Graduate Research Papers   Student Work

1994

Enrichment for all: A successful alternative for the instruction of Chapter I students

Karmen R. Larson
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

Enrichment for all: A successful alternative for the instruction of Chapter I students

Abstract

The instructional approach traditionally used for the instruction of Chapter I students is that of remediation. This approach tends to enable and perpetuate low achievement in students by focusing on skills and mechanics at the students' present level of achievement. Acceleration instead of remediation can prevent students from staying behind or falling further behind grade level. This paper describes a program developed by the researcher based on acceleration as an alternative to traditional Chapter I instruction. The results of the implementation of this program with third grade Chapter I students are also presented in this paper.

ENRICHMENT FOR ALL:

A SUCCESSFUL ALTERNATIVE FOR

THE INSTRUCTION OF CHAPTER I STUDENTS

A Research Paper

Submitted to the

Division of Early Childhood Education

Department of Curriculum and Instruction

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Education

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

by

Karmen R. Larson

July, 1994

This Research Paper by: Karmen R. Larson

Titled: ENRICHMENT FOR ALL:
A SUCCESSFUL ALTERNATIVE FOR THE
INSTRUCTION OF CHAPTER I STUDENTS

has been approved as meeting the research requirement for the
Degree of Master of Arts in Education.

Penny L. Beed

July 21, 1994
Date Approved   Director of Research Paper

Constance J. Ulmer

July 21, 1994
Date Approved   Graduate Faculty Reader

Peggy Ishler

July 22, 1994
Date Approved   Head, Department of Curriculum
                       and Instruction

ABSTRACT

The instructional approach traditionally used for the instruction of Chapter I students is that of remediation. This approach tends to enable and perpetuate low achievement in students by focusing on skills and mechanics at the students' present level of achievement. Acceleration instead of remediation can prevent students from staying behind or falling further behind grade level. This paper describes a program developed by the researcher based on acceleration as an alternative to traditional Chapter I instruction. The results of the implementation of this program with third grade Chapter I students are also presented in this paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Chapter I, a federally funded assistance program, has existed since 1965 as a type of academic intervention developed specifically for the disadvantaged population. The goal of the Chapter I program is to serve as the "bridge" to close the gap between the discrepant achievement of disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students in basic skills. However, studies such as the Sustaining Effects Study have suggested that the achievement gap in reading between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged is still substantial even though disadvantaged students in Chapter I are doing better than those not in Chapter I (Slavin, 1991).

Similar disappointing long-term effects are being seen in the building in which this researcher works as a Chapter I reading teacher. A large percentage of the third graders served have already received Chapter I assistance for three or four years. Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) results suggest that some of the students are still just as far behind as they were when they started three or four years ago.

Traditionally, remedial readers, which include Chapter I Reading students, have been found to use different strategies than more proficient readers (Purcell-Gates, 1991). Remedial readers use an overall passive approach during reading rather than actively constructing meaning (Purcell-Gates). They read in a word-by-word manner, perceiving reading as decoding rather than comprehension (Purcell-Gates). They fail "to use self-regulatory strategies to monitor comprehension progress" (Purcell-Gates, p. 236). Why have remedial programs such as Chapter I not fulfilled the optimistic hopes of the program planners?

Chapter I Reading as a compensatory program has traditionally used a remedial model. Students are pulled from their regular classroom for supplemental instruction. Students identified as needing Chapter I reading assistance are usually taught in the Chapter I program with the idea that instruction needs to be focused on the present level of achievement to master fundamental skills needed before they can function on grade level. This approach to remediation may appear to help students at the time instruction is given as they "successfully acquire" specific skills, but the approach actually enables students to

fall further and further behind as they are kept from enriched activities that have higher expectations and use higher-order thinking skills (Levin, 1989). In addition, in the classroom, low-achievers, or students performing academically below grade level, have been found to receive qualitatively different instruction than their higher achieving peers (Allington, 1983; McGill-Franzen & Allington, 1991). Traditional remediation strategies stress reduced expectations that stigmatize students as slow learners. Often instruction is given at a pace much slower than that of non-Chapter I students. Mechanics of basic skills are usually emphasized over applications that are more intrinsically motivating and interesting (Levin). Low achieving students also spend less time engaged in reading text and more time on skill work, they are interrupted more often than better readers, and their texts are more phonetically controlled and lack natural language. This type of instruction limits the use of higher-order thinking skills and meaning-making of low achieving students (Allington; McGill-Franzen & Allington).

Statement of the Problem

It is imperative that within schools throughout the nation this academically disadvantaged population receives successful intervention at some point to stop this downward cycle of students staying behind or falling further and further behind. We need to help them learn more rapidly and more effectively so they can at least "keep up" and hopefully "catch up" (Levin, 1988). Educators are beginning to make changes in instruction to increase the quality and rate of achievement in all students. Henry Levin emphasizes the need for acceleration of students rather than remediation through enrichment opportunities. Howard Gardner also suggests enrichment opportunities for students that involve the seven intelligences rather than focusing on one or two intelligences in instruction (Gardner & Hatch, 1989). Lillian Katz (1991) believes that goals for students should include broad habits of mind or dispositions rather than the acquisition of particular skills and processes and should be developed within a project-based environment.

Henry Levin of Stanford University developed the Accelerated Schools Program where the goal is to help disadvantaged students learn

faster rather than slower so they may enter the educational mainstream by the end of elementary school (Levin & Hopfenberg, 1991). The strategy that Levin suggests to meet this goal is one of enrichment rather than remediation. While learning through enrichment students are engaged in interest-based holistic project work that requires the use of higher-order thinking skills and integrates subject areas as well as skills (Levin & Hopfenberg).

Howard Gardner's Theory of Multiple Intelligences includes the idea that each individual has a personal profile of intelligences and uses a degree of intelligence from at least seven different areas: linguistic, musical, logical-mathematical, spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, interpersonal, and intrapersonal (Gardner, 1983). Traditionally, schools have operated nearly exclusively within only two areas of intelligence: linguistic and logical-mathematical. Many of the students served in a Chapter I program may continue to lag behind if their intelligence is measured only within a narrow focus of linguistic and logical-mathematical competencies and if educators do not base their instruction on the multiple intelligences for effective learning and teaching (Gardner & Hatch, 1989).

Lillian Katz (1991) advocates that general habits of mind or dispositions are important goals for students to work toward. Dispositions are inclinations to behave in a certain way or habit of mind. Rosegrant and Cooper (1986) conducted research on the development of literacy with microcomputers and found that there are five dispositions or learning behaviors essential for acquiring literacy. These dispositions are focused participation, self-regulation, persistence, risk taking, and hypothesis testing. For these dispositions to emerge, an environment that involves enrichment and encourages students to take control of their learning is essential.

