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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the evaluated elements of an adequate early intervention reading program for bilingual (Spanish/English-speaking) and monolingual (English-speaking) students, as viewed by their first or second grade, bilingual or monolingual teacher.

Fifteen bilingual and fifteen monolingual, first and second grade teachers (N=30) from three area urban school districts constituted the subjects of this study. An anonymous survey was sent to each of the thirty teachers. From a listing of key components of a reading program, teachers rated each of the fifteen elements they felt as being most important to the population they serve. Comparisons were then made to determine the relationship between both groups’ evaluations of the given components.

Results revealed that most subjects from both groups felt very strongly about all the elements listed on the survey. A common feeling among all was that all the “pieces” need to fit together for the reader (in any language) to excel. Analysis of the surveys demonstrated that an interesting pattern exists between the bilingual and monolingual teachers’ surveys. For both groups, the three most selected items of importance were: student confidence, parental support, and phonics.
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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the evaluated elements of an adequate early intervention reading program for bilingual (Spanish/English-speaking) and monolingual (English-speaking) students, as viewed by their first or second grade bilingual or monolingual teacher.

Question

How do first and second grade, bilingual (Spanish/English-speaking) and monolingual (English-speaking) teachers evaluate the basic elements of an adequate early intervention reading program for the population they serve?
NEED FOR THE STUDY

The population of school-age children served by the American Educational System is undergoing significant change. Currently, children in American schools represent diverse racial, economic, and linguistic backgrounds (Nieto, as cited in Goatley, Brock, and Raphael, 1995). Also, there is a significant increase in the number of students receiving special education services (McGill-Franzen & Allington, as cited in Goatley, Brock, and Raphael, 1995). Clearly, then, programs and approaches designed to foster early literacy learning must take into account the needs of diverse learners. Educators must examine such needs and shape current literacy programs and practices to provide literacy access to students of all abilities and needs.

Reading is more than theory, although most research is based on that. Educators need to examine the needs of children as readers and which elements will make up an adequate early intervention reading program to meet those needs (of both native and non-native speakers of English). Teachers no longer serve a homogeneous population; the same curricula can no longer be made to fit all children with such diverse needs. Effective teaching methods of reading and writing must be developed and applied to meet the needs of all children. Teachers will voice those needs as they see them for the population they serve.
DEFINITION OF TERMS

Discontinued - The point at which a child is reading and writing at the average level of his peers and has, in place, a self-extending system of strategies for learning about literacy every time he reads and writes. This is considered the exit point for children in the Reading Recovery Program. (Discontinuing Testing - Based on the use of three assessments: Text Level Reading, Writing Vocabulary, and Dictation.)

Early Intervention Program - Supplementary instructional services that are provided early in a student’s schooling and are intensive enough to bring “at-risk” students quickly to a level at which they can profit from good quality classroom instruction.

Exited - When a student has not made sufficient gains to meet the average level of his peers in the allotted time for the short-term Reading Recovery program and will no longer receive Reading Recovery services. At this point, other services may be required.

Not-Discontinued - These were children who were receiving tuition at the time of final testing and need further instruction. They had entered the program as others left it and their programs were incomplete.
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The following are variables that could have limited the results of this study:

1. There was a low return rate of survey responses.

2. The final number of responses was reduced due to the fact that several surveys were not completed fully.
SUMMARY

The purpose of the study was to examine the evaluated elements of an adequate early intervention reading program for bilingual (Spanish/English-speaking) and monolingual (English-speaking) students, as viewed by their first or second grade, bilingual or monolingual teacher.

Each day there is an increasingly diverse student population whose needs, in many cases, may not be met within the public schools. In order for all children to be given an opportunity to learn, educators must modify the curricula to meet the needs of all students.

It was important to conduct this study because educators need to constantly examine current literacy programs that promote a primary goal in education: for each student to become a flexible and independent reader and writer.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine the evaluated elements of an adequate early intervention reading program for bilingual (Spanish/English-speaking) and monolingual (English-speaking) students, as viewed by their first or second grade, bilingual or monolingual teacher. This chapter examines current reading programs and their components.

