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The purpose of this study was to investigate the story retelling abilities of preschool children who have experienced storybook reading and storybook reenactment bilingually, in English and Spanish, and preschool children who have experienced storybook reading and storybook reenactment in English only. This is a clinical case study employing both quantitative and qualitative measures comparing four treatment groups. Three evaluation instruments were developed by the researcher and used for posttesting; a story comprehension test, a story retelling guidesheet/scoresheet, and a storybook literacy response evaluation. In addition, participant observation and teacher interviews were used to gather qualitative data regarding learning center extensions of the target text and teacher beliefs and practices about the use of storybooks.

The findings from this study show that scores for children who experienced storybook reading and storybook reenactment were significantly better on both the story retelling and story comprehension measures. In addition, a larger proportion of children who experienced
storybook reading and reenactment were found to perform at the second level of literacy response on the Levels of Literacy evaluation. No differences were found in relationship to the language used on any of the dependent measures.

Findings from qualitative data showed that children were involved in limited extensions of the storybook read to them regardless of whether they experienced storybook reenactment or discussion. Teacher beliefs and practices related to their role during learning center play was believed to have some influence on children's choices regarding story extensions or dramatic play theme content. Recommendations were made to pre-school teachers that story reenactment was an effective technique with both bilingual and monolingual presentation. Additional research questions were posed also.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Head Start programs along with other early childhood programs are experiencing heightened enrollments of linguistically and culturally diverse children. Greater diversity for many programs means greater challenge in providing developmentally appropriate programming. In addition to working with children and families who have need for social services, nutrition and health care, Head Start provides education for children representing a diversity of cultures, languages, and special needs. Practitioners have numerous questions about how to work most effectively with children who will be learning English as a second language (ESL). Language and literacy skills are essential tools needed by ESL learners in order to achieve academic success.

Story reenactment is one strategy which has been found to be beneficial in language and literacy development of monolingual English-speaking children. Reenacting stories appears to foster children’s understanding of the story structure and enhances oral language, as well as recall and retelling of stories (Morrow, 1985; Pellegrini & Galda, 1982). Reenactment is also suggested for helping ESL students increase their English vocabulary and comprehension (Spodek, 1993). However,
no research which specifically focuses on the effects of reenactment on story retelling on non-English preschoolers was located. The present study investigates the effects of storybook reenactment on story comprehension and retelling abilities of bilingual, English-, and Spanish-speaking Head Start children. Storybook reading and story reenactment were conducted either bilingually or only in English.

Purpose of the Study

This study focuses on preschool children’s storybook retelling and comprehension abilities. It compares the storybook retelling and story comprehension abilities of preschool children after engaging in storybook reenactment activities with those children not engaging in storybook reenactment activities. In addition, storybook reading and storybook reenactment were conducted bilingually (English/Spanish) and in English only.

Research Questions

This study focuses on and is guided by the following research questions:

1. Does storybook reenactment have an effect on children’s story retelling abilities? Is the effect on storybook retelling the same for storybook reading and reenactment conducted bilingually (English/Spanish) or in English only?
2. Does storybook reenactment have an effect on children's story comprehension ability? Is the effect on comprehension the same for storybook reading and reenactment conducted bilingually (English/Spanish) or in English only?

3. Does storybook reenactment have an effect on children's level of literacy responses? Is the effect on literacy response the same for storybook reading and reenactment conducted bilingually (English/Spanish) or in English only?

In addition, a qualitative perspective was incorporated into this study for investigation of the following questions:

4. Do Head Start children who have experienced bilingual, Spanish and English, storybook reading, and story reenactment and Head Start children who have experienced storybook reading and reenactment only in English engage in learning center experiences that extend the story?

5. Do the beliefs and practices of teachers regarding storybooks and storybook related experiences influence the literacy experiences they provide for young children?

Operational Definitions

Bilingual education involves the use of various approaches to educating students of non-English-language backgrounds for the purpose of (a) continuing to support development of the primary language (L1),
(b) supporting the acquisition of a second language (L2), or
(c) instruction in the content areas using both L1 and L2.

Children's storybook rereadings are defined as children's readings of storybooks that have been read to them (see level of literacy response).

English as a second language (ESL) is a language instruction program designed to teach English to students whose native language is not English.

Limited English proficient (LEP) is a term referred to non-English speaking students who have limited skills in the English language.

Level of literacy response is a process used to evaluate children's rereadings of storybooks (also called storybook reenactments by Salinger [1988]).

Story reenactment is defined as acting out the entire story from beginning to end which may involve taking on character roles, dramatizing the story, and performing speaking parts.

Story retelling is defined as retelling a story to someone else after hearing it read.

Limitations

1. A convenience sample was selected based on the language factor and willingness of the program to participate in the study. Study results are, therefore, applicable only to the sample.
2. Size of the sample was determined by the number of children enrolled in each classroom at the time of the study.

3. At the time of this study the Head Start program was under an interim grantee and staff were uncertain about the security of their jobs.

Background of the Questions

Interactionist theories provide a theoretical basis for the “natural” approach endorsed by Head Start as the most effective and appropriate method to incorporate in helping children to acquire language competence in English. The interactionist’s position regarding language acquisition bridged some perspectives held by two other predominant theorists—nativists and behaviorists. According to Chomsky (as cited in Berk, 1994), children are born equipped with an innate ability, or “language acquisition device,” that allows them to acquire language (p. 352). The founder of behaviorism, Skinner (as cited in Berk, 1994) concluded that children learn language as the adults around them “apply the principles of operant conditioning” to the child’s attempt at verbal communication (p. 352). Interactionists recognize that a child equipped with all the basic learning faculties acquire language by being involved in social interaction with others within their environment (Berk, 1994). Piaget and Vygotsky have both been classified as supporters of interactionist beliefs (Berk, 1994; Berk & Winsler, 1995; Wadsworth, 1971) and have had a strong influence on early childhood education beliefs and practices (Bredekamp & Rosegrant, 1992, 1995).
Three Piagetian principles have had a tremendous impact on Head Start's educational component. First, Piaget and many other theorists believed that children learn through active exploration of their environment (Berk, 1994; Wadsworth, 1971). This ideology formed the basis for child-initiated learning through active exploration or discovery learning which is evident in Head Start's use of learning centers and first-hand experience approach (ACYF, 1986). Head Start Performance Standards (ACF, 1984) require that programs foster meaningful interactions between children and their peers, as well as interaction with adults. Secondly, a child's current stage of cognitive development, according to Piaget, is to be respected and supported without attempting to rush children from one stage to the next (Berk, 1994). Thirdly, although Piaget views children as all going through the same stages of development, he recognized that they do so at different rates. Developmentally appropriate educational programs in Head Start incorporate both individual and age-appropriateness in planning curriculum that meet the needs of each child (ACYF, 1986).

Vygotsky (as cited in Berk, 1994; Berk & Winsler, 1995) emphasized social interaction to be an essential aspect of a child's cognitive development. Vygotsky perceived social interaction to be culturally distinct, therefore, children are socialized in culturally relevant ways. Vygotsky viewed language as the major means through which cultural interaction takes place and emphasized the importance of
language acquisition in children. Social interaction, more specifically cooperative dialogues, between children and those more knowledgeable than them are necessary in order for children to learn cultural ways of thought and behavior. The zone of proximal development, according to Vygotsky, represented that range of tasks that a child can learn with help from more skilled peers and adults (as cited in Berk, 1994). He did not, however, believe that children progress through the same basic stages of development. Instead, Vygotsky regarded children as continuously changing in thought and behavior as a result of ongoing social interaction.

Head Start philosophy can be said to reflect both Piaget’s and Vygotsky’s theories in performance standard guidance provided for building children’s communication skills (ACF, 1984). In accordance with Piagetian beliefs, Head Start Performance Standard 1304.2-1(2)(i) states that children should be encouraged to “solve problems, initiate activities, explore, experiment, question, and gain mastery through learning by doing” (ACF, 1984, p. 7). Additional guidance states that the sequence of classroom activities should “progress from simple to complex tasks, and from concrete to abstract concepts” (ACF, 1984, p. 7).

Head Start Performance Standards reflecting Vygotskian beliefs include Head Start Standard 1304.2(ii), which states that intellectual skills are developed by “promoting language understanding and use in an
atmosphere that encourages easy communication among children and between children and adults” (ACF, 1984, p. 7). Further guidance under the same standard, suggests that staff plan activities that “allow ample time for both spontaneous activity by children and blocks of time for teacher-directed activities” (ACF, 1984, p. 229). In addition, Head Start Performance Standards make the following recommendations to promote the development of language and communication.

- Give children ample time to talk to each other and ask questions in the language of their choice;
- Encourage free discussions and conversation between children and adults;
- Provide games, songs, stories, poems which offer new and interesting vocabulary;
- Encourage children to tell and listen to stories. (ACF, 1984, p. 7)
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The present study investigated the storybook retelling and story comprehension abilities of Head Start children who experienced storybook reading and reenactment in either bilingual, English/Spanish, or English only. The following review of related research was organized in the areas of language development, language and literacy development, story reenactment, and story retelling. Related research regarding cultural diversity and education, language diversity in particular, has also been reviewed.

Language Development

By the time young children go to preschool they have already made enormous strides toward developing communicative competence in their home language (Tabors & Snow, 1994; Wong-Filmore, 1991). Through their involvement in everyday life experiences with others, children have gained some understanding of rules associated with the phonology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics of their home language (Jalongo, 1992). Normally, continuation of oral language and communicative competence development can be expected to flourish as the child enters into the world of formal education in a community.
where the language and communication patterns used are the same both in the school and at home (Heath, 1983).

For many children who speak a language other than English, further successful language growth depends on how the child copes within the school’s predetermined agenda (i.e., to foster language development in both languages, to teach English). In addition to learning a new language and how to function properly in the dominant culture, non-English speakers must also learn school talk (Seefeldt, 1992) or the established way of using language for communication within the school setting (Freeman & Freeman, 1994; Heath, 1983; Kagan & Garcia, 1991).

A smoother transition to school can be facilitated when teachers nurture talk between children and others, provide activities that encourage talk and encourage meaningful conversations within a supportive environment (Genishi, 1992). Even though teacher and child may come from diverse language backgrounds the purposes for communication, to reach communicative competence, can still be identical. Learning to express themselves through oral communication helps to lay the foundation that later supports the development of reading and writing skills (Genishi, 1992; Soundy & Genisio, 1994).
Language and Literacy Development

Language and literacy development, in association with different factors perceived to be influential in early childhood education, has been extensively researched (Spodek, 1993; Spodek & Saracho, 1993; Seefeldt, 1992). Research conducted in the past has focused on many variables and aspects of young children's language to describe how they acquire literacy skills and to suggest how to support that development (Spodek & Saracho, 1993). Basic beliefs have changed about what constitutes developmentally appropriate practice in nurturing literacy development. For example, an acceptable premise now is that children begin to acquire literacy skills early on, at birth or before birth rather than later in early childhood (Spodek, 1993). Early childhood programs should, therefore, seek effective ways to involve the home in literacy development efforts.

Story reading is an important part of the daily curriculum in early childhood classrooms and efforts to establish and support story reading at home have become a priority in many early childhood programs. In two different Head Start shared reading projects, researchers used “dialogic reading” as part of intervention studies designed to help children develop language and emergent literacy skills (Whitehurst, Angel, Crone, & Fischel, 1994; Zevenbergen et al., 1994). Dialogic reading is characterized by the on-going dialogue that occurs between reader and child during the reading of a story. Dialogic reading is
designed to give children a more active role as they respond to the adult’s questions and prompts and eventually read more and more of the story. Teachers were trained to use dialogic reading techniques with small reading groups and parents were trained to use the techniques while reading at home.

The Zevenbergen study involved 20 Head Start classrooms, 10 in the control group and 10 in the experimental group. Researchers spent the first year training parents and teachers on dialogic reading. In the second year, Head Start staff were responsible for conducting the training.

Though results from the Zevenbergen study were very positive, the researchers noted that children from more advantageous backgrounds were still outperforming Head Start children in language and literacy skill development at the end of the year. Findings from Zevenbergen and other studies support the belief that a stronger emphasis on dialogic types of reading, similar strategies and parent involvement, and training would improve effects (Kertoy, 1994; Whitehurst, Angel, Crone, & Fischel, 1994).

Zevenbergen et al. (1994) also recommended using classroom volunteers to provide one-to-one reading with the children which they believe greatly improves effectiveness. In addition, the researchers made modifications in the project, such as translating materials, to work more effectively with Spanish-speaking families. A similar reading study
involving home and school and read-aloud techniques reported positive results for parent read-aloud on vocabulary development of students in a kindergarten class (Hastings-Góngora, 1993). The effect of specific interactive strategies and the impact of reading strategies have been linked to language and literacy achievement (Hastings-Góngora, 1993; Kertoy, 1994; Morrow, 1992).

Whitehurst, Angel, Crone, and Fischel (1994) examined classroom and home-based related sources of variation in literacy practices and asked, what differential effects, if any, these variations have on children’s language and emergent literacy skills. Again, the interactive style of adult-child picture book reading, dialogic reading, was used as a method of intervention. Analysis reported no effects of classroom intervention or individual differences among classrooms in children’s language abilities at exit from Head Start. A difference had been expected based on the intervention which had been selected because of previous success with diverse populations, including Spanish-speaking children with normal development, children with developmental disabilities, and children from varied socioeconomic status.

In a study focusing on vocabulary acquisition of young children, Senechal and Cornell (1993), investigated the impact of a single storybook reading and the specific variation in parent behavior used when reading to children. Eighty 4-year-olds and eighty 5-year-olds were recruited in local day cares, nursery schools, and kindergarten
representing middle-class and upper-middle-class English-speaking families. One hundred and fifty-three of the children were Caucasian and seven were Asian.

Four reading behaviors were observed during a single reading of a story: use of questions, use of recasts, use of repetition to emphasize certain words, and reading the storybook verbatim. The questioning condition involved "what-or-where questions" as target words appeared. In the recasting condition, the experimenter repeated the sentence and replaced the target word with a synonym. Sentences with target words were simply repeated a second time for the repetition condition. The last condition involved a simple reading of the book as it was presented. Active participation and reading the book verbatim were found to have the same effects. However, an increase in children's receptive vocabulary showed a difference between the acquisition of receptive vocabulary and the acquisition of expressive vocabulary.

Sénéchal and Cornell (1993) provided several explanations for the lack of effect of active participation. First, the researchers suggested that the meaning for new receptive vocabulary might be acquired when presented in comprehensive context. Therefore, a child might learn new vocabulary by listening to the narrative and attempting to understand the new words. Second, the single reading may not be enough to allow for differences in vocabulary acquisition, as a result of reading practice, to surface. Third, receptive vocabulary may not be sensitive to the
various reading practices parents use though other dependent measures such as frequency of language exposure may be. Fourth, the four styles of reading were all initiated by adults which raises the need to investigate the possibility that effectiveness of participation may only be evident when it is initiated by the child. Finally, active participation may serve other purposes, such as motivating children to read (Senechal & Cornell, 1993).

Martinez and Teale (1993) investigated the storybook reading style of six kindergarten teachers. Five of the classrooms had 22 children and one had 20 children. All six classrooms were in suburban school districts composed of ethnically diverse middle-income families. Selection of the teachers for this study was based on a 3-year minimum teaching experience, recommendations from principals, teacher’s regular use of storybook reading, and positive attitudes toward storybook reading.

Both quantitative and qualitative methodology were used for the study on teacher storybook reading styles. Three main features of style emerged and were used to classify the data. The three features of storybook reading style were focus of the teacher talk, type of information teacher or children talked about, and strategies used for instruction. Martinez and Teale (1993) found that each teacher had a distinctive style with some variation across the three features of style.
According to Martinez and Teale (1993) the three features of storybook reading style were highlighted because they “revealed the styles most clearly” (p. 182). Herrera, a teacher in Martinez and Teale’s study, for example, was found (a) to focus teacher talk on textually and pictorially explicit information, (b) in her classroom the type of information teacher and children talked about were key elements of the story episodes, and (c) the instructional strategies she used most were reviewing and recapitulating.

No one storybook reading style was identified as being superior to the others. Martinez and Teale (1993) suggested that each style allows the teacher to “move students along different paths in literacy development” (p. 196). Though six distinctively different styles were identified by Martinez and Teale for each teacher, they also found that all of the teachers shared one characteristic in their reading style, they all dominated both the content and degree of talk about the storybook. The researchers concluded that this teacher-centered way of reading was characteristic of teachers in many kindergarten classrooms (Martinez & Teale, 1993).

Martinez and Teale (1993) suggested that future research could identify many more teacher storybook reading styles and/or could focus on the extent or impact of variation within a number of styles. In addition, the researchers believed subsequent research can pinpoint particular features of storybook reading styles and investigate the
relationships between these features or their effect on various aspects of children's literacy development. One such aspect, according to the researchers, is “story comprehension of target stories read by the teacher” (Martinez & Teale, 1993, p. 197). Martinez and Teale believed that the storybook reading experience “has a greater impact on young children's literacy development than any other literacy-related activity” (Martinez & Teale, 1993, p. 197).

Effects of frequent one-to-one readings on children from low socioeconomic status was the focus of one study that encouraged interaction between teacher and children (Morrow, 1988). The study investigated (a) whether frequent one-to-one story readings increased the number of story-related comments or questions children made, (b) if there was an effect on the type and complexity of children's comments or questions, and (c) if repeated readings of the same book made a difference on children's questions or comments. In this study, seventy-nine 4-year-old subjects were assigned to three different groups: Group 1 experienced readings from different books; Group 2 experienced repeated book readings with three books; and Group 3 was the control group.

The research assistants for the two experimental groups were trained to use three types of interactive behavior. First, in a managing role the researchers were to introduce the book and guide the children through a brief discussion about the book. Second, in a prompting role
they were to encourage questioning, commenting, and inference. Third, research assistants were to use “support and information” to explain and react to questions and comment on the story as well as helping children see relationships to real life experiences.

