

The Importance of Effective Early Intervention

Dorothy S. Strickland

The Case for Prevention and Intervention

Few would argue that learning to read is the most important accomplishment of a child's early elementary school experience. Fortunately, by the time most children enter fourth grade, they have learned to read with sufficient comprehension and fluency to approach new material with confidence. For these children, learning to read and write follows a relatively predictable pattern. Their success can be traced to a variety of attributes and experiences, some of which preceded their formal schooling: (a) They have normal or above average language skills, (b) they come from homes that provide them with a fair amount of motivating and pleasurable experiences with books and literacy, and (c) the schools they attend offer experiences that help them understand and use reading to make meaning with print and offer frequent opportunities to read and write. Although some of these children may have periodic difficulties with specific aspects of literacy learning, their overall progress is steady and sure. As they encounter the more formal and complex tasks involved in conventional reading and writing, influences at home and school help these children build successfully on their early experiences with literacy (Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998).

For some children, however, learning to read can be difficult and unrewarding. The reasons for this vary widely. Acquiring literacy may be especially challenging for children with a history of preschool language impairment (Scarborough, 1998), children with limited proficiency in English (August & Hakuta, 1997), children whose parents had difficulty learning to read (Gilger, Pennington, & DeFries, 1991; Vogler, DeFries, & Decker, 1985), children with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (Shaywitz, Fletcher, & Shaywitz, 1995), children who lack motivation to read (Snow, Barnes, Chandler, Goodman, & Hemphill, 1991), and children from poor neighborhoods (Teddlie, Kirby, & Stringfield, 1989).

However, although one or more of these factors are often present when children are experiencing difficulty learning to read, none is an automatic barrier to literacy development. For example, although low achievement is a widespread problem among poor children whose first language is not the language of instruction, it is likely that neither linguistic differences nor poverty alone is solely responsible for the high degree of risk faced by these children.

One important reason for the current emphasis on early intervention (i.e., programs designed to positively influence the course of language and literacy development in children age 0–8) is the research evidence indicating that a pattern of school failure starts early and persists throughout a child’s school career. Longitudinal studies (Juel, 1988) show that there is an almost 90% chance that a child who is a poor reader at the end of grade 1 will be a poor reader at grade 4. These children grow to dislike reading and, therefore, read considerably less than good readers both in and out of school. This is an important finding, because time spent reading is highly correlated with achievement in learning to read (Allington, 1980; Anderson, Wilson, & Fielding, 1988; Stanovich, 1986; Stanovich & Cunningham, 1998).

Another compelling reason to promote early intervention is the realization that supplementary remedial programs such as Title I and “replacement” programs that substitute for regular, in-class instruction have had mixed results (Johnston, Allington, & Afflerbach, 1985). Some researchers suggest that such programs complicate the process for the struggling reader by offering approaches to reading that are philosophically different from those offered in the classroom (Santa & Høien, 1999). Regardless of the reason for a child’s failure in reading, educators recognize their responsibility to provide programs that preempt potential problems early and thwart the potential for a chain of failure throughout the school years.

Specific Programs

A variety of approaches to prevention and intervention have reported some positive results. We acknowledge that in many cases there are competing claims about the level or quality of their achievements. However, the purpose here is not to enter into that debate, but to offer these as examples of well-known programs that have undergone serious scrutiny and report some evidence of success. References for those reports are cited after each description.

Family-oriented prevention programs tend to focus on both parents and their young children. Such programs may be located in a variety of settings and often target a number of outcomes in addition to language and literacy. As the focus shifts from prevention to intervention, most programs are found in school settings. Many employ small-group instruction, whereas others restrict instruction to one-on-one tutoring models. Some intervention programs take place in the regular classroom with instruction supplied by the regular classroom teacher or by a reading specialist. Others occur outside the regular classroom and make use of reading specialists or well-supervised volunteers or paid tutors. Some programs are linked to classroom instruction, as is Success for All's tutoring component (Wasik & Slavin, 1993). Others, such as Reading Recovery and Book Buddies, do not attempt to foster a tight curriculum link (Invernizzi, Juel, & Rosemary, 1997). Success has been demonstrated in a variety of settings, including large urban districts, small suburban schools, and rural areas. Brief descriptions of several prevention and early intervention programs follow. The list is by no means exhaustive. Programs were selected to be illustrative of the various kinds of efforts in existence that report some measure of success based on research findings.