Even in the best situations, some students have problems learning to read and write. The growing number of children considered to be "at risk" is a critical concern for educators and for all citizens (Hodgkinson, as cited in Pinnell, 1989). According to research evidence, it is possible to prevent reading failure for the majority of students (Pinnell, 1989; Reynolds, 1991; Taylor, Frye, Short & Shearer, 1992).

Services for "at-risk" children must be shifted from an emphasis on remediation to an emphasis on prevention and early intervention. Prevention means providing developmentally appropriate programs, in addition to regular programs, and giving regular classroom teachers effective instructional programs, curricula, and staff development to enable them to see that most students are successful the first time they are taught. Early intervention means that supplementary instructional services are provided early in students' schooling and that they are
intensive enough to bring "at-risk" students quickly to a level at which they can profit from quality classroom instruction. Many "at-risk" students have not had the literacy experiences necessary to provide a framework for the instruction they receive in school—they do not sort things out for themselves (Heath; Mason; Teale & Sulzby; Wells, as cited in Pinnell, 1989).

Within the mass education taking place in schools and classrooms, disadvantaged children may find it particularly difficult to display their language competence according to unwritten conventions of the classroom (Gumperz, as cited in Pinnell, 1989). Poor readers apparently get fewer chances to read text, are more frequently corrected (Allington, as cited in Pinnell, 1989), and are led to focus on words, letters, and sounds rather than on meaning in reading (Gumperz; McDermott, as cited in Pinnell, 1989). This impacts the children's participation and reluctance to initiate learning.

There are currently about 7.5 million school-aged children in the United States who enter school speaking languages other than English (Lyons, as cited in Escamilla, 1992). This adds yet another dimension to student needs. About 85% of these students speak Spanish as a first language (Lyons, as cited in Escamilla, 1992). The number of Spanish-speaking students entering United States schools has steadily increased over the past decade and these children constitute the fastest growing group in the United States public schools (Broun, as cited in Escamilla, 1992). The projected growth of Spanish-speaking students in United States schools (35% over the next decade) (Lyons, as cited in Escamilla, 1992), coupled with the continued over-representation of
these students in remedial programs, support a strong need for studies to be conducted and reviewed in this area of education.

An adequate framework for Early Literacy Lessons has been examined time and time again. What most effectively facilitates students' learning and independence in reading and writing in their native language? How do we assist Spanish-speaking children who are having difficulty learning to read without prematurely submersing them in English and/or without permanently placing them in classes for "slow learners"? Additionally, are those same elements, within the framework, sufficient enough in second language learning for a child transitioning from Spanish to English? What are the first and second grade teachers' (monolingual and bilingual) views as related to the population with which they work? Let us first examine some programs in practice and review their elements and degree of productivity.

As Chall (as cited in Pinnell, 1989) has stated, "All effective reading programs expose children to a variety of activities that include a wide array of reading and writing" (p. 523). In order to look at a program we need to define what reading actually entails, as the foundation is laid by the child in the first one to three years of literacy learning. From there, we can assess what components are necessary. For this study, reading is defined as a message-getting, problem-solving activity which increases in power and flexibility the more it is practiced (no matter the language).

During the past twenty years, bilingual education programs have been widely implemented in the United States as a means of providing quality educational experiences to Spanish-speaking language minority students. Politically, bilingual education has been extremely
controversial. However, research studies have established that bilingual programs are pedagogically sound when fully implemented with well qualified staff and administrative support (Cummins; Hakuta, as cited in Escamilla, 1992).

Bilingual programs are implemented in many different ways. However, they generally utilize a child's native language for initial literacy development and gradually add on English as a second language. This model has demonstrated that initial success in native language literacy provides a base for subsequent success in English (Escamilla; Krashen & Biber; Ramirez, Yuen & Ramey, as cited in Escamilla, 1992).

In spite of the above achievements and the overall positive impact of bilingual education programs, there are some language minority students who have not achieved the desired results in native language or second language literacy. These students, like their English-speaking counterparts, may have difficulty at the beginning stages of literacy acquisition, requiring special attention or "something extra" in the way of instruction to achieve the levels of literacy and biliteracy needed to be academically successful.