Morrow (1988) developed categories for coding children’s responses from transcript analysis of data from this study and from descriptions or categories used by other researchers. The major categories were (a) focus on story structure, (b) focus on meaning, and (c) focus on print and illustrations. Morrow’s (1988) study found an increase in number of comments and questions by both of the experimental groups. The researcher noted that responsiveness was not apparent until the fourth reading and attributed the increase to the interactive style of the adults plus the consistency in repetition of the reading experience (Morrow, 1988).

Kertoy (1994) expanded on Morrow’s (1988) study by investigating the effects of commenting or questioning strategies on the “complexity and spontaneity of responses” made by children (p. 61). Kertoy’s (1994) study involved 24 children attending a Montessori school. The children were randomly assigned to a comment, question, or control group. The researcher used one book as a warm-up and five other books for treatment. Questions and comments were pre-selected and strategically placed within the five storybooks in the order the research assistant would be reading them.
Children in the three groups for Kertoy's (1994) study were read the story individually. Individual readings were believed to be most appropriate in order to clearly record children talking and be able to acquire the necessary data for analysis. Comment units (c-units) were used to code utterances for analysis. Kertoy (1994) adapted four categories from Morrow's (1988) study: (a) focus on story structure, (b) focus on story meaning, (c) focus on print, and (d) focus on illustrations.

Findings from Kertoy's (1994) investigation suggested that commenting elicits more complex utterances from children involved in a joint storybook reading experience with an adult. Commenting was believed to encourage children to talk more while questioning was believed to elicit more complex responses to target questions. Further research with children from other socioeconomic groups was suggested since this investigation was limited to middle class subjects.

Story Reenactment or Story Dramatization

Story reenactment requires the use of virtually the same skills necessary for successful participation in sociodramatic play (Ishee & Goldhaber, 1990). Children must be able to reach consensus with peers regarding the play theme in the play experience, in addition to negotiating roles and outcomes of the storyline (Ishee & Goldhaber, 1990). Participation levels vary as children gain more experience and
confidence. Ishee and Goldhaber identified several levels of participation for children involved in story reenactment:

1. Observer--has a need to watch from afar or as part of an audience before participating at another level.

2. Walk on--will walk on to the stage and stands by other players to watch, but uses no gestures or verbalization.

3. Mime--sits in the audience and pretends to gesture the actions of several actors.

4. Mime plus--imitates the gestures and words of a particular actor.

5. Actor--is now acting with gestures and dialogue and little prompting.

6. Actor/author--in addition to actor role, suggests variations or their own story for reenactment.

7. Narrator--will narrate story with inanimate objects.

While some children jump from one role to another with great ease, others are more comfortable within a specific role and choose to stay in it for a while. While functioning as an observer, the teacher's role is as a facilitator guiding children through a strategically planned course of story reenactment. According to Ishee & Goldhaber (1990), 5-year-olds were not yet able to narrate with a group of children during story reenactment. Children as young as 3 years, however, are found to
be very capable of participating in story reenactment experiences (Howarth, 1989; Paley, 1992; Soundy & Genisio, 1994).

Techniques Encouraging Story Reenactment

Howarth (1989) described a unique method for preparing 3-year-olds to become adept participants in story reenactment experiences. Howarth suggested that the younger children be strategically introduced to parts of the story during free choice or on the playground. An example was with the story *The Three Billy Goats Gruff*, by Stevens (1987), where she set up a bridge and taught the children to recite the phrases. After a few sessions on the bridge, the children became familiarized with this part of the story and participated in the full production.

Paley's (1981, 1992) ethnographic observations of young children provided evidence of how storytelling techniques are used to teach young children and to learn about them. Paley described her classroom and the routine as one that daily incorporate acting out stories that the children are read, children's dictation of original stories, and children working as a group to act out the stories they tell. Paley provided insight into how the story production process has evolved as children work through challenging problems with the teacher acting as a guide.

Paley (1981) described how her kindergarten class began acting out original stories in *Wally's Stories*. An original story dictated by
Wally initiated an intense interest in story dictation and enactment by all the children. Previously, only a few girls had shown any interest in story dictation and writing their words had been the culminating point for this activity. Paley discovered that her kindergarten class needed to see their words in action to capture their meaning more effectively.

In *You Can't Say You Can't Play*, Paley (1992) described how children work through the issues of inclusion and rejection when the new rule, “You Can't Say You Can't Play” is instituted. Paley’s new rule encountered heavy resistance and scrutiny as she discussed it with children from fifth grade to kindergarten. Prior to this rule, children had selected who they wanted to act out their stories which consistently meant the exclusion of some children. The new rule allowed for children to be selected to act out a role by going around the rug, giving everyone a turn, and letting each child participate on an equal basis.

In addition to generating a more inclusive and fair environment when the new rule is instituted, Paley (1992) discovered that in the acting out of stories the children’s experiences were broadened. Children began to take on a broader range of roles when they happen to be next in line and are expected to take on whatever role is available. The challenges are many as girls take on roles usually played by boys, boys take on roles traditionally played by girls, and children who have never played an aggressive or submissive role get an opportunity to do so. Paley (1992) suggested that 5-year-olds are adeptly capable of thinking
and using language, at even higher development levels, when encouraged to create and dramatize their own stories.

Effectiveness of Story Reenactment

Story retelling has been linked to enhancement of story comprehension, understanding of story structure, and oral language development (Morrow, 1985, 1993). In the first of two studies conducted by Morrow (1985), children's story comprehension was enhanced after listening to the story and retelling it. Fifty-nine kindergarten children were randomly assigned to an experimental or control group. In addition to listening to the story, the experimental group was involved in pre- and post-discussions and were asked to retell the story to a researcher. Total comprehension scores were significant, although posttest scores were higher, they were not significantly so.

Morrow (1985) selected books for this study based on specific criteria. First, the books had to be similar in length and have well developed story structures which included character, setting, theme, plot, and resolution. Secondly, the stories "involved characters and concepts familiar to kindergartners" (p. 650). Finally, the books were unfamiliar to the children. According to Morrow (1985), one book, The Lonely Skyscraper, was used for pretesting. What's the Matter, Sylvie, Can't You Ride and The Bear on the Doorstep, were used as treatment and posttest books.
Morrow’s (1985) study involved reading a story to the children and having pre-and post-discussions with both an experimental and a treatment group. Following the discussions, the researcher had the children in the control group draw something based on the story. The experimental group did story retellings after being instructed to tell the story “as if telling it to a friend who had never heard it before” (Morrow, 1985, p. 650).

Morrow’s (1985) study indicated a significant difference only for total comprehension score. The magnitude of the difference, however, was quite small, only 3.1%. Therefore, Morrow speculated that if children had consistent experience in retelling that this might have a positive effect on their story comprehension. Morrow also concluded that adult supervision and assistance would be required.

In the second study, Morrow (1985) hypothesized that comprehension might be further enhanced when story retelling was frequently practiced and when children’s retellings were guided by an adult. A total of 82 children, 39 boys, and 43 girls from 17 kindergarten classrooms, were involved. The children attended schools located in urban and suburban areas and came from lower-middle class to upper-middle class socioeconomic levels. Subjects had a mean age of 5.2 years and ability levels that ranged from below average to above average. The following questions were the focus of this study:
1. Do practice and guidance in retelling stories improve a child's ability to answer structural and traditional comprehension questions about stories?

2. Do practice and guidance in retelling stories improve a child's ability to retell stories by including more structural elements in the narrative?


Morrow's (1984) second study utilized procedures from the first study, but it included eight consecutive treatments and guidance was given as needed during story retellings. Again a story comprehension test was administered in addition to the story retelling tests. Comprehension tests included five structural questions (related to setting, theme, plot, sequence, and goal or problem) and five traditional questions (related to information directly stated in the text which required the children to recall, interpret, and classify information. Retellings were tape-recorded after children listened to the story. Analysis of the retellings were conducted for inclusion of the story components.

Morrow's (1985) hypothesis that frequent practice in retelling would improve story comprehension scores was confirmed by the "large significant improvement that the experimental group made in all comprehension scores in study 2" (p. 657). Study results were attributed
to the frequent practice in retelling with adult guidance rather than simple rehearsal of the story (Morrow, 1985).

Morrow (1993) suggested that practice in retelling can help children improve this ability considerably. She stipulates that it is necessary for teachers to make children aware of their intent for the retellings. For example, if the teacher is attempting to teach the children about story sequence, she should ask children to concentrate on what happened first, second, and last. Morrow also recommended that when children are going to be expected to retell a story they should be told this before the story is read to them.

Other Literacy Involvement Activities

A different form of retelling, “storybook reenactment,” is described by Salinger (1988) as “children retelling the contents of a storybook as though reading to themselves” (p. 211). The child is asked to “read” a book that has been read to them to determine the child’s level of response to literacy. In the first level, children label and make comments about the pictures they see in the book, but they are not actually telling a story. Children at this level also skip or repeat parts of the text and primarily appear to be commenting to themselves. In the second level, “real storytelling governed by print,” children use a “book-like” or “speech-like” form of language and may use phrases from the actual storybook (Salinger, 1988, p. 214). Content of their “reading” may or
may not equate to the original story. The third level involves “real storytelling governed by print” and indicates that the child is reading or attempting to read some print (Salinger, 1988, p. 214). At this level, children are exhibiting an awareness of letter and sound combinations and comprehension. Children may sound out some words, skip others, and recognize some words from their environment. Storybook reenactment or children’s rereadings, at this point, typically match the actual content of the storybook.

A study on thematic-fantasy play by Pellegrini and Galda (1982) suggested that children are not able to remember complete stories before approximately 8 years of age. Story reconstruction through thematic-fantasy play, however, improved story comprehension for children in kindergarten and first grade. Two other methods of story reconstruction training, adult-lead discussion and drawing, were studied for their effects on story comprehension. Adult-lead discussions were found to be more effective than drawings, but less effective than thematic-fantasy play.

The 108 subjects for Pellegrini and Galda’s (1982) study involved an equal number of males and females from grades 1 and 2. Subjects were randomly assigned to one of the three treatment conditions. Experimenters worked with the children in groups of four in two separate training sessions. In the thematic-fantasy play condition, a story was read to the children after which experiments assigned each child a role
and asked the group to act out the story. Children in the adult-led discussion group were read the story and engaged in a discussion by an experimenter asking evaluative and clarification questions, such as “Which part did you like best?” Children in the drawing group were read the book and asked to draw what they could about the story. Experimenters audiotaped all discussion group interaction and videotaped the play episodes. After the second training session, a criterion-referenced test was given on the story read. Dependent measures were the scores on the criterion-referenced test and retelling test.

Another study by Galda, Pellegrini, and Cox (1989) involved university preschoolers and examined the relationship between symbolic play, metalinguistic awareness, and emergent literacy. Twenty-six 4½-year-olds and twenty-four 3½-year-olds were observed during classroom free play for 1 year. The first two objectives of this research were to study the predictive relationship between representational play, children’s metalinguistic verb usage, and development of writing and reading skills. The third objective was to “examine the predictive relation between metalinguistic verbs and performance on the concepts of print measure” (Galda, Pellegrini, & Cox, 1989, p. 294).

Galda, Pellegrini, and Cox’s (1989) study involved observations and audiotaping of nine 15-minute free-play sessions during the fall and winter terms. Children’s assessment measures, on the Peabody Picture
Vocabulary Test for receptive vocabulary and literate behavior, were used to control for ability. The children were given a writing task in which they were asked to tell, dictate, and write a story about a series of thematically oriented pictures. A reading task, administered twice, required that the children “read” age-appropriate books after having heard the experimenter read them. Shulzby's writing and reading models were used for analysis (Galda, Pellegrini, & Cox, 1989). Results indicate that the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) was the only significant predicatory of children's emergent literacy, while use of symbolic play was a positive predictor and the use of metalinguistic verbs was a negative predictor.

Dramatic Play Environment

One study investigated the dramatic play environment and features that influence preschool children’s dramatic play (Dodge & Frost, 1986). The purpose of Dodge and Frost's study was (a) to investigate how different materials and room arrangements influenced dramatic play and (b) to investigate the dramatic play of boys and girls in different settings. The research involved observations of same-sex pairs of children during 15 separate visits to a laboratory playroom. Each visit to the playroom lasted approximately 20 minutes. Several times during the study the researchers systematically redesigned the play environment. The sessions were videotaped and audiorecorded.
Dodge and Frost (1986) found that certain types of materials in the play environment stimulated children's dramatic play, while other materials brought about different kinds of play. Large numbers of items like foam, cylinders, and blocks encouraged construction while large movable items, such as cardboard boxes and telephone spools, stimulated pretend-play. Dodge and Frost's study substantiated previous studies which found that children preferred to play with materials that were action-oriented and that they could move around.

Dodge and Frost (1986) found that boys and girls responded differently in the home corner. The girls were comfortable in the home corner and manipulated the environment when necessary to support their imaginative play themes. Boys were hesitant and generally touched or picked up materials that were male-oriented. Boys preferred playing in the "store" rather than in the home corner. The researchers concluded that the "home corner tended to support pretend play in the female dyads but hindered such play in the male dyads" (Dodge & Frost, 1986, p. 168).

Dodge and Frost (1986) suggested that teachers needed to be aware of how the housekeeping corner can both encourage dramatic play and limit dramatic play. The researchers recommended setting up a non-thematic corner that would support dramatic play and be more inviting to both boys and girls. Such a corner might include large boxes or other moveable items with the periodic addition of props from some
of the other areas to further support dramatic play. Since the other corners are highly structured to meet specific theme-related objectives, a neutral setting is more supportive of a wide range of dramatic play themes.

Cultural Diversity and Education

Cultural conflict between schools and diverse populations often contribute to the problems experienced by minority students in today's schools. Dropout rates are highest for minority students and are believed to reflect the lack of success students experience in fitting into the cultural context of most American classrooms (Crawford, 1989; Cummins, 1989; Figueroa & Garcia, 1994; Garcia, 1993; Heath 1983; Schmidt, 1994). The issue of conflict between culture and public schools is magnified by emerging trends in demographics that underscore the United States as a nation of immigrants and refugees more than ever in its history (Figueroa & Garcia, 1994).

The past decade, 1980 to 1990, brought 9 million new immigrants to this country, the largest number of immigrants in the last 200 years (Davis, 1993). Most of these immigrants were Asian or Hispanic. For 1990, non-Hispanic whites represent 75.2% of the population; minority population growth continues toward comprising the majority (Davis, 1993; Figueroa & Garcia, 1994). By the year 2010, Texas, California, Florida, and New York are projected to have about one-third of the
nation's youth, and more than one-half of the youth will be minority (Davis, 1993). Non-white and Hispanics presently make up about 23% of the student population in grades K through 12, which is estimated to increase to 70% by the year 2026 (Figueroa & Garcia, 1994).

Along with the diversity in ethnicity, race, and culture, a diversity in languages spoken in the home is evident. In almost 14% of American households, the language spoken at home is a language other than English (Davis, 1993). Immense population growth, as well as predicted future growth, of culturally and linguistically diverse groups in this country has prompted public school systems to reassess educational programming for culturally diverse, non-English speaking students.

Bilingual Education

Schooling of linguistically and culturally diverse children is characterized by an overriding debate regarding instructional use of the second language. Early studies tried to uncover the intricacies of bilingualism—the how and why it might be beneficial. For many immigrants to the United States, bilingualism was envisioned as a linguistic, intellectual, and academic liability (Crawford, 1989). Families changed names and avoided native languages so that they could assimilate completely. Schools often reinforced the effort to extinguish native languages (Crawford, 1989; Cummins, 1989). More recent studies have concluded that bilingualism is not a liability (Snow, 1987,
1993; Wong-Filmore, 1991); some have associated bilingualism with higher cognitive functioning (Cummins, 1989; Hakuta & Garcia, 1989) or treated it as an additive (Soto, 1993).

Language programs are generally found to incorporate one of three methods: transitional bilingual education, maintenance bilingual education, or immersion. Bilingual education models in early childhood programs typically incorporate both languages to varying degrees. Transitional models stress native language use while the student learns English in preparation for mainstreaming, or transitioning, into an all-English classroom. In maintenance or developmental bilingual education the focus is on dual language development or an “additive” approach rather than supplanting the native language. Immersion programs, on the other hand, involve teaching in English with limited use of the native language since more concentrated doses of English, as early as possible, are believed to produce a greater advantage (Spodek, 1993). Though prevailing models are distinguishable by the theory or methodology adopted, they all seem to share a common goal: to help students acquire the level of language proficiency necessary, in English, to achieve academic success (Cummins, 1989; Tabors & Snow, 1994).

A common concern in adapting these programs for young children in determining what language is the most appropriate for instructional use in an early childhood setting. While some strongly advocate for home-language instruction, others believe in dual instruction or believe
the best practice is to immerse children into total English instruction. Home-language advocates argue that skills and concepts can be taught in the language the child already knows and that learning a second language while learning skills and concepts can have detrimental academic and sociocultural results (Soto, 1993; Wong-Filmore, 1991).

Programs reporting to incorporate both languages have not proven to be without pitfalls. Evidence shows that invariably teachers favor one language over the other and that children are not benefitting from instruction where the lesson is simply repeated in the second language (Crawford, 1989). Results from most studies indicate that English language proficiency and academic concept development evolve most effectively when the first language is utilized (Crawford, 1989; Cummins, 1989; Freeman & Freeman, 1994; Lindholm, 1991; Medina, 1991, 1993; Soto, 1993).

One particular study examined Spanish and English language proficiency and academic achievement of second- and third-grade English and Spanish speakers in a two-way bilingual/immersion model (Lindholm, 1991). The three assumptions forming the basis of this model were addressed and supported: (a) levels of proficiency have an effect on cognitive processing, (b) academic and communicative language proficiencies are distance, and (c) transfer of content does occur across languages. This study emphasized the importance of utilizing the first
language to reach dual language proficiency which can lead to higher levels of academic achievement in English (Lindholm, 1991).

