She chose to start and end her reading lessons in the way she was trained to do in the ALL program. The children began their lesson by reading familiar books and Ms. Stone took a Running Record of one student. She also introduced a new book and the students would read the new book.

Ms. Stone modified the writing section of the ALL lesson structure. She did not use the sentence generation and cut-up sentences during this time. Instead Ms. Stone wanted her students to work on developing a basic sight vocabulary. When Ms. Stone met with her students, she usually focused on visual cues and word recognition. Regardless of the reading level of her students, Ms. Stone's focus for reading was at the word level, in that she emphasized recognizing words rather than on the meaning of sentences and stories, with her students.

Fostering word recognition. Ms. Stone wanted her students to develop a basic sight vocabulary. She believed that word recognition was essential for reading fluency and competency. When she met with her students, whether in groups or individually, she reinforced word recognition. The following excerpt is an example of how she did this:

T: Do you see a spelling word from this week?

[S used finger to point to word.]

T: How did you know that said "bed"?

S: It starts with a "b".

T: What if you cover up the y in the word "they".

S: the

T: Cover up the y and the t.

S: he

T: There are words hiding in that word.

S: I see a boy in his bed.

T: Do good readers use pictures to help them?

S: Yes.

[T introduces a new book.]

T: What time of day do you think this story takes place?

S: At night.

T: How do you know?

S: There are stars.

S: There's a tiger.

T: Did you look at the word or the picture of a tiger.

[S pointed to the picture.]

T: Can you find the word "tiger".

[S pointed to the word.]

T: On the next page there's a speech balloon. What's the word?

S: Mom!

T: It starts like "mom".

S: Mother!

T: It starts like "Mother", but it's another word.

[T gives wait time while S try to figure out the word.]

T: That word is "Mommy".

[S read chorally.]

T: Everybody find the word “into”. Cover the “in”. Cover the “to” and the word is “in”. Put them together and they make the word “into”. Read it again and remember the word “into”.

[S reread.]

T: Look at the word “was”. Cover the “w” and what do you see?

S: as

T: That’s a spelling word this week. (September 10, 2003)

In the above example, Ms. Stone reinforced word recognition and word-building. She often referred to spelling words when she worked with her students in reading. She also wanted her students to recognize words within longer words, so she would have them take apart the words to identify smaller words. The students would look at the pictures to help them gain meaning, which was a strategy that Ms. Stone taught her students to use, but more often than not she would redirect her students’ attention to the print. She used visual cues with her students more than any other reading cue.

Ms. Stone taught her children compound words and rhyming words. She often asked her children to focus on these as they were reading. Although the children would use picture cues to construct meaning of texts, Ms. Stone wanted to ensure that her students recognized the words associated with the pictures. In the following example, Ms. Stone used visual cues to encourage her students to tune in to the printed word:

T: How did you know this was teapot?

S: I saw “tea” and “pot”.

T: So you think about the spelling of the word? Girls come join us. Let’s

look at the cover.

[S read title, *I Saw a Dinosaur*]

T: What do you know about this story?

S: It's about dinosaurs.

T: Look at the word "bedroom". What kind of word is that?

[No response.]

T: How many words do you see? It has two words. What are they?

S: Bed. Room.

T: Right. It's a compound word.

[T takes calculator and shows S.]

T: What is this?

S: Calculator.

T: Find the word calculator.

[S cannot find the word.]

T: How can you tell which word is "calculator"?

[S do not know.]

T: Calculator begins with a "c". What does it end with? cal-cu-lat-or-r-r-r.

S: "r"

[S point to the word "calculator".]

T: Turn the page. See those three dots. One dot is a period and tells us to stop.

Three dots means there's more on the next page. Let's read the page.

[S read the page chorally.]

T: What animal is on this page?

S: Elephants.

T: What are they wearing?

S: Yellow and red pants.

T: What animal is on the next page?

S: Kangaroo.

T: Find the word “kangaroo”.

[S point to the word “kangaroo”.]

T: Read the book to yourself. (February 23, 2004)

Ms. Stone wanted her students to recognize unfamiliar words. When she introduced a new book, she and her students would preview the pages together. Ms. Stone asked questions about the pictures, but would then ask the students to connect the picture to a word on the page. She did this to prepare her students to read the book independently. She also would often point out conventions of print, such as the use of periods and ellipses, as in the above example.

Ms. Stone encouraged her students to practice sight words. When students encountered unfamiliar words or if they had difficulty attacking a sight word, Ms. Stone would write the word on a card or small piece of paper for the students. The students kept the cards in their individual bags of books. Sometimes Ms. Stone instructed her students to practice reading the word cards. The following example shows how she reinforced sight words with her students:

[T introduces the new book, *Words are Everywhere*.]

T: Let’s look at this book.

S: There’s a spelling word.

T: Which word?

S: Us

[S point to the word, “us”.]

T: Look at the pictures. Which sign tells us about children?

[S cannot find it.]

T: Can you find the word “children”?

[S point to the word.]

T: Can you find the spelling word “tell”?

[S point to the word.]

T: Can you find our old spelling word “find”?

[S point to the word.]

T: Cover up the word to show us “in”.

[S cannot do this.]

T: How do you spell “in”?

S: i-n

T: That’s right.

T: Find the word “cannot”.

[S point.]

T: That word is a compound word. Show me the two words.

[S cover word to show “can” and “not”.]

[Later in the lesson, two students had trouble with the word “tell”. T wrote the word on a piece of paper for each of the students.]

T: This is a spelling word. What does it say?

S: Tell.

T: Put it in your bag. [S put word card in bag.]

[T explained to me that she made sight word cards for her students and had students practice reading them at their seat.] (February 24, 2004)

In the above example, when the teacher introduced the new book, a student pointed out a spelling word. The teacher intended to preview the pictures with her students, but as the focus of Ms. Stone's reading lessons were usually around the words, the student pointed out the spelling word on the page. The rest of the lesson focus was on words as well. Using words on cards did not seem to be an effective way to reinforce words, however, because even though the students encountered the spelling word "tell", they did not recognize the word in context.

Data Analysis

The phenomenological data collected from Ms. Stone included one 30 minute focus group interview, two individual 30 minute interviews, and 22 classroom observations. The focus group interview took place on February 26, 2003. The individual interviews with Ms. Stone took place on April 2, 2003 and again nearly one year later on March 17, 2004. There were 11 classroom observations made in Fall, 2003 and 11 classroom observations made in Spring, 2004.

There were 34 constructs that emerged from Ms. Stone's interview data. Table 14 specifies the five constructs with the highest frequency that emerged from these data. Please refer to Appendix E for a description of the constructs.

Table 14

Constructs from Ms. Stone's Interview Data

Construct	Frequency
Running Records	10
Assessment	9
Meeting Child's Needs	7
ALL Training	7
Reading Strategies	6

These data indicated that Ms. Stone informally assessed her students on a regular basis using Running Records, specific information from Clay's *Observation Survey* (2002), and the Developmental Reading Assessment (Beaver, 1999). She did this to determine the appropriate instructional level for each of her students. In an effort to meet her students' reading needs, Ms. Stone emphasized assessment and reading strategies in her classroom.

There were 30 constructs that emerged from Ms. Stone's classroom observational data. Table 15 specifies the eight constructs with the highest frequency that emerged from these data. Please refer to Appendix E for a description of the constructs.

Table 15

Constructs from Ms. Stone's Observational Data

Construct	Frequency
Visual Cues	94
Meaning Cues	28
Sight Words	28

Constructs from Ms. Stone's Observational Data (continued).

Construct	Frequency
Choral Reading	19
Conventions of Print	17
Hearing Sounds	14
Running Records	13
Centers	13

There were three themes that emerged from Ms. Stone's interview and classroom observational data. They developed after a thorough analysis of the data, which included reading through the data at least three times for a holistic sense of the data, analyzing the data for meaningful units, developing constructs from the emerging meaningful units, and tallying the constructs for frequency. The themes that emerged were *Individual Assessment, Reading Strategies and Cueing Systems,* and *Focus on Print and Sight Words*. These themes encompassed the essence of Ms. Stone's teaching of reading. Table 16 presents these themes and the frequency with which they occurred in the data collected from Ms. Stone.

Table 16

Themes from Ms. Stone's Data

Theme	Frequency
Individual Assessment	32
Teaching and Reinforcing Reading Strategies	128
Focus on Print and Sight Words	49

Individual Assessment

Ms. Stone wanted comprehensive and very specific knowledge about each student's reading ability. She felt that she could better help her students with their reading skills if she had this knowledge. In an effort to gain as much information as possible about each student she would actively observe them as they read, and individually assess each of her students. She administered parts of Marie Clay's *Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement* (2002) to some of the students in her class at the beginning and end of the school year. Ms. Stone explained why she did this in the following excerpt from one of her interviews (March 17, 2004):

> …The ones who were below level the first nine weeks, I did those children. Someone who came in reading at a level 10, I didn't think there was any need for that. But the ones who I'd say were at a level 4 or below at the beginning of the year or by October, I had done the *Observation Survey* for all of them. And the ones who are still below level or borderline at the end of the year are the ones I'm planning on redoing and seeing what improvements were made.

Ms. Stone further explained that the *Observation Survey* was especially helpful at the beginning of the school year and during the school year with students who transferred into her class. The information she obtained from the survey helped her make decisions about appropriate placement as well as what to do to help her students progress in reading. She stated:

> Especially at the beginning of the year. It let's you know what letters they know, what sight words, how they hold the book and how they look at a book, and it's a good starting point, I feel, to then take them from that point and see the

> progress as the year goes on to then go back and see what they've done, but I think it's a good starting assessment. Sometimes what they come in with from kindergarten really doesn't give you enough information, and this was definitely good to have it. (March 17, 2004)

During the year, Ms. Stone would individually assess each student using a district-adopted reading assessment, the Developmental Reading Assessment (Beaver, 1999). She would also take Running Records of each of her students on a regular basis and would use the information gained from the assessments to determine each student's strengths and weaknesses. She also used the information from the Running Records to make decisions about the appropriate reading level for each student.

Ms. Stone would take at least one Running Record per week for each of the students in her class. Her reading groups usually met for approximately 15-25 minutes each day, depending on their reading level. She explained that she would meet for a longer period of time with the students who were reading at lower levels because she would have them do more writing and word work.

Reading Strategies and Cueing Systems

The reading strategies and cueing systems were emphasized in the ALL Training Program and were clearly observed in Ms. Stone's classroom as well. Ms. Stone explicitly taught the reading strategies to her students when she met with them as a whole group. She would use the cueing systems when she met with small groups and individual students.

Reading strategies. Ms. Stone taught her students reading strategies to use when they encountered unfamiliar text. She had reading strategy cards posted in her shared reading area. There were nine cards in all. They were:

1. Look at the beginning sound. Look at the ending sound.
2. Make sense?
3. Look at the pictures.
4. Sound right?
5. Look right?
6. Guess.
7. Chunk
8. Try it again.
9. Read. Read.

There also was a poster with a *Reading Strategies Song:* Look at the pictures. Still no clue? Read it again all the way through. When you get to the place where you are stuck, get your mouth ready and the word pops up!

Ms. Stone believed that students needed to know and utilize the reading strategies to be successful readers. She modeled and reinforced the reading strategies with her students because she believed they needed to be able to use them to become independent, fluent readers. She fostered their success in reading by:

> Teaching them different ways of what to do when they come to a word. Can they look for the picture for clues? Can they find a little word inside that they know is there? Does it make sense? Asking them questions, does it look right? Getting them to look at the beginning, the end, seeing different word families,

different things inside the word that are going to make them become more fluent readers. (April 2, 2003)

The above excerpt came from an interview with Ms. Stone during her ALL training year. At that time, she received intensive training regarding the reading strategies and cueing systems. She practiced questioning techniques with her students to encourage them to employ the reading strategies.

In the year following ALL training, Ms. Stone was still teaching her students the reading strategies because she believed:

> Those strategies are what a child is going to need to use in order to read and they need to know that if they come to an unknown word, what they can do to help themselves. Can they look for a little word, can they check the picture, can they think of something else that begins with that letter, to get their mouth ready. Without going over those things and having them around the room and using the cards and just talking about always what you can do, they're not going to know, okay when I come to a word I don't know, what are my options? So it's something that's very important for them to be able to read. (March 17, 2004)

The reading strategies were emphasized during the ALL Training Program, and they were inherent in Ms. Stone's reading program as well. Ms. Stone explicitly taught the reading strategies to her students when she worked with them as a whole group. She referred to the posted strategy cards and song. When she worked with small groups and individual students, she typically reminded them to "get your mouth ready" and "look at the picture", as the following example illustrates:

T: Please choose a book and begin reading quietly.

T: What's the name of the story?

S: w-w-w (attempts word)

T: You got your mouth ready. Use the picture. These are great pictures to help.

[S read quietly to themselves. Two girls chose the same book to read.]

T: I just want you looking at the cover of this book. What do you see on the cover?

S: A sun.

S: A birthday.

T: This story is called *The Surprise Inside*. What do you think the surprise in the box will be?

S: Balloons and presents.

T: Let's read the title again. [S read the title chorally.] Let's open it up.

T: What color box did he get?

S: Red

T: Can you find the word "red"? Point to the word. [S point to the word.]