Reading Recovery, an early intervention program developed by Marie Clay in 1979, is designed to raise the lowest achieving readers in first grade up to the average level of their class in 12 to 16 weeks. On the basis of teacher recommendation and the results on The Observation Survey (the assessment tool of Reading Recovery) four children are selected at the beginning of first grade to receive one-on-one instruction 30 minutes every day by a teacher who has been trained for one year in the pedagogical techniques of Reading
Recovery. Instruction is individualized for each child within the confines of a lesson framework consisting of five components: reading familiar books; taking a running record on the new book from the day before; working with magnetic letters; writing, cutting up and reassembling a sentence; and reading a new book.

Each 30-minute session is highly supportive and focuses on helping students untangle confusions and learn to construct meaning from print. In tutoring, a flexible framework of reading and writing activities is used; the real job is to engage children in reading and writing, observe them closely, and tailor teaching moves to help each one discover and use effective literacy strategies. Recent research suggests that the more experiences Reading Recovery teachers have teaching low-progress students, the greater their ability to make judicious instructional decisions in an efficient manner (Pinnell, DeFord, & Lyons, 1993).

The Field Trial Research in 1978 was an exploratory study to find out what kinds of outcomes were possible for the children (n=122) given special help in the Reading Recovery Program. Using the t-test of significant differences, it was found that the mean test scores of all three groups (Control, Discontinued, Not-Discontinued) increased from initial to final testing on Book Level, Reading Vocabulary, Concepts About Print, Dictation and Letter Identification so that statistically significant differences were recorded. The Discontinued group made higher and significantly different gains from the control group in all tests. The Not-Discontinued group made gains that were not significantly lower than those of the Control group on Book Level,
Reading Vocabulary and Letter Identification. They were significantly higher on Concepts About Print and Dictation.

In the One-Year Follow-up Research in 1979, the progress of all these children was reassessed. The results of the t-test (at the p<0.01 level) between the mean difference scores for groups show that the Discontinued group made significantly better progress than the control group relative to their Initial scores, and this trend was maintained at Follow-up. Discontinuing judgments were made on the evidence of strategic behavior (as gains in reading can be described in terms of operations carried out by children rather than items of knowledge gained).

The non-exclusion policy of Reading Recovery means that any child regardless of ethnic group, language spoken, attendance, or potential is eligible for extra assistance. Given this non-exclusion policy, the success of different groups of children is a question of considerable importance (Glynn, Crookes, Bethune, Ballard, & Smith; Nicholson; Clay; Clay & Tuck, as cited in Smith, 1996).

Commonly expressed beliefs by some teachers and specialist educators working with children who had English as a second language, are that these children would be less successful in Reading Recovery than their native English-speaking peers (and possibly should be excluded from the program); that they would rely dominantly on grapho-phonemic cues at the expense of meaning and syntax; and that subsequent progress would be restricted by their limited oral language proficiency (Watson, as cited in Smith, 1996). Many researchers question the necessity for a threshold of language proficiency before children can benefit from bilingualism (Cummins & Swain,
Whilst Wells (1981) queried the extent to which oral language is related to reading acquisition, other researchers equated deficient academic achievement (Oller, 1979), and learning disability (Vellutino, 1979) with deficient language proficiency. Labov (1970), on the other hand, rejected any direct relationship between language proficiency and failure, emphasizing the importance of sociolinguistic and sociocultural factors in academic achievement. Edelsky (1991), however, is highly critical of the "threshold hypothesis" (Cummins, 1979; Cummins & Swain, 1986) arguing that it ultimately disempowers minority language students, and that the research on which the theory is based merely measures "test-wiseness" and not language proficiency at all.

Clay & Watson (1982) analyzed the records of those students (n=68) who were in the Reading Recovery Field Trials in 1978 (Discontinued and Not-Discontinued). At this level of analysis, differences between ethnic groups in the way the program was implemented were minimal. Differences between the recommendations for teaching Reading Recovery and what occurred were pronounced. The good results achieved were gained on the risky foundation of a partial implementation of the recommended program.

Three years later Clay & Watson did a Follow-up Study in 1981. These test results (using the Burt Word Reading Vocabulary Test, the Schoenell Word Reading Vocabulary Test and the Peters Word Spelling Test) allow an evaluation to be made of one of the major claims for the Reading Recovery Program. This evaluation states that children are kept in the program until they can rejoin an average group
in their class. The goal of Reading Recovery has been to equip them with independent learning strategies that will enable them to maintain that position in an average group.