Another study examined two proficiently different Spanish limited English proficient groups, in grades 1 through 8, and concluded that to achieve a maintenance bilingual education (MBE) programs' goal of full bilingualism, the native language must be used as the means of early instruction (Medina, 1991). A subsequent study involving basically the same grades and an analysis of reading and mathematics achievement resulted in findings strongly supporting the potential mediation effects of native language proficiency on Spanish achievement outcomes (Medina, 1993).

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate preschool children's story retelling and comprehension abilities after storybook reading and storybook reenactment experiences. The storybook reading and storybook reenactment was conducted either bilingually (English/Spanish) or in English only. Research reviewed for this study includes investigations of diverse strategies, practices, and program models seeking answers to some of the more perplexing questions related to providing developmentally and culturally appropriate curriculum that supports language and literacy development in young children.
Strategies believed to have positive effects focused on some form of story reconstruction, such as thematic-fantasy play, story reenactment, storybook reenactment (children's readings), story retelling, and practice in story retelling (Morrow, 1985, 1993; Pelligrini & Galda, 1982; Salinger, 1988). Story reconstruction strategies are thought to be helpful, to larger or lesser degrees, for working with young children in bilingual education programs (Lindholm, 1991; Medina, 1991; Spodek, 1993).

Research which specifically focused on the effects of storybook reenactment on story retellings of non-English speaking children was not located. Studies of this nature are necessary to further understanding of how to best serve language diverse children acquire the language and literacy skills required for academic achievement. In addition to investigating the effects of storybook reenactment on preschool children's story retelling and story comprehension abilities, this study also compared the effects of reenactment when conducted either bilingually (English/Spanish) or in English only.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of two independent variables, story reenactment and language of instruction, on story retelling, comprehension, and literacy response level as measured by interview questions and retelling procedures. While story reenactment has been found to be an effective strategy in English-only settings with young children, the input of instructional language on story retelling and story comprehension has not been explored. In addition to these quantitative measures, a qualitative study of children's learning center play related to the target story and teacher's beliefs and practices for storybook use was undertaken.

This section includes a description of subjects, setting, procedures experienced, quantitative instrumentation and qualitative instrumentation, research design, and statistical analysis. The final data collection process and book selection were based on the results of a pilot study, therefore, the book selection and pilot study are also included in this section.

This study was conducted at a Head Start center in the city of Albuquerque, New Mexico. The center is located in a neighborhood
populated by large numbers of low socioeconomic families. The center was selected based on location, population served, and willingness of program director, and center staff to participate in the study. Consent for subject participation was acquired from subjects and each subject’s parent or guardian (Appendix A). This study was conducted during the months of February, March, and April, 1996.

Subjects

Sixty-seven Head Start children participated in this study. Subjects were enrolled in a Head Start center serving a total of 257 children in southeast Albuquerque. Approximately 80% of the children are classified as Hispanic. Head Start families involved at this center are predominantly Hispanic and include recent immigrants from Mexico, first and second generation Spanish-Americans, and Mexican-Americans. A few children are immigrants from Central and South America. About 1% of the children are classified by the program as Asian or Pacific Islander, approximately 4% are Black, 6% are White, and 10% are Native-American.

Thirty-four of the subjects were boys and 33 of the subjects were girls. At the time of this study almost half, or 33 of the subjects, were 4-year-olds. The number of 4-year-olds in the study is reflective of the percentage of 4-year-olds enrolled at the center. Four-year-olds account for 54.3% of the total program enrollment. Twenty-two subjects were 5
years old and 12 were 3 years old. Subjects had been enrolled in the program approximately 7 months. Three subjects were absent during the story readings or the testing period and were dropped from the data analysis. One child was dropped because she refused to participate.

Fifty-two of the subjects were Hispanic, 10 were Native-American, 2 were Black and Hispanic, 1 was Black, 1 was White, and 1 was Vietnamese. Representation of explicit Hispanic origin was not specified for all the subjects although two of the teachers indicated during interviews that they had children who were Mexican, Cuban, and Central or South American. In addition, the distinction between families who consider themselves Spanish-American and those who consider themselves Mexican-American was indeterminate from the documentation available.

Twenty-five of the children were from homes where English and Spanish were spoken or homes that had been identified by the teachers as “bilingual Spanish/English.” Twenty-three of the children came from homes identified by the teachers as predominantly Spanish-speaking. Fourteen children came from homes where English was the only language spoken. Five of the families had indicated that English and a language other than Spanish was spoken in the home (1 Vietnamese, 1 Navajo, 3 Pueblo Indian).
Setting Description

The Head Start program is located in a building previously occupied as an elementary school. Classrooms are similar in structure and vary in size with some rooms having slightly more space than others. The four classrooms used for this study are set up in Learning Centers and have an area designated for large group activity. Each classroom includes several learning centers including a library, dramatic play or housekeeping, discovery, art, music, block, and a mathematics or manipulative center.

Each classroom operates on a half-day schedule that provides services to one group of children in the morning and a different group of children in the afternoon (Appendix B). Morning classes were used for the purposes of this particular study. Teachers generally follow a daily schedule provided by the central office though they have the flexibility to deviate from the schedule with proper planning. Most of the children are bused to the center.

Though all the teachers follow the same basic schedule, the use of time for each activity varies according to the teacher. Basically, in a 4-hour time span, the children eat breakfast, have group time, work/play in learning centers, play outdoors, eat lunch, and prepare to go home. Children eat breakfast between 8:00 and 8:30 in the morning. The approximate time spent in group time is 15 minutes. Learning center time is usually scheduled to last between 45 minutes to 1 hour. Outdoor
play can run between 30 to 45 minutes. Lunch is scheduled for 11:00 a.m. and is over by 11:30 a.m. Time is then spent cleaning up the room, taking care of bathroom needs, and preparing to go home. Teachers take the children to their buses at 11:40 a.m. or wait for parents to pick them up.

One teacher and a teacher’s aide work with the children. The teacher is responsible for developing the lesson plans with assistance from the teacher’s aide. Lesson plans are collected and reviewed by an Education Specialist 2 weeks before they are implemented. Occasionally a volunteer parent or grandparent may come in to help in the classroom or supervise during outdoor play.

All four teachers in the study groups have a Child Development Associate (CDA) credential, however, teacher experience in Head Start and professional training varies considerably among the four teachers. The teacher for Group A has been with the program the longest, 29 years. The Group C teacher has 8 years, the Group D teacher has 5 years, and the Group B teacher has 2 years experience with Head Start. Selection of teachers and classrooms was done by the Education Specialist and central office and based on teacher stability with the program and willingness to participate in this study.

The national and local political climates at the time of this study were perceived as having a negative impact on the Head Start program and program staff performance. Nationally, the government had recently
experienced a shutdown because the “government fiscal year had ended and Congress hadn’t yet approved spending plans for the next year” (Turque & Thomas, 1995, p. 26). In previous years, Congress had passed continuing resolutions to pay the bills for government funded agencies, however, this time Congress and the president could not come to an agreement. The possibility of a shutdown created stressful situations for programs and federal employees across the country.

Locally the political situation was also tenuous because Head Start was operating under the governance of an interim grantee. The previous grantee had been terminated and the new grantee was not announced until the beginning of April. Uncertainty and possible administrative changes created added stress for Head Start staff who were already feeling insecure about keeping their jobs. The program experienced unusual staff turnover between the months of November and December, 1995, and January, February, and March, 1996. Inability of the Head Start program to reach full enrollment was also attributed to the political climate.

Procedure

This study is a clinical case study employing both qualitative and quantitative measures that compared four different treatment groups. The four treatment groups were randomly assigned to one of the treatment conditions based on the two independent variables:
reenactment versus discussion and English only versus bilingual presentation of the story. Group A was involved in storybook reading, discussion, and reenactment in English only; Group B was involved in bilingual, English/Spanish, storybook reading, discussion, and reenactment; Group C was involved in storybook reading and discussion in English only; and Group D was involved in storybook reading and a bilingual discussion. The number of children per classroom were: Group A--18, Group B--13, Group C--19, and Group D--17. Storybook reading and dramatization procedures were developed based on a process originally by Howarth (1989) for reenacting fairy tales (Appendix C). No bias was believed to exist with any group with regard to language.

The researcher conducted the storybook readings and storybook reenactments during a 3 week period. Posttesting included a story comprehension test, a story retelling test, and a storybook reenactment evaluation. The storybook reenactment evaluation was conducted approximately 1 week after the story was read to the children. Story comprehension and story retelling tests were administered immediately after completion of the story reading and discussion or reenactment sessions. All testing was administered by the researcher in a room provided by the program.

Coyote: A Trickster Tale From the American Southwest, by Gerald McDermott (1994), was read to the children in each class as a group. The readings were conducted during the regularly scheduled group time.
Each reading began with the same introduction of the book, the title was given, and the children were told that “this is a story about a blue coyote that is always getting into trouble.” The researcher read the book while holding it so that it faced the children and they were all able to see the pictures.

Group A was read the storybook in English and involved in a discussion after the reading. During the reading, the researcher acknowledged comments or responded to questions about the story. After the story was read, the researcher led the group in a discussion by asking the following questions: What did you think of this story? What was your favorite part of the story?

All the children were encouraged by the researcher to engage in the discussion by going around the circle and giving each of them a chance to respond to the questions. The researcher led the discussion in English though children were encouraged to participate in the language of their choice. Discussion time averaged about 8 minutes.

The following day, Group A was again read the story in English and involved in a discussion. This time the group discussion was followed by a reenactment of the story. The reenactment was led by the researcher and also conducted in English. The researcher explained the process for reenactment of the story and answered children’s questions. Main character roles (Coyote and Old Man Crow) and support roles (Snake, Badger, Woodpecker, and group of crows) were all assigned by
going around the circle and giving each child an opportunity to participate. As suggested by the researcher, if a child did not want to perform a major role they were given the option of being with the group of crows. Two children in Group A decided they wanted to sit and watch. The researcher narrated the story and led the children in the reenactment by asking the children to “act it out” or “pretend.” The researcher also encouraged the children to say the dialogue parts for their characters, for example, all the crows say to Coyote, “Give me my feathers back!”

For the second reenactment, children who wanted to switch roles were given the opportunity to do so. Most children decided to stay in the same role. By the second reenactment the children were able to reenact the story and perform their parts with more ease. The story was reenacted a third time to allow those who wanted to perform a different role a chance to do so.

The same procedure for the story reading and reenactment was followed with Group B except that it was conducted bilingually, in English and Spanish. Reading of the storybook was done page by page in English and in Spanish. Responses to children’s questions or comments were conducted in the child’s language of choice. Discussion questions were given in English and repeated in Spanish as follows: What did you think of this story? Que piensan ustedes de esta historia? What was
your favorite part of the story? Que parte de la historia fue la favorita o les gusto mas?

Story reenactments for Group B followed the same sequence as for Group A. Groups C and D were read the storybook and involved in a discussion (no reenactment) using the same questions. Group C was read the storybook and led in the discussion in English. Group D was read the storybook and led in a discussion, bilingually in English and Spanish. Discussion questions were stated in both languages and discussions generally followed in English and Spanish. Story readings, story reenactments, and group discussions were videotaped.

Quantitative Instrumentation

Three instruments modeled after the work of researchers in the field were developed by the researcher. The Storybook Comprehension Test (Appendix D) and the Storybook Guidesheet/Scoresheet (Appendix E), were modified as a result of pilot testing. The Levels of Literacy Response Evaluation (Appendix F) was adapted from Salinger (1988) and the researcher did not pilot test it.

The Story Comprehension Test was adapted from procedures developed by Morrow (1993) for research involving kindergarten children. According to Morrow, story comprehension can be assessed by measuring the child’s knowledge of specific elements of the story’s structure (e.g., setting, characters, theme, plot episodes, and resolution).
This instrument included six questions which were scored one point each (Appendix D).

The second instrument, the Storybook Guidesheet/Scoresheet, was developed from instruments originally designed by Morrow to guide and score kindergarten children's retelling of a story. The Storybook Guidesheet/Scoresheet for Grading the Retelling of *Coyote: A Trickster Take From the American Southwest* (McDermott, 1994) has six major sections: characters, setting, theme, plot episodes, resulting, and sequence (Appendix E). A scoring system worth 16 points total was used.

A third instrument, the Levels of Literacy Response, was developed from a process which is called "storybook reenactment" that is used to assess the literacy level from a child's rereading of a storybook after it is read to them (Salinger, 1988). This process involved handing children the storybook after it has been read to them and asking them to "read the story to me, please." Children's responses are classified in one of three levels: "(a) descriptive comments governed by pictures, but not telling a story, (b) real storytelling governed by pictures, and (c) real storytelling governed by print" (Salinger, 1988, p. 211) (Appendix F).

Qualitative Data Collection

Qualitative data was gathered throughout the study primarily involved participant observer methodology. The researcher conducted
observations of the children in the library center and the dramatic play center to gather data relevant to children's extensions of the target text. Informal interviews by the researcher gathered data regarding teacher beliefs and practices that were relevant to the types of literacy experiences provided in the classroom. Fieldnotes, videotaping, and audiotaping documented the data collection.

The primary way qualitative data was documented was through fieldnotes. Fieldnotes are described as a “written record of what the researcher has seen and heard in the field and his or her own feelings, reactions, and thoughts” (Stainback & Stainback, 1988, p. 112). Fieldnotes were recorded in a comprehensive format as soon as the researcher left the research setting. While at the research setting the researcher kept abbreviated notes whenever possible or recorded notes as soon as possible upon leaving the research setting. Taking notes while at the research site can sometimes become obtrusive and impede the researcher from participating to the fullest extent or paying close attention to details. Taking notes while interviewing can also make informants uncomfortable or less willing to share information (Stainback & Stainback, 1988).

At the start of this investigation an orientation meeting was conducted by the researcher to inform the Head Start education specialist, center director, and teachers about the scope of this study. A preliminary schedule was developed with the education specialist and
shared with the teachers and center director (Appendix H). A detailed procedure for conducting the study with each group was also developed and shared with the teachers (Appendix I). The researcher met with each teacher informally to go over the procedures and answer any questions.

Stainback and Stainback (1988) recommended that the researcher, as a participant observer, enter into the natural setting of the persons under study and systematically and unobtrusively collect data on what they say and do. This approach requires that the researcher strive to maintain an appropriate balance between participation and observation (Bogden & Biklen, 1992). The degree of participation is determined by the focus of the study and the purpose for participation. Participation enables data collection needed for the study from an insider’s perspective (Bogden & Biklen, 1992). Data were documented in the form of fieldnotes and transcripts from audiotaping and videotaping. Initial visits to the research setting enabled this researcher to blend into the natural setting and become accepted as one of the teachers. Spending time in the classroom with the teachers reassured them that the researcher was not there to watch and criticize or to spy on them.

The researcher also established a sense of trust with the children by spending time in the classroom talking to them and reading books to them (Appendix H). During initial visits the researcher brought the video camera in to get teachers and children used to having it around. Establishing positive rapport and a comfortable atmosphere are critical
for the purpose of gaining access to necessary information for the investigation (Stainback & Stainback, 1988).

As a participant observer, the researcher had the opportunity to participate in various capacities which included working with the children, supervision of children during learning centers and outdoor play time, preparation of classroom materials, and general clean-up duties. Most of the time spent working with the children occurred as children needed assistance during learning center time (e.g., getting materials, mediating disagreements) or during planned group activities (e.g., making Easter baskets, making Easter greeting cards). Supervision of the children during learning center and outdoor play time also involved walking around the classroom or playground to make sure the children were safe and engaged in activities.

The researcher assisted the teachers in preparation of materials and with other classroom duties. Teachers usually had several things that needed to get done, such as patterns that needed cutting out, papers to sort, bulletin boards to update, and children’s work that needed to be put up for display. There were also notices or newsletters that had to be sorted along with anything else that the children were to take home at the end of the session.

Clean-up duties were ongoing and usually revolved around preparation for, or clean-up after, mealtimes. The researcher and the children would clean-up the classroom tables in preparation for breakfast.
and lunch. Two helpers for the day were accompanied by the researcher to the kitchen to get their classroom’s food cart. After meals children cleaned their own places and the researcher assisted the helpers in putting the serving dishes and utensils on the food cart. Again, the two helpers for the day were accompanied by the researcher to the kitchen to return the cart. Sometimes mealtime clean-up also involved sweeping the floors, mopping up spills, and collecting trash.

On two separate occasions the researcher was asked to step in for the teacher’s aide who was absent in classroom D. The researcher performed all the teacher’s aid duties except for the paperwork. Generally, the teacher’s aide assists the teacher by taking care of the classroom clean-up, supplies and equipment, helping with mealtimes, bathroom duties, and supervision of the children. Occasionally, some of the children asked the researcher to read a book or join them in a play activity. The researcher helped the children prepare to go home (e.g., put away materials and equipment, gather personal belongings), walked them to the bus pick-up point, and stayed with them until they were all on the correct bus.

After the children were gone, the researcher helped the teacher to prepare for the next session. The classroom had to be put back in order and materials were replenished where needed. The teacher also asked for assistance in sorting out children’s clothing from the clothing bank (a box of second hand clothes). After the clothing was sorted, the
researcher labeled each item with children’s names as indicated by the teacher.

Participant observation sessions were videotaped to allow the researcher to function as a participant observer and be able to view and review the videos at the end of each session. Several viewings of the videos were conducted as the researcher transcribed the dialogue and actions from the videotaped observation sessions. Additional viewing of the videos allowed the researcher to edit written transcripts for accuracy and detail of participant actions or statements.

Classroom observations were also conducted by the researcher during selected learning center and dramatic play center time for each classroom. Observations of activity in the library and dramatic play centers focused on spontaneous responses to the Coyote story in these centers. Each of the four study groups was observed three different times in the library center and three different times in the dramatic play center. Observation periods in the naturalistic settings generally lasted about 20 minutes and were recorded in the form of fieldnotes.