T: Can you find the word "green"? [S point to the word.]

T: There are two colors on this page.

S: Pink and yellow.

T: Let's read it.

S: Pink and [pause] orange!

T: How did you know it said "orange"?

S: Because is has an "o".

T: If it said yellow, what letter would there be?

S: "y"

T: Let's read the story from the beginning. [S read the book to themselves.]

T: Read the story again while I get the activity ready. [S read softly.]

[T took a white board and marker, made two columns, and wrote 2 words at top.]

red green

T: I'm going to give you each a red piece and a green piece. I'm going to write a word on the board and you're going to show me if it rhymes with red or green. Put up the red piece if you think it rhymes with red, and the green piece if it rhymes with green.

[T wrote the words, bed, head, green, led, mean, teen, fed. She said each word and the S put up the appropriate color piece. T put a red or green dot next to each of the words.]

T: What do they both have at the end? We're going to do two more because you guys are doing awesome.

T: Let's read all of the words that are red. [S read the words chorally.]

T: Let's read all of the words that are green. [S read the words chorally.]

(September 11, 2003)

In the above example, Ms. Stone reinforced the reading strategies. Once again, Ms. Stone wanted her students to focus on the printed page, as well as the picture. She prompted them to identify and read words, like "red" and "green". During the writing portion of the lesson, rather than asking the students to generate a sentence, she worked on rhyming words. This was very typical of her lessons. She would have the students identify and write words.

Cueing systems. Ms. Stone observed her students when they were reading to determine the cues they relied on to help them with unfamiliar text. She observed and documented the cues each of her students used when they were reading. Then, when she worked with them, she would try to strengthen the cueing systems that were weaker for them. She explained what she had learned from training in this way:

> …but it has given me more insight as far as seeing their strengths and their weaknesses and what cues they're using and the meaning, visual, the structure, things like that. I was not aware of them before. It's not written down anywhere that if a child says this, this is the reason why, and now this class has really shown me. (April 2, 2003)

> …being able to interpret the cues that they're using, the meaning, structure, and visual. How they are reading. From the training, probably the thing I took away the most is how to use those assessments to help you plan to see if the child focuses totally on the pictures or if they're looking for meaning, what it is that they're using to help them read and then what that in turn tells me what I need to focus more on with my teaching…if I was seeing, like when Ms. Hazlett would mark down the different types of questions that we asked and if I saw that I kept asking questions pertaining to visual, to know that I needed to focus more on asking things about meaning and structure. If I have a child who's very meaning based, here's what we can do to focus on something else. It made me more aware and showed me how to interpret the reading and the cueing systems that my students are using. (March 17, 2004)

The above excerpts from interview data indicated that Ms. Stone had learned the cueing systems and genuinely wanted to help her students become better readers by using the appropriate cue with each of her students.

Although she was aware of the three cueing systems, and recognized the need to include meaning cues, she relied heavily on visual cues. An analysis of the observational data indicated that Ms. Stone used 94 visual cues, as opposed to 28 meaning cues, over 22 days of observations during her reading group time. The reason for this preponderance of visual cues was because of Ms. Stone's focus on sight words and print with her students.

Focus on Print and Sight Words

An analysis of Ms. Stone's observational data indicated that she relied heavily on visual cues and sight words to teach her students to read. During 22 days of observation, Ms. Stone used visual cues with her students 94 times when she worked with them at group time. She also taught and reinforced sight words 28 times over the same period of time. She clearly wanted her students to focus on the printed page when they were reading.

Ms. Stone began to teach her students sight words at the beginning of the school year. The following excerpt from her observational data illustrates the way in which she chose to do this:

> T: …Yesterday afternoon we talked about 12 special words that we need to know how to read and write in first grade. [The words were on cards and placed in a large apple pocket chart on the white board. T pointed to the words. T and S read the words chorally.]

S: and

T: I see boys and girls who are sitting quietly.

S: can

S: dad

S: is

T: i-s "is"

S: see

T: I see good students.

[T and S said each word and spelled them chorally.]

T: We're going to take those words and sometimes when you're learning new words it helps to write them over and over. Well we're going to practice those 12 special words that you need to know for first grade. We're going to rainbow write our words. What colors do you see in the rainbow?

S: red

T: We're going to take each word and write the word with different colors.

[T wrote words on board and modeled for students.]

T: I'm going to say each word and you say them after me.

[T read words and S repeated.]

T: I want to see some beautiful, beautiful work. (August 13, 2003)

Ms. Stone had her students practice writing and reading sight words on a daily basis. She wanted her students to develop a basic sight vocabulary that they could utilize when they were reading.

The students in Ms. Stone's class often were given word cards to practice reading. The following example shows how Ms. Stone encouraged her students to focus on words and print by using visual cues:

[T is working with S and has word cards for S. S is reading each word card. T tells him to put the word cards in his bag full of familiar books.]

T: Choose a book from your bag to read. [S read *The Surprise Inside*.]

T: Let's read *Look Again* (a Literacy Place My Book S put together.)

[T chunks words for students.]

T: You know this word. [T covers up "inside" to show "in".]

[T covers up "th" in "this" and says what does this say?]

S: is

[T uncovers word.]

S: this

T: Let's read *My Feet*. (Literacy Place My Book)

T: Who has funny feet on this page?

S: cat

T: Point to that word.

[S point to "cat". T continues on each page asking students to find the animal with funny feet and pointing to the corresponding word.]

T: Look at page 2. Find the word "funny". [S point.]

T: Can you find the word "fun"? [S point.]

T: Can you remember the spelling word that rhymes with "fun"?

S: run

[S read the book on their own.]

T: I'm going to put a big star next to the "f" in "feet" so that when you see it you'll remember the word "feet". (February 26, 2004)

The above excerpt was a typical example of how Ms. Stone conducted her reading lessons with small groups and individual students. There was a definite pattern of fostering word recognition, using visual cues, and encouraging her students to focus on the print on each page in the book, particularly with her at-risk students. Ms. Stone often covered parts of words for students to show them the part of the word that they already recognized. She would often try to take them from the "known" to the "unknown". For example, when her student did not recognize the word "inside", she showed him "in" to help him figure out the word "inside". She did this to prepare her students to read the books independently. The students in her class who were visual learners and /or strong readers had no difficulty with this. The students in her class who were not visual learners and who struggled to learn to read had great difficulty.

Ms. Stone taught her students basic sight words by writing them on cards for students and asking them to practice reading them. She pointed out spelling words and had them identify spelling words in the books they read. She also encouraged students to build new words with words that they already recognized. She often practiced word building with them, by using rhyming words. The following excerpt was an example of this:

[T passed out word cards and asked S to read them. S reviewed sight words.]

T: I need Jazlyn to take out the story *Words are Everywhere.*

[T instructed other students to read quietly while she took a Running Record.]

T: How does it begin?

S: /t/

T: That was a spelling word last week. Can you take a guess?

How does it begin?

S: /h/ "help"

T: Good.

[S turns the page and finds the word card "tell" marking the page. T had instructed S to put the card there so that when she was reading the word "tell" on the page, she would remember it when she saw the word card.]

T: That's for you. Remember the word?

S: tell [S read page with "tell".]

T: Get your mouth ready. [S doesn't know the word.]

[T tells S the word.]

T: It's important to take a guess. This word looks like "these" but it says "things". Read it again.

[S has trouble reading "not".]

T: Look at that /t/ sound at the end.

T: Stretch it out. [T stretches out sounds for S…n-o-t.]

S: not

[S has trouble with the word "way". T writes "day".]

T: What's the word?

S: day

[S makes the connection and says, "way".]

[T works with another S.]

T: What is it?

S: Monkey?

T: It begins like "monkey". [T tells word "monster".]

T: Which one of those words is our spelling word?

S: me

T: Can you think of a word that rhymes with "me"?

S: we

T: Put your books away. We're going to do something different today. I want you to number your paper 1-9. [T passes out paper.]

[T lists words and asks students to write words.]

T: "at" Change the word "at" to "bat". Change the word "bat" to "sat". I want you to write the word "it". Change the word "it" to "sit". Change the word "sit" to "bit"…Can you think of a word that starts with an "h" that rhymes with the first word on your paper?

S: hat

T: How do you spell it? [S spell word.] Circle the word "at" in "hat". We're going to read through the words and spell them. Take these back to your seat and I'll ask you about it later. S take word cards for "they" and "with" to read at their seats.] (March 2, 2004)

In the above example, Ms. Stone worked on developing a sight vocabulary and word building with her students. She used a concept that was taught in the ALL training program as well, which was to take something that a child already knows and build

on that knowledge in order to learn something new. Ms. Stone used this concept when she had her students build words from words that they already knew. Although the students were able to do this, they really had difficulty reading the books. In general, Ms. Stone spent the majority of her reading group time assessing students and working with words and print on the page, rather than on the meaning of texts. The students spent so much time taking apart the story and on skill work, they rarely had time for fluency practice and reading for meaning.

Summary of Results for Ms. Stone

Many of the concepts taught in ALL training had become a part of Ms. Stone's teaching repertoire. She taught and reinforced reading strategies, which were emphasized in ALL training such as chunking and "get your mouth ready". The data collected from her also indicated that she employed the cueing systems, with a particular emphasis on visual cues.

Ms. Stone reported that she planned to use what she had learned in the ALL Training Program in exactly the way she had been taught to use it. During an interview she mentioned that she intended to put it into her Professional Development Plan at the school for the following school year. She explained, "next year, when I do my professional plan, the past couple of years I've done it for reading, and I would like to be able to incorporate that I'm using this program in my plan" (April 2, 2003). A thorough analysis of the data indicated that Ms. Stone did use many concepts from training in her teaching. She met with students individually and in small groups, as she had been trained to do, in order to better observe students and determine the appropriate course of action to help them become better readers. She used Clay's *Observation Survey of Early Literacy*

Achievement (2002), which she had received training on how to administer during ALL training.

Ms. Stone used the ALL lesson structure with a slight modification. She would begin her reading group lessons with an opportunity for students to read familiar books and she would take a Running Record of at least one student during this time. She also introduced a new book at each group time. In terms of the writing portion of the lesson structure, however, she made modifications. She would sometimes plan to have students generate and write sentences, but not on a consistent basis. Instead, she would use the writing section of the ALL lesson structure to reinforce sight words and word building. Ms. Stone explained why she chose not to include the writing portion in her lesson structure. She said:

> …I didn't entirely follow the writing of the ALL program. I kind of tweeked it to my own and I didn't really feel that that was something necessary. We used other ways of helping each other figure out what part, what letters we needed…The writing was probably the shorter of the parts, maybe five minutes because mainly the children who I used the program with were fairly on level for writing and writing was not something that they really needed as much to focus on, which is why I kind of eliminate a lot of the writing parts.
>
> (March 17, 2004)

Ms. Stone chose to modify the lesson structure because she did not feel that it was necessary for her students. Her students wrote sentences and stories individually and as a class, but Ms. Stone chose not to have them do this during reading group time.

Member Checks

After I analyzed the data and developed case studies of the ALL Training Program, I met individually with the site-based trainer, Ms. Hazlett, and the two selected participant teachers, Mrs. Paterson and Ms. Stone. I shared each case study with the appropriate participant. I conducted a member check with Ms. Hazlett to discuss and confirm the findings from her data. I also conducted individual member checks with Mrs. Paterson and Ms. Stone to discuss and confirm the findings from their data. Each of the participants agreed with the interpretations of the data and confirmed the findings of the study.

Ms. Hazlett

Ms. Hazlett and I met to discuss the findings from the ALL training data in February, 2007. At that time I reviewed the data collection and analysis procedures with her and then shared the case study findings from the phenomenological data of the ALL Training Program. We discussed the emerging themes and I showed her support for these themes in the data. She confirmed the themes and agreed with the findings from the study. At that time she also mentioned a concern she had about the sustainability of the program. She did not think the ALL participant teachers were using what they had learned in training any longer. Ms. Hazlett often visits teacher's classrooms as a Reading Coach in the school. It was in this capacity that she was able to make the observation that teachers no longer applied what they had learned in training in their classrooms.

Mrs. Paterson

Mrs. Paterson and I met to discuss the findings of the study in February, 2007. At that time I reviewed the data collection and analysis procedures with her and then shared

the case study findings from the phenomenological data collected and interpreted from her interviews and classroom observations. We discussed the emerging themes and I showed her support for these themes in the data. She confirmed the themes and agreed with the findings from the study. She laughed and admitted that she still taught reading in the same way, four years after the data collection period. Mrs. Paterson reiterated the need for her students to learn and use the reading strategies and to construct meaning from texts. She also mentioned language development goals for her students.

Ms. Stone

Ms. Stone and I met to discuss the findings of the study in March, 2007. At that time I reviewed the data collection and analysis procedures with her and then shared the case study findings from the phenomenological data collected and interpreted from her interviews and classroom observations. We discussed the emerging themes and I showed her support for these themes in the data. She confirmed the themes and agreed with the findings from the study. She admitted that she still taught reading in the same way as she had four years ago but that she hoped she used more meaning cues now. She explained that she now taught second grade and her students already used a basic sight vocabulary consistently. She mentioned that she thought her focus had probably shifted from predominantly visual to a more meaning orientation. At least she hoped that was the case.