Research into the success of Reading Recovery in Australia (Wheeler, 1986), in the United States of America (Pinnell, DeFord, & Lyons, 1988; Smith-Burke & Jaggar, 1994) and in Surrey, England (Wright, 1992), shows that the program also achieves its aims in very different education systems. Results of the research studies from these three countries lead to the conclusion that most children will be able to make the transition if they receive the supplementary help offered in Reading Recovery from specially trained teachers in a short-term intervention.

It has also been found that the strategies English-speaking students are observed to use while participating in Reading Recovery lessons are the same strategies Spanish-speaking students use as they make accelerated progress in Descubriendo La Lectura lessons (McDonough & Brena, 1993). During the 1989-90 school year, Descubriendo La Lectura, a reconstruction of Reading Recovery in Spanish, was implemented in a large urban school district in Southern Arizona. It was the first such program of its kind in the United States. It was created for students who are in bilingual education programs, receiving initial literacy instruction in Spanish, and experiencing difficulties in learning to read. These children need what Dr. Clay calls a "second chance" at learning to read, and their success or failure in native-language literacy will have an impact on how well they learn to read in English, as well (McDonough & Ruiz, 1994).
According to Cambourne (1988), learning to use and control the language of a culture is a tremendous intellectual accomplishment and children do it successfully throughout the world. From his research, Cambourne (1988) concluded that there are certain conditions under which children, beginning at birth, acquire language. These conditions include the following: Immersion, Demonstration, Expectations, Responsibility, Use, Approximation, Response, and Engagement. Based on the conditions of learning a language, Cambourne (1988) concluded that "while the conditions for learning to talk cannot be precisely replicated for the written mode of language, the principles which they exemplify can." (p. 45) He goes on to say that, when teachers understand these principles, they will try to "simulate for the written work" (p. 45) the conditions that made it possible for oral language to emerge. These principles of learning identified by Cambourne (1988) apply to literacy learning in Reading Recovery/Descubriendo La Lectura lessons.

First year research efforts in Descubriendo La Lectura in 1989-90 focused on the construction of an equivalent Spanish Observation Survey and the establishment of the validity and reliability of the survey. As an equivalent version, however it is important to note that it was not a direct translation. In a research study done by Andrade, Basurto, Escamilla and Ruiz (1992), data were collected on 144 first grade children who were ethnically Mexican-American and dominant Spanish-speaking; all subjects were learning to read in Spanish. Data collection included administration of the English and Spanish versions of a language assessment scale, of a standardized
Spanish reading achievement test, and of the Spanish version of the observation instrument designed for the program.

Validity was established by comparing results of observation tasks on the Spanish Survey to the La Prueba Spanish Reading Test. The Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 test-re-test procedure was used to establish the reliability of the test. Results established the survey instrument as reliable and valid for Mexican-American students in the study. Further, results compared favorably with validity and reliability of the English survey version. Further research on the instrument's use with other regional or dialectal populations is recommended since these assessments do not represent all information available on individual children.

The unique aspect of Descubriendo la Lectura is that it has adapted the Reading Recovery model in a way that utilizes the students' native language for instruction, and incorporates the cultural background of the students into the Reading Recovery situation. In order to encourage literacy acquisition, the most powerful teaching builds on competence instead of deficits (Pinnell, 1989). This program uses student competence in Spanish and the student's cultural background as a basis for developing literacy.

Similar results were found in the study and application of the Reading Recovery program in Spanish in the Tucson Unified School District. With regard to impact on students (n=23), Descubriendo La Lectura program students made significant gains in their literacy acquisition during the course of this project. Further, these gains were significant when compared to a control group of children who were also struggling in Spanish literacy, but did not have the Descubriendo
La Lectura program (DLL). DLL students' growth surpassed that of a comparison group of first grade students learning to read in Spanish.

On all measurement criteria used on the study, DLL students not only caught up with their "average" peers, but surpassed them at statistically significant levels. While this finding is greatly encouraging for DLL students, it raises some concerns with regard to the quality of Spanish reading instruction for children in the regular bilingual classrooms.