Observations of a teacher planning session for each group were also conducted to acquire data about teacher planning for the inclusion of storybooks and storybook extension activities in their lesson plans. In addition, teacher perspectives regarding the use of storybooks and related literacy activities were sought. Each teacher planning session was documented in detailed fieldnotes.
Another data collection method used for this study was informal interviewing. An important goal in interviewing is to acquire relevant information from a key informant's perspective (Stainback & Stainback, 1988). Interviews with teachers, conducted once at the beginning of the study and once at the end of the study, were audiotape recorded to acquire authentic transcripts of teachers' beliefs and attitudes regarding storybook reading, reenactment, or other storybook extension activities. The following set of questions focused the interviews on the topic of storybooks in the classroom:

1. How often do you read storybooks to children?
2. Do you organize activities for children as follow-up to reading aloud? What are they?
3. What value do you see in reading aloud to children?
4. Do you ever see children acting out roles, sing songs, using words, or any other spontaneous response to book reading?

Throughout the study, informal interviews were also documented as the researcher asked the teachers to share their observations of the children during learning center time. Teachers were asked to keep a log to document their observations, in the library and dramatic play centers, of children's spontaneous responses to the storybook readings. Each documentation included the data and a description of what was observed along with any comments the teacher felt were important.
Book Selection and Pilot Study

The storybook selected was written by Gerald McDermott (1994) and is called *Coyote: A Trickster Tale From the American Southwest*, or in Spanish, *Coyote: Un Folclorico Del Sudoeste De Estados Unidos*. This particular book met several criteria. First, children in a pilot study responded to the book very favorably. Second, the book was available in both English and Spanish. Third, the book was unfamiliar to the children and teachers participating in the study. Finally, the following book selection guidelines recommended by Jalongo (1992) were used to evaluate the book and determine that the book was appropriate for the group of young children participating in this study:

1. Does the book compare favorably with other picture books of its type?
2. Has the picture book received the endorsement of professionals?
3. Are the literary elements of plot, theme, character, style, and setting used effectively?
4. Do the pictures complement the story?
5. Is the story free from ethic, racial, or sex-role stereotypes?
6. Is the picture book developmentally appropriate for the child?
7. Do preschoolers respond enthusiastically to the book?
8. Is the topic (and the book’s treatment of it) suitable for the young child?
9. Does the picture book appeal to the parent or teacher?

Additional evaluation questions for illustrations:

1. Are the illustrations and text synchronized?

2. Does the mood conveyed by the art work (humorous/serious, rollicking/quiet) complement that of the story?

3. Are the illustrative details consistent with the text?

4. Could a child get a sense of the basic concepts or story sequence by looking at the pictures?

5. Are the illustrations or photographs aesthetically pleasing?

6. Is the printing (clarity, form, line, color) of good quality?

7. Can children view and review the illustrations, each time getting more from them?

8. Are the illustrative style and complexity suited to the age level of the intended audience?

The results of the pilot study also showed that children responded favorably to the selected text both before and after it was read to them. Prior to reading the book in the pilot study, the researcher asked six children to look at three books and select the book that they would like to hear read to them or the one that looked the most interesting. Four of the children selected Coyote while the other two children selected a book called Stellaluna (Cannon, 1993). The book that was not selected by any of the children was The True Story of the 3 Little Pigs (Scieszka, 1989).
During the pilot study all six children were individually read the Coyote story. Half of the children asked the researcher to read the story again while two of them asked if they could look at the book some more. After the reading the researcher asked the children, “What do you like the most about the book?” The children’s responses included that they liked the colors, the “silly Coyote,” and the pictures. The researcher also read Stellaluna to the two children who had selected it and found that it was too long and the children began to lose interest about three-fourths of the way through the reading.

During the pilot study the researcher tested the story comprehension test and the story retelling test in addition to evaluating the treatment process and guidelines. As a result of the pilot study, several changes were incorporated. First, the comprehension testing instrument and scoresheet were modified to better accommodate the developmental level of this age group. This involved changing wording that some children had trouble comprehending, for example, instead of asking, “Who is the main character in this story?,” the question was changed to, “Who is this story about?” Second, there appeared to be too many questions for the story comprehension test, therefore, multiple-choice questions were removed and only open-ended questions were retained.

Third, the last part of the story comprehension test asked children to organize a series of six pictures from the story in the order they
occurred. Six pictures appeared to be too many for the children to work with, they became frustrated and lost interest in the activity. The fact that the pictures were also black and white photocopies instead of the original colored pictures may have contributed to the children having difficulty arranging the pictures in sequence. Therefore, three actual pictures from the book were selected to be used for the sequence portion of the story comprehension test.

A fifth change related to the story guidesheet for grading the retelling of Coyote and involved eliminating items in the plot episodes that were believed to be nonessential. The sixth and last change that was incorporated as a result of the pilot study involved the reenactment part of the procedure. During the pilot, children were tested individually and acted out the role of the main character, the Coyote, while the researcher acted out the other characters. In addition to allowing the necessary time for the children to get comfortable with the idea of reenacting the story, it became cumbersome for the researcher to act out the other roles. When the children were allowed to reenact the story in a small group, they became more comfortable and involved. Therefore, the children were kept in their regular classroom groups for the reenactment portion of the procedure in the actual study.
Data Organization and Analysis

Data analysis were conducted using both quantitative and qualitative procedures. Quantitative analysis of data determined the effect of the two independent variables. Analysis of variance procedures were performed with measures of retelling and comprehension to analyze individual variables separately. In addition, chi-square tests were conducted to compare differences in literacy response levels of children's storybook rereadings.

Qualitative data analysis were ongoing as the researcher gathered data from interviews and classroom observations and prepared transcripts. Transcript analysis of videotaped classroom observations were conducted at the end of each session or soon after. Several viewings of the videos were conducted as the researcher transcribed the dialogue and actions during the classroom observation sessions into written transcripts. The researcher conducted daily reviews of fieldnotes, audio and videotape transcripts, and fieldnotes documenting informal interviews.

Bogden and Biklen (1992) believed that qualitative investigations require constant and persistent reviewing of data gathered daily. According to Bogden and Biklen, the researcher continuously organizes and categorizes information in search of any patterns, relationships, or commonalities that may exist. A constant comparative approach was used to allow relevant data to generate systematically as the researcher
transcribed taped interviews and fieldnotes into transcripts on a daily basis.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the story retelling and comprehension abilities of preschool children who have experienced storybook reading and storybook reenactment bilingually, in English and Spanish, or in English only. Quantitative measures were used in comparing four treatment groups: Group A--storybook reading and reenactment in English only; Group B--bilingual storybook reading and reenactment; Group C--storybook reading and discussion in English only; Group D--bilingual storybook reading and discussion.

This study focused on five research questions:

1. Does storybook reenactment have an effect on children’s storybook retelling ability? Is the effect on storybook retelling the same for storybook reading and reenactment bilingually (English/Spanish) or in English only?

A factorial analysis of variance was conducted to test the hypothesis that children’s storybook retelling scores would differ in terms of their experiences with storybook reenactment and language used. Storybook reenactment did have a significant effect on children’s storybook retellings. The interaction between language and story
reenactment experiences was not significant--$F(1,63) = 1.26, p > .05$. As seen in Table 1, the mean retelling scores ranged from 9.54 (Group B) to 7.18 (Group D) of a total possible score of 16. In addition, the minimum, maximum, and median scores per group, as well as the number of subjects per groups is displayed in Table 1.

Table 1

**Descriptive Statistics of Groups in Terms of Retelling Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum Score</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A--English/reenactment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B--Bilingual/reenactment</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C--English/discussion</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D--Bilingual/discussion</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Language--$F(1,63) = 1.26, p > .05$; reenactment--$F(1,65) = 7.73, p < .05.*
2. Does storybook reenactment have an effect on Head Start children's story comprehension ability? Is the effect on comprehension the same for storybook reading and reenactment conducted bilingually (English/Spanish) or in English only?

An analysis of variance was conducted to test the hypothesis that storybook reenactment would affect children in terms of story comprehension. As seen in Table 2, children's story comprehension was

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics of Groups in Terms of Story Comprehension Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum Score</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A reenactment</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B reenactment</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C no reenactment</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group D no reenactment</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $F(1,65) = 13.61, p < .05.$
affected by reenactment $F(2,64) = 6.73, p < .05$. Univariate analysis of variances were conducted to test the independent effect of reenactment on story comprehension. Comprehension of children who experienced story reenactment was significantly higher than those who did not experience story reenactment. The average comprehension score for reenactment was 4.32 while the average comprehension score without reenactment was 3.25. Reenactment scores were significantly higher than the non-reenactment scores $F(1,65) = 7.73, p < .05$.

3. Does storybook reenactment have an effect on children’s Level of Literacy Responses? Is the effect on literacy response the same for storybook reading and reenactment conducted bilingually (English/Spanish) or in English only?

Analysis of scores for the Levels of Literacy Response (Children’s Storybook Rereadings) evaluation as seen in Table 3 provides composite scores for the total group, scores for reenactment and non-reenactment groups, and individual group scores. None of the children scored in Level 3, “real storytelling governed by print,” which indicates that the child is reading or attempting to read some print. Children at the third level are exhibiting an awareness of letter and sound combinations and comprehension. Of the reenactment group, 68% were at Level 2 while only 47% of the non-reenactment group were at Level 2.

Based on the data presented in Table 3, chi-square analyses were conducted to determine the relationship between reenactment
Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Groups in Terms of Levels of Literacy Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Level #1</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Level #2</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Level #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group D</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

experiences and Level of Literacy Response. Since no children scored in the 3rd Literacy Level, this level was omitted from the chi-square analyses. There was a significant relationship between reenactment experiences and Level of Literacy Response, chi-square (1, N = 67) = 4.06, p < .05. Those children participating in reenactment were more likely to be at Literacy Level 2. Those who did not receive reenactment were independent of literacy levels, chi-square (1, N = 36) = 0.12, p > .05.
4. Do Head Start children who have experienced bilingual, English/Spanish, storybook reading, and story reenactment and Head Start children who have experienced storybook reading and reenactment only in English engage in learning center experiences that extend the story?

Though some storybook extensions were observed they were limited and do not provide sufficient information to determine whether storybook reenactment influenced children’s extensions into learning center experiences. It is possible that a more extensive observation period is needed in order to gather the necessary information. The data gathered, however, did provide information regarding the children’s experiences in the learning centers.

Three major categories for themes were observed in the dramatic play and library centers: (a) child choice, (b) curriculum theme, and (c) Coyote story theme. According to the data in Table 4, most of the time children selected play themes (choice events) that were not preplanned by the teachers or influenced by storybook readings. Five storybook extensions were observed, one in the dramatic play center and four in the library center (Appendix J).

Child choice themes refers to themes selected for learning center play that were strictly based on what the child or children were interested in playing. Curriculum themes include curriculum idea selected and
Table 4

Frequency and Participation in Dramatic Play and Library Center Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Dramatic Center</th>
<th>Library Center</th>
<th>Composite Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choice events</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme events</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyote events</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total events</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Girls</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Boys</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

preplanned by the teacher. Coyote story theme refers to learning center activity that was influenced by the target story.

Children did not seem to be influenced by the teacher's preplanned ideas for themes, however they did appear to be influenced by the play environment, particularly in the dramatic play center. Dramatic play centers are sometimes referred to as housekeeping centers and are set up to resemble a typical family kitchen and bedroom. Child-size furniture includes a kitchen table, sink, refrigerator, stove and cabinets, with a few
doll beds, and an array of dolls. The setting itself may be more inviting to girls than to boys. In addition, the learning centers include a child-size closet with dress-up clothes which included dresses, shoes, and hats for girls and a limited number of items for boys.

Most of the play themes in the dramatic play center predominantly involved some aspect of “mother caring for children” as seen in Table 5, learning center play themes. Children also decided which children would be involved in their play theme. The mother and child theme was a part of every learning center event observed in the dramatic play center. The total number of girls involved in the dramatic play and library centers were 53 while 16 boys total participated. The fact that girls dominated learning center play may help explain why most of the play themes were focused on “mother caring for children” types of scenarios.

Curriculum themes are topic themes selected by Head Start central office staff and center staff. Teachers, however, have the flexibility to incorporate different ideas into lesson plans and plan activities related to the themes. Teachers are encouraged to be creative and develop their own ideas for addressing the themes. Eight different themes were suggested in the curriculum for the months of March and April. As seen in Table 6, Teacher D was the only teacher to deviate from the recommended curriculum themes by selecting to incorporate the themes of Mardigras and Native-Americans.
Table 5

Learning Center Play Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Play Theme</th>
<th>Number of Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dramatic Learning Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child initiated/child choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother caring for child/children</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus ride</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/school</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food preparation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyote related themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One coyote chasing children</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Library Center Themes**               |                  |
| Child initiated/child choice            |                  |
|   Books on variety of topics            | 6                |
| Curriculum themes                       |                  |
|   Books on Easter, farming, or farm animals | 5          |
| Coyote related                          |                  |
|   Coyote book reading events            | 4                |
| **Total**                               | 15               |
Table 6

Group Comparisons of Curriculum Themes, Books, and Teacher Selected Dramatic Play Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Curriculum Theme</th>
<th>Books Read to Children</th>
<th>Teacher Selected Dramatic Play Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 4-27</td>
<td>Clouds and wind</td>
<td>Animals of Buttercup Farm, Good Morning Chick, Gilberto and the Wind, April Showers, Cold has Passed, Rosie’s Walk, The Apple and the Moth, The Very Hungry Caterpillar</td>
<td>Making farm animal sounds. Float like clouds. Float like clouds around the room. Pretend to be a Leprechaun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8-19</td>
<td>Nature and spring</td>
<td>Dandelion</td>
<td>Pretend to be a florist. Pretend to sell and deliver flowers. Pretend to be a farmer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mariposa, I was Walking Down the Road, Old Lady Who Swallowed a Fly</td>
<td>Do story: Mariposa (butterfly).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 29-</td>
<td>Zoo Animals</td>
<td>Pretend to be a zoo.</td>
<td>Keeper, to be a farmer, to be an animal trainer. Pretend to be an elephant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Very Hungry Caterpillar, Other: Flannelboard, The Turnip Story</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Curriculum Theme</th>
<th>Books Read to Children</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 5-15</td>
<td>Pets St. Patrick’s</td>
<td>The Pet Story, Francisco’s Puppy, A Rare Pet, Spots, The Orange Striped Cat</td>
<td>Have a pet store. Have a pet store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-29</td>
<td>Weather Easter</td>
<td>Peter Cotton Tail</td>
<td>Prepare food for Easter dinner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8-19</td>
<td>Food preparation</td>
<td>The Prize Rooster, Mimosa the Hen</td>
<td>Dress up as farmers. Farm Animals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 22-</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Planting a Rainbow, In the Tall, Tall Grass</td>
<td>Spring cleaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(table continues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Curriculum Theme</td>
<td>Books Read to Children</td>
<td>Teacher Selected Dramatic Play Themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 5-15</td>
<td>Pets</td>
<td>Little Frog</td>
<td>Pretend we have a pet store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Patrick's</td>
<td>The Green Tree Frog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Millions of Cats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ten Little Rabbits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flossie and the Fox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-22</td>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Child choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-29</td>
<td>Easter</td>
<td>Peter Rabbit</td>
<td>Preparing foods for Easter dinner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8-19</td>
<td>Food preparation</td>
<td>Gregory the Terrible Eater</td>
<td>Dress up and prepare nutritious food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farm animals</td>
<td>Dinner is Ready Jessie!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Magic School Bus Gets Baked in a Cake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Very Hungry Caterpillar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Magic School Bus Plants Seeds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Viviendo en la Tierra (Living on the Earth)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On the Farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Big Red Barn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-26</td>
<td>Week of the young child</td>
<td>Momma Do You Love Me? I Like Me</td>
<td>Child choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>What Makes Day and Night</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Very Quiet Cricket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inch by Inch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In the Tall, Tall Grass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other: Three Billy Goats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gruff (flannelboard story)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Curriculum Theme</th>
<th>Books Read to Children</th>
<th>Teacher Selected Dramatic Play Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 12-15</td>
<td>Madigras</td>
<td>Collier Encyclopedia</td>
<td>Pretend to be a news reporter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dress up for Madigras.</td>
<td>Dance to jazz music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>St. Patrick's</td>
<td>The Story of St. Patrick</td>
<td>Make up own stories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretend to be a pirate, St. Patrick, or Roman officer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-29</td>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>The Wind</td>
<td>Pretend to be the three pigs and big bad wolf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zip Whiz Zoom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wet and Dry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 8-19</td>
<td>Planting and watering</td>
<td>Growing Vegetable Soup</td>
<td>Pretend to be farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planting a Rainbow</td>
<td>Pretend to plant and care for fruit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 22</td>
<td>Native-Americans</td>
<td>Hats, Hats, Hats</td>
<td>Pretend to get ready to go to the Pueblo Indian Cultural Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arrow Into the Sun, A Pueblo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indian Tale</td>
<td>Dress up like Native-Americans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 also provides a group comparison of curriculum themes, books read to the children, and dramatic play themes that were preselected by the teacher. Each curriculum theme was generally incorporated for 2 week time periods. A wide selection of books were read to children, most of the books related to curriculum themes.

Books read to children includes all the books that each teacher reported to have read to the children within the different curriculum
theme periods. These were books selected by the teacher generally to coincide with the curriculum theme. Most of the books were read by the teacher although occasionally the teacher assistant read to them.

Teachers sometimes suggested dramatic center play themes or ideas for children's pretend play. Teachers selected these dramatic play ideas based on their perceptions of how to incorporate program suggested curriculum themes. Teachers were expected to inform children of the dramatic play theme ideas during morning group time. Comparison of teacher selected play themes listed in Table 6, curriculum themes, book and dramatic play themes, and number of events seen in the three categories in Table 4, frequency and participation in dramatic play, and library center events, revealed that teacher suggested theme ideas were rarely adopted by the children.