Purpose of the Paper

The purpose of this paper is to describe the Enrichment For All (EFA) program which is based on the theories of accelerated learning and multiple intelligences. The goal of the program is to promote the five learning behaviors (dispositions) suggested by Katz (1991). The program was developed by this researcher as an instructional program to be used in a Chapter I setting. The researcher based the program on the premise that disadvantaged students need an enriched curriculum

that encourages independence through applications of skills and allows

for multiple representations of knowledge.

Questions

The questions addressed in this paper are:

1. What evidence is there to show that reading levels of the

students involved in the EFA program have changed?

2. In what ways did the students show changes in self-perception

after being involved in the program?

3. What evidence is there to show that each of the five

dispositions listed was being applied by students involved in the

program?

        a. focused participation

        b. self-regulation

        c. persistence

        d. hypothesis testing

        e. risk taking

Definitions of Terms

In order to help the reader better understand the terms used in this

paper, some definitions are included.

Chapter I Students--Chapter I students are students considered educationally disadvantaged since they are identified to be served in a Chapter I program by achieving lower than average in reading.

Disadvantaged Students--Disadvantaged students are those who "because of poverty, cultural differences, or linguistic differences tend to have low academic achievement and experience high secondary dropout rates" (Levin, 1987, p. 60).

Focused Participation--Focused participation is the engagement in a task.

Hypothesis Testing--Hypothesis testing is the testing of an assumption after it has been constructed by a student about how the world works.

Low-Achievers--Low achievers are students performing academically below grade level.

Passive Readers--Passive readers are readers who perceive reading as pronouncing the words rather than constructing meaning as they read.

Persistence--Persistence is staying with a task even though it may be difficult or challenging.

Risk Taking--Risk taking is the attempt to execute a task before it has been mastered.

Self-Regulation--Self-regulation is the regulation of one's own behavior.

Slowed Down Instruction--Slowed down instruction is the movement through a standard text or curriculum at a slower pacethan the average ability student is instructed.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter 2 will first contrast traditional remedial reading instruction

and accelerated instruction. Then the theoretical base for the

Enrichment For All (EFA) program will be provided.

Traditional Chapter I Instruction

The traditional Chapter I program has come to recognize and

accept the typical Chapter I student who follows the unwritten rule that

"low-achievers in the primary grades almost invariably remain low-

achievers throughout their school careers" (McGill-Franzen & Allington,

1991, p. 20). Oftentimes gains that are made by a Chapter I student do

not remain with the student, so the student remains with the program

(Rosenberg, 1988). A majority of Chapter I students remain in or at least

return to the program for many years throughout their school careers

(Anderson & Pellicer, 1990).

Some traditional practices and beliefs within the Chapter I

program have led to the acceptance of the "permanent" Chapter I

student. These practices and beliefs are intended to assist

disadvantaged low-achievers, but instead tend to perpetuate the low

achievement. The theory of reductionism, or reducing complex learning

into a series of sequential tasks, influenced instruction that was

developed in programs for "slow learners." There was a focus in

Chapter I to identify specific subskill deficiencies while slowing down

instruction to make the skills more concrete (Allington, 1983; McGill-

Franzen & Allington, 1991). Remediation assumes an overall premise

that students need to learn specific basic skills or fundamentals before

they can attempt anything more challenging (Levin, 1987a). This

strategy of remediation expects disadvantaged low-achievers to learn at

a slower rate and allows them to fall further and further behind higher-

achieving peers (Levin & Hopfenberg, 1991).

The widening of the achievement gap occurs not only because of

the instruction students are receiving with remediation, but more

importantly, because of the instruction they are not receiving with

remediation. With a remediation strategy, there is a limited range of

higher-order thinking skills used. Remediation reinforces the

recollection of skills rather than helping students construct relationships

and build connections which will result in the retention of content and

improved performance in the classroom (Allington, 1983; McGill-

Franzen & Allington, 1991; Pogrow, 1990). Remedial students are usually not actively involved participants in their learning, but rather passive receptacles of knowledge. Instead of developing independent work habits, many remedial lessons tend to foster dependence on the teacher (Allington, 1987). Instead of direct instruction where tasks are set for students, schools should ". . . help students learn how to formulate their own problems and how to design the tactics and strategies to solve them" (Eisner, 1991, p. 14). The lack of high expectations that are characteristic of traditional remedial instruction reduce expectations of teachers and students themselves (Levin, 1987a). A learned helplessness develops when the teacher accepts effort (trying) rather than accomplishment (learning) and the student has no reason to work harder (Anderson & Pellicer, 1990; Pogrow).

It is our responsibility as educators to recognize these practices and beliefs as detrimental to disadvantaged students. Henry Levin (1989) urges that we cannot afford to allow the downward cycle of disadvantaged students to continue as these students go through school. The number of disadvantaged students in the public schools of the United States is increasing rapidly and is characterized by low

academic achievement and high dropout rates. Economically, this disadvantaged population will be very costly to Americans as a large percentage of new workers will be unprepared for jobs and the ". . . quality of the labor force will deteriorate considerably" (Levin, 1989, p. 3).

<div align="center">Accelerated Instruction</div>

Levin (1987b) suggests that the remedial approach that has traditionally been implemented and accepted for the education of disadvantaged students should be replaced with an accelerated approach designed with components that are absent from the remedial strategy. An effective approach for education of the disadvantaged needs to include three main components. First, expectations and high status for participants should be inherent in the approach, as opposed to the low expectations that are characteristic of the remedial approach. Second, a deadline for closing the achievement gap needs to be set so that disadvantaged students don't fall further behind. Thus, the goal of mainstreaming the educationally disadvantaged students could be met. Finally, the curriculum needs to be faster-paced and should actively engage students in using higher-order thinking skills and interesting

applications rather than limiting students to mechanics while leaving out content and understanding (Levin).

The accelerated approach has been adopted by schools involved in the Accelerated Schools Project that was established in 1986 at Stanford University (Levin & Hopfenberg, 1991). These schools are transitional elementary schools ". . . designed to bring disadvantaged students up to grade level by the end of sixth grade" (Levin, 1987a, p. 20). Data from standardized tests was collected from several schools in Missouri and Texas that were involved in the Accelerated Schools Project for over three years. The findings suggest that "students in all of the schools studied are either already at or above grade level or they are moving toward achieving this goal" (Finnan & Levin, 1994, p. 34). For example, Eugene Field Elementary School in Missouri reported that in 1988 52% of the second grade students were on grade level, but in 1992 88% were on grade level. In 1988, fifth graders from Hollibrook School in Texas started the Accelerated School Program one and one half years behind grade level but were performing above grade level by 1991 (Finnan & Levin).