In 1992, Escamilla investigated the utility of a set of Spanish-language instructional materials, Descubriendo La Lectura, in compensatory or remedial literacy education for Spanish-speaking elementary students. Program development included identification of 300 Spanish-language books at 28 difficulty levels, development of six observational tasks to provide a profile of the individual student's reading repertoire, and testing of the reliability and validity of the adapted materials with students in five Texas, Illinois, and Arizona school districts.

The final report outlines the study's objectives and procedures, then presents and analyzes results for each task and correlation. It is concluded that the observational tasks are both reliable and valid, and that the materials had a significant impact on the subjects' literacy acquisition, suggesting that the Reading Recovery approach does help students who are struggling to read in a relatively short time period, and accelerates students so they are on a par with or ahead of average readers.

Detailed studies of young children's behavior provide compelling evidence that learning language and literacy is a constructive,
purposeful, active process (Bissex; Clay; Ferriero & Teberosky; Y.M. Goodman; Harste, Woodward, & Burke; Sulzby, as cited in Pinnell, 1989). As children encounter and use language for different purposes, they develop new knowledge and the ability to use new forms. Research suggests that poor readers, although not different as learners from those perceived to be good readers, may be learning different things than good readers from classroom instruction. They may be attending to and using a narrow range of strategies and applying their knowledge in rigid ways (Clay, 1985). Clay also points out that children who fail to progress in reading have often become passive in their confusions (1993).

Every reader has to be able to operate a system of checks and balances to achieve either understanding of a text or error-free reading. Such a system of checks and balances is possible because the messages in language have high redundancy. Language is organized in several ways. We can focus on the sound system or on the meaningfulness of the language. In reading we have the letters with some systematic links to the sounds of language, the structures of sentences, and the meanings of messages. At each of these 'levels' there are rules which govern the occurrence of language features and we can make predictions because some things are more likely to occur than others.

Good readers use meaning, their own sense of language structure, and visual information to monitor their own reading. This means that children think about their own reading and are aware when their reading does not make sense or does not sound like what they recognize as valid language patterns. They are aware of discrepancies between their reading and the visual information in the print. Good
readers constantly cross-reference the different kinds of information they bring to the reading of a text. A reader might use one kind of information to predict a word but will check that prediction by using another source of information. For example, children may check a picture or meaning cue against a visual cue such as the beginning letter of the word or they may check a language prediction against a sampling of letters. As children gain control of all of these strategies, they use them in an upward spiral of increasingly complex text while maintaining speed and fluency. When they can do this successfully, they are said to have a self-extending system (Clay, 1991).

An analysis was made of detailed records kept by Reading Recovery teachers for three groups of children (n=420) taught in New Zealand in 1988. The analysis compared change over time in the achievements of children who reached average-band performance for their classes, with children who did not reach this criterion level and required specialist reports. Seven tests were routinely administered at entry to the program and at exit (called Discontinuing). Six were from the Diagnostic Survey (Clay, 1985) and one was the nationally standardized Burt Oral Word Reading Test (New Zealand Council for Education Research, 1981). Relationships were found between levels at entry and the probability of being either discontinued or referred. Correlations between entry scores and length of time in the program for the successful children (Discontinued) showed that children with the lowest scores tended to take longer to meet the criteria for discontinuing; they had more to learn.
As Chall has stated (as cited in Pinnell, 1989), “all effective reading programs expose children to a variety of activities that include a wide array of reading and writing” (p. 523). Literacy learning is social in nature. Children learn to read and write in the same natural way they learn to talk. Smith (1996) suggested that perhaps learning would be easier if it was introduced more naturally instead of trying to fit an ideal approach to learning. There are two ways in which we can help a child to learn. One of them is by attempting to teach him; the other is by facilitating his attempts to teach himself.
Summary

Many research studies have shown the power of early intervention programs in correlation with student academic progress. Teaching a child how to learn is a much more effective than to simply tell them what to learn. The programs reviewed have demonstrated their effectiveness in doing just that. In order to support student achievement, the important elements of reading and writing must be consistent “across the board.”
CHAPTER III

THE RESEARCH DESIGN

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the evaluated elements of an adequate early intervention reading program for bilingual (Spanish/English-speaking) and monolingual (English-speaking) children, as viewed by their first or second grade, bilingual or monolingual teacher.