Coyote Storybook Theme Events

Approximately 18% of all events observed during learning center time were related to the Coyote story, as seen in Table 4. A total of 13 children participated in Coyote events which took place in the dramatic play center or the library center. Dramatic play center storybook related events involved three girls and one boy. Sixty-nine children total were involved in the learning center play observations. One of the 13 dramatic play center events observed was related to the Coyote storybook. This event took place in Group A which had experienced an
English reenactment of the storybook.

The Coyote event involved four children, one boy and three girls. This event began with two girls running from an invisible coyote. Another girl enters the play episode by volunteering to be the coyote. Later a boy asks permission to join the group by offering to be “El Coyote Azul” (The Blue Coyote). The following excerpt from field notes provide some insight to the children’s perspectives of Coyote and how his role was portrayed. The children’s names have been changed, for purposes of confidentiality, in all of the following field note quotations.

Amy and Beth run in and out of dramatic play area, both are screaming, they are being chased by an invisible coyote.

Amy: “I told you he was there, he’s a scary coyote, right?”
Beth: “Yea, he’s mean, and ugly! Let’s hide in here.”
Beth points to a place in the dress-up closet. Amy climbs in and crouches down.
Amy: “But you gotta cover me, hurry, get that blanket!”
Beth: “There, he can’t see you now. But, where do I hide?”
Amy: “Get under the table, under the table, he can’t see you under the table, okay?”
Beth: “He will see me!”
Amy: “He can’t, because it’s magic, see and he can’t, he can’t see when it’s magic!”
Beth: “Oh yea, it’s magic.”
Beth crawls under kitchen table. Christina has been to the side watching and listening.

Christina: “Yo puedo ser El Coyote Azul, eh? Quieres Amalia? Y yo las voy a perseguir!” (I can be the Blue Coyote, huh? Do you want me to Amy? And I’ll chase you twol)
Amy and Beth look at each other. Beth goes to whisper something to Amy.
Amy: “Bueno, tu eres el coyote pero . . . .”
Sammy: “Hey, I can be Coyote, rrrrr, I can okay?”
Christina: “Wait Sammy I’m gonna be coyote, you always wanna be coyote.” Christina said, “right Amy?”
Amy: “Oh, now you, Sammy is El Coyote okay? An you hide, under the table, Coyote can’t see under the table, okay, Sammy?”

Sammy: “Okay, but you better run, rrrrrrrrr, I’m hungry! rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr
Leo: “He say, hey ye yea, hey ye yea, hey ye yea!”
Leo bounces upper body up and down as he chants. He tried to get the attention of another boy.
Leo: “Look, he said. Ouch! He stick the feather, ouch, ouch!”
Leo continued looking through the book page by page. He would stop at places where he remembered words or phrases, sometimes he repeated the phrases two or three times. He repeated some phrases from the text almost verbatim and some he edited in his own creative way.
Leo: “Coyote said, ‘Thank you, thank you, but I wanna fly too!’”
Leo: “Wait for me! You can’t leave me here you bums!”

The second Coyote event takes place in Group B and involved a girl who is playing mother and comes into the library center with her baby. She picked up several books and quickly flipped through them. She picked up Coyote book and sat to read it to her baby. An excerpt from field notes describes how she shares the book with her baby:

Maggie is determined to prop her baby just right so she can read to her. She asks her baby, “Puedes ver, sí, sí mi amor?” (You can see, right, right my love?) She finally gets her baby in a comfortable position next to her. Maggie holds the Coyote book so the baby can see it. She reads. “El Coyote, este es el coyote, lo vez?” (The Coyote, this is the coyote, you see?) Maggie is telling the story by describing the pictures. “El Coyote fue a ver los pájaros, los pájaros cantan y bailan! Mira están bailando, así y así.” (The Coyote went to see the birds, the birds sang and danced. See they’re dancing, like this and like this.)

Maggie continues to read the book to her baby. She stops every few minutes to check the baby and ask her if she is alright. She speaks to the baby in a very loving tone. She also caresses the baby and kisses her often. When she finishes reading the book Maggie asks her baby if she likes it. Since the baby liked the book Maggie promises to bring her back the next day and read to her again: “Si mi amor, mañana venemos otra vez, sí. Te portas tan bien. Te gusto? Te gusto el libro? Bueno, mañana te lo leo otra vez.” (Yes my love, tomorrow we’ll come again. You are so good.
You like it? You like the book? Good, tomorrow I’ll read it to you again.)

The third Coyote event involved the most children and took place in Group D’s library center. One girl who was playing the teacher leads her three students, three girls, to the library. The three girls are model students and follow the teacher’s directions at all times. When the “teacher” began reading the Coyote storybook a boy who had been looking at a book on dinosaurs puts his book down and listens to the story. This excerpt is an example of what transpired during most of this event:

Francis is the teacher, she is taking her 3 female students on a trip to the library.
Francis: “You sit here, you here and . . . Josie, are you listening? You can’t take the book now, wait ’till I say okay.”
Francis directs the girls to the child-size couch.
Josie: “Yes, teacher, but I want more books.”
Francis: “Okay, but you wait, I’ll say when, okay?”
Josie: “Okay teacher.”
Francis: “I have to read you a story first, then you get some books. Remember this book [points to Coyote book]?”
Erika: “I know, I know, el blue perro!” (The blue dog.)
Francis: “It’s not a dog, no, remember . . .”
Erika: “It’s a wolf, a big, bad . . .”
Francis: “Erika, you have to wait, did I say you could talk?
Erika shakes her head “No.”
Josie and Anna frantically wave their hands in the air.
Francis: “Yes, Anna?”
Anna: “I know, I know, he’s the blue, the blue . . .”
Anna and Josie: “The Blue Coyote!”
Francis: “Very good, you remember! Wait, let me sit here.”
Francis moves a chair that matches the couch and sits so she can face her students. She holds the book on her lap, facing her students.
Francis: “Now, everybody can see.”
Her students nod in agreement and smile.
Francis: “Coyote was always getting into trouble. See? He stuck his nose in that hole and that thing bit it off!”
A boy that has been looking at a book about dinosaurs has put his book down and closed it. He is now listening to Francis read.
Francis continues to read, she remembers most of the story. When Francis gets to parts she doesn’t remember she improvises or calls on her students. Francis is animated as she uses her voice to emphasize parts of the story or speaking parts for different characters. Francis captures and holds the attention of her audience throughout the story.
Francis: “Ahhh! Said Coyote, if I could fly, like that! If I could fly like that, I would be the happiest in all the world!”
Francis holds the book with her left hand and makes a flying motion with her right arm.
Francis: “Coyote says to the grandpa bird, please, little birdie, can you teach me to fly? The bird, I mean, this is a, a....”
Josie: “It’s a crow, grandpa crow.”
Francis: “Very good Josie, this is grandpa crow, and these are the baby crows. Grandpa crow says, ‘You silly coyote, you can’t fly, you’re a dog, I mean a coyote.’”
Everybody laughs as Francis changes to a deeper voice for grandpa crow.
Francis: “Hey, maybe if we give you feathers, you can fly!”
Erika: “He goes oh, oh, ouch!” She flinches her face.
Francis: “He yelled, ouch! Oouuuch!!!! And the grandpa said, ‘Okay, you’re ready’ and now the coyote is dancing. And he goes like this ‘Ne, ne, aarrr, aarrrr, aarrrr.’”
Francis laughs hard, throwing her head back. She repeats her imitation of Coyote singing in a low grumbly voice, gets her students to laugh over and over.

The fourth and final event in the library center that is related to the Coyote story is the only event that involves an adult and is also with Group D. At the request of two girls the teacher assistant has come over to read the Coyote book. The assistant teacher is reading the story for the first time and pauses to let the girls tell some parts. Both girls are using English with bits of Spanish. Sometimes the teacher assistant, who
does not speak Spanish, asks the girls to repeat what they say. At times the girls repeat what they say and translate from Spanish to English. In the following excerpt the girls provide some translation:

Mary: “Coyote burned his head and his colita!” (laughs)
“His tail, you know?”
Teaching Assistant: “His what, ko-lee-tah, his ko-lee-tah?”
Mary: “Yes, colita! His tail. This long thing, see?”
Sally: “Yeah, it’s called a colita. And he burned it off!”
Teaching Assistant: “Oh, I see, because he was falling so fast, right?”
Mary and Sally: “Yeah!”
Teaching Assistant: “He fell so fast, his ko-lee-tah, right? Caught on fire.”
Mary: “He fell, plop! Right into the water! Splash! En la agua!”
Teaching Assistant: “In the water right? I know that word, ‘agua,’ water. He fell in the water, the agua, and oh-oh, he looks mad.”
Sally: “Yeah, cause the birds are laughing at him.”
Teaching Assistant: “That’s right, he heard the crows laughing at him and he saw them flying away. Coyote ran after them and OOPS! He tripped and went tumbling in the dirt!”
Mary: “That’s why how come he’s not blue no more.”
Sally: “He turned brown, like the dirt.”
Teaching Assistant: “Coyote went home soaked and covered in dust. . . .”
Mary: “Teacher, read it again, read it again!”
Sally: “Please teacher, okay?”
Teaching Assistant: “I tell you what, we have to clean up and put things away now, but I promise I’ll read it again tomorrow, okay? You can remind me and I’ll read it, okay?”
Sally: “Okay, teacher.”
Mary: “Yeah, but I won’t let you forget, okay?”
Teaching Assistant: “Yes Mary, you won’t let me forget, right?”

5. Do teacher beliefs and practices, regarding storybooks and storybook related experiences, influence the literacy experiences they provided for young children?
Teacher Perspectives and Practices

Teacher perspectives and practices did have some influence on the literacy experiences they provided for children, though children’s involvement in these activities was limited. Data that investigates teachers’ perspectives and practices regarding storybook and storybook-related activities for children were categorized into four categories: (a) teachers’ views on storybook and reading aloud, (b) follow-up activities to storybooks or reading aloud, (c) teacher experience and training related to storybooks, and (d) factors influencing the inclusion of storybooks in the curriculum. Though the teachers expressed similar objectives more than once regarding the use of storybooks and storybook related activities, they had distinct priorities when it came to actual classroom practices. All the teachers expressed some knowledge of guidelines that describe developmentally appropriate literacy related curriculum for young children (Bredekamp, 1986) and each teacher expressed her views on why they as teachers are not always able to follow these guidelines.

Teacher Views on Storybooks and Reading Aloud

All the teachers felt that sharing storybooks and reading aloud to children every day was extremely important and necessary to children’s overall literacy development. In addition, they acknowledged that in their classrooms storybooks and reading aloud is popular with most of
the children. Though the teachers expressed some knowledge of
developmentally appropriate practice regarding the use of storybooks and
storybook-related activities, they had different interpretations when it
came to actual classroom practices as can be seen in the following
extraction from interviews:

Teacher A: “Usually I read to them during large group time. If we have enough staff and children are in the library center we’ll go in and read to them. Sometimes we just don’t have the time.”

Teacher B: “We have about two themes a month and we always try to match the book with the theme. Sometimes I just bring books I think the kids will enjoy. It [reading] helps their language because they hear a lot of different words. While they are waiting for breakfast to be set up ... when waiting for parents to pick them up they can read books.”

Teacher C: “I read to them everyday, just about. Sometimes if we’re on a certain theme and a certain book we’ll do it during circle time. I’ll read whenever the children ask to be read to.”

Teacher D: “I read to them everyday. If it’s not a book it’s this card. Like today we are studying presidents, so I make up a scroll and in the scroll I have a picture of a brick house. I write something simple like, ‘This is the first brick house ever built,’ and I say George Washington lived in this house. Then I have a picture of a horse and I write, ‘George Washington like to ride his horse.’ I’m doing Mardigras next week ... and they will be like newscasters and that’s another way of telling them the story of Mardigras.”

Follow-Up Activities to Storybooks or Reading Aloud

Only Teacher D kept a log of follow-up activities related to the Coyote text, the other teachers said they did not remember it or did not have anything to report. Teacher D had two storybook related extension activities that she reported. The first one involved a group of three children that asked her to read them the Coyote story during learning
center play. Teacher D stated that she was excited that they remembered so many parts and were able to retell them to her. She also stated that the children had asked if she would read the book again the next day and that she had agreed to do so. A second extension of the Coyote storybook occurred as children play acted the story of The Three Little Pigs. Teacher D reported that as children were playing the big, bad wolf as he starts to huff and puff at the first pig’s house, they spontaneously changed him into the Blue Coyote and went on to play parts of the Coyote story.

Teacher D: “Jessie was playing the big, bad wolf and all of a sudden he says he’s the Blue Coyote and starts running after the pigs. I asked him if he could think of how the crows might sound when they sing and he tried to do a bird sound. Of course I had to add my own ideas.”

Teachers stated that the most frequently used follow-up activity to other storybooks was discussions right after finishing the story. Again, discussions were limited because of time constraints, teachers felt they had to stay on schedule mainly because of mealtimes (breakfast and lunch) and having to adhere to the bus drop-off and pick-up times. Discussions were mostly teacher-directed through the use of closed questioning. Although only Teacher A said she had her class act out stories, they all stated they used some type of follow-up activity.

Teacher A: “We do flannel board stories for most of them. The children really like The Big Turnip. If there’s a real simple, simple story then we act it out, like we’ll do The Three Bears.”
Teacher B: “After the story I'll ask them some questions to see what they remember. I haven’t done any other activities with the stories we’ve read this year, not any.”

Teacher C: “I try to have things in the centers that relate to what our book was about. Or I take them to the library and we get books related to the theme.”

Teacher D: “I tell them a story then I ask them to tell it back to me to see if they remember how it goes. I like to use puppets, like Chef Combo to tell them stories. They really like it when I change my voice to a pretend voice.”

In relationship to follow-up activities during learning center play, teachers expressed two different philosophies regarding teacher intervention or guidance. Three of the teachers (Group A, Group B, and Group C) believed that their main objective for planning learning center activities was to encourage and support child-centered learning and that the teacher-directed learning took place during large or small group activity times. Planning for learning centers involved incorporating ideas and activities that were not only related to the curriculum theme but which would allow children to explore and experience on their own. Some of these ideas are expressed in the following excerpts:

Teacher A: “I go around the room to make sure the kids are involved in something. They hardly notice I’m around because they are so busy, they’re learning on their own, which is what’s supposed to happen anyway, right?”

Teacher A: “When they ask me questions, I just ask them right back, I mean I try to get them to answer their own question.”

Teacher B: “Sometimes I go into the dramatic play area, like when they want me to be the guest and they make coffee or cook something for me to eat, but mostly I watch to see how they are playing. I only get involved if they have a problem they can’t work out on their own.”

Teacher B: “I make sure I praise them a lot when they get really creative and come up with their ideas. They are supposed to
be in charge of their own learning and these kids are always busy learning.”

Teacher C: “My children know what to do. They go into their learning centers and play or work hard, but they don’t know they’re really working, as far as they know it’s all fun play time. They love to come and play in the learning centers more than anything. They decide which center they want to go to. I don’t tell them where to go.”

Teacher C: “At circle time we talk a little about what they did in the learning centers and I get a good idea of what they experienced and the kind of things that they are learning about.”

A different philosophy was expressed by the fourth teacher, which was the teacher for Group D.

Teacher D: “I make them think by asking them a lot of questions. I’m always in there, in the learning centers I mean. I play with them and I give them ideas, like I’ll say, ‘What if the hat was magic and . . . ,’ you know, something that will get them to try a new idea.”

Teacher D: “Some of these children are very creative but a lot of them, sometimes it takes them a while to catch on. I act like a kid with them to try to bring them out of their shell, I know sometimes they probably think I’m a little strange, but they don’t seem to mind.”

Teacher D: “I wish I could figure out how to make it to all the learning centers in one day, I just can’t do it. I get in there and get involved and before I know it time has just passed, I guess I’m having fun too.”

Teacher D felt it was important to be in there with the children guiding them and building on their ideas or giving them new ideas. She believed that some children needed to be motivated to try out new experiences. Teacher D also felt she needed to be more like the children in order to get them to be more like children themselves. She expressed this idea in the following way:
Teacher D: “You wouldn’t believe what some of these children have to live with. Some of them are in the worst living conditions I have ever seen. They have to deal with all kinds of problems, their dad may be a drunk or on drugs, they have no furniture, sleep on the floor. . . . So I sometimes I have to remind them that they are children and that children should have fun especially when they are learning.”

Teacher Experience and Training Related to Storybooks

Though teacher experience and training varied considerably, from 2 years to 29 years experience, and from little to extensive training, all the teachers stated a need for training on children’s literacy development in general and how to help them develop pre-reading skills in particular. Regarding the use of storybooks or reading aloud to children in the classroom, each teacher expressed a particular need:

Teacher A: “I need some ideas for new books, especially books that talk about different families or how different families live and do things. I have children from divorced families, mixed families, all kinds of families.”

Teacher B: “We need books that different children can relate to, we have children from different cultures and we have to help them be aware of differences. We have Mexican-Americans, Native-Americans, Asians, and others.”

Teacher C: “I would like to get some flannel board stories or learn different ways to tell the same stories. There are some stories like The Red Red Strawberry and The Very Hungry Bear that children like to hear over and over.”

Teacher D: “I think we need more books with lots of pictures and some of those big books. I think big books are great. We need more books that are funny or relate to children’s sense of humor. We need to replace some old books too, they can get really worn out.”
Factors Influencing Inclusion of Storybooks in Curriculum

The teachers were consistent in explaining what helped them to determine what storybooks would be included in the classroom. First, getting new books is limited by the amount of resources available for supplies each year. Teachers know that they can only depend on getting a limited number of new books and each of them has spent their own money to buy more books. Teacher A started supplementing her book supply by using a new city library program she had recently found out about. Second, teachers are expected to use thematic unit topics to make decisions on some books. Third, tight time constraints dictate what books are given priority for storybook reading, sometimes teachers go with books on unit themes and other times they go with books that are most popular with the children. Books that can be read within a short period of time are more likely to be read also.