Peterson (1989) conducted a study to look at how remediation and acceleration affected similar students in mathematics. Three hundred students from each of three Utah school districts were divided into three groups, each containing 100 students similar in IQ and California Tests of Basic Skills scores. One of the groups (100 students) was identified as remedial, another group was identified as average and another group was identified as accelerated. The students identified as remedial were then split into three groups and were taught using 1 of 3 programs. The first group of students spent the entire school year studying mechanical skills at their present level of achievement. The second group of students used the standard math curriculum but moved at a slower pace than the average students. The third group was taught using a pre-algebra program designed for accelerated students. All of these programs were used throughout the school year. The students identified as low achieving or remedial that were taught using acceleration improved significantly more than the low achieving peers taught with remediation or slowed down instruction. The skills they had *not yet mastered before the instruction were learned indirectly as they* were applied to the accelerated curriculum. Stanley Pogrow (1990)

also argues that if general thinking ability is enhanced and specific

subskills are not the focus of instruction, then basic skills will improve as

a by-product. Both Peterson and Pogrow agree with Levin (1987a) that

low achieving students may never return to the educational mainstream

if they continue to learn through a remedial approach.

In order to apply the principles of acceleration to children's

instruction, educators must be convinced of the ability of all children to

learn. According to Levin, (cited in Brandt, 1992) when attempting to

accelerate the learning of students, the teaching-learning approach that

works best for disadvantaged students is one that is often used with

gifted and talented students (Brandt). He maintains that students should

be exposed to rich experiences and as much stimulation as possible

through a hands-on curriculum. They should be presented with

challenging material that will require them to work harder and smarter

(Brandt; Fiske, 1991). Students should be active participants in the

development of applications that are meaningful and useful in their lives

(Levin, 1987b). The students' talents, gifts, and strengths should be the

focus of planning for instruction (Brandt). Every student enters school

with a different array of talents and a variety of strengths that educators

have the opportunity to build upon. Howard Gardner's Theory of

Multiple Intelligences states that there are seven intelligences that every

individual may possess: linguistic, musical, logical-mathematical,

spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, interpersonal, and intrapersonal (Gardner,

1983). Gardner defines intelligence as the "ability to solve problems, or

to fashion products, that are valued in one or more cultural or community

settings" (1993, p. 7). Every individual has differing tendencies toward

each of the seven intelligences and therefore has a unique personal

profile of intelligences because of individual genetic differences as well

as environmental experiences (Gardner & Hatch, 1989).

Historically, schools have not recognized all seven areas of

intelligence as legitimate knowledge sources and have focused

exclusively on the linguistic and logical-mathematical intelligences as

ways to represent knowledge and ways to assess children for ability and

achievement (Gardner & Hatch, 1989). This lopsided view of

intelligence in the schools has automatically left some children at a

disadvantage. Students who are taught remedially run the risk of not

being able to develop all seven areas of their intelligence. Students who

are not as strong in representing knowledge through linguistic or logical-

mathematical tendencies are viewed as less competent when assessed

within those areas of intelligence. Gardner (1993) states, "Where there

is only one standard of competence, it is virtually inevitable that most

students will end up feeling incompetent" (p. 74). Schools need to

individualize by recognizing all the variations of intelligence and

designing educational programs that allow children to develop their

strengths and thus enable them to maximize their potential (Eisner,

1991; Gardner). If this can be accomplished, ". . . not only will people

feel better about themselves and more competent; it is even possible that

they will also feel more engaged" (Gardner, p. 12).

The theories of Howard Gardner and Henry Levin are common in

supporting the ideas that there are multiple ways to represent knowledge

and that through enriched experiences students will have the chance to

enhance their learning and maximize their potential. Gardner suggests

project work related to a theme as an effective way for children to apply

strengths and extend learning (Gardner, 1993). The project approach

introduced by Lillian Katz and Sylvia Chard (1989) as a way of

teaching and learning applies the theories of both Henry Levin and

Howard Gardner as children study a theme-related topic in depth

individually or with a group. The project approach involves choices and encourages active participation which builds intrinsic motivation and positively affects achievement. The teacher builds on the child's proficiencies rather than deficiencies and allows for multiple representation of knowledge. The project approach requires sustained effort for a long period of time after advanced planning for the project. Topics and content for projects are drawn from what is familiar to the student.

The components of the project approach would suggest the fostering of the five dispositions for learning which were identified in research by Rosegrant and Cooper (1986) as essential to acquiring literacy. These five dispositions are focused participation, self-regulation, persistence, hypothesis testing, and risk taking. "Focused participation is another term to describe engagement . . . with a high level of participation and attention" (Bredekamp & Rosegrant, 1992, p. 74). Self-regulation is the ability to regulate one's own behavior and "make appropriate, ethical decisions" (Bredekamp & Rosegrant, p. 76). Persistence is the disposition of staying with a task even though it may be difficult or challenging. Hypothesis testing is the process that

children repeatedly go through as they "construct assumptions about

how things work in the world and then try out their assumptions"

(Bredekamp & Rosegrant, p. 75). Risk taking is the attempt to execute a

task before one has mastered it. A learning environment that

encourages and allows for choice and active participation will support

these dispositions (Bredekamp & Rosegrant).

This paper describes the EFA program designed by the

researcher. The program implemented project work with third grade

Chapter I students to apply the principles espoused by Levin (1987b)

and Gardner (1993) and looked at the effect of the program on the

student's reading abilities, perceptions of their abilities, and dispositions

during reading.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes how the Enrichment For All (EFA) program

was implemented as a study. First the participants and setting are

explained. Next the EFA program is described. Finally, the research

tools and the methods are described.

Participants

This study focused on third grade students who attended Chapter

I in small groups daily during the 1993-1994 school year. The

participants in the study were 10 third grade students and a Chapter I

reading teacher in an elementary school in a large city in the Midwest.

The children came to Chapter I for 25 minutes daily in small groups of

three or four. The teacher/researcher in this study was in her second

year of Chapter I teaching experience.

The students' reading levels ranged from 2 years behind grade

level to 1 semester behind. These groups were selected for the study

because of their discrepant reading levels and because all of the

students had already received two or three years of remedial assistance.

All of the 10 third grade students were passive readers; that is, the

students considered reading as pronouncing the words correctly rather than meaning making. When discussing, students did not appear to readily make connections between reading and their own lives and experiences, nor between reading and writing. Reading strategies used by these students were not consistent, and most students relied heavily on one strategy rather than utilizing a variety of strategies to support their reading. In all school settings, the students were very dependent on teacher feedback to feel confident about their reading and writing. Tasks were fulfilled by these students because they were assigned by the teacher and they were usually complete when the minimum expectations were reached.

In their classrooms, the students' reading program was presented thematically according to the Houghton Mifflin Literature-Based Series. Vocabulary was taught prior to reading the text rather than during the reading of the text. The <u>Selection Response Booklet</u> and <u>Student Resource Booklet</u> provided by the company were used in conjunction with a majority of the selections. The pages used in the workbooks were chosen by the teacher and assigned to every third grade student. Many of the students within the classroom were assigned reading selections

from the second grade Houghton Mifflin readers so they could practice

at the appropriate reading level. Those were the same materials that the

students had read during their previous school year.