Family Literacy Programs

The Even Start Family Literacy Program consists of a variety of family literacy projects established for the purpose of integrating early childhood education and adult education for parents into a unified program. There are four features that have been found to be critical to the success of these programs: (1) Steps must be taken to ensure participation through such means as providing transportation and child care and attention to possible emotional barriers such as fear of school and low self-esteem; (2) the curriculum must be meaningful and useful to the participants; (3) the staff must be stable and highly capable; and (4) there must be ample funding to ensure that the program is sustained over time (DeBruin-Parecki, Paris, & Siedenburg, 1997).

Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) is a home-based instruction program designed to help parents provide their children with school readiness skills. Parents and children engage in a variety of reading-related activities. Components of HIPPY, such as home visits and parent education, have been adapted into many other family literacy programs (Baker & Piotrkowski, 1996).

Prekindergarten and Kindergarten Programs

Head Start is the most widely known early intervention program for economically disadvantaged children. Although Head Start programs vary widely, they all strive to provide a range of comprehensive services for children and families, including a “developmental” curriculum. Like many other programs designed for children in poverty, Head Start programs often produce immediate effects for reading achievement that then tend to decline over time. Nevertheless, some programs have produced sizable gains that persist into the school years. The magnitude of initial effects appears to be related to a program’s intensity, breadth, and attention to the involvement of the children’s parents (Bryant, Lau, Burchinal, & Sparling, 1994).

High Scope (Perry Preschool Project) is a comprehensive preschool program that focuses on language development. The curricular approach is based on Piagetian theories of child development and focuses on key experiences designed to create opportunities for children to learn key concepts (Berrueta-Clements, Schweinhart, Barnett, Epstein, & Weikart, 1984).

Whitehurst’s Emergent Literacy Intervention is an early literacy intervention program for preschool and kindergarten children. The program has two components: dialogic reading and phonemic awareness, the understanding that speech is composed of individual sounds. The dialogic reading component involves interactive storybook reading and the use of open-ended questioning strategies that focus on comprehension rather than on simple recall of facts (Whitehurst et al., 1994).

Primary Grade Programs (Grades 1–3)

Book Buddies is a supplementary intervention in which selected children receive one-on-one tutorials twice a week in addition to classroom reading instruction, using community volunteers as tutors. Tutors receive continuous on-site training and supervision. The four-part lesson consists of repeated reading of familiar text, word study (phonics), writing for sounds, and reading a new book (Invernizzi et al., 1997).

Early Reading Intervention (ERI) is a tutoring program that targets first and second graders at risk for failure to read. The program is organized to enable a small group of students to work with their teacher 15 to 20 minutes a day, 3 days a week. The children also read individually to instructional aides, volunteers, or older students for 5 minutes each day. The program focuses on word analysis strategies in the context of reading storybooks. Opportunities for rereading through choral reading or partner reading are offered (Taylor, Strait, & Medo, 1994).

First Steps is a one-on-one tutoring program based on many of the principles of Reading Recovery. The 30-minute tutoring sessions consist of book reading in which the child rereads a book from a series of leveled books; a word study component in which the tutor takes the child through a series of letter and word sorts based on need and level of development; a writing activity; and the reading of a new story (Morris, 1995; Santa & Hoiem, 1999).

Reading Recovery is the best known and researched beginning reading intervention program. Designed for first graders, it involves one-on-one tutoring by teachers who receive extensive training in theory and practical approaches to working with children experiencing difficulty learning to read. The lessons involve rereading of previously read books, independent reading of a new book introduced in a previous lesson, word analysis and comprehension strategies, writing and reading of the child's own sentences, and the introduction and supported reading of a new book (Pinnell, DeFord, & Lyons, 1988).