Inclusion of Bilingual Books

Only Teacher A selected bilingual books, or Spanish/English books. She was the only one that felt comfortable with her command of the Spanish language. The other three teachers stated that they understood some Spanish but did not know enough to be able to "read or tell" a complete story in Spanish. They expressed their feelings about their limited Spanish skills in the following statements:

Teacher B: "I'm always getting stuck, but I try anyway. It may come out wrong sometimes, but the children get the idea. I
pick up new words or the correct words from the children that are Spanish speakers. I've actually learned more Spanish from working with the kids.”

Teacher C: “I can speak a little Spanish, but I can’t read it at all. It’s really hard at the beginning of the year when so many of the children don’t know a word of English and neither do their parents.”

Teacher D: “If I speak Spanish the children laugh at me. Sometimes the parents laugh at me too. I just didn’t grow up with Spanish, we spoke English all the time. I know I need it, I know I would be better able to communicate with some of the kids. It helps when the aide is a Spanish-speaker, but this year I have an aide that only speaks English so we just do the best we can.”
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the story retelling and comprehension abilities of Head Start children who have experienced storybook reading and story reenactment either bilingually, in English/Spanish, or only in English. Quantitative and qualitative methodology was used to conduct this investigation and identify effects of four different treatment groups on children's story retelling abilities.

Sixty-seven Head Start children were involved in four classrooms which were randomly assigned to one of four different treatment situations: Group A--story reading and reenactment in English, Group B--bilingual story reading and reenactment, Group C--story reading and discussion in English, and Group D--bilingual story reading and discussion. Three testing measures were developed by this researcher based on the work of previous researchers: (a) Story Comprehension Test, (b) Guidesheet/Scoresheet for the Retelling of Coyote: A Trickster Tale From the American Southwest, and (c) Levels of Literacy Response (Children's Storybook Rereadings). In addition,
classroom observations and teacher interviews were conducted to gather relevant data.

Results

These quantitative questions were addressed by this study is. First, is there a difference in the story retelling abilities of Head Start children who have experienced storybook reading and story reenactment? According to results from this study, children who experienced reenactment scored significantly higher on retelling measures. Part two of this question investigated whether language used had an effect on retelling abilities and found no difference. Second, this study investigated the effects of storybook reenactment on children’s story comprehension ability and found that children experiencing reenactment scored significantly higher. Third, this study sought to find out if a difference existed in the Level of Literacy Response of Head Start children who have experienced storybook reading and reenactment and found that a larger portion of children experiencing reenactment scored in the second level. In each case, no effect was found for the language of presentation, English/Spanish, or English only.

From the qualitative perspective of this study, the fourth question inquired whether Head Start children who have experienced storybook reading and story reenactment either bilingually, English/Spanish, or only in English, engage in learning center experiences that extend the story.
Though children were involved in some storybook extension activities, whether they experienced reenactment or not, this involvement was limited and did not provide sufficient information with which to make conclusive statements. Findings did, however, suggest that teacher involvement may have had an influential effect on whether children engaged in storybook extensions or not. The fifth and final question focused on how the beliefs and practices of teachers regarding storybooks and storybook related experiences influence the literacy experiences they provide for young children. Findings suggest that teacher beliefs and perspectives regarding teaching approaches influenced literacy experiences teachers provided in the classroom, although children's responses to these experiences was minimal.

Discussion

**Effect of Reenactment on Story Retelling**

Children who experienced reenactment performed significantly better on retelling measures than children who did not experience reenactment. These findings are consistent with previous investigations of story retelling both as a method of language assessment (Genishi & Dyson, 1984) and as a teaching strategy to help enhance story comprehension (Morrow, 1985). The same rationale given for the positive effects of reenactment on story comprehension can be offered for the positive results in story retelling. The reenactment experience
allowed children to expand their understanding of the story through their personal involvement in acting it out, and they were better able to retell it more accurately.

**Retelling and Language**

Story retelling scores were significantly higher for those children who experienced reenactment regardless of whether the experience was bilingual, English/Spanish, or only in English. Research of this nature involving Spanish-speaking preschoolers was not located for review of the literature, this investigation sought to examine the effects of the language used for reenactment.

Several possible conditions are presented that may explain why language differences were not prevalent. First, this study was conducted after children had been in the program about 7 months. During this time, children's preschool experience was primarily conducted in English. According to some of the research reviewed for this study and qualitative data from the present study, this is an adequate amount of time for some children to become comfortable with or gain enough skills in English to be able to engage in "productive language use" (Tabors & Snow, 1994, p. 11), especially when English is the primary language used during the daily preschool experience.

A second reason for no language difference may be attributed to the nature of the reenactment activity. Reenactment of the Coyote story
provided experiences that incorporated qualities that have been highly recommended as developmentally and culturally appropriate for linguistically diverse young children, including: (a) an action-oriented nature, (Garcia, 1991), (b) use of repetitive dialogue, (c) context-related activity (NAEYC, 1995; Spodek & Saracho, 1993), and (d) adult guidance (Morrow, 1985). Therefore, in accordance with the research, the reenactment type of activity used for this study was found to be quite powerful with the linguistically diverse group of young children. A third condition relating to the language variable involves the inability to locate previous research of this nature with Spanish-speaking preschoolers. Such research may have contributed to the design of this study or to some other aspect of the methodology. It is, therefore, uncertain whether some aspect of the methodology lacked the sensitivity to detect any language influence. Nevertheless, the findings from this study did not indicate that having the reenactment experience in English only or bilingually made a statistical difference.

**Effect of Reenactment on Story Comprehension**

Children who experienced storybook reenactment scored significantly better on the Story Comprehension Test than children who did not experience reenactment. Findings of the reenactment experience from the present study support the findings from previous research which explores different forms of story reenactment such as story retelling
(Morrow, 1988, 1993), story acting (Paley, 1981, 1992), and thematic-fantasy play (Pellegrini & Galda, 1982) and their effects on story comprehension. In addition to the powerful quality of the reenactment experience as discussed previously, another condition which may have contributed to children's comprehension of the story involves the text itself. *Coyote: A Trickster Tale From the American Southwest* included characters, a story line, action, and language that made for a very appealing storybook with this age group. In addition, the Coyote story also had a humorous quality that the children readily responded to, as was evident in some of the dialogue during extension of the story into learning center play and dialogue during the reenactment experience.

**Effect of Reenactment on Levels of Literacy Response to the Storybook**

A difference in children's Level of Literacy Response to the storybook in terms of reenactment was found; a larger proportion of those children who experienced reenactment were in the second literacy level. Children's responses were randomly distributed within the first two levels and none of the children were able to respond at the third level. Head Start children's performance on this assessment with respect to reenactment is consistent with findings from similar research investigating young children and literacy development (Galda, Pellegrini, & Cox, 1989; Genishi & Dyson, 1984), and early childhood literature focusing on young children and emergent literacy (Jalongo, 1992;
Morrow, 1993). Children involved in a preschool setting such as Head Start are generally not expected to perform at the literacy level described here as level three.

**Storybook Extension Into Learning Center Play**

Children from the groups who experienced storybook reenactment, as well as children from one group who did not experience reenactment, were involved in extensions of the storybook into learning center play. Five storybook extensions were observed, one of these events took place in the dramatic play center and the other four took place in the library center. No storybook extensions were observed with Group C while two were observed with Group D, both groups did not experience reenactment. Though the information gathered provided some insight regarding children's learning center play, there was not adequate information to substantiate conclusions related to extension of the target story into learning center play.

The fact that three of the groups had an extension of the story provides some insight regarding the favorable response the text received from children. Other than having the Coyote text available in the library there were no props or people, except in the case of Teacher D, to prompt children's behavior. Having the text available in the library, however, may have motivated some of the occurrence of play events associated with the storybook.
At least three additional points may be considered in the degree of influence that the experience with the text had in addition to what the number of observations indicate. First, the themes that children selected to incorporate into the dramatic play and library centers were, for the most part, not the same themes that program staff and teachers had planned. Though planning for curriculum theme activities was very intensive, with program staff and classroom teachers spending several hours a week in planning sessions, children were not incorporating preplanned ideas into learning center play. More than 50% of the time children were playing out themes that they chose and not what was planned for them.

A second point to consider with regard to the impact of the text is that the observations were conducted after the children had been on spring break for 1 week. Therefore, that children were able to recall what they did has even more meaning. The third and final point is that children played out a Coyote-related event regardless of what treatment group they were in. Whether they reenacted the story or discussed it in a group, children extended the story into learning center play.

Possible explanations for the occurrence of two text related events with Group D are offered, all of which suggest an influential effect from the teacher. Teacher D was the only one of the four teachers who documented other extension activities. Her descriptions of the two events were detailed and informative. She was enthusiastic about the
children's interest in the storybook and supported those interests by reading the story again and talking about it. It is highly possible that there was more interest in the text with Group D because of the teacher's interest and support.

Learning center episodes in the dramatic play and library centers were dominated by girls and play themes that were selected by girls, including Coyote related events. Most of the play themes involved girls in the role of caring mothers or young daughters. This observation is consistent with previous research on gender preferences during learning center play and generates interest regarding practices and beliefs for provision of developmentally appropriate guidance during learning center play. While some believe children should explore their own interests, others believe children need to be encouraged to try new experiences with the teacher guiding them.

In accordance with previous research related to children's learning center play preferences (Dodge & Frost, 1986; Seefeldt, 1992; Spodek, 1993) and findings from this study, girls are more interested in the home and family type of learning center. Some of the research suggested that the way this learning center is designed (Spodek, 1993), the props used, and management of learning centers (Dodge & Frost, 1986), contribute to gender preferences. It is, therefore, possible that a more neutral type of learning center and provision of props may have generated more learning center extensions of the target story.
Teacher Beliefs and Practices

Results from this study provide some indication that teacher beliefs and practices regarding storybook reading and storybook related activities influenced the types of literacy related activities they provided for the children. These results, however, are inconclusive with regards to the impact this may have had on the children's literacy experiences. More extensive research in this area would have been required in order to determine more accurately how the teachers' beliefs and practices related to the literacy experiences they provided.

Findings from this study indicate that the teachers acknowledged they had specific needs related to the use of storybooks and storybook related activities. These acknowledgements may help to explain why there was a lack of teacher involvement or support for the study project. The most important concern was for training on how to use storybooks most effectively to promote literacy development. In addition, the teachers felt that the schedule needed to be adjusted to allow more time for inclusion of storybooks or related activities during learning center time. Finally, the teachers had a need to learn about what is considered developmentally appropriate practice when using storybooks and related activities with young children.

Teacher perspectives regarding teacher intervention or guidance during learning center play was evident in the beliefs and practices they expressed. Three of the teachers believed they were supposed to
encourage a child-centered approach in their classrooms. They perceived their lack of intervention in the learning center as developmentally appropriate practice. Less teacher intervention meant that children were self-directing their learning. They saw their role as planners for a learning environment that supports first-hand exploration and learning through play.

Teacher D had a different perspective regarding the teacher's role, she believed that in addition to providing a stimulating learning environment she must be a guide and provide some direction. Therefore, she was continuously involved in the learning center activities with the children. One of her strategies was to use a lot of questioning to keep children thinking about what they are involved in. She was the only teacher to purposely focus children's attention on the Coyote text by reading it again and talking about it. Teacher D's approach may have had a direct influence on children's interest in the text and may explain why Group D had more involvement in story extensions during learning center play.

Implications

Piagetian and Vygotskian Perspectives

The theoretical basis for this investigation reflects the beliefs of both Piaget and Vygotsky. Both developmental theorists provide interactionist beliefs that explain some of the conditions that best foster
children’s learning. Positive effects of the reenactment experience are consistent with the interactionist perspective of Piaget and Vygotsky, which endorses active participation and social interaction (Berk & Winsler, 1995; Wadsworth, 1971) to support the development of children’s understanding of the world around them. Piaget and Vygotsky’s beliefs regarding the importance of intersubjectivity for peer sociodramatic play are also reflected in the collaboration that took place as children worked together to reenact the story.

Piaget’s perspective regarding how children develop understanding is coveted by some early childhood professionals as “providing the most scientifically accurate and comprehensive explanation on how understanding develops” (as cited in Taylor, 1996, p. 259). Some supporters of Piaget’s constructivist theory believe that teaching should reflect this perspective which is based on the belief that children develop understanding as they interact with their environment seeking solutions to problems or constructing their understanding (Taylor, 1996).

In accordance with Piagetian belief that children’s performance in storybook retelling and comprehension measures may have been enhanced by reenactment because they were able to interact socially to construct the meaning of new words or phrases. This experience was true for English speakers as well as non-English speakers. Children’s responses to the word “chanting” during one of the reenactment experiences, for instance, provided an example of how both
English-speakers and non-English-speakers were able to reach an understanding of what this new word meant. The children’s names have been changed, for purposes of confidentiality, in all of the following field note quotations.

Researcher reads: “Coyote saw a flock of crows. They were chanting. They were dancing.”
Researcher: “Let’s dance around in a line, remember like the crows were dancing, and chant, ‘Hey ye yea yea.’”
Children are following researcher’s lead.
Tammy: “They sing teacher, like Indians.”
Researcher: “Yes, chanting, chanting is a different way of singing.”
Tammy: “They sing like that at the, at the, oh, I don’t. . . .”
Esther: “Cantan, estan cantando Tammy.” [Singing, they were singing Tammy.]
Researcher: “Sí, estaban bailando y cantando, así. . . .” [Yes, they were dancing and singing, like.]
Tammy: “I know how to, how to chant, like ‘Hey, hey, hey. . . .”
Esther: “I sshh sh- shant, canto, yo puedo cantar asi. . . .” [I chant, sing, I can sing like.]
Esther repeated the word “chant” several times to herself.

For Tammy, an English-speaker, though the word “chant” was new to her, she understood easily that it was a form of singing that she was familiar with. In addition to learning this new word, Tammy was making a connection of what this new word meant to her prior experiences with this form of singing. Esther, on the other hand, learned the sound of a new word in English, learned that it was some type of singing in English, and then made the transfer of meaning to “cantar” or “cantando” in Spanish.
In accordance with Vygotskian belief, both girls arrived at their new levels of understanding through sociocultural interaction with more knowledgeable others. In attempting to associate the new word to the meaning of the word within the context of the story, children had to communicate their thoughts with each other and the adult. Both children used their own language to communicate their thoughts to others. Vygotsky referred to language as the most important “tool of the mind” and the most frequently used “human representational system” (as cited in Berk & Winsler, 1995, p. 38). The reenactment experience allowed children to interact socially with others and exchange ideas to help them formulate their understanding.

According to Vygotsky, the “zone of proximal development” represents the area of sensitivity in which learning and cognitive development occurs (as cited in Berk & Winsler, 1995, p. 24). Vygotsky suggested that educational activity needed to be geared toward this zone, meaning that academic instruction should challenge children and at the same time be attainable with the help of adult guidance or more experienced peers. Reenactment of the Coyote story provided a challenging educational experience which children were able to use to construct a more comprehensive understanding of the story.

The element of intersubjectivity is a feature of both Piagetian and Vygotskian theory. Intersubjectivity refers to the process by which two individuals who begin a task with different understandings arrive at a
shared understanding. Like Vygotsky, Piaget believed that social interaction (i.e., socializing, playing, talking, and working with others) was important in helping children with their attempts to understand another individual’s point of view. According to Berk (1994), Vygotsky emphasized the role of social communication in cognitive development as a crucial means by which more competent peers or adults can help children learn within the zone of proximal development.

The reenactment experience involved “scaffolding,” or tutoring, which occurred as more experienced or knowledgeable others helped children reenact a particular character’s part (Berk & Winsler, 1995). Scaffolding was introduced by other scholars to explain how the process of guiding learning is adjusted according to individual needs (Berk & Winsler, 1995). During the reenactment experience with Group B, the scaffolding process also involved translating the story into Spanish thereby making the experience more meaningful to non-English speakers. As children became involved in putting the story into action, some children relied on their own language, or variations of the language, to help others participate, as was the case in the following excerpt:

Researcher: “Otro día, Coyote se dio de narices con la Serpiente, Y se metió en tremendo lio! Coyote siempre se metía en lios. (Coyote went looking for Snake but only found trouble. Coyote was always in trouble.)

Joe is playing the part of Snake but seems unsure about how to act. He gets down on the floor on his knees and hands. Several children offer suggestions to Joe.

Danny: “Ponte de panza Joe, como víbora sabes? No como el coyote.” (Get on your belly Joe, like the snake, you know?
Not like the coyote.) (Danny used the word vibora rather than serpiente.)

Gloria: “Y le haces así, hssssssss, hssssssss.” (And you go like this, hssssssss, hssssssss.)

Joe, who speaks no English, got down on his belly and makes the hissing sound as suggested by his classmates.

Reenactment of the Coyote story allowed children the opportunity to try out their own ideas for how the Coyote character would act and then incorporate the ideas suggested by their peers. Language the children used was modified or enhanced as more experienced or knowledgeable peers or adults helped children build their understanding of new words or phrases. The educational process experienced through storybook reenactment encompass important features of Piagetian and Vygotskian beliefs which help to explain the educational potential of a storybook reenactment experience.

Implications for Early Childhood Programs

The findings from this study have implications directly related to teacher training in the area of storybooks and storybook reenactment and implications regarding teacher training on other curriculum that supports language and literacy development. In addition, implications related to teachers and classroom practices that address the needs of all children.

Implications for teacher training. In addition to the findings from this study, the literature reviewed for this study suggest that storybooks
and storybook extension activities are not generally incorporated into the early childhood curriculum to the extent that it should. Part of this may be due to a lack of understanding for how children develop language and literacy skills and how storybooks can impact this development. Early childhood education programs need to provide the necessary training to educate teachers and promote developmentally appropriate practice in this area.