The third grade classroom teachers asked that the students be

taught more basic skills in Chapter I since they were struggling in the

language-based basal. It seemed that the additional isolated skill work

that the classroom teachers requested would only make the students

struggle more or continue to lag behind at the least. In order for the third

graders to feel comfortable in a comprehensive language-based basal

program, they needed to learn to think comprehensively rather than

focusing on isolated skills or parts of the program.

<u>Setting</u>

For Chapter I instruction, the 10 third grade students were pulled

out at the request of the third grade classroom teachers. Since the

students were pulled out for a relatively short period of 25 minutes daily,

it was necessary to make the EFA program as integrated and

comprehensive as possible.

Description of the Enrichment For All Program

The EFA program is an alternative approach to teaching reading that was implemented with Chapter I students. It is based on the idea that all students, including those in remedial programs, need to have opportunities for enrichment and for the application of the variety of intelligences that they may possess. The program is a project approach with the main components of: student-selected literature, enrichment activities, projects, and thematic organization. The processes featured in the program are self-selection, self-evaluation, representing knowledge using multiple intelligences, group processing, and exploration and discovery.

The overall goal of the EFA program was to help third grade Chapter I students, who have not had increased success with remediation strategies, to read more successfully on grade level in their regular classroom reading program. The third grade students were given enrichment opportunities which invited them to use a variety of the seven intelligences during their Chapter I instruction time. Additional long-term goals for the third grade students were:

1. To increase self-regulation.

2. To use hypothesis-testing while interacting with the
environment.

3. To invite risk-taking.

4. To encourage focused participation.

5. To become persistent

6. To enjoy learning and maintain a desire to learn.

7. To develop foundational skills needed for further growth in
literacy, mathematical thinking, scientific thinking, cultural
understandings, the arts, and other areas of the curriculum.

8. To use language as a tool for learning and a means of
communication.

9. To grow in appreciation of literature and the process of
speaking, listening, writing, reading, and creating.

10. To develop basic thinking skills.

To work toward the long-term goals of the program, the students'
daily activities were organized around a student-selected general theme
that was related to a component of the third grade classroom curriculum
in some way. By organizing the program with a thematic approach,

many decision-making opportunities were provided for the student. Each small group of three or four students cooperatively chose a desirable theme and webbed different ways of perceiving that theme. The themes suggested throughout the program were: weather, nature, food, school, heroes and heroines, dreams, adventure, folktales, tall tales, fables, reptiles, and friends. After the webbing discussion with students, the teacher acquired approximately 25 books from the library. The books pertained to topics that the students had generated when elaborating on the theme. The interests and the reading level of each student were kept in mind as books with a variety of style and reading levels were chosen. The students then spent at least two class periods exploring the books as they thought about which one they might be interested in as their piece of literature for the theme. The teacher stressed that they should think about which books would be not too easy, not too hard, but "just about right" since they would be responsible for getting to know the book very thoroughly throughout the theme. It was also suggested that they look seriously at whether or not the book would hold their interest for a period of 3 to 6 weeks.

After the initial selection of literature was completed, the students were asked to think of possible writing activities that could be applied to any pieces of literature (Appendix A). They were also asked to come up with a variety of project ideas that could represent a piece of literature (Appendix B). The teacher encouraged the students to think divergently to come up with multiple ways of representing their books and explained the seven intelligence areas to them. Each group collaboratively came up with an ongoing list for writing activities and project ideas knowing that the writing ideas would be used on a daily basis and the project ideas could be chosen for a culminating book representation. Both of these lists were displayed in the room and were added to and changed as the children progressed through the theme.

After selecting the theme, a piece of literature, and some possible literature activities and culminating projects, each student was responsible for becoming very familiar with his or her book. A student was expected to be involved in multiple readings of his or her chosen book and to work through writing activities as he or she became familiar with the book. Finally, after two to three weeks of getting to know the book and concepts, characters, and vocabulary related to the book, the

student represented his/her book through a culminating book project

which encouraged and allowed for the application of any of the seven

areas of intelligence. During the study, the students and teacher

completed four thematic units that lasted 4 to 8 weeks each. Objectives

for the students to achieve during each theme were the following:

The student in the learning environment will :

1. Express ideas effectively using verbal and written

communication.

2. Be an active learner using student discovery and testing of

ideas.

3. Work individually to apply general ideas to his or her specific

literature situation.

4. Work cooperatively with the group to apply learning.

5. Apply newly learned skills in a culminating book project.

The thematic units were selected by the students and teacher to

correlate with the regular classroom activities. This selection process

began by discussing the theme that the students were involved in within

the third grade classroom and how the theme could be extended in

Chapter I. This correlation with the classroom theme helps the student to

continue to be a part of the regular classroom even though he or she

was working outside the classroom. It was hoped that the students would

see themselves as contributors to the work of the class and that the

students in the classroom would also see these contributions as relevant

and important.

Each of the students had a portfolio and helped select samples of

work that they felt would represent their learning. As they pursued their

selected activities and projects, the teacher and student made decisions

about any changes or adaptations that needed to be implemented.

Throughout the program the students had opportunities to share samples

of work from their portfolios with peers.

<div align="center">Research Tools and Their Uses</div>

The research tools used in the study were: the Joy Informal

Reading Inventory (IRI) (Keith, 1974), the Qualitative Reading Inventory

(QRI) (Leslie & Caldwell, 1990), a self-evaluation survey,

observational reports, and anecdotal records. In this section, each

research tool will be described and explained in terms of its use in the

study.

Two reading inventories were used in this study as one way to get information about each child's growth in word identification and comprehension. The Joy IRI consists of a group of leveled passages that the student reads and answers questions about. The student's independent, instructional, or frustration reading level can be determined by scoring word identification accuracy and comprehension of the passage. This reading inventory was chosen by the researcher because every participant involved in the study had an instructional reading level identified from March of the previous school year that could be used as a pre test to measure growth.

The researcher identified the instructional reading level of each of the students in March of 1994 as a post test.

The QRI consists of leveled passages that the student reads, retells verbally, and answers questions about. Before the student begins reading the passage, the prior knowledge of the student in relation to the passage is scored. The student's independent, instructional, or frustration reading level can be determined by the word identification accuracy and comprehension of the passage. The questions that determine the comprehension score are identified as explicit or implicit.

There is also an acceptability factor when counting miscues to accept reading that may not have been exactly accurate but did not change the meaning of the text and to account for miscues that have been self-corrected. The researcher selected the QRI because growth could be measured over a period of time, but it was also more congruent with the EFA program than the Joy IRI was. The QRI considers the individual student by looking at prior knowledge strengths and weaknesses and allows for construction of meaning during the reading of the passage without penalizing the students for meaningful substitutions of words or self-corrections. None of the students had been given this reading inventory previously. An instructional level was determined for some of the students in September as a pre test and all of the students were given the QRI in May as a post test to measure growth or find an appropriate reading level. The researcher was unable to determine an instructional level for all of the students in September because two of the students were unable to achieve an instructional level on the inventory when it was administered, and two of the students transferred into the program from another Chapter I program in January.