Schoolwide Programs

Success for All is a comprehensive school-restructuring program that serves students at risk for failure in grades 1 through 6. It includes a prekindergarten and kindergarten program, a Beginning Reading or Reading Roots program, and a Beyond the Basics or Reading Wings Program. The program includes a mixture of phonics, direct instruction of comprehension strategies, and listening comprehension skills. Cooperative learning strategies are integrated heavily throughout the curriculum, as are one-on-one tutorials (Slavin et al., 1996).

The Kamehameha Early Education Program (KEEP) Whole Literacy Curriculum was designed for Native Hawaiian students in kindergarten through grade 6. This program addresses issues faced by at-risk children facing similar challenges. It includes readers' and writers' workshops, portfolio assessment, word-reading and spelling strategies, voluntary reading, and established literacy benchmarks for student success. The ongoing staff development of teachers before and during implementation is stressed heavily (Au & Carroll, 1997).

Characteristics and Components of Prevention and Intervention Programs

A limited number of existing prevention and intervention programs are described in this chapter; yet, in looking at these programs, it

becomes obvious that despite similar goals, implementation varies widely. Nevertheless, several examinations of the characteristics of successful prevention and intervention programs reveal a fair degree of agreement regarding essential elements or components that receive attention (Duffy-Hester, 1999; Pikulski, 1994; Snow et al., 1998; Wasik, 1998). Following are brief descriptions of these components. These have been divided into two categories: those considered key to the overall implementation of the program and those that relate more specifically to curriculum content. The curriculum components are further divided among those stressed in family literacy, prekindergarten, and kindergarten prevention programs and those that receive emphasis in early intervention programs designed for the primary grades.

Implementation Components of Prevention and Intervention Programs

Timing. Early intervention is preferable to extended remediation. Age-appropriate efforts aimed toward prevention and intervention begin during the prekindergarten years and receive special emphasis during the early primary grades.

Time. Struggling readers and writers receive more time on task than children not considered at risk. Most school-based interventions for reading occur on a daily basis for the duration of a school year or a good portion of the school year.

Materials. Students for whom intervention is warranted are given materials that they can handle successfully. Although materials vary widely among interventions, careful attention is given to their selection and use. Programs make use of materials characterized as predictable, phonologically regular, or linguistically regular, or those that are leveled or sequenced from easy to more difficult. Some programs make use of several types of texts, and some texts include a combination of these features. Programs generally strive for materials that are interesting and engaging and that provide a degree of challenge without frustration.

Nature of instruction. Lessons generally consist of a variety of activities involving a well-formulated and consistent plan or approach. One-on-one and small-group instructional formats are used widely. Activities usually include some rereading of previously read continuous texts,

introduction of new texts, word study that includes phonics and other word recognition strategies, and writing.

Documenting and monitoring learning. Individual progress is monitored on a regular, ongoing basis. Students are generally evaluated in relation to a set of predetermined program goals, benchmarks, or levels.

Professional development. Although intervention programs vary widely in their training and use of personnel, the professional development of teachers, aides, and volunteers is considered an important component of the success of all intervention models.

Home-school connection. A systematic program of home support is characteristic of intervention programs. Many include a built-in monitoring system designed to provide feedback from the home.

Curriculum Components of Prevention Programs: Family Literacy, Prekindergarten, and Kindergarten

Learning to read and write does not begin in first grade. Long before formal schooling, parents and caregivers help lay the foundation for the development of essential cognitive skills and positive attitudes. Although programs designed to prevent failure in reading place emphasis on different components, there is some similarity in the overall nature of the curriculum. Curricular components generally include the following:

Language development with an emphasis on vocabulary and concepts. Extending children's vocabulary and discourse patterns involves both linguistic and cognitive development. Making sense of print requires the use of a combination of semantic, syntactic, and graphophonic cues along with background knowledge. Focusing on the development of vocabulary, concepts, and linguistic patterns helps children make good predictions about print. Children who have an abundance of opportunities to expand their language and linguistic repertoires are more apt to decipher words unknown to them as readers and to make sense of what they read (Halliday, 1975; Morrow, 1993).