Findings also suggest that a number of different factors influence the use of storybooks in the classroom, including program planning and resources. Programs should ensure that teachers have adequate resources to carry out program plans or, if necessary, find alternative resources, such as library lending programs. Many teachers become discouraged and sometimes feel unappreciated when they have to use their own resources to supplement classroom materials.

**Implications for teaching practice.** Several implications for teachers of young children can be drawn from the results of this particular study. First, findings from this study support the belief that storybooks and storybook reenactment activities are successful in helping children's story comprehension and retelling. Some believe that storybook reading is the single most important literacy development experience for young children. Teachers need to understand the importance of storybooks and storybook related activities and
incorporate them into daily curriculum. Teachers should carefully consider how storybooks are presented and consider reenactment, discussion, or some other form of follow-up activity to motivate children to extend storybooks into learning center play.

Second, teachers need to be aware of the purpose for including storybooks in curriculum and establish appropriate methods to determine if this purpose is being met. For example, if the purpose for including a storybook is to teach about a particular theme, the teacher could determine children’s perceptions by questioning children regarding the theme (i.e., Can you tell me what this story was about?). On the other hand, if the purpose is to see if children comprehend the story sequence, the teacher can ask the child to reenact the story and later have them retell it.

Third, an adequate amount of time should be devoted to storybooks and storybook related activities during the daily curriculum. A special time devoted to storybook reading signals to children that this is a valued activity. Children can get a different message when a teacher tells them that she will read them a story “if there is enough time” or “while we wait for our lunch.” Teachers need to support the development of an appreciation for books and reading.

Fourth, careful critique of young children’s books is necessary to ensure that books are developmentally appropriate. Developmentally appropriate includes individually appropriate, as well as culturally
appropriate. It is important to include books that children from different cultural or linguistic backgrounds can relate to. In addition to the criteria used in this study, there is recommended criteria offered by other sources in the field that can be useful in selecting appropriate books for young children (Bredekemp & Rosegrant, 1992, 1995).

Fifth, teachers should assess learning center activity periodically to determine if curriculum objectives are being met. Learning centers provide excellent mediums for learning experiences that meet young children's individual developmental needs. Children's responses to the learning centers can provide teachers with clues regarding their particular interests. Careful assessment of learning center activity can usually detect when children's interests and teaching objectives are in conflict and in need of some adjustment.

Sixth, and finally, early childhood curriculum should offer a balance between child-centered and teacher-directed experiences. Both approaches used to counterpoise each other provide an environment more conducive to learning. Providing experiences for self-directed learning or exploration is equally important to providing guidance and helping children reach the next level of understanding.

**Implications for Future Research**

Based on the review of the literature for this study, the findings of this study, and personal correspondence with experts in using story
acting with young children (personal communication, L. M. Morrow, June 15, 1995; V. G. Paley, May 16, 1996), more research involving story reenactment and language diverse preschool children is needed. According to Paley,

> to dramatize is to translate into another language, one so similar to play itself the child feels confident and lively. Those who watch the acting out of stories feel the same sense of total participation, finding it easy to imagine exactly what is happening in a second language.

Paley and Morrow acknowledged that research which specifically addresses how language diverse preschoolers respond in story reenactment situations would benefit the early childhood profession.

Research on story reenactment with language diverse preschoolers could focus on a number of important issues. One of the most important issues could be timing and potential effectiveness of story reenactment at different points during the child’s preschool experience. This study was conducted late in the school year, it is very likely that the reenactment experience would have a different level of effectiveness early in the year when children are first exposed to a different language and struggling to understand it. Longitudinal studies investigating the effects of periodic story reenactment sessions would also be appropriate.

Also in relationship to timing and potential effectiveness of storybook reenactment would be research that investigates repeated reenactment of the same storybook or multiple storybooks. Though storybook reenactment is believed to enhance language and literacy
development, many other questions exist regarding when and how story reenactment would best benefit young children. Research possibilities appear to be extensive and would be particularly useful if conducted with children who are in classrooms where multiple languages are involved. For example, what is the effect of providing story reenactment during the first month of preschool? Is this effect different when story reenactment is provided toward the end of the school year? Is the effect different when the children involved speak several different languages? Is the effect of story reenactment different when props are used? Or, is the effect of story reenactment, using wordless books different for non-English speakers?

**Head Start.** Research specifically regarding Head Start classroom operations would be helpful in several areas. One possibility for future research with Head Start relates to the schedule for classroom management. Research is needed to help determine if the different activities offered are being allotted the necessary time for optimal effectiveness or if adjustments can be made that would ensure a more balanced array of experiences. Some of the questions teachers need answered include issues related to how they are spending their story time. Are they allotting enough time to literacy related experiences?

Another recommendation for research with Head Start relates to teacher training. Different investigations could help determine what
types of literacy related training is the most needed when you have such a variety of experience and expertise among teachers. Questions that could be addressed in this area may include: Is there a difference in storybook reenactment experiences when teachers are taught the reenactment process? Does teacher training on story reenactment effect how much time is devoted to story reenactment in the classroom? Or, Does teacher training on story reenactment effect teacher attitudes toward using story reenactment in their classrooms?

Instrumentation and methodology. In the process of assessing children for levels of literacy response, several recommendations for more effective instrumentation and methodology were noted. First, given the fact that children performed a wide range of skills within Levels 1 and 2, this instrument can be significantly modified to provide more information regarding what particular skills the child exhibits. In addition, each level could include categories that can produce a more accurate picture of the child's literacy response to a storybook. Finally, the process would need to be repeated with a variety of different books to identify consistencies or inconsistencies in children's responses. A revised copy of this instrument is included in the Appendix (Appendix F) as an example of what intermediate levels of literacy response might include.
**Storybook extensions.** There were five extensions of the storybook observed in learning center play, one in the dramatic play center and four in the library center. Except for the text itself there were no props or individuals to prompt or guide children's play. Further research regarding storybook reenactment could investigate the effects of using various props or strategies to encourage storybook extensions into learning center play. Also, in this study, girls outnumbered boys in all the events observed whether they related to the text or not. Future research that investigates the effects of storybook reenactment on gender-role participation would be very useful for planning early childhood curriculum that is sensitive to or discourages sex-role stereotypes.

**Limitations of the Study**

The first limitation involved local programmatic conditions of the site used. Teacher participation and involvement with storybook reading and interest in the study in general was negatively influenced by the teachers' perceptions of the program's instability and a lack of job security. At the time of this study the program was under the direction of an interim grantee, or governing agency, and the decision for a permanent grantee had not been made. Teachers were concerned that the changes in program governance would ultimately mean the loss of their jobs. They expressed feeling stressed by the situation and
unappreciated by central management because they were not given any information on the situation. It is possible that these conditions, present at the time of this study may have had a negative impact on teachers and contributed to a lack of interest in the project.

A second limitation related to lack of control regarding the timing for parts of this study. The researcher arrived at the research site on three occasions when last-minute schedule changes had been made and a readjustment of project time lines were necessary. Although none of the adjustments were believed to hamper the study in any major way, one particular adjustment may have had an influential effect. This involved the observations of children during learning center activity, some of which eventually occurred after the children came back from spring break. Ideally, a week-long break would not have been a part of this project agenda. It is, therefore, possible that more storybook extensions may have been observed had the week-long break not occurred.

Conclusions

Storybook reenactment was effective in helping children's story retelling abilities regardless of the language used. Children's comprehension of the story and their level of literacy response was also improved. There was no difference in performance between the language treatment groups; children performed well with either English or bilingual reenactment. Findings from this investigation supported
previous research that advocates the use of storybooks and story
reenactment for the enhancement of young children language and
literacy development.

Today's early childhood classroom has become more challenging
than ever as the students increasingly mirror the growth of a linguistically
and culturally diverse nation. Early childhood professionals struggle with
issues that arise daily regarding how to provide the most appropriate and
productive programming for all students. Incorporating culture and
language can become an overwhelming venture when several different
cultures and languages are represented in a single classroom. As ongoing
controversies are debated and decisions are made about curriculum, it is
important to acknowledge that some teaching strategies work better than
others in helping young children acquire the language and literacy skills
necessary for achieving academic success. The findings from this study
suggest that storybook reenactment is a strategy that is beneficial in
helping support language and literacy development. Future research that
addresses the conditions for optimal use of storybooks and reenactment
with language-diverse children would further professional understanding
and educational effectiveness of curriculum for young children.
APPENDIX A

PARENT AND CHILD CONSENT LETTERS
Parental Consent Letter

Dear Parents,

I am a doctoral student at the University of North Texas and I have been given permission to conduct a research project at the Youth Development Inc./Centro de Amor Head Start center where your child attends. I am requesting permission for your child to participate. The study will involve story reading to the children by an adult, story reenactment or dramatization and activities related to the story. Upon completion of these activities the children will be asked a series of questions regarding the story. The children will also be asked to retell the story in their own words. The purpose of the study is to see what effect involvement in the story reading and follow-up activities has on children's comprehension and retelling abilities.

Children will have the story read to them during their regularly scheduled storytime or group activity time. All activities related to the story will be incorporated into the children's regularly scheduled day of activities. Each child will be asked to leave the classroom with me or a research assistant for testing purposes. Children will be taken out of the classroom only if they are comfortable and willing to do so. At no time will any child be pressured to participate in any of the activities. Children's responses on story retelling tests and a story comprehension test will be documented in writing and tape-recorded on a cassette recorder. Children's reenactments of the story will also be video-taped. Upon completion of the study I will retain all documentation, including audio tape and video recordings of children's responses. These tapes may be shared with the child's teacher, other students or at professional conferences. To preserve confidentiality only children's first names will be used to identify children.

Your decision whether or not to allow your child to participate will in no way affect your child's standing in his or her Head Start classroom. At the conclusion of the study, a summary of group results will be made available to all interested parents and teachers. Should you have any questions or need further information, please call me at 884-3970. Thank you in advance for your cooperation and support.

Sincerely,

Cathy Gutierrez-Gomez
THIS PROJECT HAS BEEN REVIEWED BY UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS:

Please indicate whether or not you wish to have your child participate in this project, by checking a statement below and signing in the space provided. Please return this letter to your child's teacher as quickly as possible.

I do grant permission for my child ____________________________
to participate in this project.

I do not grant permission for my child ____________________________
to participate in this project.

_________________________________________________________
Parent/Guardian's Signature
Children's Consent Form

To Be Read To Each Child:

____________________ (Child's Name), I am going to explain to you what we are going to do. If there is something you do not understand or if you want to ask me a question you may do that at anytime.

First, I am going to read a story to you. Then, we will discuss it. We can also discuss the story as I read it to you. Next, we will be doing some activities related to the story. I will be tape-recording and video-taping some of these activities. I will then ask each child to come with me to another room so I can ask you some questions about the story; these sessions will also be tape-recorded.

If you are not comfortable with something we are doing all you have to do is tell me and we will stop. Is this OK with you?

Thank you,

Cathy Gutierrez-Gomez
Typical Classroom Schedule
Head Start Center

8:00 am  Children begin to arrive
8:30 am  Breakfast
9:00 am  Bathroom/Toothbrushing
9:15 am  Large Group/Circle Time
9:30 am  Learning Centers
10:15 am Outdoor Play
10:45 am Prepare for Lunch
          Bathroom and Handwashing
11:00 am Lunch
11:30 am Bathroom
          Prepare to go home
11:40 am Take children to bus
11:50 am Bus leaves
APPENDIX C

ONE WAY OF USING THE FAIRY TALES
One Way of Using the Fairy Tales
by Mary Howarth

1. Read the tale over to yourself several times. Think about the logistics of using the story in your classroom space. Start with a simple story. Plan your physical structure to facilitate smooth movement during the dramatization: table or board "bridge"; three chairs on either side for Billy Goats; pillows or tumbling mat if the troll is really to fall (jump).

2. Begin using story rhymes and repetitions during daily classroom routines and on the playground.

3. Arrange children in a circle for storytelling. If possible, dim the lights. A candle in the center of the circle adds warmth and calms the children.

4. Let the children respond freely to the first tellings. Be sure to check that they understand unfamiliar words or phrases.

5. After the children are familiar with the sequence of events, suggest acting it out. Keep track of which part each child selects. Assure them that everyone will have the opportunity to play all the parts he or she most wants. As they learn that they actually will get their turns, this becomes simpler and faster.

6. If there is too much competition for certain parts or no one is willing to do a part alone, suggest that perhaps two children would like to do the part together. If a child shows fear or hesitation, the teacher can hold her hand while walking through the part with her. (I'm always close by when the troll gets "butted" off the bridge.)

7. Use the structure of the story to clearly delineate a beginning ("Once upon a time...") and the end ("Snip, snap, snout, my tale's told out!"). Keep the action moving as the story unfolds. Do not stop and ask, "Then what did the Littlest Billy Goat say?" This makes the enactment a memory quiz, which results in everyone becoming nervous. Tell the story simply and slowly, watching the children for cues that something needs reiterating. Soon the children will join you to supply a word or chant a familiar phrase. Eventually the play becomes the thing and the entire class helps to move it along.

8. Keep costumes and props to a minimum: children can easily get distracted into dress-up. The more I use the tales, the fewer props I find necessary. It's good for the children to pretend.

9. If you enjoy the tale, your delight will be contagious.
APPENDIX D

COMPREHENSION TEST AND
DIRECTIONS
Comprehension Test

Directions: Place a one (1) point in the space provided for correct response. Place a zero (0) for incorrect response or no response given.

POINTS
1. Tell me the title of this book?
   Answer: Coyote

2. What is this story about?
   Possible Answers:
   (Place an X by the answer or answers given.)
   ___ A Coyote
   ___ A coyote that's always getting into trouble.
   ___ A coyote that wants to be like the crows (or the birds).

3. Who else is in the story?
   (Place an X by the answer or answers given.)
   ___ Old Man Crow  ___ Flock of 6 crows
   ___ Badger  ___ Snake
   ___ Woodpecker

4. What did Coyote want to do or try to do in this story?
   (Place an X by the answer or answers given.)
   ___ Coyote wanted/ tried to dance and sing like the crows.
   ___ Coyote wanted/ tried to fly like the crows.

5. What happens to Coyote at the end of this story?
   (Place an X by the answer or answers given.)
   ___ Coyote tried to fly and fell to the ground.
   ___ Coyote's tail caught on fire.
   ___ Coyote fell in the water.
   ___ Coyote got covered in dust.
   ___ Coyote went home all wet and covered in dust.

6. Story Sequence:
   Look at these pictures from the book and tell me which of these happened 1st, 2nd and last.
   (Child is given 3 pictures from the book to arrange in sequence.)

Total Points
Directions for Administering Comprehension Test

Materials: Question/Scoring sheet, storybook, pencil, cassette tape recorder and tapes.

1. Read the story to the child. Tell the child that you will ask him or her questions about the story and to retell the story after you have read it.

2. After the story, read one question at a time to the child and mark the answer clearly in pencil.

3. Do not supply answers or prompt but give children positive reinforcement whether they are right or wrong.

4. One point (1) is to be given for responding correctly to the questions eventhough the child may give more than one response.

5. Total possible points is 6.
APPENDIX E

STORYBOOK GUIDESHEET/SCORESHEET FOR GRADING
THE RETELLING OF COYOTE: 'A TRICKSTER TALE
FROM THE AMERICAN SOUTHWEST
Story Guidesheet/Scoresheet for Grading the Retelling of
Coyote: A Trickster Tale From The American Southwest

Child's Name_________________________ Age _____ Sex _____
Teacher's Name______________________

**DIRECTIONS:** Place a one (1) next to each element if the child includes it in his or her presentation. Credit "gist" as well as obvious recall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points &amp; Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Characters</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Characters (*main character)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Coyote, Old Man Crow, Flock of 6 Crows (1 point each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Score of Secondary Characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badger, Woodpecker and Snake (1 point each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characters Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Setting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Begins story with &quot;Once upon a time ...&quot; (1 point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Begins story with similar kind of introduction. (1 point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Theme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Coyote was always getting into trouble. (1 point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Coyote was trying to be like the crows; to dance like them, to sing like them, and to fly like them. (1 point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Plot Episodes</strong> (Total of 6 Episodes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Coyote went looking for trouble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Coyote's head caught on fire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Snake wrapped himself around Coyote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode 1 Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Coyote heard laughing and singing and went to take a look.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Coyote saw crows chanting and dancing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Coyote wanted to fly like the crows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode II Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Episode III
a. Coyote asked the crows if he can dance with them.  
b. Old Man Crow says yes, but Coyote can't dance good.  
c. Coyote says Thank You, but now he wants to fly too.

Episode III Totals

Episode IV
a. Old Man Crow and the 6 crows give Coyote feathers.  
b. Coyote tries to fly and falls to the ground.

Episode IV Totals

Episode V
a. Old Man Crow and the 6 crows give Coyote feathers from their other wing.  
b. Coyote couldn't keep up, he wanted the crows to carry him.  
c. The crows pulled their feathers out of Coyote.  
d. Coyote fell to the ground so fast that his tail caught on fire.

Episode V Totals

Episode VI
a. Coyote fell into some water.  
b. Coyote went running after the laughing crows.  
c. Coyote tripped and got all covered in dirt.

Episode VI Totals

5. Resolution (1 point)
   Today Coyote
   a. is the color of dust  
   b. has a burnt, black tip on his tail  
   c. is still always getting into trouble

Resolution Totals

6. Sequence (1 point)  
   Sequence Total (Score 1 for proper order or partial order, 0 for no order.)

Total Points
APPENDIX F

LEVELS OF LITERACY RESPONSE: EVALUATION
OF CHILD REREADING
The following classifications will be used to assess each child's level of response to the storybook that was read to them. Children will be assessed individually. The researcher will hand the child the storybook and ask - "Will you read this story to me, please?"

Check the appropriate classification.