Research Questions

The following research questions were investigated in this study:

1) How do first and second, bilingual or monolingual teachers evaluate the basic elements of an adequate early intervention reading program for the population of students they serve?

2) How do the evaluations of the two groups compare?
Methodology

Subjects:

This study involved fifteen bilingual (Spanish/English-speaking) and fifteen monolingual (English-speaking) first and second grade teachers from three surrounding area urban school districts.

Materials:

A researcher made/constructed survey was administered to each of the thirty classroom teachers (see Appendix A). Given a listing of key components of a reading program, teachers rated each of the elements that they felt were most important for the population of students they serve. The survey had a total of fifteen components rated on a scale from one to six—six being the highest and most important. Teachers were also to circle the three elements that they found most important that support an early intervention first or second grade reading program.

Procedures:

Once approval was granted from each of the three surrounding area urban school districts, the same anonymous survey (see Appendix A) was administered to each of the teachers. The data collected were analyzed according to the population served (bilingual vs. monolingual). The mean and standard deviation were calculated for each. The two groups were then compared to each other.
Analysis of the Data

The completed surveys were collected and the mean and standard deviation was calculated for each reading component listed on the survey. The most important elements, as rated by the teachers, were also tabulated for each group. Comparisons of the calculated mean were made between survey responses from the bilingual and monolingual teachers. It was determined from the information collected that bilingual and monolingual teachers rated the same reading components as being most important.

Summary

This study was initiated to examine how first and second bilingual or monolingual teachers evaluate the basic elements of an adequate early intervention reading program for the population of students they serve and to determine which components were most important for each group (bilingual and monolingual).

Thirty first- and second-grade, bilingual and monolingual teachers participated in this study (fifteen from each group). A researcher made/constructed survey was administered to each of the thirty classroom teachers. Comparisons of the collected data were then made as to what both groups of teachers rated as the most important elements of an adequate early intervention reading program.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the evaluated elements of an adequate early intervention reading program for bilingual (Spanish/English-speaking) and monolingual (English-speaking) students, as viewed by their first or second grade bilingual or monolingual teacher.

The following Tables contain information gathered from the teacher surveys.
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Elements as Evaluated by Bilingual 1st and 2nd grade teachers</th>
<th>Mean (1-6)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Phonics (recognizing letters that encode sounds)</td>
<td>5.667</td>
<td>0.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Student reads familiar books for fluency and confidence</td>
<td>5.533</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/word work (attends the details of letters and correct letter order)</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>1.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic (word meaning):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive (speaking vocabulary)</td>
<td>5.333</td>
<td>1.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptive (listening vocabulary)</td>
<td>5.267</td>
<td>1.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax (natural language structures and grammar)</td>
<td>4.800</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Parental support</td>
<td>5.800</td>
<td>0.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to specialists and support staff</td>
<td>5.067</td>
<td>1.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>5.467</td>
<td>0.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing sounds in words (patterns and vowel sounds)</td>
<td>5.333</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of self-monitoring strategies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>5.667</td>
<td>0.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>4.933</td>
<td>1.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>5.200</td>
<td>0.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture learning</td>
<td>4.800</td>
<td>1.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Confidence/self-esteem</td>
<td>5.533</td>
<td>0.743</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: "Good readers automatically use meaning, structure and visual cues. One is not more important than the other. Parental support, which includes reading to children from birth, talking with their children and interpreting their environment... and stressing the importance of learning, is also critical. Children also need appropriate materials to practice their emerging literacy and to develop their confidence."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Elements as Evaluated by Monolingual 1st and 2nd grade teachers</th>
<th>Mean (1-6)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Phonics (recognizing letters that encode sounds)</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Student reads familiar books for fluency and confidence</td>
<td>5.333</td>
<td>0.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/word work (attends the details of letters and correct letter order)</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>0.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic (word meaning):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive (speaking vocabulary)</td>
<td>5.333</td>
<td>0.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptive (listening vocabulary)</td>
<td>5.400</td>
<td>0.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax (natural language structures and grammar)</td>
<td>4.933</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Parental support</td>
<td>5.667</td>
<td>0.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to specialists and support staff</td>
<td>4.933</td>
<td>1.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>4.867</td>
<td>1.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing sounds in words (patterns and vowel sounds)</td>
<td>5.733</td>
<td>0.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of self-monitoring strategies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>5.333</td>
<td>0.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>5.467</td>
<td>0.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>5.467</td>
<td>0.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture learning</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>1.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Confidence/self-esteem</td>
<td>4.733</td>
<td>1.633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: "Parents need to educate kids at home so they’re ready to enter school. Our children come to school without background information needed."