Understandings about the functions of print. Children who realize the functional relevance of written language are more likely to be motivated to explore its use for their own purposes (Neuman & Roskos, 1989; Weiss & Hagen, 1988). Such purposes include writing notes and letters,

reading newspapers and magazines, making and using lists, and using a television guide.

Print awareness and concepts about print. To make sense of written language, young learners need to acquire a general knowledge about reading and writing as representations of ideas, knowledge, and thoughts, as well as an understanding of how print works. Sensitivity to print in the environment is a significant first step toward developing an understanding of what it means to be a reader and writer. Print concepts are the conventions that govern written language, such as spaces between words, directionality, and punctuation (Galda, Cullinan, & Strickland, 1997).

Literacy as a source of enjoyment. The development of a positive view toward reading and other literacy experiences is important. Children who have positive attitudes and expectations about reading are more likely to be motivated to learn to read.

Knowledge of narrative structure. Knowledge of the structure of stories is important, because most of the material used to teach reading to young children is written in narrative form. Children are apt to understand material presented in a form with which they are familiar.

Storybook reading. Exposure to and enjoyment of good quality literature builds positive attitudes, expands language and concepts, and contributes to children's understanding of the reading process (Dickinson & Smith, 1994; Neuman & Roskos, 1989; Robbins & Ehri, 1994).

Knowledge of the alphabet. Knowledge of the alphabet is one of the best predictors of success in early reading. Research in this area suggests that alphabet knowledge is a byproduct of extensive early literacy experiences. Thus, simply teaching children the alphabet without rich literacy experiences has proven unsuccessful (Ehri, 1983; Venezky, 1975).

Phonemic awareness. Phonemic awareness involves knowledge of the individual sounds in spoken language. Research indicates that a child's ability to distinguish between phonemes is one of the best predictors of reading success (Stahl & Murray, 1994; Stanovich, 1994). Like knowledge of the alphabet, however, some research suggests that phonemic awareness is best learned within a context of a variety of literacy experiences (Moustafa, 1997).

Opportunities to write. Giving children opportunities to write helps foster both reading and writing development. Children's attempts at spelling provide opportunities to apply what they know about written language and develop new understandings about word structure and the relationships between language and print (Sulzby, 1986).

Curriculum Components of Early Intervention Programs (Grades 1–3)

Early intervention programs involve taking inventory of the components listed earlier and addressing those areas that require attention. Special emphasis is placed on the following:

- Reading comprehension strategies focus on the self-monitoring of texts and the use of fix-up strategies when misunderstandings occur. Some of the ways that children demonstrate their comprehension of texts involve retelling stories, making predictions, summarizing stories and books by briefly telling what they are about, and participating in discussions generated by comprehension questions.
- Word recognition strategies, including phonics and structural analysis, are addressed as essentials for skillful reading. Many programs stress phonics. Others emphasize experiences in a full array of strategies, such as the use of word meanings and sentence structure, combined with phonics, as tools for decoding unknown words.
- Fluency is addressed by helping students develop the ability to read expressively and meaningfully as well as accurately with appropriate speed.
- Writing is taught as an important path to word analysis skills, spelling, and self-expression. Writing is seen as a key to understanding the relationship between oral language and print.

Learning From Efforts at Prevention and Intervention: Implications for Policy and Practice

One of the key lessons learned from the research on intervention programs is that no matter how effective an intervention may be, it does not stand alone. The problems faced by children who are having difficulty in reading are rarely unidimensional—nor are the solutions. It is critical for schools and classroom teachers to build in a safety net for

children experiencing difficulty so that they can be identified early and their problems addressed within the regular course of instruction. Some researchers even believe that “removing students from the regular classroom and placing them in resource rooms for special or compensatory education services prevents classroom teachers from realizing that something is wrong with the instruction in their own classroom” (Duffy-Hester, 1999, p. 491). Obviously, many children will require help from specialists outside the regular classroom. Nevertheless, the instruction received in the regular classroom will remain at the center of the child’s literacy program.

In addition to strong “first teaching,” ongoing special attention to children with persistent reading difficulties must take place in the regular classroom. Children who are given extra support outside the classroom often need continued support in the regular classroom after they are released successfully from the external support program. These children often remain vulnerable after they have “caught up” with their peers. Vigilance within the regular classroom is needed to support and maintain the gains they have made, and this must extend well beyond the primary grades.