The researcher designed a self-evaluation survey (Appendix C) as a pre- and post- evaluation tool to note any significant changes in self-perception of the students as readers. The items were selected based on student perceptions about learning that were observed with third grade Chapter I students the previous year. The items also reflect goals of the program that were intended to be reached during the implementation of the program. Before this study began, the students were given the self-evaluation survey to complete about themselves and their reading. They were given the survey again as each of the thematic units was completed. The survey asked the students to evaluate the quality and understanding of their work as well as their independence level as they worked in the program.

Daily field notes were recorded by the researcher during the implementation of the EFA program. The field notes contained observations of students' work processes, comments, and discussions. In addition, the researcher kept anecdotal records of themes that were selected, of webbing, and of books that were selected by the participants. The field notes were used to recall behaviors displayed

and comments made by the participants as the researcher analyzed

changes in learning behaviors for the findings of the study.

To summarize the results of the program, information gathered from

the data was written on a separate file folder for each child. On each

student's folder the pre- and post- instructional readability level was

recorded for the Joy IRI and the QRI. These scores were compared to

determine the amount of growth that had taken place throughout the

year. Growth of more than one year or more than one reading level

would be considered significant.

The number of positive, neutral, and negative responses of each

student on the self-evaluation survey were tallied and recorded for two

surveys; the survey given at the beginning of the program, and the

survey given after the completion of the program. The first and last self-

evaluation surveys were compared for each participant to see if any

significant pattern or change in self-perception was seen from the

beginning of the program to the end. Also, some written comments on

the self-evaluation survey from the students about their work within the

program were recorded as a quotes. These comments were recorded if

they reflected an attitude change or an awareness of a learning

behavior.

After several readings of the field notes and a great deal of

thought about behaviors that students exhibited throughout, the

examiner recorded observations of behaviors exhibited by each student

that showed evidence of the five learning behaviors or dispositions. The

number of students exhibiting each behavior was then tallied to look at

commonalities among the 10 students.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Questions

In this chapter, the findings will be reported for each of the
questions of the paper. The questions are:

1. What evidence is there to show that reading levels of the
students involved in the Enrichment For All (EFA) program have
changed?

2. In what ways did the students show changes in self-perception
after being involved in the program?

3. What evidence was there to show that the five learning
behaviors listed below were being applied by students involved in the
program?

   a. focused participation

   b. self-regulation

   c. persistence

   d. hypothesis testing

   e. risk taking

Changes in reading levels and self-perception will be shown for

each student and summarized for the group. Evidence of application of

each of the five dispositions will be shown by listing the behaviors

exhibited by students that characterized the application of that

disposition. For each behavior listed under the category of the

disposition, a scenario involving one student that showed that behavior

will be described.

Changes in Reading Levels

The Joy Informal Reading Inventory (IRI) and the Qualitative

Reading Inventory (QRI) were used to show the growth of the students

after being involved in the EFA program. Table 1 shows the results of

the children's performance on the Joy IRI. A look at pre- and post-

instructional levels reveals that all of the 10 participants progressed at

least one reading level from March 1993 to March 1994. Two students

progressed four reading levels, 2 students progressed three reading

levels, 3 students progressed two reading levels, and 3 students

progressed one reading level.

The QRI pre- and post- scores for instructional reading levels can

be seen in Table 2. The scores showed that all six of the participants

Table 1

Growth Between Pre-and Post-Administrations of Joy Informal

Reading Inventory at Instructional Levels

	Primer	Gr. 1	Gr. 2-1	Gr. 2-2	Gr. 3-1	Gr. 3-2	Gr. 4	Gr. 5
Angel					1	2		
Christy			1			2		
Curt	1		2					
Denise		1	2					
Doug			1			2		
Gordon		1				2		
Julie			1			2		
Missy				1		2		
Tina				1				2
Trevor		1	2					

1 - pre-test instructional level - March 1993
2 - post-test instructional level - March 1994

who had a pre- and post-instructional reading level on the QRI

progressed at least one reading level from September of 1993 to May of

1994. Two of the participants did not have an instructional level in

September because they read at frustration on the primer level which is

Table 2

Growth Between Pre- and Post-Administrations of Qualitative

Reading Inventory at Instructional Levels

	Primer	1	2	3	4	5
Angel			1		2	
Christy			1		2	
Curt*				2		
Denise**				2		
Doug		1			2	
Gordon	1			2		
Julie				1	2	
Missy**						2
Tina			1		2	
Trevor*			2			

1 - pre-test instructional level - September 1993
2 - post-test instructional level - May 1994
*didn't achieve instructional level when administered September 1993
**this student was not involved with the program in September 1993

the lowest level available to score on the QRI. One of those students

read at an instructional level of third grade in May and the other at an

instructional level of second grade. Two other participants progressed

three reading levels from September to May, three students progressed

two reading levels, and one student progressed one reading level. The

final two participants were not tested in September because they

transferred into the EFA program from another Chapter I program in

January of 1994.

In summary, all the children showed growth by advancing at least

one reading level on the Joy IRI. The six students who were

administered the QRI with both pre- and post- tests showed growth by

advancing at least one reading level. Most of the students progressed

more than one reading level on both the Joy IRI and the QRI. The

expected growth of the average reader on the QRI would be one year.

Changes in Self-Perception

The self-evaluation survey was given to all of the students before

the EFA program began and after each theme throughout the program.

The survey asked the students to evaluate the quality of their work

throughout the program and their independence level as they worked

within the program. As Table 3 shows, three of the participants in the

study had more positive responses on the self-evaluation survey at the

end of the program than at the beginning.

Table 3

Numbers of Positive, Neutral, and Negative Responses on the Self-

Evaluation Survey of Reading Abilities and Level of Independence

Completed by Students in September and in May

| | 1st Self-Evaluation Survey Completed | | | 2nd Self-Evaluation Survey Completed | | |
	+	0	-	+	0	-
Angel	4	6	0	7	3	0
Christy	7	3	0	8	2	0
Curt	5	5	0	9	1	0
Denise	7	3	0	5	5	0
Doug	10	0	0	10	0	0
Gordon	4	6	0	2	8	0
Julie	2	8	0	5	5	0
Missy	5	5	0	5	5	0
Tina	4	4	2	2	8	0
Trevor	10	0	0	8	2	0

+   number of positive responses
0   number of neutral responses
-   number of negative responses

Four of the participants had less positive responses at the end of the

program than at the beginning. These four participants seemed to

have higher expectations for themselves at the end of the program

and seemed to be answering the self-evaluation more reflectively and genuinely than at the beginning. Three of the students had the same number of positive responses at the beginning and end of the program. None of the participants in the study had more than two negative responses on a survey at the beginning of the program and there were no negative responses at the end of the program.