____ A. Descriptive comments governed by pictures but not telling a story. Child makes comments on or labels what they see in the pictures. May appear to be commenting primarily to self. May skip or repeat parts.

____ B. Real storytelling governed by pictures. Child uses "book-like" or "speech-like" language or a combination of both. May use phrases from the actual story and reading intonation. May use phrases like "once upon a time". Content may or may not match content of original story.

____ C. Real storytelling governed by print. Child is reading or attempting to read some print. Exhibits beginner's knowledge of letter-sound combinations and comprehension. May sound out some words and skip others. May read words they recognize from their environment. May be reading words they recognize from their environment.
APPENDIX G

LEVELS OF LITERACY RESPONSE
(REVISED)
Levels of Literacy Response: Evaluation of Child Rereading
(REVISED)

Child's Name __________________________ Group/Teacher __________________________

The following classifications will be used to assess each child's level of response to the storybook that was read to them. Children will be assessed individually. The researcher will hand the child the storybook and ask - "Will you read this story to me, please?" If the child indicates that he/she does not know how to read the researcher should encourage the child by saying the following:

"Do you remember how I read you this story? I would like for you to look at the book and tell me what is happening in the story. Will you do this, please?"

Check the appropriate classification.

____ A. LEVEL 1: Descriptive comments governed by pictures but not telling a story. Child makes comments on or labels what they see in the pictures. May appear to be commenting primarily to self. May skip or repeat parts.

____ A-0 Child does not respond or refuses to participate.

____ A-1 Child makes comments governed by the pictures or labels what he sees, but there is no or limited connection to the story. Examples: "The blue dog was looking for his momma." "The chicken was flying."

____ A-2 Child makes comments governed by the pictures and comments are related to the story. Examples: "The blue coyote was always looking for trouble." "The crows went flying."
B. LEVEL 2: Real storytelling governed by pictures.
Child uses "book-like" or "speech-like" language or a combination of both. May use phrases from the actual story and reading intonation. May use phrases like "once upon a time". Content may or may not match content of original story.

B1 Opens book and starts to "read" the pictures.
Example: "The snake bit him."
Content may not match content of original story.

B2 Uses "book-like" or "speech-like" language or combination.
Example: "Then the snake bit coyote's nose."
Content matches content of original story.

C. LEVEL 3: Real storytelling governed by print.

C1 Child is aware of the connection between print and reading.
Exhibits beginner's knowledge of letter-sound combinations and comprehension.
Example:
For word "blue" - "B - B - B L - BL - BL - BLUE"
May sound out some words and skip others.
May read words they recognize from their environment.

C2 Child is reading using at a steady pace, still pauses periodically.

C3 Child is reading with ease.
APPENDIX H

STUDY PROJECT CALENDAR
Study Project Calendar/Timelines

March 5-8  Meet teachers visit classrooms

March 14, 1996  Orientation and interviews with teachers

March 19-20  Group B: Bilingual Story Reading
(Story reading and discussion - approximately 15-20 min.)

March 20  Group B: Bilingual Story Reading, Reenactment & Testing
(Story reading and discussion - approximately 15 min.)
(Reenactment session - approximately 15-20 min.)
(Testing - about 5 minutes per child)
(Total testing time - approximately 2 hours)

March 21  Group D: Bilingual Story Reading & Testing
(Story reading and discussion - approximately 15-20 min.)
(Testing - about 5 minutes per child)
(Total testing time - approximately 2 hours)

Group A: English Story Reading
(Story Reading and discussion - approximately 15-20 min.)

March 22  Group A: English Story Reading, Reenactment & Testing
(Story reading and discussion - approximately 15 min.)
(Reenactment session - approximately 15-20 min.)
(Testing - about 5 minutes per child)
(Total testing time - approximately 2 hours)

March 26  Group C: English Story Reading & Testing
(Story reading and discussion - approximately 15-20 min.)
(Testing - about 5 minutes per child)
(Total testing time - approximately 2 hours)

March 26  Group B: Storybook Reenactments (Child Readings)

March 27  Group C: Storybook Reenactments (Child Readings)
Group D: Storybook Reenactments (Child Readings)

March 28  Group A: Storybook Reenactments (Child Readings)

Book readings will take approximately 5-8 minutes per
child. Approximately 2 hours per class will be spent for testing on each of these days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 29,</td>
<td>Observations of children in Dramatic Play Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10 &amp; 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1-5</td>
<td>Program closed for Spring Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11, 18 &amp; 23</td>
<td>Observations of children in Library Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 25</td>
<td>Informal Interviews with teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

INDIVIDUAL GROUP STUDY PROCEDURES
Study Procedures: Group A

Story Reading With Reenactment English Only

Day 1

I. I will visit the classroom 2 times before the story reading day to allow time for the children to become comfortable and familiar with me.

II. Story Reading Day _____________________.
    (Date to be set with the teacher).

III. Procedure for Story Reading Day (Story to be read in English)
    A. Teacher will assemble children for regular Circle/Large Group time.
    B. Teacher will introduce me if this has not already taken place.
    C. I will give an introduction of the story and explain the process that the children will be involved in.
    D. I will read the story.
    E. Children will be allowed to comment or ask questions during the story reading.
    F. After the story is read I will lead a discussion of the story using the following questions:
       1) What did you think of this story?
       2) What was your favorite part of the story?
    G. Discussions to be lead in English (children may use the language of their choice).

Day 2

IV. Procedure for Story Reading Day (Story to be read in English)
    *Procedure same as #III above.

V. Children will be involved in a reenactment of the story.
    A. I will explain what will happen and how to reenact a story.
    B. I will assign roles: Coyote, Old Man Crow, 6 Crows, Woodpecker, Badger and Snake.
    C. I will narrate the story as the children act it out.
    D. Children will be encouraged to say their parts or use words they think their character would use.
    E. After reenacting the story one time the children will be allowed to reenact it again if they want to. Children can act out a different character. We will reenact the story a third time if needed to allow children to play different characters if they wish to.
VI. Testing Following Reenactment
   A. Children will be led to testing room by the teaching assistant.
   B. A Story Comprehension Test will be given to see how well the children understood the story. Children will be asked 6 brief questions.
   C. A Story Retelling Test will follow the Comprehension Test. The child will be asked to retell the story to me as if they were telling it to a friend that has never heard it before.
   D. I will record the children's responses on a form and will also audio-tape the sessions.
   E. The Teacher Assistant will take the child back to the classroom.
   F. Testing time will be approximately 8-10 minutes per child.

Day 3 & 4

VII. Learning Center/Free Play
   A. Storybook will be placed in Library Center for children to read on their own.
   B. Children will be observed 3 times during Learning Center Time.

1 Week Later

VIII. Storybook Readings
   A. Children will be led to testing room by the teaching assistant.
   B. Children will be handed the storybook and asked to "read" the story.
   C. Sessions will be approximately 8 minutes per child.
   D. Sessions will be audio-taped.
Study Procedures: Group B

Story Reading With Reenactment Bilingual

Day 1

I. I will visit the classroom 2 times before the story reading day to allow time for the children to become comfortable and familiar with me.

II. Story Reading Day ________________
(Date to be set with the teacher).

III. Procedure for Story Reading Day (English/Spanish)
A. Teacher will assemble children for regular Circle/Large Group time.
B. Teacher will introduce me if this has not already taken place.
C. I will give an introduction of the story and explain the process that the children will be involved in.
D. I will read lines of the story in English and then in Spanish.
E. Children will be allowed to comment or ask questions during the story reading.
F. After the story is read I will lead a bilingual discussion of the story using the following questions:
   1) What did you think of this story?
      Que piensas de esta historia?
   2) What was your favorite part of the story?
      Que parte fue tu favorita o te gusto mas?
G. Discussions will be done bilingually (children may use the language of their choice).

Day 2

IV. Procedure for Story Reading Day (Story to be read in English/Spanish)
*Procedure same as #III above.

V. Children will be involved in a reenactment of the story.
A. I will explain what will happen and how to reenact a story.
B. I will assign roles: Coyote, Old Man Crow, 6 Crows, Woodpecker, Badger and Snake.
C. I will narrate the story as the children act it out.
D. Children will be encouraged to say their parts or use words they think their character would use.
E. After reenacting the story one time the children will be allowed to reenact it again if they want to. Children can act out a different character. We will reenact the story a third time if needed to allow
children a chance to act out different characters if they wish to.

VI. Testing Following Reenactment
A. Children will be led to testing room by the teaching assistant.
B. A Story Comprehension Test will be given to see how well the children understood the story. Children will be asked 6 brief questions.
C. A Story Retelling Test will follow the Comprehension Test. The child will be asked to retell the story to me as if they were telling it to a friend that has never heard it before.
D. I will record the children's responses on a form and will also audio-tape the sessions.
E. The Teacher Assistant will take the child back to the classroom.
F. Testing time should be approximately 8-10 minutes per child.

Day 3 & 4
VII. Learning Center/Free Play
A. Storybook will be placed in Library Center for children to read on their own.
B. Children will be observed 3 times during Learning Center Time.

1 Week Later
VIII. Storybook Readings
A. Children will be led to testing room by the teaching assistant.
B. Children will be handed the storybook and asked to "read" the story.
C. Sessions will be approximately 8 to 10 minutes.
D. Sessions will be audio-taped.
Study Procedures: Group C

Story Reading With Discussion English Only

Day 1

I. I will visit the classroom 2 times before the story reading day to allow
time for the children to become comfortable and familiar with me.

II. Story Reading Day ____________________
(Date to be set with the teacher).

III. Procedure for Story Reading Day (Story to be read in English)
A. Teacher will assemble children for regular Circle/Large Group
time.
B. Teacher will introduce me if this has not already taken place.
C. I will give an introduction of the story and explain the process
that the children will be involved in.
D. I will read the story.
E. Children will be allowed to comment or ask questions during the
story reading.
F. After the story is read I will lead a discussion of the story using the
following questions:
   1) What did you think of this story?
   2) What was your favorite part of the story?
G. Discussions to be done English (children may use the language
of their choice).

IV. Testing
A. Children will be led to testing room by the teaching assistant.
B. A Story Comprehension Test will be given to see how well the
   children understood the story. Children will be asked 6 brief
   questions.
C. A Story Retelling Test will follow the Comprehension Test.
   The child will be asked to retell the story to me as if they were
telling it to a friend that has never heard it before.
D. I will record the children's responses on a form and will also
   audio-tape the sessions.
E. The Teacher Assistant will take the child back to the classroom.
F. Testing time will be approximately 10 minutes per child.
Day 2

VI. Learning Center/Free Play
   A. Storybook will be placed in Library Center for children to read on their own.
   B. Children will be observed during Learning Center Time.

1 Week Later
VII. Storybook Readings
   A. Children will be led to testing room by the teaching assistant.
   B. Children will be handed the storybook and asked to "read" the story.
   C. Sessions will be approximately 8 to 10 minutes.
   D. Sessions will be audio-taped.
Study Procedures: Group D

Story Reading With Bilingual Discussion

Day 1

I. I will visit the classroom 2 times before the story reading day to allow time for the children to become comfortable and familiar with me.

II. Story Reading Day _________________.
   (Date to be set with the teacher).

III. Procedure for Story Reading Day (Story to be read in English/Spanish)
   A. Teacher will assemble children for regular Circle/Large Group time.
   B. Teacher will introduce me if this has not already taken place.
   C. I will give an introduction of the story and explain the process that the children will be involved in.
   D. I will read the story.
   E. Children will be allowed to comment or ask questions during the story reading.
   F. After the story is read I will lead a discussion of the story using the following questions:
      1) What did you think of this story?
         Que piensas tu de esta hishtoria?
      2) What was your favorite part of the story?
         Que parte fue tu favorita o te gusto mas?
   G. Discussions to be done bilingually (children may use the language of their choice).

IV. A. Children will be led to testing room by the teaching assistant.
   B. A Story Comprehension Test will be given to see how well the children understood the story. Children will be asked 6 brief questions.
   C. A Story Retelling Test will follow the Comprehension Test.
      The child will be asked to retell the story to me as if they were telling it to a friend that has never heard it before.
   D. I will record the children's responses on a form and will also audio-tape the sessions.
   E. The Teacher Assistant will take the child back to the classroom.
   F. Testing time will be approximately 8-10 minutes per child.
Day 2

VI. Learning Center/Free Play
   A. Storybook will be placed in Library Center for children to read on their own.
   B. Children will be observed during Learning Center Time.

1 Week Later

VII. Storybook Readings
   A. Children will be led to testing room one at a time by the teaching assistant.
   B. Children will be handed the storybook and asked to "read" it.
   C. Sessions will be approximately 8 to 10 minutes.
   D. Sessions will be audio-taped.
   E. Children will be taken back to classroom.
APPENDIX J

LEARNING CENTER EVENT SUMMARIES
## Learning Center Event Summaries

### Dramatic Play Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Play Theme Description</th>
<th>No. of Boys and Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-29</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2 Boys rearranging an Easter basket. 1 Girl is wanting to show them how she thinks it should go.</td>
<td>2 Boys, 1 Girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Girls run in, looking for hiding places  &quot;El Coyote&quot; is after them. Another girl joins in, offers to be the Coyote. A boy then joins and wants to be Coyote. Girls reluctantly let him join. 1 Girl hides in dress-up closet and one hides under kitchen table. Lots of screams. Teacher steps in, says too many in area.</td>
<td>3 Girls, 1 Boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Girls giving babies a bath. Using soap and water. Others want to join in but activity has been limited to 2 children at a time.</td>
<td>2 Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mom fixing &quot;huevos de Pascuas&quot; (Easter eggs) for her 2 children. Children complaining that they are starving. One girl asks teacher if they can color the Easter eggs. Have to go to Art Area to decorate eggs.</td>
<td>3 Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>One child is the teacher, she is taking 3 students to the library. They go to Library Center and look at books. Girl playing the teacher gets Coyote book and reads it to the children. Holds book &amp; talks like a teacher.</td>
<td>4 Girls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Curriculum Themes: Clouds & Wind, Weather, Easter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Play Theme Description</th>
<th>No. of Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2 Moms (comadres) and their daughters are dressing up, getting ready for a wedding. Moms get their daughters dressed.</td>
<td>4 Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4 Girls are in kitchen cooking. Making</td>
<td>4 Girls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dramatic Play Center Events (cont'd)

pizza, cakes & tortillas with playdough. 1 Boy
1 Boy asks if he can make a pancake.

C 2 Girls feeding, dressing their babies. Babies are sick, moms give medicine & take temperature.

D 2 Girls shopping for groceries with their babies. Arranged all fruits & vegetables (plastic) on table and kitchen counter.

Curriculum Themes: Nature & Spring, Food Preparation, 4-17

| 4-17 | A | *Dramatic Play Center (Housekeeping) Mother having a baby. One girl is the doctor, one is the nurse, and one is the patient. | 3 Girls |
|      | B | Mom cooking for her 3 children, getting them ready for school. | 4 Girls |
|      | C | 2 Girls want to take baby on bus ride. Make bus with chairs. Several children join in. Two boys want to both be bus drivers. | 2 Girls |
|      | D | Mother and daughter are taking baby to the "clinica" (clinic). Girls switch mother & daughter roles. | 2 Girls |

Curriculum Themes: Farming & Farm Animals

*Dramatic Play Centers basically consist of a kitchen area (refrigerator, table & chairs, sink & cabinets) dolls and doll beds, and dress-up clothes.
# Library Center Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>#Girls/#Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-29</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2 Girls sharing a book, <em>The Very Hungry Caterpillar</em>. Girls comment on the pictures. 1 Boy looking at <em>Coyote: A Trickster Tale From The American Southwest</em>.</td>
<td>2 Girls/1 Boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Variety of books out, some relate to Curriculum Theme: April Showers, Gilberto and the Wind, Good Morning Chick. 2 Coyote books (English &amp; Spanish) are out on bookshelf in <em>Library Center</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 girl comes in to sit on childsize couch in Library Center, she is cradling her baby. Picks up several books, looks at them and puts them back. Flips through Coyote book puts it back. 2 Coyote books are out on bookshelf.</td>
<td>1 Girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Boy looking at book about Peter Rabbit 1 Boy looking at book about Baby Animals. 1 Coyote book (English) is out on bookshelf.</td>
<td>2 Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Boy looking at book on dinosaurs Girl playing teacher comes in with her 3 students, she reads Coyote story to them. Boy looking at dinosaur book stops to listen to Coyote story. (See Dramatic Play Observations)</td>
<td>1 Boy/4 Girls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum Themes: Clouds & Wind, Weather, Easter

| 4-10 | A     | Parent Volunteer is reading *Peter Cotton Tail* to 2 Girls. Girls listen quietly.                  | 2 Girls      |
|      | B     | 1 Boy looking at *Francisco's Puppy*, 1 Boy looking at book on Cats.                              | 2 Boys       |
|      | C     | No one in Library Center                                                                         |              |
Library Center Events (cont'd)

D Teacher Assistant read Coyote book to 2 girls, the girls told parts of story. Some parts were from original story (i.e. "Coyote burned his head and his tail", "smashed into the ground cause he couldn't fly") Some parts they modified (i.e. "He was hungry and tried to eat the birds", "He was kinds stupid and nobody wanted to be his friend")

Curriculum Themes: Nature & Spring, Food Preparation,

4-17 A 3 Boys laying on their stomachs, looking at 3 different books: The Very Hungry Caterpillar, Farm Animals, & Brown Bear, Brown Bear. Coyote (Spanish & English) books are on bookshelf.


C 1 Girl looking at The Magic School Bus 1 Boy looking at Gregory The Terrible Eater No Coyote books visible.

D 3 Girls looking at picture cards with pictures of different fruits & vegetables. They are sorting the cards out by color. Teacher took Coyote books home to read and forgot to bring them back.

Curriculum Themes: Farming & Farm Animals

*Library Centers consist of a childsize couch and matching chair, book display with 14 to 16 diverse books.
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