Cross Case Analysis

After a thorough analysis of the phenomenological data for each of the cases, there were obvious similarities and differences across cases. Most notable among the similarities were the assessment procedures and the use of cueing systems to teach and

reinforce reading strategies. There was a strong emphasis in ALL training on the best way to teach and reinforce reading strategies through thoughtful and appropriate questioning techniques. The teachers employed these questioning techniques in their classrooms. The assessment procedures that were taught in training included using Running Records, Clay's *Observation Survey*, and documenting individual student progress through the use of anecdotal records. The teachers utilized these assessment procedures in the year following ALL training as well. The greatest difference that emerged from the data was the focus of reading instruction between the two teachers. Each teacher favored one cueing system over the others, which led to differences in their reading instruction.

Similarities Across Cases

Assessment

The title of the course in the first semester of training was: Assessment in Literacy. There were five course objectives which were all related to assessment in literacy. The syllabus (2003) listed the following course objectives (see Appendix C):

1. conduct systematic observation of students
2. administer instruments appropriate for determining student literacy functioning status
3. select books at the appropriate level for individual students
4. plan and implement a daily "30" minute ALL lesson
5. make decisions to facilitate acceleration of students

The trainers taught the participant teachers how to conduct systematic observation of students and provided them with Clay's (2002) *Observation Survey*, as well as training on

its administration. The teachers were expected to use the instrument with each of their students in the first semester of training. Both of the teachers who were selected to participate in the study used the instrument during training as well as in the year following training.

Running records. The teachers were taught how to keep a Running Record of student reading behaviors during the ALL training. The trainers modeled how to take a Running Record and had the teachers practice recording and analyzing student behaviors. The teachers also practiced using Running Records with their ALL group of three students, in their respective classrooms, during training. Both of the participant teachers in the study used Running Records on a daily basis with their students in the year following training as well.

Anecdotal records. The teachers were given various forms by the site-based trainer that could be used with their ALL group of students as a record-keeping tool. The forms were used to document what took place when the teacher met with her students during reading group time. Both of the participant teachers used anecdotal record forms in the year following ALL training (see Appendix F and G). The form that each teacher chose to use differed, but both teachers chose to use a form from ALL training to document what took place during each reading lesson.

Reading Strategies and Cueing Systems

The trainers emphasized reading strategies and cueing systems in the ALL Training Program. Every session in the 11 weeks of the second semester of ALL training was devoted to teaching and reinforcing the reading strategies and cueing systems. As a result, both of the participant teachers taught and reinforced the reading strategies to their

students in their respective classrooms. The teachers asked the questions that they were taught in ALL training to help their students employ the appropriate reading strategies when they came to unfamiliar words. The teachers and their students were definitely familiar with the reading strategies and used them on a daily basis in their respective classrooms.

Differences Across Cases

The differences that emerged from the phenomenological data were between the two first grade teachers. The data indicated that Mrs. Paterson and Ms. Stone each favored one cueing system over the others, which led to differences in their instruction. The results showed differences in the questions they asked their students as well as the focus of each teacher's instruction.

Mrs. Paterson

Mrs. Paterson favored meaning cues when she scaffolded instruction with her students. She often asked the question, "Does it make sense?" She asked this to direct her students to think about the meaning of text, as they attempted to problem-solve on unfamiliar text. She also asked students to preview the pictures before, during, and after reading. She engaged them in conversations about the meaning of what they were reading as well continually checked for text comprehension. Additionally, Mrs. Paterson encouraged her students to make connections between texts as well as between texts and their own lives. The data indicated that Mrs. Paterson emphasized meaning construction and language development in her reading instruction.

Ms. Stone

Ms. Stone favored visual cues when she scaffolded instruction with her students. The question she often asked was "Does it look right?" She asked this to direct her students to the print on the pages of texts, as students attempted to problem-solve on unfamiliar text. She taught sight vocabulary with word cards and had students study words out of context. She reinforced spelling words, compound words, and rhyming words in texts. She taught conventions of print, such as the use of capital letters and punctuation marks. The data indicated that Ms. Stone emphasized word recognition and print in her reading instruction.

Elements of Accelerated Literacy Learning Training

The elements of the ALL Training Program were the ALL concepts that were taught to the teachers. The following is a list of the elements of ALL training:

- Observation Survey
- Running Records
- Anecdotal Records
- Leveled Books
- Acceleration
- 10-10-10 Lesson Format
- Familiar Read
- Writing
- New Book
- Reading Strategies
- Cueing Systems

- Teaching Points
- Follow the Child's Lead
- Student Grouping
- Conversation about Text

These concepts included the use of the Observation Survey, Running Records, and anecdotal records as means of gathering individual student assessment data. Teachers were also taught how to select leveled books for the appropriate reading level of each of their students and acceleration procedures. A particular lesson format (10-10-10) was explicitly taught to teachers, which included instruction for each of the three segments of the lesson (Familiar Read, Writing, Introduction to the New Book). In the writing segment of the lesson, teachers were instructed in the use of Elkonin boxes and sentence generation and construction. Reading strategies and cueing systems were outlined in-depth. Trainers explained the philosophy of the program as well, which included following the child's lead during instruction. In addition, teachers were taught how to group their students and how to encourage conversation about text. Table 17 presents a summary table of the research findings with regard to what elements of training teachers chose to use in their classrooms as well as the modifications that they made.

Table 17

Summary Table of Findings

Elements of Training	Mrs. Paterson		Ms. Stone	
	Used	Modified	Used	Modified
Observation Survey	*			*
Running Records	*		*	

Note. An asterisk * indicates the teachers' choice for each of the elements of training.

Summary Table of Findings (continued).

Elements of Training	Mrs. Paterson		Ms. Stone	
	Used	Modified	Used	Modified
Anecdotal Records	*		*	
Leveled Books	*		*	
Acceleration	*		*	
10-10-10 Lesson Format	*		*	
Familiar Read	*		*	
Writing		*		*
New Book	*		*	
Reading Strategies	*		*	
Cueing Systems	*		*	
Teaching Points	*		*	
Follow the Child's Lead	*			*
Student Grouping	*		*	
Conversation About Text	*			*

Note. An asterisk * indicates the teachers' choice for each of the elements of training.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I answered the four research questions after an in-depth analysis of observational and interview data from trainers and teachers in an early intervention training program. First, I analyzed the data from the Accelerated Literacy Learning Training Program, which included a thorough analysis of data from two teacher focus group interviews, one trainer focus group interview, one site-based trainer interview, and training transcripts from 11 weeks of ALL training. Explanations of the ALL Training

Program with thick descriptive details regarding what was emphasized in training were presented. Secondly, I analyzed data from two participant teachers, which included two focus group interviews, two 30 minute interviews with each of the two selected teachers and transcripts from 22 days of observational field notes in each of the teacher's classrooms. Case studies were presented of the trainers' and two participant teachers' perceptions of the ALL Training Program.

The findings indicated a preponderance of support from the trainers in the ALL Training Program. The themes that emerged from the analysis of trainer data were decision-making and support. The trainers explained that their role was to help foster appropriate decision-making and to guide and support teachers as they tested and implemented the program in their classrooms.

The findings also indicated that the concepts that were emphasized in ALL training were also the concepts emphasized by the teachers in their classrooms. In the ALL Training Program teachers were trained to administer a survey to their students to determine specific information with regard to each of their student's strengths and weaknesses in reading. Both teachers chose to administer the same survey to their students in the year following training as well. The teachers were also trained to use a Running Record with their students in an effort to identify miscues and determine the appropriate Reading level for each student. Both teachers used Running Records on a regular basis in their classrooms in the year following training.

In the ALL Training Program the trainers taught reading strategies and cueing systems and provided the teachers with questions they could ask their students to reinforce these. Both of the teachers in the study used the questions with their students.

They both taught their students the reading strategies and utilized the cueing systems as well to reinforce the use of the reading strategies.

It was interesting to note that the two participant teachers who were interviewed and systematically observed both used the ALL lesson structure in the same way. They started their lessons with a 10 minute warm-up, in which each student read familiar books to build fluency in reading. The teachers also used at least 10 minutes of the lesson time to introduce a new book. However, both teachers chose not to use the 10 minutes of writing as they were trained to do. Both teachers modified the lesson structure and chose to spend the remaining 10 minutes on reading work that they viewed as necessary for child acceleration.

The decisions that each teacher made regarding how they spent their group time with their students, as expressed in interviews and interpreted from observations, reflected how reading was taught in their respective classrooms, as well as what each teacher emphasized with each of their students. These decisions were made with regard to individual students and their respective reading needs, which was a goal of the ALL Training Program. Each teacher designed a program for each of their students that they believed would best meet each child's individual learning needs.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

The purpose of this qualitative research study was to describe and explain the characteristics of a successful professional development model in an early intervention training program. The focus of the study was on particular aspects of literacy instruction that were emphasized during training sessions and trainer and teacher perceptions of the Accelerated Literacy Learning (ALL) Training Program. In particular, this study investigated how two teachers applied what they had learned from their participation for two semesters in the ALL Training Program. This study examined the elements of training that two teachers chose to transfer to their classrooms, as well as modifications they chose to make, in the year following training in an effort to gain further insight into effective teacher training practices. The following research questions guided this study:

1. How do teachers who have received early intervention training for two semesters apply this knowledge in their classrooms during the following school year?
2. What do teachers choose to use and not use from the training program and why?
3. What modifications of the program do teachers make, if any, and why?
4. What are the perceptions of trainers about an early intervention training program?

To obtain answers to these research questions, I conducted individual and focus group interviews with teachers and trainers, made observations of training sessions, analyzed course agendas and materials, and observed two teachers in their classrooms in the year following training. These data were analyzed using qualitative analysis procedures. Content analysis was used to examine the classroom and training observational field

notes. Interview analysis was used with the individual and focus group interviews. Pattern analysis guided the systematic examination of all of the data to determine patterns and emerging themes. I followed a phenomenological theoretical approach and reported my findings through descriptive case studies.

This chapter begins with a summary of the study, followed by a discussion of the contributions of this study to the existing body of knowledge on professional development and teacher training. This chapter also discusses conclusions and implications gleaned from the results of this research study. Limitations of the study will be presented as well. Finally, this chapter outlines recommendations for models of professional development and teacher training practices and recommendations for future research.

Summary of the Study

This qualitative study investigated a successful professional development model in an early intervention training program. A thorough examination was made of the ALL Training Program as well as classroom literacy instruction in the classrooms of two ALL participant teachers, in the year following training, in an effort to ascertain what elements of training teachers chose to use and modifications they chose to make in their classrooms Purposeful sampling (Patton, 2002) was used to select two participant teachers for systematically observations and interviews.

Observational field notes were analyzed from 11 weeks of ALL training. In an effort to present the data as accurately as possible, direct quotes were used from the training sessions. This made it possible to accurately describe and explain the phenomena under investigation. The field notes were analyzed strictly through

qualitative means. The first step was to type the field notes and read through them twice for a holistic sense of the data. Then these documents were read line by line, and units of meaning were identified and highlighted. Twenty-four constructs related to ALL training (see Table 6) emerged from these data. A construct key (see Appendix E) was developed and used for coding as well, as I continually returned to the data. These emerging constructs were tallied and themes emerged based upon the frequency of constructs in the data for each teacher.

In addition to the field notes, two focus group interviews, with a total of six participating teachers, one focus group interview with two support trainers, and one interview with the site-based trainer were also conducted. All of these interviews were recorded, transcribed, and then analyzed using qualitative analysis procedures. The same sequence of procedures was used with these data. Each transcript was read twice in an effort to capture a holistic sense of the data. Then the transcripts were read line by line, and units of meaning were identified and highlighted. Constructs emerged from these data and were tallied. Emergent themes were based upon the frequency of each construct and emerging patterns in the data.

Two first grade teachers were purposefully selected from the ALL Training Program to participate in this study, based on extreme case sampling. Each teacher was interviewed in Spring 2003 and Spring 2004. The interviews were recorded and transcribed. A total of 22 observations were made of each teacher during their literacy instruction. Field notes were taken in each of the teacher's classrooms during their literacy instruction for 11 days in Fall 2003 and 11 days in Spring 2004. These data were analyzed using qualitative analysis procedures.

The data collected from Mrs. Paterson were analyzed first. The interview and classroom observational data were read twice for a holistic sense of the data. These documents were then read line by line, and units of meaning were identified and highlighted. Twenty –nine constructs emerged from Mrs. Paterson's classroom observational data (see Table 11) and 34 constructs emerged from her interview data (see Table 10). These constructs were tallied and themes emerged based upon the frequency of the constructs. A descriptive case study of Mrs. Paterson was formulated from the holistic and analytic data.

The data collected from Ms. Stone were analyzed next. The same analysis procedures were used with Ms. Stone's data. Thirty constructs emerged from Ms. Stone's classroom observational data (see Table 15) and 34 constructs emerged from her interview data (see Table 14). These constructs were tallied and themes emerged based upon the frequency of the constructs. A descriptive case study of Ms. Stone was formulated from the holistic and analytic data.

A cross-case analysis was conducted after each case was presented separately to determine similarities and differences between and across cases. This was done to answer the research questions posed in this study. The study findings indicated that teachers chose to use many elements of training in their classrooms in the year following training. It was discovered that the elements that the teachers chose to use in training were the elements that the trainers emphasized in training sessions. These elements were modeled frequently during training sessions through the use of videotapes and were reinforced in teacher's classrooms through the use of coaching by trainers.