Although the amount of change in positive responses was moderate, most of the students became more specific from the beginning to the end of the program on the self-evaluation survey when they were asked to explain why they felt they did or did not do a very good job on their book and the activities to go with it. An example comment from Curt in December of 1993 states, "Yes, I did a good job on my activities with my book." The same student in May of 1994 wrote, "I think I did a good job on my illustrations. I like the way I cut my book." Julie wrote after the first theme, "I tried my best." After the last theme she wrote, "I think I did a good job because I tried to make the words in the sentence go along with the pictures." This change in specificity suggests that the students became more reflective about their learning processes. Nine of the 10

participants showed more specificity on the comments at the end of their

self-evaluation surveys as the program progressed.

<div align="center">

Application of the Five Dispositions

</div>

After studying the field notes, the researcher noted behaviors that

seemed characteristic of the five dispositions: (a) focused participation,

(b) self-regulation, (c) persistence, (d) hypothesis testing, and (e) risk

taking. Each behavior was categorized under 1 of the 5 dispositions

and the number of students exhibiting that behavior was tallied (Table 4).

In each of the following sections the findings are summarized for each

disposition by stating the behavior that was observed and by providing

an example of the behavior as exhibited by at least one student.

Focused Participation

Focused Participation is application to a learning task with a great

deal of participation and attention. As Table 4 indicates, all 10 of the

participants showed focused participation as they began to

dialogue more during the program. They began to verbalize their

thoughts more readily during planning and implementation of their units.

This was seen as the members of one of the groups discussed their

Table 4

Number of Students Showing Behaviors as Evidence of the Five

Dispositions

	10	9	8	7	6	5	4
A. Focused Participation							
1. began to dialogue more	X						
2. seemed to enjoy reading and writing in this environment	X						
3. began reading more actively				X			
4. became more involved as a group member				X			
B. Self-Regulation							
1. became more independent	X						
2. reflective about their learning	X						
3. selected more appropriate books and activities						X	
4. used advanced organizing						X	
C. Persistence							
1. worked more thoroughly and took more time					X		
D. Hypothesis-Testing							
1. became more confident			X				
2. became more aware of conventional spelling						X	
E. Risk-Taking							
1. selected more extensive or comprehensive activities/projects				X			
2. began to select activities for more appropriate reasons					X		

projects informally as they worked on them. These students had selected similar projects, but had each taken a different direction. They seemed excited about each other's projects and offered compliments and suggestions for them.

All of the participants also seemed to enjoy reading and writing in this environment. An example of this was regular prompt arrival of third grade students at the Chapter I door and the intent engagement that often caused the group to rush off to their classroom because they had forgotten to "watch the clock."

Seven of the participants began reading more actively or focusing on the meaning of the text rather than just pronouncing the words. Some of the students read with a piece of paper beside them that was used to jot down words or phrases that they didn't understand or wanted to know more about.

An increased involvement as a group member was observed in seven of the students. One group of 3 had a list of activities with scribbles and scratch marks because they initiated as a group the modification of their initial ideas as they refined their understanding of the activities. In contrast, before the program, the students in this group

exhibited passive behaviors such as withdrawing from the group physically and waiting quietly until the teacher requested some participation from them.

Self-Regulation

Self-regulation refers to the ability to regulate one's own behavior by making appropriate decisions. As shown in Table 4, all 10 of the participants displayed self-regulating behaviors by becoming more independent as the program evolved. By November, a typical entrance into the Chapter I EFA program involved the students greeting the teacher and collecting their book and supplies to begin where they had left off the day before without any directions from the teacher. Before this program was implemented, a typical entrance by the same students involved the students entering the classroom and sitting at the table to wait for the teacher's directions.

All of the participants also demonstrated that they were more reflective about their learning after being involved in the program. For example, in May of 1994, one of the students wrote on her self-evaluation as a response to her book and activities, "I learned something. I learned that it takes a whole lot of time." The same student

in December responded about her book and activities, "My handwriting was good. The book was good."

Five of the students improved in independently selecting more appropriate books and activities for themselves. One student, who is very strong in drawing meaning from text but weak in decoding, started the first theme with a very easy book and struggled more than he needed to because the content was too simplified for him. Because the vocabulary was so controlled, there was not enough meaning for the student to depend upon. He realized that even if the book looked too difficult at first, he would be able to work through the text because of interest and understanding. He began selecting literature that was much more difficult than his first selection and compensated by finding alternative ways to get through the first one or two readings of his book. One way he accomplished this was by asking an adult to tape a reading of the book. He listened to the tape one or two times to become familiar with the characters and plot of the book as background knowledge for working through the book.

Five participants demonstrated advanced organization before beginning an activity. One student completed a story board to organize

his writing before starting. Another student made a list of the steps she would follow to complete her project.

Persistence

Persistence is shown when a student stays with a task even if it is challenging or difficult. Six of the students showed persistence by working more thoroughly and taking more time on their activities and projects as the program progressed (Table 4). One of the students began the program by completing activities as quickly as possible and acted disgusted if the teacher suggested that there was plenty of time to begin another activity. In contrast, a writing activity he selected during the last theme was completed over a period of 10 school days.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing is the trying out of assumptions after they have been constructed by children. As seen in Table 4, eight of the participants displayed more confidence at the end of the program than at the beginning. These efforts were classified as examples of hypothesis testing. Two of the students depended heavily on a great deal of direction from the teacher as the program began. It was even difficult for them to choose activities without hesitation. At the beginning of the

program these students asked for feedback frequently, but both of them were able to go for longer periods of time without feedback later in the program. The hypothesis they were testing in this situation was their ability to use less and less teacher guidance in order to complete an activity successfully.

Five of the students became more aware of conventional spelling. The move of a student from developmental spelling to conventional spelling shows hypothesis testing as the students test hypotheses about their meaningful construction of written language. Their developmental spelling is refined to conventional as they correct their original assumptions about writing. One student began the program depending on developmental spelling with no interest in the conventional spelling of the words. In the second theme he asked for conventional spelling of some of the words as he went. Some of the conventional spelling was applied on the published copy of his writing. During the last theme he completed his story first, circled the words he was unsure of, and asked for corrections on his circled words. On the published copy of his story during the last theme he applied the conventional spelling without direction from the teacher.

Risk Taking

Risk taking is the attempt to complete a task before it has been mastered. This disposition was evidenced as more extensive or comprehensive activities and/or projects were selected by seven participants as the program progressed (Table 4). Originally, students chose to do many simple activities rather than a small number of more involved activities. For example, one student chose many simple activities during the first two themes. Most of the simple activities selected during the second theme were similar to the activities completed during the first theme. During the last theme she ended with a project that began as a simple writing activity, but she chose to extend the simple summary into a production to be videotaped as a news report and worked diligently on it until the project was completed at the end of the theme.