The literature on prevention and intervention provides an abundant research base and a wealth of practical suggestions for educators, policymakers, and others as they consider how they might help alter school and classroom policy and practice to provide for the child who needs intervention (Allington & Walmsley, 1995; Duffy-Hester, 1999; Pikulski, 1994; Snow et al., 1998; Strickland, 1998a, 1998b; Wasik, 1998). The following suggestions are gleaned from the literature and organized around four areas: (1) school and classroom organization, (2) nature of instruction, (3) documenting and monitoring learning, (4) home-school connections, and (5) professional development.

School and Classroom Organization

A well-organized, articulated, and coordinated system of support services at the district, school, and classroom levels is essential for effective intervention. School districts should provide clearly stated policies and goals and provide the resources needed to implement them. One example is the need to provide students with opportunities to learn in reasonably sized classes. Another example is the need to coordinate in-class and pull-out efforts so that instruction offered in various settings is complementary. Still another example is the need for an emphasis on

quality instruction in the regular classroom, regardless of the support services provided for intervention.

Implementing quality classroom instruction in the regular classroom requires policies that provide for large blocks of uninterrupted time for language arts instruction with flexible grouping patterns that allow for varied types of materials, instructional tasks, and grouping structures. Small-group instruction is particularly crucial for the struggling reader, who often needs a second or third try at learning the reading strategies previously introduced to the entire class. Small similar-needs groups allow teachers to tailor instruction and maintain the attention of children who tend to be distracted easily. They offer opportunities for guided practice under the watchful eye of the teacher, who uses this time to monitor children's reading behaviors and adjust instruction accordingly. Additional opportunities for struggling readers to work in pairs and in heterogeneous small groups with children of varied abilities and interests avoids the stigma that may be associated with long-term ability grouping.

Nature of Instruction

Children requiring intervention need extra assistance to become strategic readers who think with texts. Intervention programs need to engage these students in activities involving higher level intellectual processes with expectations that are challenging for them as well as realistic. Reducing the curriculum to low-level skills that require little thinking with text minimizes the chance that the students will gain ownership and control of what they learn so that they can apply it to new situations. Students should spend most of their time actually reading rather than on useless seatwork or other activities that do not directly support learning to read. Skills should not be taught to them in a manner suggesting they can only learn by accumulating disparate pieces of information. Strickland (1998b) outlines some instructional strategies that promote thinking with text for all students: (1) the use of multilevel activities, (2) specific instruction in self-monitoring and self-assessment, (3) scaffolded instruction that makes use of modeling and demonstrations, and (4) linking reading and writing instruction. Following is an explanation of each of these strategies:

1. Multilevel activities help ensure that students who are struggling will engage in the same intellectual processes as everyone else, with expectations appropriate to their current level of performance. With multilevel tasks, the teacher gives the same task to the entire

group with the understanding that each child will respond according to his or her ability. For example, most writing assignments in response to reading are multilevel because they allow struggling students to participate in the same thought processes and communications activities as the rest of the class. The teacher analyzes the products for possible teaching points and evidence of continuing growth in every child.

2. Children experiencing difficulty need special help in monitoring their own comprehension. They must be taught to self-question: Does this make sense? Does it sound right? Does it look right? As with all learners, these children need to treat learning to read and write as problem-solving activities that they are increasingly equipped to handle on their own.
3. Scaffolded instruction that makes use of modeling and demonstrations should be a key element of reading and writing lessons. Of particular value are think-alouds, in which teachers say aloud what they are thinking as they read and write. This helps make the processes visible for struggling learners. These children need to know how skilled readers and writers do what they do.
4. Instruction in reading and writing should be linked together and taught so that they are used skillfully and strategically. Struggling learners need to be taught in ways that help them generate new knowledge and new applications. Teachers need to be explicit about how what is learned about reading can help with writing and vice versa.