The findings also indicated that teachers made modifications to the lesson format that they were taught in training. The segment of the lesson that the teachers chose to modify was one that was not as prescriptive in training as other lesson segments. The trainers did not spend as much time discussing the writing segment of the lesson format as they did the other segments and consequently the teachers made modifications. Interestingly, the lesson format was emphasized in training, so the teachers chose to use the lesson format, but they modified a section of the format that was not clearly explained in training.

Characteristics of Successful Models of Professional Development

An extensive amount of research has been conducted to determine the characteristics of effective professional development models (Askew, Fulenwider, Kordick, Scheuermann, Vollenweider, Anderson, & Rodriguez, 2002; Hughes, et al. 2002; Rodgers, Fullerton, & DeFord, 2002; Rodgers & Pinnell, 2002). Askew, et al. (2002) suggested that professional development programs should be connected to practice, and that teachers should be engaged in the teaching process as they acquire new understandings and learn new innovations. Teachers who practice and implement an innovation as they are learning about it are able to put it in the context of their own classrooms.

Research suggests that professional development programs are successful when they incorporate supportive structures such as site-based facilitators, support groups, and coaches (Anders & Evens, 1994; Anders, Hoffman, & Duffy, 2000; Hughes, et al., 2002; Moore, 1991). Effective models of staff development also usually employ the following features: monitoring, coaching, teacher reflection, conversation, voluntary participation,

full-school participation, collaboration among role groups, and ongoing assistance in assimilating new information (Hughes, et al., 2002; Pinnell, 2002). Hughes, et al. (2002) explained that when these effective features are present in a professional development model, teachers are more likely to develop into reflective practitioners who take ownership in their learning. This in turn might likely result in a change in teaching practice.

This study examined an early intervention training program that utilized a successful model of professional development. The Accelerated Literacy Learning (ALL) Training Program incorporated the following suggested characteristics of professional development: monitoring, coaching, teacher reflection, conversation, voluntary participation, and ongoing assistance in assimilating new information. The findings of this study confirmed that teachers who participate in professional development programs with the above characteristics are likely to use what they have learned in their classrooms.

Monitoring and Coaching

Anders and Evens (1994) suggest that when teachers are monitored and coached as they learn to implement a program in their classrooms, they are more likely to utilize what they have learned. Coaches are employed to provide training, demonstration lessons, observations, and immediate feedback to the teachers at their site. In this way, teachers have a site-based person who can mentor, coach, and assist them as they learn to implement a new innovation. Coaching is an effective way to provide teachers with the knowledge and requisite skills to improve their teaching practice (Darling-Hammond & MacLaughlin, 1995; Lyons, 2002).

Teachers gain confidence when they are able to apply what they are learning in their classrooms and receive feedback from knowledgeable colleagues on a regular basis. Teacher leaders or coaches lend support to teachers by conducting frequent observations to gain insight into teacher/student interactions. Askew and Gaffney (1999) recommend that teachers be given opportunities to discuss their teaching practices with teacher leaders or coaches. When teachers discuss problem-solving techniques with certain students in mind, and receive ongoing feedback from teacher leaders or coaches, they are able to discover what works and assess why it works. This leads to more teacher reflection and refinement of teaching practices.

The ALL Training Program employed a Reading Coach as the head trainer. Ms. Hazlett was a Reading Coach at the school site where the training took place in the second semester and where eight of the participant teachers worked. Therefore, Ms. Hazlett was very accessible to the teachers and was able to monitor and coach the teachers as they implemented the ALL program in their classrooms. Since Ms. Hazlett was on site, the teachers received assistance on an as-needed basis. During the training year, the teachers were using the elements of training and were fully implementing the program. One of the reasons for this might have been because Ms. Hazlett was able to facilitate the implementation of the program, since she was employed as a Reading Coach at the school site.

Teacher Reflection and Conversation with Peers

Research also supports the need for teacher reflection (Bos & Anders, 1994; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993; Zeichner, 1980) and conversation with peers (Askew & Gaffney, 1999; Combs, 1994; Lyons, Pinnell, & DeFord, 1993; Lyons, et al., 1993;

Rodgers, 2002). When teachers learn new concepts about teaching and are able to process what they are learning through dialogue with colleagues and self-reflections, there is more likely to be a shift in their thinking and beliefs about teaching (Askew & Gaffney, 1999; Lyons & Pinnell, 1999; Lyons et al., 1993; Rodgers, 2002). Teacher reflection and conversations with peers about their teaching are central to the learning process.

Teacher Reflection

When teachers are given opportunities to reflect on what they are learning and how it is working in their classrooms, they continue to process, revise, and construct new ideas and beliefs about teaching. The ALL teachers were asked to write written reflections at the end of every weekly ALL session. They were given a prompt to respond to regarding the challenges and triumphs of the ALL program in their classrooms (see Appendix H for homework reflections). A trainer would read and provide written feedback to each teacher's written reflections. These reflections encouraged teachers to process what they were learning and formulate and revise theories about student learning to improve their teaching practice.

Conversation with Peers

When teachers are encouraged to converse with their peers about their experiences, they process and internalize what they are learning. The teachers in the ALL program were able to dialogue with each other on a weekly basis about what was working or challenging in their classrooms. They questioned each other and the trainers about decisions they had made with regard to instruction. The ALL teachers were particularly interested in the procedures and routines each teacher had established with

their ALL groups, as these differed among teachers. Through dialogue, the ALL participant teachers were able to negotiate new understandings about scaffolding instruction for at-risk readers.

Sustainability

Snow, Burns, and Griffin (1998) reported that research-based content and systematic follow-up are required for sustainability, but that many programs don't provide these due to lack of funding and resources. In an effort to provide sustainability, many districts employ teachers as coaches at school sites (No Child Left Behind Act, 2001; U.S. Department of Education, 2001). The ALL Training Program employed a Reading Coach to provide teacher training, which made the implementation of the ALL program successful during the training year. In the years following training, however, there was not a plan in place for systematic follow-up, due to lack of funds, which led to concerns about the sustainability of the ALL program.

Ms. Hazlett mentioned a concern she had about the sustainability of the program. She did not think the ALL participant teachers were using what they had learned in training any longer. Ms. Hazlett often visits teacher's classrooms as a Reading Coach in the school. It was in this capacity that she was able to make the observation that teachers no longer applied what they had learned in training in their classrooms.

Contributions of the Study

Although previous research has identified characteristics of effective professional development and determined the need for systematic follow-up for sustainability, there is a lack of research regarding the transfer of knowledge from an effective professional development model to classroom practice. This study addresses this apparent lack in the

body of literature on professional development and teacher training. It should be of interest to school administrators, university professors, educators, researchers, and change agents seeking to implement new innovations in schools. In addition, this study might also be of interest to educators seeking to improve their teaching practice for at-risk students in literacy, as it provides specific examples of appropriate instruction for individual students who struggle to learn to read and write.

Conclusions

In order to accurately answer the research questions in this study, it was necessary to study the knowledge that was generated in the ALL Training Program. Since I was a participant-observer in the ALL Training Program, I was well-versed in what was taught during the training sessions. In addition, I maintained copies of hand-outs, agendas, and the course syllabus, which were analyzed using qualitative means. Also, 11 weeks of field notes from the second semester of training were analyzed using qualitative analysis procedures to discover the elements of training that were emphasized in the ALL Training Program.

Elements of Accelerated Literacy Learning Training

The elements of the ALL Training Program were the ALL concepts that were taught to the teachers. The following is a list of the elements of ALL training:

- Observation Survey
- Running Records
- Anecdotal Records
- Leveled Books
- Acceleration

- 10-10-10 Lesson Format
- Familiar Read
- Writing
- New Book
- Teaching Points
- Reading Strategies
- Cueing Systems
- Follow the Child's Lead
- Student Grouping
- Conversation about Text

These concepts included the use of the Observation Survey, Running Records, and anecdotal records as means of gathering individual student assessment data. Teachers were also taught how to select leveled books for the appropriate reading level of each of their students and acceleration procedures. A particular lesson format (10-10-10) was explicitly taught to teachers, which included instruction for each of the three segments of the lesson (Familiar Read, Writing, Introduction to the New Book). Teachers were instructed to choose no more than three teaching points for instruction with each child so that the child would not become overwhelmed. In the writing segment of the lesson, teachers were instructed in the use of Elkonin boxes and sentence generation and construction. Reading strategies and cueing systems were outlined in-depth. Trainers explained the philosophy of the program as well, which included following the child's lead during instruction. In addition, teachers were taught how to group their students and how to encourage conversation about text.

The elements of training that were emphasized the most, based on an analysis of data, were the Observation Survey, Running Records, Reading Strategies, and Cueing Systems. The trainers taught the teachers assessment procedures using the Observation Survey and Running Records, and reinforced reading strategies and cueing systems with the ALL teachers. They modeled these strategies through the use of videotapes. The trainers presented videotapes of other teachers using reading strategies, and they also used the ALL teachers' videotapes to comment on the importance of teaching these strategies to students. The trainers focused on what the teachers said to students to encourage them to use reading strategies as well as provided analytic commentary on students' use of the strategies.

The teachers' choice to use the elements of training that were emphasized by the trainers is a testimony to the importance of prioritizing training concepts in a professional development model. If there are numerous new concepts that need to be taught in a training program for teachers (such as in the ALL Training Program), there is the distinct possibility that teachers might get overwhelmed and might be less likely to utilize what they have learned. Therefore, it might be wise for trainers to prioritize the new concepts and to emphasize them through modeling, repeated practice, and coaching.

Elements of ALL Training Used in the Classrooms

Ms. Stone and Mrs. Paterson used many of the elements of training in their respective classrooms in the year following training. Both teachers used similar assessment procedures, including the use of Clay's *Observation Survey* at the beginning of the school year to determine the appropriate reading level for each of their students and to form reading groups. They also used Running Records and anecdotal records on a

daily basis with their groups of students to maintain detailed records of student progress in reading. Both teachers also developed a similar reading routine with their students and taught and reinforced Reading Strategies.

Modifications to the Lesson Format

Mrs. Paterson and Ms. Stone made modifications to the lesson format in the year following training. Both teachers chose to modify the writing section of the lesson format. During the second 10 minutes of the lesson, the teachers would choose to teach a concept based on what they felt their students needed to become better readers, rather than specifically on constructing sentences. Mrs. Paterson usually spent this time discussing the story sequence, asking her students to retell the story and answer comprehension questions. Ms. Stone typically focused on word recognition and skills during this time. For example she would reinforce spelling words, sight words, rhyming words, and compound words.

Interestingly, both teachers had the same reason for choosing to modify the writing section of the lesson format. They both felt that their students did not need instruction in writing. Both teachers taught writing as a separate subject, rather than as part of the reading lesson. The teachers explained that their children were able to write paragraphs and stories and therefore did not need the focused work on sentence structure. This was certainly true in the Spring, but the teachers also chose to make the modification to the writing section at the beginning of the year when their students were just learning how to write sentences. Therefore, there must have been a reason other than that their students did not need to learn how to write sentences any longer. The fact is that the sentence generation in the writing section had the potential to develop much more than

just sentence structure. It slowed down the reading process for children as they learned how to stretch the sounds in words to spell words, using letter-sound relationships. They learned directionality, matching, and conventions of print as well.

Why did the teachers choose to modify the writing section of the ALL lesson format? One potential reason might be because writing and what a teacher might do during the writing section was not emphasized in training. The teachers watched videos of what other teachers chose to do during the writing section, but explicit instruction with regard to what to do during the writing segment of the lesson was lacking. The writing section of the lesson was simply not emphasized in training as much as the other sections of the lesson.

One of the developers of the ALL program discussed a possible reason why writing was not emphasized in training with me. She suggested that the writing section of the lesson structure was the weakest element of training. She thought this might have been because it was a weak area in the development of the program as well. The writing section and what to do with children during those 10 minutes of the lesson was not fully developed before the start of the training program, which meant that the trainers weren't confident about what to teach, and consequently the teachers weren't sure what to do with their students during that time.

Dr. K, another program developer, suggested that the teachers might have "opted out" of the writing segment of the lesson for another reason. He suggested that Clay's Reading Recovery training model provided more flexibility in the writing segment of the lesson than the other segments of the lesson. He speculated that Clay's "ambiguity led to training flexibility that doesn't tell teachers what to do during the writing segment." He

thought this training flexibility might have led teachers to make modifications to the writing segment of the lesson format.

I asked Ms. Hazlett to respond to Dr. K's statement about Clay's ambiguity in the writing segment of the lesson. Her perception of Clay's model was that there was a definite prescription for the writing segment, but that there was a larger range of options for teachers in the writing segment than in other segments of the lesson. She took responsibility for the teachers' choice to modify the writing segment of the lesson by saying that the trainers weren't sure what to teach beyond the sentence generation and the cut-up sentence. She also felt that Clay's original one-to-one tutoring model in the writing segment was "less accessible" to the ALL push-in model with three students. The sentence generation and cut-up sentence was simply too lofty a goal to accomplish with three students in 10 minutes.