Five of the participants began to select activities and projects for more appropriate reasons as the program went on. For example, at first two of these students would repeatedly choose an activity because their friend had chosen it during the first two themes. For the last theme in the program, both students selected books and activities based on their

own interests. The risk taking here involved the declaration of personal choice within a group of students without the fear of peer rejection.

<div align="center">Summary</div>

Results of the data gathered from the research tools indicate that there were changes that took place during the implementation of the EFA program. Data taken from the two reading inventories show growth in instructional reading levels of participants throughout the school year. The self-evaluation survey that was administered to the participants revealed a change shown in comments written at the end of the program that were more specific than comments written at the beginning of the program. Finally, the field notes documented observations of the 10 participants exhibiting changes in learning behaviors that were characteristic of the five dispositions.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Summary

The purpose of this paper was to describe the Enrichment For All (EFA) program that is based on the theories of accelerated learning and multiple intelligences. The questions addressed in this paper were:

1. What evidence is there to show that reading levels of the students involved in the EFA program have changed?

2. In what ways did the students show changes in self-perception after being involved in the program?

3. What evidence is there to show that the five dispositions listed below were being applied by students involved in the program?

   a. focused participation

   b. self-regulation

   c. persistence

   d. hypothesis testing

   e. risk taking

Reading Abilities of Students

Question 1, "What evidence is there to show that reading levels

of the students involved in the EFA program have changed?",

addresses the changes in instructional reading levels for both the Joy

Informal Reading Inventory (IRI) and the Qualitative Reading Inventory

(QRI). The change in growth was determined after administering a pre-

and post-test to the students involved in the program. The instructional

reading levels of both inventories were positively affected by

involvement in the program. All of the students progressed at least one

reading level on both reading inventories and most students grew more

than one reading level. The EFA program increased the general

reading ability of all students involved.

Perceptions of Students

Question 2, " In what ways did the students show changes in self-

perception after being involved in the program?", looked at the effect of

the program on the perceptions of the students about the quality of their

work and their independence level in reading. The pre- and post- self-

evaluation surveys were studied to look at the changes in the numbers

of positive, neutral, and negative responses and the changes in the

nature of the comments written by the students. Although the number of positive responses from the pre- to the post- administration of the survey was moderate, 9 of the 10 participants became more specific in their comments about their work and their reading as the program progressed. The increase in specificity indicates that, after being involved in the EFA program, there was a general heightened awareness of learning by the students as well as a clearer understanding of what was to be accomplished throughout the program within the activities and projects.

<div align="center">Dispositions of Students</div>

Question 3 addresses the five dispositions when asking "What evidence is there to show that the five dispositions were being applied by students involved in the program?" The evidence was drawn from the researcher's field notes which documented observations and discussions with the students throughout the program. The researcher identified all learning behaviors that signified change and then categorized each behavior as 1 of the 5 dispositions.

Focused participation refers to the engagement of a student in a task. All of the students in the study began to dialogue more and enjoyed reading and writing in the environment of the program. Seven of

the participants began to read more actively by focusing on the meaning of the text rather than just pronouncing the words. More involvement as a group member was also shown by seven of the students. These behaviors suggest that involvement in the EFA program leads to an increase in focused participation of the student.

Self-regulation is the regulation of one's own behavior shown by making appropriate choices. All 10 of the participants showed this by becoming more independent as the program evolved. All of the students also showed more reflection about their learning after being involved with the program. More appropriate book and activity selections were made by 5 of the 10 participants and five students began to organize before beginning an activity. These behaviors exhibited by the students involved in the program indicate that the program increases self-regulation in the students.

Persistence is the staying with a task even though it may be difficult or challenging for a student. Six of the students exhibited the behavior of working more thoroughly and taking more time on their activities as the program progressed. Even though the findings of persistence are more limited than the other dispositions, some of the

behaviors exhibited classified as other dispositions could be considered persistence as well. An example of this is the risk taking behavior of working more extensively or comprehensively on activities and projects. Confidence, discussed as a hypothesis testing behavior, and independence, discussed as a self-regulation behavior could also show persistence in some situations. The behavior of working more thoroughly and taking more time on activities and projects along with other behaviors shown throughout the program are evidence that involvement in the EFA program leads to an increased persistence in the student.

Hypothesis testing is the testing of an assumption after it has been constructed by a student about how the world works. Students in the program exhibited hypothesis testing by becoming more confident and becoming more aware of conventional spelling throughout the program. Eight participants became more confident and five of the participants showed an increased awareness of conventional spelling from the onset of the program. These behaviors are evidence that the EFA program increased hypothesis testing as a disposition in most of the students.

Risk taking is the attempt to execute a task before it has been

mastered by a student. In the study, risk taking was exhibited in two

ways. More extensive or comprehensive activities and projects were

selected by seven of the participants. Five of the participants also

began to select activities and projects for more appropriate reasons.

Risk taking was a result of involvement in the EFA program for most of

the students.

Conclusion

The EFA program developed by the researcher provided

accelerated instruction with high expectations by actively engaging the

students in higher-order thinking skills and applications which were of

interest to the students. The program allowed for the application of the

seven intelligences and the five learning dispositions in a project-based

learning environment. The instruction provided by the EFA program

succeeded in enhancing the development of 10 students in three ways.

First, all of the children showed increased ability to read and

comprehend. Second, the children showed an increase in personal

reflection about learning processes and abilities. Finally, the children

successfully applied five dispositions or habits of mind that will be

necessary for lifelong learning. The results indicate that the program

was worthwhile for the students and provided benefits that may not have

been available if traditional Chapter I instruction had been offered.

<u>Implications</u>

1. The EFA program was developed by the researcher as an

alternative to the traditional remedial approach often used in Chapter I

programs. The enrichment strategies implemented with the EFA program

have suggested very positive results for the Chapter I students involved

in the program. The approach taken with the EFA program can be used

to enrich not only students in Chapter I, but also students within the

regular classroom. This program should be shared with regular

classroom teachers so that this approach can be provided for students

within the regular classroom as well as Chapter I students.

2. Within the EFA program there were many opportunities for

students to represent knowledge through the seven intelligences in a

variety of ways. During the implementation of the EFA program, students

selected activities and projects depending on their interests and

strengths. Educators should take the responsibility of becoming aware

of the seven intelligences and how they can be included as an integral

part of the students' instruction so that all students' maximum potentials

can be reached.

Limitations

1. The findings of this study pertain to the 10 participants in the

study. In order to generalize the findings to other groups of students it

would be helpful to look at a larger group of students.