Documenting and Monitoring Learning

Keeping track of how well students are doing is integral to successful interventions. Teachers who respect and respond to variability are constantly alert to individual needs, whether they indicate long-term additional support or short-term attention. Merely documenting and assessing progress is not enough, however. The instructional decisions that are based on what is learned are what really count. Assessment tools such as running records, rubrics, checklists, personal conferences, and observational notes should be used to monitor progress and plan instruction. This type of documentation more truly reveals student needs as opposed to norm-referenced standardized tests or even teacher-developed paper and pencil tests alone (Calfée & Hiebert, 1988).

Home-School Connections

A systematic program of home support, with a built-in monitoring system, should be in place. This helps to keep parents and other caregivers informed about the expectations of the school and their child's progress. Keeping them involved makes it less likely that they will be surprised about their child's progress. Home activities should emphasize independent reading and writing, be easily monitored by parent and teacher, and not be too time consuming.

Professional Development

A program of ongoing professional development that emphasizes that every staff member must share in the responsibility for struggling readers and writers can be effective in improving the instructional program for these students and promoting a mindset that acknowledges that these children are everyone's responsibility (Strickland, 1995, 1998a). Areas of focus that need to be addressed include the following:

1. *How young children learn to read and write and the implications for instruction.* Although teachers are presumed to be well acquainted with these concepts, it helps to have them discussed in a forum where wide disparities between classroom instruction and specialized programs for learners at risk can be acknowledged and addressed.
2. *Instructional strategies that support what is known about how young children develop literacy.* What teachers believe regarding how language and literacy develop will influence their decisions about good instructional practice. The focus should be on what is known about how young children learn and the developmentally appropriate practice for teaching comprehension and word recognition strategies.
3. *Merging instruction with assessment in beginning reading programs.* Classroom teachers need manageable assessment tools that focus on students' application of skills and strategies in use and provide needed information to tailor instruction to individual needs. Teachers need help in collecting and interpreting the information they get from work samples and observations.
4. *Evaluating the beginning reading program.* Professional activities that support ongoing updates and discussions of new developments in the field should take place on a regular basis. Grade-level study groups or staff meetings designated for this purpose help

facilitate the faculty's need to reflect on programmatic issues, set goals, and conduct long-range planning and self-assessment at the program level.

Needed Research

The need for effective prevention and intervention programs will probably exist for many years. As new attempts to deal with the issue are initiated and studied, more will be learned about how to make these efforts successful. Continued efforts to refine and improve on existing programs also will prove valuable. Several areas of research appear to be in need of special attention.

There is a need for literacy inventories and classroom observation tools that help teachers identify those children who are potentially at risk for failure. Tools that help differentiate between a lack of literacy experiences and low learning potential would be useful in helping teachers to make that important distinction. Assessment tools that are manageable, informative, and easy to integrate into the ongoing instructional program are needed to help reading specialists and teachers link instruction to assessment.

In recent years, many research efforts have been designed to describe the characteristics of exemplary classroom teachers and teaching. An in-depth look at what these teachers do to help the struggling students in their classrooms would provide needed information about the best ways to differentiate instruction.

Many schools are still grappling with issues related to pull-out intervention programs versus programs that involve special help within the classroom. More information on the positive and negative features of both and the circumstances that encourage or discourage positive results would be useful.

In situations in which schools adopt special programs involving highly trained personnel, there is a need to know more about how to improve articulation between the specialists and the classroom teachers and promote harmony among programs.

In schools where reading failure is chronic, a complete overhaul is often needed to effect change. Efforts to develop more whole-school literacy intervention models that include a strong research component are needed. A limited number of models have the intensive research evidence to support their claims, which leaves educators with few choices. Models that provide options to adapt to local needs would be particularly helpful.

Continued research on effective instructional strategies, content focus and sequence, and strategies that promote motivation to learn among readers and writers at risk could potentially improve the quality of instruction.

Researchers agree that ongoing professional development for teachers, supervisors, and administrators as well as training for paraprofessionals and volunteers is critical to the success of intervention programs. Creative and cost-effective methods that truly engage educators in shaping and implementing professional development is needed to make them systemic and useful as ongoing support.