Another problem that surfaced related to the writing segment of the lesson was pacing. Teachers were concerned about the pacing of the lesson and adhering to the 30 minute lesson plan structure. The activities that were suggested to use during the writing section often took more than 10 minutes, which made pacing and keeping to the suggested time frame difficult to do. The teachers may have chosen to modify the writing section because they were concerned that it would take too long and not leave enough time to introduce a new book.

The writing section was labor-intensive for the teachers because they were instructed to write the sentences for each of their three students and cut them up. When a teacher only has 10 minutes, this is difficult to do, particularly since it takes a few minutes for each student to generate a sentence. Also, additional time is needed for each

student to write their sentence, with guidance from the teacher. When you have three students writing three different sentences, this becomes time-consuming for the teacher and the students.

When the teachers brought this problem to the attention of the trainers during ALL training, one of the suggestions for resolving this was to let the focus child generate the sentence and allow the other two students to write the focus child's sentence. The teachers tried this but found that it was still taking much longer than 10 minutes because they continued to have to write three sentences and cut them up as well as provide scaffolded instruction to each of their students as the students attempted to write the given sentence. It became frustrating for many teachers and students. Thus the teachers seemed to find the writing section a lesson in futility. They might have modified the writing section of the lesson format because after weighing the amount of time needed for that section versus increases to student individual reading and writing progress, the teachers might have found a disconnect.

Confirming and Disconfirming Cases

Ms. Stone was purposefully selected to participate in this study because she reported that she intended to use what she had learned in the ALL Training Program in her classroom in the year following training. She was selected as a confirming case based on her self-reports as well as observations of her using the elements of ALL training in her classroom during the training year. The findings of this study confirmed that she used many elements of ALL training in her classroom in the year following training, but that she also made many modifications based on her reading instruction.

Ms. Stone's focus on print and word recognition with her students was not an

intended goal of the ALL program and led to an imbalance in her reading instruction. Her attention to visual cues over meaning and structure cues made it difficult for some students to accelerate. There were students in her class who were not visual learners and consequently experienced great difficulty understanding the visual cues Ms. Stone offered. Certain students did not have a firm understanding of letter-sound relationships and/or concepts about print. These students might have benefited more from meaning cues.

Clay (1993) suggests that teachers "must be reflective and responsive to the negotiations of the child" (p. 4). To accomplish this, teachers must carefully observe students as they read and accurately record what students can already do. Systematic observation and careful monitoring of student reading behaviors will help a teacher address the appropriate and inappropriate reading behaviors of a child. The goal is to encourage children to employ appropriate reading behaviors. Since every child negotiates text differently, a skillful teacher must respond to each child differently. Strategic teachers understand that acceleration is more probable if they respond to each child with appropriate cues, at the point of need. A teacher who chooses the same response to use with all children is doing the children a disservice.

A teacher who has a bias toward one cueing system, just as a child who favors one cueing system over another, is unbalanced. Effective reading instruction, particularly with at-risk students, necessitates knowing the strengths of each child, building on those strengths, reinforcing the use of reading strategies, and using a balance of cues with each child. If a teacher relies heavily on one cueing system over others, then it is likely that some children's reading needs are not being met in that teacher's classroom.

Mrs. Paterson was purposefully selected to participate in this study because she reported that she did not intend to use what she had learned in the ALL Training Program in her classroom in the year following training. She was selected as a disconfirming case because of this. Mrs. Paterson was the only teacher in the ALL Training Program who admitted that she would probably not use what she had learned in training in exactly the same way in her classroom.

Interestingly, the findings of this study confirmed that Mrs. Paterson did in fact use many elements of ALL training in her classroom in the year following training. She made a modification to the lesson format, but other than that Mrs. Paterson could have been a model for the ALL Training Program in the classroom. She had internalized the knowledge she had gained from the ALL training and made it part of her teaching repertoire during the training year. She had not even realized that she had done this and was surprised to find that she was a confirming case rather than a disconfirming case.

I thought perhaps my presence might have affected this finding. Since I had taken the training with Mrs. Paterson, I was concerned that she might have thought I was "checking up" on her. When I discussed this possibility with her, after I had collected and analyzed the data and met with her to confirm the findings, she disagreed with me. She said that my presence did not affect what she did naturally with her children during reading instruction.

In conclusion, it seems the selection factors used in this study were not as important as the robustness of the findings. In other words, a teacher's perception of whether they would be or would not be a confirming case was less important than the effect of the training. The selection factors were used to add breadth and depth to the

findings, but in fact both teachers were found to be confirming cases, in the sense that they both used elements of ALL training in their classrooms in the year following training. Thus, in this study, the use of purposeful sampling and selection factors as discreet factors did not produce extreme cases.

Implications

There are several implications for professional development and teacher training from the findings of this study. First, the results of this study indicated that teachers who participated in a yearlong teacher training program applied what they had learned in their classrooms. Secondly, the findings confirm that what is emphasized and explicitly taught in training programs will probably be applied in teachers' classrooms. Thirdly, teachers are more likely to apply what they have learned from trainings and teacher in-services when they are supported as they implement new practices. The last implication for teacher training from the findings of this study is that teachers might make modifications and might not utilize what they learned in training in exactly the same way as they were trained to do. Each of these implications is discussed further in the following sections.

Length of Teacher Training Programs

The length of teacher training programs seems to be an important consideration in terms of whether or not teachers will apply what they have learned in their classrooms. The ALL Training Program took place over two semesters. The teachers who chose to participate in the program made a commitment to attend weekly training sessions over the course of approximately eight months. This is a substantial commitment in the life of a busy teacher.

There was an incentive for the teachers which might have influenced their decision to participate in the training program. The teachers were offered university course vouchers for six credit hours at the University of South Florida. Some of the teachers were interested in pursuing a Master's degree, which might have made their participation in the ALL Training Program more attractive. Most of the teachers genuinely wanted to participate in the training, however, because they were interested in helping at-risk readers in their classes. They also hoped that the training would help them become better Reading teachers.

Training Emphasis

The findings of this study seem to indicate that the concepts that were emphasized in training were the concepts that were transferred to the teachers' classrooms. After a qualitative analysis of the ALL Training Transcript data, the element of training that was emphasized the most was Reading Strategies, which included Strategy Talk and Strategy Use. Both teachers in this study taught and reinforced Reading Strategies with their students.

It appears that teachers who are explicitly taught concepts through the use of demonstration, modeling, and guided practice are more likely to apply these concepts in their classrooms. The trainers taught the teachers Reading Strategies directly through lecture, but also taught them implicitly through the use of videotapes and modeling. The teachers also practiced teaching and reinforcing Reading Strategies in their classrooms with the guidance of an assigned trainer. It seems that by emphasizing these concepts in training, the teachers were more likely to use them in their classrooms.

Supportive Structures

The ALL Training Program provided teachers with effective supportive structures such as monitoring, coaching, teacher reflection, conversation, voluntary participation, and ongoing assistance in assimilating new information. The three trainers in the ALL program were assigned particular teachers to observe and support in their classrooms as the teachers conducted ALL lessons and practiced what they had learned in training. These trainers provided immediate feedback to the teachers by observing them and giving them oral and written feedback with positive comments and suggestions for improvement. This feedback was constructive and helpful, rather than critical, negative, and judgmental, thus providing a positive supportive structure to the teachers.

The teachers had opportunities to converse with their peers about their ALL lessons during their weekly discussions. These discussions usually took place as teachers watched videotapes of other teachers. They shared questions and concerns during this time as well as probed for further clarification about certain ALL concepts. They often reflected on their own teaching experiences orally and in writing. Teachers were asked to write a written reflection each week, as they assimilated and practiced what they were learning in training. In general, teachers were well-supported by the trainers and the other teachers during the ALL training, which seemed to increase the likelihood that the teachers would use what they had learned in training in their classrooms.

Teacher Modifications

The findings of this study indicate that teachers seem to make modifications of structures and formats that are learned in training. In recent years many scripted programs have been taught to teachers in an effort to homogenize the teaching profession.

Based on the findings of this study, it would seem that even though teachers are taught a specific format and given a "script" of sorts to follow, they are likely to make modifications to the format or program. In fact, recent research has indicated that teaching is not standardized and cannot be scripted (Allington & Johnston, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Pressley, Allington, Wharton-McDonald, Collins-Block, & Morrow, 2001; Taylor, Pearson, Clark, & Walpole, 1999). The reason for this varies with teachers, but generally relates to decision-making.

Teachers make decisions about how to teach and what to teach their students based on their students' needs as well as what they believe their students should know. These decisions are certainly fundamental to their own training and experiences in the teaching profession. Teachers might not feel comfortable trying something new and might depend upon "the way it has always been done" because that is what is comfortable for them. Many teachers seek out new innovations and want to challenge themselves, but if found to be difficult, demanding, or time-consuming, might abandon the new innovation and return to what is comfortable.

Limitations of the Study

There were five features of this study that limit the findings. These limitations were characteristics of the design and were forecasted at the start of the study. The first limitation regarded the sample size. The second limitation related to the duration of data collection and time in the field. The third limitation concerned the diversity of perspectives among participant teachers. The fourth limitation dealt with the role of the researcher. Finally, the fifth limitation related to the data collection procedures.

One characteristic of the study that limited the findings is that the semi-standard interview questions were asked of a small sample of teachers, participating in one early intervention training program, and are not meant to be generalized. There were three trainers and 12 participant teachers in the ALL Training Program. The trainers were interviewed and six of the 12 participant teachers (three teachers in two focus groups) were interviewed as well, in an effort to obtain as many perspectives as possible about the program. Unfortunately, not all teachers were able to attend the focus group interviews. In addition, all of the participant teachers appeared to share similar perspectives, with the exception of one teacher. Therefore, purposeful sampling was used to select two teachers with differing perspectives for a focused study of the ALL Training Program.

The second limitation of the study relates to the actual amount of time spent in the field. The ALL Training Program took place over the course of two semesters. Although I was a participant observer during both semesters, I only took field notes for the second semester of training. During the first semester of training I participated more than I observed, and during the second semester I observed more than I participated. This meant that I had more data from the second semester than the first. Also, although I made 22 observations of each of the two teachers in this study in the year following training, over the course of two semesters, the observations were only made during literacy instruction from August 8, 2003 – September 12, 2003 and again from February 24, 2004 – March 18, 2004. There were 11 days of observations for each teacher in the Fall and 11 days of observations for each teacher in the Spring, thus giving this study a bounded context for literacy development.

The third limitation of the study was that all of the participants in the ALL Training Program were female teachers. This limited the diversity of perspectives among the participants in the training program. Two seemingly diverse teachers were selected for their differing perspectives because of this, in an effort to provide information-rich case studies.

A fourth limitation of the study was the role of the researcher as participant observer. I was a participant in the ALL Training Program, which made me somewhat more approachable to the other participants, since we were engaged in the same learning experiences, but they knew that I was a doctoral student at USF, which set me apart. This was particularly true because two of the trainers of the program were also doctoral students. Since I did not take field notes during the first semester of training, however, I was able to establish myself as a participant in the program and developed a good rapport with the other teachers.

In the second semester of training, I began to take field notes, which again set me apart from the other teachers. The fact that I participated in the ALL Training Program and then went into the teachers' classrooms to observe them, might have affected the findings of the study. They seemed to be comfortable with my presence, since they were accustomed to my note-taking during training, but they may have felt that I was "checking up" on them to see if they would use what they had learned in training. I told them that I was studying first grade literacy instruction, and was interested in finding out what teachers do "naturally" in their classrooms to develop literacy skills with their students, particularly those who struggled to learn to read and write, but they might have thought I wanted to see if they would use the elements from ALL training.

The fifth limitation of the study was my data collection procedures. I took "scripted field notes", which are notes that capture direct quotes and as much of the dialogue as possible between participants, during my observations of the ALL Training Program and in the classrooms. I did this rather than tape record or videotape the lessons in an effort to be less obtrusive and because sometimes it is difficult to hear the videotapes and tape recordings. I wanted a more focused study of dialogue between the teacher and her students, so I concentrated on that. Therefore, I was limited by how fast I could write and definitely missed parts of the dialogue. I collected an extensive amount of data over time, however, which allowed for emerging patterns and themes, and thereby strengthened my confidence in the study findings. Also, I conducted member checks with each participant teacher and the site-based trainer to further confirm these findings.

Recommendations for Models of Professional Development and Teacher Training Practices

The results of this study lead to several recommendations for professional development and teacher training. First, it is recommended that training programs that are developed to instruct teachers in the application of teaching concepts should be at least two semesters in length. Secondly, training programs should incorporate supportive structures as teachers assimilate and practice these concepts in their classrooms. Thirdly, systematic follow-up is recommended in the form of study groups and/or peer coaching to provide sustainability in the years following training. Lastly, funding and resources should be made available for the continued success of training programs.

Length of Training Programs

One of the issues raised in this study, which is consistent with existing research, is the length of time it takes to implement new educational innovations (Mouza, 2003; Sparks & Hirsh, 2000). When teachers participate in professional development programs over a short duration, they are less likely to implement concepts from training in their classrooms. For example, one qualitative study (Mouza, 2003) found that teachers who had participated in a 12 week professional development program designed to help teachers integrate technology in their classrooms did not have an effect on teacher practice. The study concluded that the duration of the training program was not sufficient for implementing changes in the classroom. In contrast, the findings from this study of the ALL Training Program suggest that teachers who participate in a yearlong training program are more likely to apply and use what they learn in their classrooms.