“All pieces need to fit together for readers to excel.”
Findings and Interpretations

This study involved thirty first- and second-grade, bilingual or monolingual teachers from three surrounding area urban school districts. The following items show an interesting pattern between the elements evaluated by bilingual and monolingual teachers for an adequate early intervention reading program.

Both groups selected the same three components as being the most important elements. Those three components were: phonics, parental support, and student confidence/self-esteem.* The one targeted as the most important for bilingual teachers was parental support, whereas, the one targeted as the most important for monolingual teachers was phonics. Although hearing sounds in words had a high mean, it was not rated as one of the three most important components.

For bilingual teachers, letter/word work, syntax and culture were rated of least importance from the mean scores, all of which had similarly low mean scores. For monolingual teachers, culture learning was rated of least importance by an unusually low mean score.

The study also revealed an interesting comparison between both groups. Bilingual teachers rated student confidence/self-esteem and materials much higher than did monolingual teachers.

*Note: Confidence item was listed twice on the survey in different forms: Student reads familiar books for fluency and confidence; and Confidence/self-esteem. For tallying purposes, both items were averaged as one score of student confidence/self-esteem.
Summary

There is a strong correlation between what bilingual and monolingual teachers evaluate as important reading components for an early intervention reading program. The results demonstrated that a pattern exists between first and second-grade, bilingual or monolingual teachers' surveys. The three components selected as being the most important for both groups were: phonics, parental support, and student confidence/self-esteem.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the evaluated elements of an adequate early intervention reading program for bilingual (Spanish/English-speaking) and monolingual (English-speaking) students, as viewed by their first or second-grade, bilingual or monolingual teacher.

Conclusions

The results of this investigation demonstrated that there is a considerably strong agreement between first and second-grade, bilingual or monolingual teachers' evaluations of key components of an early intervention reading program.

The bilingual and monolingual groups selected the same three components as being the most important elements. Those three components were: phonics, parental support, and student confidence/self-esteem. The one targeted as the most important for bilingual teachers was parental support, whereas, the one targeted as the most important for monolingual teachers was phonics. Although hearing sounds in words had a high mean, it was not rated as one of the three most important components.
For bilingual teachers, letter/word work, syntax and culture were rated of least importance from the mean scores, all of which had similarly low mean scores. For monolingual teachers, culture learning was rated of least importance by an unusually low mean score. The study also revealed an interesting comparison between both groups. Bilingual teachers rated student confidence/self-esteem and materials much higher than did monolingual teachers.

These findings are consistent with most program elements in current early intervention reading programs, such as the Reading Recovery program in English.
Implications for Classroom Practice and Research

These results support the need for the implementation of all key components within an early intervention reading program for bilingual and monolingual students. Further investigation is needed to explore different reading programs’ effectiveness in meeting all of the students’ needs, in any language.
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APPENDIX A

Based on your experiences with the population of students you serve, please rate the importance of each of the following items and circle the three that you find most important that support an early intervention first or second grade reading program.

Please be sure that you have specified below, the type of classroom in which you teach:

Please check: ☐ bilingual classroom ☐ monolingual classroom

Grade level _____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>minor</th>
<th>major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phonics (recognizing letters that encode sounds)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student reads familiar books for fluency and confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/word work (attends to the details of letters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic (word meaning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. expressive (speaking vocabulary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. receptive (listening vocabulary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax (natural language structures, grammar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to specialists and support staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing sounds in words (patterns and vowel sounds)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of self-monitoring strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. meaning (making sense of a story by using background experiences)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. structure (syntax/knowledge of language)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. visual (word recognition)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence/self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>