2. Some people may feel that the testing resources available to

assess students are limited and not sufficient to test the goals of the

program and the application of multiple intelligences. However, the

observations recorded by the researcher are valid ways to assess

whether application of these goals and intelligences have taken place

because students can be observed displaying learning behaviors in an

authentic setting.

Directions for Future Research

1. Positive results were shown for the participants that were

involved in the EFA program. Studies involving a more diverse group or

a larger group of students would enable generalization of the results

more broadly.

2. The positive results that came out of the study implementing the EFA program pertained to a group of students that were all identified as Chapter I, or remedial students. This program could be implemented with not only Chapter I identified students, but with entire classrooms of students to see if the results are similar for students not identified as needing Chapter I assistance.

3. The 10 Chapter I students who were part of the EFA program were academically similar in terms of general reading ability. A study implementing the EFA program for an entire classroom of students could also look at the results for Chapter I students while working within the regular classroom among a large academically diverse group as compared to results for Chapter I students while working outside of the classroom in small academically similar groups.

4. The five dispositions referred to in the study addressed habits of mind that are necessary for any kind of learning throughout life. It would be helpful to study a longitudinal collection of data on the original students involved in the EFA program to see if there is a continuation of the application of the five learning dispositions that were documented in the study.

REFERENCES

Allington, R. L. (1983). The reading instruction provided readers of differing reading abilities. The Elementary School Journal, 83(3), 176-184.

Allington, R. L. (1987). Shattered hopes: Why two federal reading programs have failed to correct reading failure. Learning, 16(1), 60-64.

Anderson, L. W., & Pellicer, L. O. (1990). Synthesis of research on compensatory and remedial education. Educational Leadership, 48(1), 10-16.

Brandt, R. (1992). On building learning communities: A conversation with Hank Levin. Educational Leadership, 50(1), 19-23.

Bredekamp, S., & Rosegrant, T. (1992). Reaching potentials: Appropriate curriculum and assessment for young children. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Eisner, E. W. (1991). What really counts in schools. Educational Leadership, 48(5), 10-17.

Finnan, C., & Levin, H. (1994). <u>Using school organization and culture to raise school effectiveness</u>. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Fiske, E. B. (1991). <u>Smart schools, smart kids: Why do some schools work</u>? New York: Simon & Schuster.

Gardner, H. (1983). <u>Frames of mind</u>. New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, H., & Hatch, T. (1989). Multiple intelligences go to school: Educational implications of the theory of multiple intelligences. <u>Educational Research</u>, <u>18</u>(8), 4-10.

Gardner, H. (1993). <u>Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice</u>. New York: Basic Books.

Katz, L. (1991). <u>The teacher's role in the social development of young children</u>. Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education.

Katz, L. G., & Chard, S. C. (1989). <u>Engaging children's minds: The project approach</u>. New Jersey: Ablex.

Keith, J. L. (1974). <u>Word attack joy</u>. Naperville, IL: Reading Joy.

Levin, H. M. (1987a). Accelerated schools for disadvantaged students. <u>Educational Leadership</u>, <u>44</u>(6), 19-21.

Levin, H. M. (1987b, June). <u>New schools for the disadvantaged</u>. Paper presented at the Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory.

Levin, H. M. (1988). <u>Accelerated schools for at-risk students</u> (CPRE Research Report Series RR-010). New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education.

Levin, H. (1989, May). <u>Accelerated school: A new strategy for at-risk students</u>. Bloomington, IN: Consortium on Educational Policy.

Levin, H. M., & Hopfenberg, W. S. (1991). Don't remediate: Accelerate! <u>Principal, 70</u>(3), 11-13.

Leslie, L., & Caldwell, J. (1990). <u>Qualitative reading inventory: QRI</u>. Harper Collins.

McGill-Franzen, A., & Allington, R. L. (1991). The gridlock of low reading achievement: Perspectives on practice and policy. <u>Remedial and Special Education, 12</u>(3), 20-30.

Peterson, J. M. (1989). Remediation is no remedy. <u>Educational Leadership, 46</u>(6), 24-25.

Pogrow, S. (1990). Challenging at-risk students: Findings from the HOTS program. <u>Phi Delta Kappan, 71</u>(5), 389-397.

Purcell-Gates, V. (1991). On the outside looking in: A study of remedial readers' meaning-making while reading literature. <u>Journal of Reading Behavior</u>, XXIII(2), 235-253.

Rosegrant, T., & Cooper, R. (1986). <u>Talking text writer: Professional guide</u>. New York: Scholastic.

Rosenberg, B. (1988). A look backward and forward. <u>American Educator, 12</u>(1), 30-47.

Slavin, R. E. (1991). Chapter I: A vision for the next quarter century. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(8), 586-591.

APPENDIX A

Writing Activities Suggested by Students

1. Design a crossword puzzle
2. Design a word search puzzle
3. Make a story map
4. Write a letter to the author, illustrator, or a character in the book
5. Write interview questions that you would ask the author, illustrator, or character in the book
6. Write a different version of the story
7. Write a sequel to the story
8. Summarize the story in your own words
9. Write and videotape a booktalk selling your book
10. Write a play about your book
11. Give a news report about your book
12. Write a song about your book
13. Write a poem about your book
14. Rewrite the story using the original illustrations
15. Do research on a part of your book--report that research
16. Rewrite the story from a different point of view
17. Compare/constrast your book with another book
18. Make a list of words within a category from your book
19. Select words from your book to learn more about
20. Discuss something about your book that you dislike or don't agree with and try to convince someone of your opinion

APPENDIX B

Projects Suggested by Students

1. Create a mobile to represent your book
2. Design a board game related to your book
3. Create a dance to represent a character in your book
4. Create a sculpture of a character or scene in your book
5. Make a diorama
6. Design a mural that represents your book
7. Videotape a booktalk selling your book to other students
8. Create a card game related to your book
9. Write and illustrate a book as a spin-off of your book
10. Videotape a news report about your book
11. Write or perform a play about your book
12. Design a book jacket to represent your book
13. Advertise your book
14. Design and create a mask of a character from your book
15. Put on a puppet show to represent your book
16. Dress up as a character from your book--introduce yourself as the character and talk about the story from your perspective
17. Design a flip book illustrating a scene from your book
18. Create a slide show that represents the book

APPENDIX C

Self-Evaluation Survey

	Yes	Sometimes	No
I do my work well by myself.	___	___	___
I can make good choices about what books are best for me.	___	___	___
I think my work is good when I am done.	___	___	___
I like reading my book more than once.	___	___	___
I understand my book better when I read it over.	___	___	___
I understand my reading when I read on my own.	___	___	___
I would rather read by myself than have the teacher read to me.	___	___	___
I am a good reader.	___	___	___
I am a good writer.	___	___	___
I did a very good job on my book and the activities that went with my book--why?	___	___	___

If I had to give myself a grade for the book I worked on for this theme, it would be (circle one)   excellent   good   okay   weak