Supportive Structures

Research suggests that effective professional development should provide supportive structures to teachers as they implement new innovations in their classrooms (Marx, Freeman, Krajcik, & Blumenfield, 1998). The results of this study support this recommendation as well. The teachers in the ALL Training Program were well-supported by the trainers and the other teachers in the program as they implemented the program in their classrooms. The supportive structures that were utilized in the ALL Training Program included voluntary participation, coaching, teacher reflection, collaborative problem solving, and ongoing assistance in assimilating new information. A supportive structure that was not included, however, was systematic follow-up. Even though the site-based trainer continued to work as a Reading Coach at the site, she felt

that teachers were no longer applying the ALL program in their classrooms four years after the training took place. One reason for this might have been because there was not a supportive structure included in the development of the program for systematic follow-up, due to a lack of funds. Ms. Hazlett's position as a Reading Coach at the school was funded by the Reading First initiative, which meant that Ms. Hazlett was expected to concentrate her coaching efforts on those initiatives. She simply was not able to provide follow-up support with the Accelerated Literacy Learning program after its completion. Ms. Hazlett was frustrated with this position and expressed her concern that the ALL teachers were no longer implementing the practices in their classrooms.

Systematic Follow-up

Many training programs simply fail to provide systematic follow-up upon completion of the program, which leads to problems of sustainability. The teachers in this study suggested that one of the most helpful supportive structures of the ALL program was the opportunity to observe other teachers (through the use of videotapes) and the conversations they had with their peers regarding the implementation of the program in their classrooms. Therefore, it is recommended that models of professional development include peer coaching and/or study groups after the completion of training, for the purposes of sustainability.

One recommendation is to develop bi-monthly or quarterly study groups, where teachers convene at their school to discuss the implementation progress with other teachers who have received training. The study group might function more effectively if there was a teacher leader willing to monitor and lead the discussions. Perhaps in the

development of the training program, a list of follow-up probing questions and discussion starters could be established for the purpose of sharing with future teacher leaders.

A second recommendation is to encourage peer coaching upon completion of a professional development program. This is difficult to do within the context of a school, since teachers are busy teaching most of the day. However, peer coaching is recommended because the teachers in this study felt most comfortable identifying and solving problems with their peers. Perhaps, with the help of administrators and other support personnel, time could be provided to teachers on a quarterly basis to observe and coach each other during the period when they implement new practices in their classrooms. This could be done on a rotating basis, where each teacher would have an opportunity to observe and coach another teacher over the course of a semester. A plan such as this might make this recommendation much more manageable for schools to implement.

Funding

Funding is always a challenging issue to face when developing a model for professional development. Teacher training can be costly and often there are not funds available to provide resources and supportive structures to schools at the completion of a training program. These are necessary, however, for the continued implementation of a program or new teaching practices in the classroom. It seems that without funding, new innovations become old and die, particularly with the plethora of choices for curricular innovations and new programs that are available to schools these days.

Interestingly, policymakers and school officials seem far too willing to move on and finance the next best innovation before they are willing to continue to finance an

innovation that they have previously backed. This is a source of frustration for many teachers. The message seems to be "keep learning new curricular innovations" rather than to deeply learn one well. When teachers are able to focus their attention on learning a program or innovation and are given time to refine and improve their skills, they have a better chance of effectively implementing the program in their classrooms. Therefore one suggestion, in terms of funding, would be to fund programs that have proven to be successful with students and continue to fund those programs, rather than abandoning them for the next best innovation. In so doing, one might find that more teachers will continue to utilize what they have learned in professional development programs over longer periods of time.

Recommendations for Future Research

The findings of this study indicated that teachers transferred concepts they had learned in training to their classrooms. However, the fact that this study focused on only two teachers over a period from August 2002 through March 2004 limits these findings. Further research is needed to determine how teachers apply what they have learned in training in their classrooms. Qualitative research studies in the area of teacher training are recommended because they have the greatest potential for ascertaining a focused understanding of what teachers choose to do with what they have learned in training in their classrooms. However, future researchers might also consider designing quantitative studies that examine student achievement in teachers' classrooms.

Future researchers may consider increasing the sample size and lengthening the study period to obtain additional perspectives about training programs. Although the teachers in this study were using elements of ALL training in their classrooms in the year

following training, it is uncertain whether or not they would continue to use these elements in future years. During an informal discussion with the site-based trainer four years after the training took place (Spring 2007), she voiced concerns about whether or not the teachers were still implementing aspects of the program. As a Reading Coach in the school, with many opportunities to observe teachers, she did not feel that the teachers were using what they had learned in training any longer. She felt that the reason for this was because the teachers were no longer monitored and a supportive structure for sustainability was missing. Future researchers may consider lengthening the period of study to include several years because of this.

This research study had only one researcher collecting data during training sessions and in two teachers' classrooms. Future researchers might want to consider using more than one researcher to collect and analyze data. If a team of researchers were available to collect data, it would be possible to collect classroom data from many teachers, thus increasing the sample size and the strength of the results of the study. If it were possible to collect interview and observational data on all of the teachers who had participated in the ALL Training Program, for example, all perspectives would have been addressed. This would have ensured accuracy and viability of the research findings.

One of the limitations of this study that might have confounded the research findings was my involvement in the ALL Training Program as a participant observer. I worked very closely with the participants in this study and had developed a strong rapport with them in an effort to gain their consent and participation in the study. Since I had participated in the ALL Training Program and then observed the teachers in their classrooms after their training year, they might have felt that I was monitoring them.

They might have chosen to use the elements of ALL training in their classrooms because I was observing them. Future researchers might consider limiting their relationship with participant teachers so that they can accurately depict what teachers do naturally with their students.

Finally, this case study incorporated observational field notes, but did not include videotapes or tape recordings of teacher-student interactions. Future researchers might want to utilize these in their research designs for the purposes of accuracy and data triangulation. In this study, data sources were triangulated, including interviews, observational field notes, and training documents, which strengthened the study findings, but some data were not captured because the researcher was limited by the data collection procedures.

Other research designs are also recommended for future study. The single most important influence on a child's progress in school is a child's teacher. The implication is that what teachers do with their students in their classrooms is of the utmost importance. For this reason, effective teacher training programs are necessary. Effective teacher training can influence a teacher's instruction, which has been proven to influence student progress. Therefore future research regarding teacher training and the transfer of new instructional practices to the classroom is recommended.

References

Adams, M.J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Allington, R.L. (1983). Fluency: The neglected goal. *The Reading Teacher, 36,* 556-561.

Allington, R.L. (2006). *What really matters for struggling readers: Designing research-based programs*. Boston, MA: Pearson

Allington, R. L., & Johnston, P. (2001). Characteristics of exemplary fourth grade instruction. In C. Roller (Ed.), Research on effective teaching. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

American Institutes of Research (1999). An educator's guide to schoolwide reform. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

American Federation of Teachers (1999). *Teaching reading is rocket science: what expert teachers of reading should know and be able to do.* Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers.

Anders, P.L., & Evens, K.S. (1994). Relationship between teachers' beliefs and their instructional practice in reading. In R. Garner & P. Alexander (Eds.), *Beliefs about text and instruction with text* (pp.137-54). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Anders, P.L., Hoffman, J.V., & Duffy, G.G. (2000). Teaching teachers to teach reading: Paradigm shifts, persistent problems, and challenges. In M. Kamil, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research: Volume III* (pp.719-42). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Anderson, R.C. (1993). The future of reading research. In A. Sweet, & J. Anderson (Eds.), *Reading Research Into the Year 2000* (p. 17). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Armbruster, B.B. & Osborn, J.H. (2002). *Reading instruction and assessment.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Askew, B.J., & Gaffney, J.S. (1999). Reading Recovery: Waves of influence on literacy education. In J.S. Gaffney & B.J. Askew (Eds.) *Stirring the waters: The influence of Marie Clay* (pp. 75-98). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Askew, B.J., Fulenwider, T., Kordick, R., Scheuermann, S., Vollenweider, P., Anderson, N., & Rodriguez, Y. (2002). Constructing a model of professional development to support early literacy classrooms. In E.M. Rodgers & G.S. Pinnell (Eds.), *Learning from teaching in literacy education* (pp. 29-51). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Baker, L. & Brown, A. (1984). Metacognitive skills and reading. In P.D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of Reading Research* (pp. 353-394). New York, NY: Longman.

Beaver, J. (1999). *Developmental reading assessment.* Scott Foresman & Co.

Beck, I., & Juel, C. (1995). The role of decoding in learning to read. *American Educator, 19* (8), 21-25.

Berg, B. (2004). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Bogdan, R.C., & Biklen, S.K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bos, C.S., & Anders, P.L. (1994). The study of student change. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Teacher change and the staff development process: A case in reading instruction* (pp. 181-198). New York: Teachers College Press.

Brashears, R., Homan, S., & King, J.R. (2002). Teacher training in early literacy intervention: Teachers' views of accelerated literacy learning. *The Florida Reading Quarterly, 38* (3), 12-19.

Bredekamp, S. (1987). *Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs serving children from birth through age eight*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Bruner, J. (2000). Reading for possible worlds. *National Reading Conference Yearbook, 49,* 31-40.

Caldwell, J.S. (2002). *Reading assessment: A primer for teachers and tutors.* NY, NY: The Guilford Press.

Chall, J.S., & Popp, H.M. (1996). *Teaching and assessing phonics: A guide for teachers.* Cambridge, MA: Educator's Publishing Service.

Clay, M.M. (1979). *The early detection of reading difficulties*. Auckland, New Zealand: Heinemann.

Clay, M.M. (1982). *Observing young readers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Clay, M.M. (1985). *The early detection of reading difficulties.* 3d ed. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Clay, M.M. (1991). *Becoming literate*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Clay, M.M. (1993). *Reading Recovery: A guidebook for teachers in training.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Clay, M.M. (2002). *An observation survey of early literacy achievement.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Heinemann.

Clay, M.M., & Cazden, C.B. (1990). A Vygotskian interpretation of Reading Recovery. In L.C. Moll (Ed.), *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology* (pp. 206-222). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S.L. (1993). *Inside/Outside: Teacher research and knowledge.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Combs, M. (1994). Implementing a holistic reading series in first grade: Experiences with a conversation group. *Reading Horizons, 34* (3), 196-207.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 8.* From http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n1/.

Darling-Hammond, L., & MacLaughlin, M.W. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76,* 597-604.

DeFord, D.E., Lyons, C.A., & Pinnell, G.S. (1991). *Bridges to literacy: Learning from Reading Recovery.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

DeFord, D., Pinnell, G.S., Lyons, C., & Young, P. (1988). *Reading Recovery: Volume IX, Report of the follow-up studies.* Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.

Delpit, L. (2002). What should teachers do? Ebonics and culturally responsive instruction. In B.M. Power & R.S. Hubbard (Eds.), *Language development* (pp.124-128). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Denzin, Norman K. (1989). *Interpretive interactionism.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Department of Education Strategic Plan (2002).

Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (2003). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry*, (2nd ed.), (pp. 1-17). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dorn, L.J., French, C., & Jones, T. (1998). *Apprenticeship in literacy.* York, ME: Stenhouse.

Douglass, B. & Moustakas, C. (1985). Heuristic inquiry: The internal search to know. *Journal of humanistic psychology, 25* (3, Summer), 39-55.

Dowhower, S.L. (1991). Speaking of prosody: Fluency's unattended bedfellow. *Theory into Practice, 30* (3).

El-Dinary, P.B. & Schuder, T. (1993). Seven teachers' acceptance of transactional strategies instruction during their first year using it. *Elementary School Journal, 94* (2), 207-219.

Foorman, B.R. (1995). Research on "The great debate over whole-language approaches to reading instruction." *School Psychology Review, 24,* 376-392.

Foorman, B.R., Francis, D.J., Fletcher, J.M., Schatschneider, C., & Mehta, P. (1998). The role of instruction in learning to read: Preventing reading failure in at-risk children. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90,* 37-55.

Frye, B.J., & Short, R.A. (1994). Accelerated literacy learning: An early intervention program for at-risk first grade students. *Kansas Journal of Reading, Spring,* 49-54.

Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Co.

Goodman, K.S. (1984). Unity in reading. In A.C. Purves & O. Niles (Eds.), *Becoming readers in a complex society* (pp. 79-114). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Goodman, K.S. (1994). Reading, writing, and written texts: A transactional sociopsycholinguistic view. In R.B. Ruddell, M.R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (4th ed., pp. 1093-1130). Newark, DL: International Reading Association.

Harste, J., Woodward, V., & Burke, C. (1984). *Language stories and literacy lessons.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Haselkorn, D., & Harris, L. (2001). *The essential profession: American education at the crossroads.* Belmont, MA: Recruiting New Teachers.

Heath, S.B. (2002). A lot of talk about nothing. In B.M. Power & R.S. Hubbard (Eds.), *Language Development* (pp. 74-79). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Hiebert, E.H., Valencia, S.W., & Afflerbach, P.P. (1994). Definitions and perspectives. In S.W. Valencia, E.H. Hiebert, & P.P. Afflerbach (Eds.). *Authentic reading assessment: Practices and possibilities* (pp. 6-18). Newark, DL: International Reading Association.

Homan, S., King, J.R., & Hogarty, K. (2001). A small group model for early intervention in literacy: Group size and program effects. Florida: Reading Recovery Projects. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 461095)

Holstein, J. & Gubrium, J. (1994). Phenomenology, ethnomethodology, and interpretive practice. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 262-272). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Honig, B. (2001). *Teaching our children to read: The components of an effective, comprehensive reading program*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Hopkins, R. (1994). *Narrative schooling: Experiential learning and the transformation of American education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Hubbard, R.S., & Power, B.M. (1993). *The art of classroom inquiry.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Huck, C.S., & Pinnell, G.S. (1986). *The Reading Recovery Project in Columbus, Ohio. Pilot Year, 1985-85.* Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.

Hughes, M.T., Cash, M.M., Ahwee, S., & Klingner, J. (2002). A national overview of professional development programs in reading. In E.M. Rodgers & G.S. Pinnell (Eds.), *Learning from teaching in literacy education* (pp. 9-28). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Hycner, R.H. (1985). Some guidelines for the phenomenological analysis of interview data. *Human Studies, 8,* 279-303.

Jacob, E. (1999). *Cooperative learning in context.* New York: SUNY Press.

Jackson, J.B., Paratore, J.R., Chard, D.J., & Garnick, S. (1999). An early intervention supporting the literacy learning of children experiencing substantial difficulty. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 14,* 254-267.

Johnston, P., & Allington, R. (1991). Remediation. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research: Volume II* (pp. 984-1012). New York: Longman.

Johnston, P., Allington, R.L., Guice, S., & Brooks, G.W. (1998). Small change: A multi-level study of the implementation of literature-based instruction. *Peabody Journal of Education, 73* (3), 81-103.

Jones, N.K. (2002). Acceleration: The key to Reading Recovery benefits. *The Journal of Reading Recovery, Fall 2002, V.2, N.1.* (pp. 1-12). Columbus, OH: Reading Recovery Council of North America.

Juel, C. (1988). Learning to read and write: A longitudinal study of fifty-four children from first through fourth grade. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80,* 437-447.

Juel, C., Griffith, P.L., & Gough, P.B. (1986). Acquisition of literacy: A longitudinal study of children in first and second grade. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 78*, 243-255.

King, J., & Homan, S. (2000). *Accelerated literacy learning program evaluation.*

Ladson-Billings, G. (1999). Preparing teachers for diverse student populations: A critical race theory perspective. In A. Iran-Nejad, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Review of Research in Education, 24*, 211-248. Washington DC: American Research Association.

Liberman, I. (1973). Segmentation of the spoken word and reading acquisition. *Bulletin of the Orton Society, 23,* 65-77.

Liberman, I.Y., Shankweiler, D., & Liberman, A.M. (1991). The alphabetic principle and learning to read. In *Phonology and reading disability: Solving the reading puzzle.* Washington, DC: International Academy for Research in Learning Disabilities, Monograph Series, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service; National Institutes of Health.

Lincoln, Y.S. (1990). Toward a categorical imperative for qualitative research. In E. Eisner & A. Peshkin (Eds.), *Qualitative Inquiry in Education: The Continuing Debate* (pp. 277-295). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Lyons, C.A. (2002). Becoming an effective literacy coach: What does it take? In E.M. Rodgers & G.S. Pinnell (Eds.), *Learning from teaching in literacy education* (pp. 9-28). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Lyons, C.A., & Pinnell, G.S. (1999). Teacher development: The best investment in literacy education. In J.S. Gaffney & B.J. Askew (Eds.), *Stirring the waters.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Lyons, C.A., Pinnell, G.S., & DeFord, D.E. (1993). *Partners in learning.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Lyon, G.R. (1997). *Report on learning disabilities research.* Statement to the Committee on Education and the Workforce. U.S. House of Representatives, July 10.

Marx, R.W., Freeman, J.G., Krajcik, J.S., & Blumenfield, P.C. (1998). Professional development of science teachers. In B.J. Fraser & K.G. Tobin (Eds.). *International handbook of science education (pp. 667-680).* Dordrecht/ Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

McCarthy, P., Newby, R.F., & Recht, D.R. (1995). Results of an early intervention program for first grade children at risk for reading disability. *Reading Research and Instruction, 34* (4), 273-294.

Merriam, S. (1988).*Case study research in education: A qualitative approach.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook, 2nd ed.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Moerman, M. (1988). *Talking culture: Ethnography and conversation analysis.* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Moore, M. (1991). Reflective teaching and learning through the use of learning logs. *Journal of Reading Education, V.17.* pp. 35-49.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mouza, C. (2003). Learning to teach with new technology: Implications for professional development. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, V. 35*, pp. 272-290.

National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction.*

From http://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/nrp/smallbook.pdf

National Research Council. (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children.* Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

No Child Left Behind Act. (2001). *Title I: Improving the academic achievement of the disadvantaged.* The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education: George Washington University.

Nye, B., Konstantopoulos, S., & Hedges, L.V. (2004). How large are teacher effects? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *26*, 237-257.

Olson, L. (2001. *Quality counts 2001: A better balance: standards, tests, and tools to succeed.* From http://www.edweek.org/ew/ew_printstory.cfm?slug=16qc.h20.

Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods.* Thousand Oaks, London: Sage Publications.

Pikulski, J. (1994). Preventing reading failure: A review of five effective programs. In Allington, R. (Ed.), *Teaching struggling readers: Articles from The Reading Teacher* (pp. 35-45). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Pinnell, G.S. (1988). *Sustained effects of a strategy-centered early intervention program in reading.* Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Pinnell, G.S. (1997). An inquiry-based model for educating teachers of literacy. In S.L. Swartz & A.F. Klein (Eds.), *Research in Reading Recovery.* (pp. 6-17). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Pinnell, G.S. (2002). Acquiring conceptual understandings and knowledge. In E.M. Rodgers & G.S. Pinnell (Eds.), *Learning from teaching in literacy education* (pp. 63-78). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Pinnell, G.S., Short, A.G., Lyons, C.A., & Young, P. (1986). *The Reading Recovery Project in Columbus, Ohio. Year 1: 1985-86.* Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.

Pinnell, G., Fried, M., & Estice, R. (1990). Reading Recovery: Learning how to make a difference. In D. DeFord, C. Lyons, & G. Pinnell (Eds.), *Bridges to literacy: Learning from reading recovery* (pp. 11-35). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Pinnell, G., Lyons, C., DeFord, D., Bryk, A., & Seltzer, M. (1994). Comparing instructional models for the literacy education of high-risk first graders. *Reading Research Quarterly, 29,* 9-39.

Pressley, M., Allington, R. L., Wharton-MacDonald, R., Collins-Block, C., & Morrow, L (2001). *Learning to read: Lessons from exemplary first-grade classrooms*. New York: Guilford.

Pressley, M., Rankin, J., & Yokoi, L. (1996). A survey of instructional practices of primary teachers nominated as effective in promoting literacy. *Elementary School Journal, 96,* 363-384.

Robb, L. (2000). *Redefining staff development: A collaborative model for teachers and administrators.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Rodgers, A. (2002). Old roads and new paths. In E.M. Rodgers & G.S. Pinnell (Eds.), *Learning from teaching in literacy education* (pp. 135-157).

Rodgers, E.M. (2002). Lessons from a successful reform initiative. In E.M. Rodgers & G.S. Pinnell (Eds.), *Learning from teaching in literacy education* (pp. 158-172). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Rodgers, E.M., Fullerton, S.K., & DeFord, D.E. (2002). Making a difference with professional development. In E.M. Rodgers & G.S. Pinnell (Eds.), *Learning from teaching in literacy education* (pp. 52-62).

Rodgers, E.M., & Pinnell, G.S. (2002). Professional development scenarios: What is and might be. In E.M. Rodgers & G.S. Pinnell (Eds.), *Learning from teaching in literacy education* (pp. 1-8). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Share, D.L., Jorm, A.F., Maclean, R., & Matthews, R. (1984). Sources of individual differences in reading achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76,* 1309-1324.

Share, D.L., & Stanovich, K.E. (1995). Cognitive processes in early reading development: Accommodating individual differences into a mode of acquisition. *Issues in Education: Contributions from Educational Psychology, 1,* 1-57.

Short, K.G. (1991). Literacy environments that support strategic readers. In D.E. DeFord, C.A. Lyons, & G.S. Pinnell (Eds.), *Bridges to literacy: Learning from reading recovery* (pp. 97-118). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Short, R.A., Frye, B.J., Homan, S.P., & King, J.R. (1997). The results of the Accelerated Literacy Learning program for at-risk first grade readers. *Journal of Reading Education, 22,* 35-46.

Short, R.A., Frye, B.J., Homan, S.P., & King, J.R. (1999). Connecting classrooms and early interventions. *Reading Research and Instruction. 38* (4). 387-400.

Slavin, R.E, & Madden, N.A. (1989). What works for students at risk: A research synthesis. *Educational Leadership, V.46.* 4-13.

Smith, F. (1978). *Reading without nonsense.* New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Smith, F. (1988). *Understanding reading.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Snow, C.E., Burns, M.S., & Griffin, P. (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Snyder, J., Bolin, F., & Zumwalt, K. (1992). Curriculum implementation. In P. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Curriculum* (pp.402-435). New York: Macmillan.

Sparks, D., & Hirsh, S. (2000). A national plan for improving professional development [Online document]. Oxford, OH. Available: www.nsdc.org/library/NSDCPlan.html.

Stake, R.E. (1995). *The art of case study research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stanovich, K. (1986). The Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly, 21,* 360-406.

Stanovich, K. (1993). Romance and reality. *The Reading Teacher, 47,* 280-291.

Stanovich, K.E., Cunningham, A.E., & Feeman, D.J. (1984). Intelligence, cognitive skills and early reading progress. *Reading Research Quarterly, 19,* 278-303.

Strickland, D.S. (2001). The interface of standards, teacher preparation, and research: Improving the quality of teachers. In C.M. Roller (Ed.), *Learning to teach reading* (pp. 20-29). Newark: DL: International Reading Association.

Taylor, B., Pearson, P. D., Clark, K. F., & Walpole, S. (1999). Effective schools / accomplished teachers. *Reading Teacher*, *53*(2), 156-159.

Taylor, B. Strait, J., & Medo, M.A. (1994). Early intervention in reading. In E.H. Hiebert & B.M. Taylor (Eds.), *Getting reading right from the start* (pp. 107-121). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Tharp, R.G., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Torgeson, J.K., Wagner, R.K., & Rashotte, C.A. (1994). Longitudinal studies of phonological processing and reading. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 27,* 276-286.

Torgeson, J., Wagner, R., & Rashotte, C. (1997). The prevention and remediation of severe reading disabilities: Keeping the end in mind. *Scientific Studies in Reading, 1,* 217-234.

Tunmer, W.E., & Nesdale, A.R. (1985). Phonemic segmentation skill and beginning reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 77,* 417-427.

U.S. Department of Education. (2001). *How to help every child become a reader.* Indianapolis, IN: Domain Publishing.

Valencia, S.E. (1990). Alternative assessment: Separating the wheat from the chaff. *The Reading Teacher, 44,* 60-61.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher mental psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wasik, B.A., & Slavin, R.E. (1993). Preventing early reading failure with one-to-one tutoring: A review of five programs. *Reading Research Quarterly, 28,* 179-200.

Wolcott, H.F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Yin, R.K. (1989). *Case study research: Design and methods. 2nd Ed.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Zeichner, K. (1980). Myths and realities: Field-based experiences in preservice teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 31* (6), 45-55.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Semi-structured Interview Protocol (Spring 2003)

1. I'd like to learn a little bit about your teaching background. How long have you been a teacher and where have you taught?

2. What has contributed most to your professional development as a reading teacher in the past two years?

3. How would you describe a typical reading lesson in your classroom?
    a. What would you expect me to see if I observed you?
    b. What are your reading goals for your children?
    c. What instructional strategies do you employ to reach your goals?
    d. How do you help your students meet your instructional goals?

4. What Reading/Language Arts curriculum do you use with your students?
    a. Does it meet your students' needs?
    b. What are your views about the curriculum?

5. What are your views about the Accelerated Literacy Learning Training Program?
    a. Does it meet your professional development needs?
    b. How has it influenced your teaching practice?
    c. What did you find most helpful about the training?
    d. How much of the training are you using in your classroom?

6. What are your views about the 30 minute ALL lesson format?
    a. Are you using the format?
    b. What do you do with your students during this time?
    c. Describe how you use the lesson format.

7. How much support did you receive from the trainers during your training?
    a. How often did they observe you?
    b. How available were they to answer your questions?

8. How do you find out what your students know in Reading?
    a. What tools do you use to determine student progress?
    b. How do you group your students?
    c. How often do you assess your students?

9. What other professional development would help you to better meet your students' needs?

10. Is there anything else you would like to add that we haven't discussed?

Appendix B

Semi-structured Interview Protocol (Spring 2004)

1. What do you do to find out which of your students may be at risk of reading failure?

2. What do you do to help students at-risk of reading failure?

3. What materials do you use with your students during reading time?

4. What is the structure of your guided reading time?

5. What do you do with your students during guided reading time?

6. Describe a typical reading lesson.

7. What are you using from the ALL training program in your classroom? (Review each of the elements of training and ask if the teacher is using it or not.) Why?

8. How do you find out what your students know in reading?
    a. What tools do you use to determine student progress?
    b. How often do you assess students?

9. What modifications to the ALL reading lesson have you made, if any, and why?

10. In what ways did the ALL training program change your teaching practice, if any?

11. What was most helpful about the training?

12. What was least helpful about the training?

13. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about your experiences with the ALL training program or your literacy teaching practices?

Appendix C

Accelerated Literacy Learning Course Syllabus

RED 6540/701 Assessment in Literacy

Accelerated Literacy Learning:
Early Intervention and Instruction

Required Text

Clay, Marie M. (1993). An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Clay, Marie M. (1993). Reading Recovery: A Guidebook for Teachers in Training. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Course Description

This course is required for teachers participating in the Accelerated Literacy Learning (ALL) Program. It covers the implementation of the ALL early intervention program within the classroom setting. Systematic observation and strategies for struggling readers are taught.

Course Objectives

1. conduct systematic observation of students
2. administer instruments appropriate for determining student literacy functioning status
3. select books at the appropriate level for individual students
4. plan and implement a daily "30" minute ALL lesson
5. make decisions to facilitate acceleration of students

Course Requirements

1. class attendance and participation
2. completion of a Reflection Journal
3. completion of record keeping forms
4. video presentation of a 30 minute ALL lesson

Appendix D

Tentative Schedule – Fall 2002

August 14	2:30 – 5:30	Training in Observation Survey (Assessment Instrument)
August 21	2:30 – 5:30	Training in Observation Survey, Overview of ALL Program
August 28	2:30 – 4:30	Classroom Management with learning centers/Roaming
September 4	2:30 – 4:30	Classroom Management/Roaming/Student Selection
September 9 -13		Initial Classroom Visits by Trainers
September 18	2:30 – 4:30	ALL Lesson Format
September 25	2:30 – 4:30	ALL Lesson Components
October 2	2:30 – 4:30	Running Records Link to Strategy Talk
October 9	2:30 – 4:30	ALL Lesson Plan and Record Keeping
October 16	2:30 – 4:30	Video of Lesson with discussion between segments
October 21-25		Trainers Begin Formal Observations
October 30	2:30 – 4:30	Evidences of Self-Monitoring/Difficulties and Concerns
November 6	2:30 – 4:30	Familiar Read and Running Record/Student Video
November 13	2:30 – 4:30	Writing and Word Work/Student Video
November 20	2:30 – 4:30	New Book/Student Video
November 27		No Class! Happy Thanksgiving
December 4	2:30 – 4:30	Strategy Talk and Evidence of Self-Monitoring/Student Video

Appendix E

Accelerated Literacy Learning Training Program
Construct Key

Construct Heading	Construct	Definition
Program Goals	Lesson Structure	Lesson Format- 10 min.-Familiar Read 10 min.-Writing 10 min.-New Book
Program Goals	Acceleration	Refers to the fast progress that is needed for children who lag behind their peers to reach an average level of reading proficiency
Program Goals	Reading Strategies	Mental activities for constructing meaning from text.
Program Goals	Strategy Use	When children employ reading strategies
Program Goals	Strategy Talk	What teachers say to children to reinforce the use of strategies
Program Goals	Teacher Change	A shift in thinking
Program Goals	Assessment	Gathering information from children about reading strengths and weaknesses
Program Goals	Leveling	Books are numbered according to level of difficulty and children are assigned a level based on their ability to read proficiently
Program Goals	Cueing Systems	**Meaning**-Does it make sense? **Visual**-Does it look right? **Structure**-Does it sound right?
Program Goals	Teaching Points	2-3 areas of weakness are identified by the teacher and become the focus of the lesson
Program Goals	Familiar Read	The first 10 minutes of

		each lesson for reading familiar books
Program Goals	Focus Child	A child selected to work with teacher
Program Goals	Student Grouping	Adjusting reading groups regularly as children make progress
Program Goals	Follow the Child's Lead	The teacher responds to child at the point of need
Program Goals	Writing	The 2nd 10 minutes of a lesson for sentence generation
Program Goals	Student Selection	How children are selected for the program
Program Goals	Discontinuing Students	When to stop working with a student
Program Goals	Hearing Sounds	Stretching the sounds in words
Program Goals	Accuracy Rate	The number of words a child reads correctly on a selected text divided by the total number of words
Program Goals	Self-correction	When a child corrects an error
Program Goals	Guided Reading	Children practice reading strategies with the teacher's support
Program Goals	Running Records	A systematic way of recording a student's reading behaviors
Program Goals	Self-extending System	Children learn more about reading and writing every time they read and write, independent of instruction
Program Goals	Building on Strengths	Designing a program for a child that builds on what they can already do
Program Goals	At-risk Students	Students who are at-risk of reading failure

Program Goals	Zone of Proximal Development	What a child can do with guidance
Program Goals	Push-in Model	An in-class model
Program Goals	Support	Providing guidance to teachers and students
Program Goals	Dialogue	Encouraging teachers to talk with trainers and colleagues
Program Goals	Small Groups	Meeting with small groups of students for instruction
Program Goals	Coaching	Trainers provide support to teachers by modeling and providing feedback
Program Goals	Reading Fluency	Uninterrupted, proficient reading
Program Goals	Pacing	Teachers determine how quickly to move through lessons
Program Goals	Observation	Teachers systematically observe students when they read
Program Goals	Immediate Feedback	Teachers provide feedback to students at the point of need
Program Goals	Fostering Independence	Teachers encourage children to become independent readers
Program Goals	Response-based Teaching	Teachers carefully decide on their response to students based on their needs
Program Goals	Child Progress	Continuous improvement
Instruction	Reading Schedule	The scheduled time reading in a classroom
Instruction	Proliferation of Reading	Reading throughout the day
Instruction	Conversation	Talking with students about the meaning of texts
Instruction	Interruptions	Students in class who interrupt the teacher during group time

Instruction	Individual	Students work alone
Instruction	Whole Group	Whole class instruction
Instruction	Helping Kids	Teachers' desire to help children make progress
Instruction	Routines	Teachers develop and teach expected procedures
Instruction	Decision-making	Teachers are constantly faced with decisions about what and how to teach
Instruction	Self-monitoring	When teachers monitor what they say to students
Instruction	Child-centered	The focus of instruction centers around the child
Instruction	Explicit Directions	Very direct instructions
Instruction	Control	Refers to either the teacher or student who controls the lesson
Instruction	Flexibility	Changing lessons as needed
Instruction	Problem-solving	Teachers model how to solve problems with texts
Instruction	Informing Parents	Sharing information of child progress
Instruction	Reflection	Thinking about teaching
Instruction	Engagement	Whether or not students are actively engaged in a lesson
Instruction	Reinforcement	Reinforcing reading behaviors
Instruction	Connections	Students relate texts to their lives
Instruction	Understanding Kids	Teachers understand how children learn
Instruction	Curriculum	Teacher uses district adopted materials
Instruction	Teacher Materials	Teacher uses own materials

Instruction	Lack of Resources	Child lacks resources
Instruction	ALL Materials	Teachers use materials from ALL training
Instruction	Choral Reading	Students read the same text aloud simultaneously
Instruction	Sight Vocabulary	Learning words in isolation, out of context
Instruction	Centers	Learning stations children visit to practice reading skills
Instruction	Tolds	Telling students an unfamiliar word
Professional Development	Teacher Preparation	Preparing teachers to teach reading
Professional Development	ALL Training	Perceptions about training
Professional Development	Practicum	The need for practice when learning to teach reading
Professional Development	Doctoral Program	Furthering education at the doctoral level
Professional Development	Funding	The importance of funding for professional development

Appendix F

Mrs. Paterson's Anecdotal Record Form

Intensive Guided Reading Planning Form: Group_______________

Warm-up Text Focus Student Running Record:	Mini-Lesson Concepts about print Strategies Fluency Comprehension Vocabulary	Phonics/Word Building Connect to Writing Letter ID/Sound symbol High frequency words Blending Solving new words	Introduction of New Text Book Walk Notes:	Comprehension Discussion:
Warm-up Text Focus Student Running Record:	Mini-Lesson Concepts about print Strategies Fluency Comprehension Vocabulary	Phonics/Word Building Connect to Writing Letter ID/Sound symbol High frequency words Blending Solving new words	Introduction of New Text Book Walk Notes:	Comprehension Discussion:
Warm-up Text Focus Student Running Record:	Mini-Lesson Concepts about print Strategies Fluency Comprehension Vocabulary	Phonics/Word Building Connect to Writing Letter ID/Sound symbol High frequency words Blending Solving new words	Introduction of New Text Book Walk Notes:	Comprehension Discussion:
Warm-up Text Focus Student Running Record:	Mini-Lesson Concepts about print Strategies Fluency Comprehension Vocabulary	Phonics/Word Building Connect to Writing Letter ID/Sound symbol High frequency words Blending Solving new words	Introduction of New Text Book Walk Notes:	Comprehension Discussion:
Warm-up Text Focus Student Running Record:	Mini-Lesson Concepts about print Strategies Fluency Comprehension Vocabulary	Phonics/Word Building Connect to Writing Letter ID/Sound symbol High frequency words Blending Solving new words	Introduction of New Text Book Walk Notes:	Comprehension Discussion:

Appendix G

Ms. Stone's Anecdotal Record Form

GUIDED READING GROUPS

Date

Students

1	4
2	5
3	6

Book Reread

Book Introduced Skill/Concept Taught

Running Record:

Appendix H

Sample of ALL Course Agendas

August 21, 2002

2:45-2:55	Sign in, Sign Snack Sign-up sheet, have refreshments, relax
2:55-3:00	Begin sharing about testing experiences
3:00-3:10	Finish sharing, introduce new members
3:10-3:25	Go over registration procedures with Dr. Homan
3:25-3:45	Dictation Test
3:45-4:10	Concepts About Print Test (CAP)
4:10-4:30	Review Running Record
4:30-4:45	Taylor Pearson Phonemic Segment and Blending Test
4:45-5:00	Go over Writing Vocabulary and Writing Sample
5:00-5:15	Questions and Exit Memos

Homework: Try out tests on students. Read in Observation Survey, Ch. 2 &3

Appendix H (Continued)

ALL Agenda

August 28, 2002

2:45-3:00 Snacks and Sticky Notes: What went well?

What was difficult?

3:00-3:45 Discussion of the Observation Survey Assessments

Sample of Observation Survey Summary

How to Choose a Group

3:45-4:30 Running Record Video and Analysis

4:30-4:45 Exit Memo – Roaming

Homework: Bring a completed Summary to share next week.

Choose group possibilities – group of 3 students

Appendix H (Continued)

ALL Agenda

October 23, 2002

3:00-3:15 Whip-Around

What is your group teaching you?

3:15-3:45 Acceleration

3:45-4:30 Group of Three Video with lesson plan

4:30-4:45 Midterm reminder for October 30th

*Observation Survey results and summary for group of 3

*Self-reflection paper

Exit Memos: How close are you to starting lessons?

Homework: Read and study Chapter 4 in Guidebook on lesson segments and be prepared to do an activity on it in class next week.

Appendix H (Continued)

ALL Agenda

November 20, 2002

3:00-3:30 Whip-Around: Share your favorite statement from the reading.

Tell us the page number so that we can highlight it too!

3:30-4:10 Ms. Hazlett's Video

4:10-4:40 Share your management ideas, centers, activities for class during

ALL lesson

Exit Memos: Where are you in your lessons? How are you doing with your 10-10-10?

Homework: Review Guidebook Chapters 1- for Final Exam in our next class

Open book and Notes

Appendix H (Continued)

ALL Agenda

January 22, 2003

3:00-3:30	Video
3:30-4:30	Work Day!
	Record-keeping Overview
	Lesson Plan Forms
	Running Record Forms
	Book Record
	Progress Summary
4:30-4:15	Reflection: As a result of today's work day, what are your organizational strengths? Weaknesses?

Appendix H (Continued)

ALL Agenda

February 12, 2003

3:00-3:45	Video of Teacher's ALL lesson
3:45-4:20	Leveled Texts
	What are they?
	What does it mean?
	How to level?
	When to move?
	How to move?
4:20-4:30	Reflection: Where are you with your understanding of leveled texts?
	Questions?

About the Author

Cynthia Calderone has been an educator for over 20 years. She was an elementary classroom teacher for 17 years and taught undergraduate and graduate courses at the college level for six years. She received a B.S. in Elementary and Special Education from Lesley College in Cambridge, MA in 1983. Cynthia joined the Department of Defense Dependent Schools system and taught at the elementary level for 13 years in Germany, England, and Korea. She earned a M.A. in Curriculum and Instruction from National Louis University in 1992.

While pursuing a Ph.D. at the University of South Florida, Cynthia taught undergraduate courses, provided Reading services to students through the Gear-up grant, supervised Level III interns, and collected and analyzed data as a member of a research team for the National Longitudinal Evaluation of Comprehensive School Reform. She has also taught graduate courses for the University of Phoenix in Belgium, England, and Germany.