Finally, ways to better involve the home in the educational process would be helpful in supporting children's cognitive and affective development.

Summary

The history of programmatic efforts designed to influence the course of young children's language and literacy development is relatively young. Nevertheless, examined collectively there is sufficient evidence to identify several factors that educators can apply to early literacy programs. Attention should be given to providing a balanced and child-appropriate curriculum, school and classroom organization that includes flexible grouping, instruction that is multilevel and makes use of modeling and demonstrations, ongoing documentation and monitoring of children's growth, and the need for strong connections between home and school.

Questions for Discussion

1. Discuss some of the factors that have caused educators to rely less heavily on remediation programs to emphasize prevention and intervention. How does this shift correspond with your personal experience as a student, teacher, or parent?
2. Select two programs listed in this chapter and arrange to observe each one. Use the factors listed in the section "Learning From Efforts at Prevention and Intervention" to assess them. Share your opinions and discuss them with others who have similar interests.
3. Share any experiences you have had with the programs described in this chapter or with similar programs. What do you see as their positive and negative features? What changes would you make?

4. Discuss the concept that “everyone is responsible for struggling readers and writers.” What are the implications for classroom teachers? Resource personnel? Administrators?
5. Review the suggestions for further research. Based on your experience, what do you see as the most pressing concern? Why?

REFERENCES

- Allington, R.L. (1980). Poor readers don't get to read much in reading groups. *Language Arts*, 57, 873–875.
- Allington, R.L., & Walmsley, S.A. (1995). *No quick fix: Rethinking literacy programs in America's elementary schools*. New York: Teachers College Press; Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Anderson, R., Wilson, P.T., & Fielding, L. (1988). Growth in reading and how children spend their time outside of school. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 23, 285–303.
- Au, K.H., & Carroll, J.H. (1997). Improving literacy achievement through a constructivist approach: The KEEP demonstration classroom project. *The Elementary School Journal*, 97, 203–221.
- August, D.A., & Hakuta, K. (Eds.). (1997). *Improving schooling for language-minority children: A research agenda*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Baker, A.J.L., & Piotrkowski, C.S. (1996). *Parents and children through the school years: The effects of the home instruction program for preschool youngsters* (Final report to the David and Lucile Packard Foundation). New York: National Council of Jewish Women. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED402406)
- Berrueta-Clement, J.R., Schweinhart, L.J., Barnett, W.S., Epstein, A.S., & Weikart, D.P. (1984). Changed lives: The effects of the Perry Preschool Program on youths through age 19. *Monographs of the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation*, 8. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press.
- Bryant, D.M., Lau, L.B., Burchinal, M., & Sparling, J.J. (1994). Family and classroom correlates of Head Start children's developmental outcomes. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 9, 289–309.
- Calfee, R., & Hiebert, E. (1988). The teacher's role in using assessment to improve learning. In C.V. Bunderson (Ed.), *Assessment in the service of learning* (pp. 45–61). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- DeBruin-Parecki, A., Paris, S.G., & Siedenburg, J. (1997). Family literacy: Examining practice and issues of effectiveness. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 40, 596–605.
- Dickinson, D., & Smith, M.W. (1994). Long term effects of preschool teachers' book reading on low-income children's vocabulary and story comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 29, 104–122.
- Duffy-Hester, A. (1999). Teaching struggling readers in elementary school classrooms: A review of classroom reading programs and principles for instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 52, 480–495.

- Ehri, L. (1983). A critique of five studies related to letter-name knowledge and learning to read. In L.M. Gentile, M.L. Kamil, & J.S. Blanchard (Eds.), *Reading research revisited* (pp. 143–153). Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Galda, L., Cullinan, B., & Strickland, D.S. (1997). *Language, literacy and the child*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt.
- Gilger, J.W., Pennington, B.F., & DeFries, J.C. (1991). Risk for reading disability as a function of parental history in three family studies. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 3, 205–217.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1975). *Learning to mean: Exploration in the development of language*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Invernizzi, M., Juel, C., & Rosemary, C.A. (1997). A community volunteer tutorial that works. *The Reading Teacher*, 50, 304–311.
- Johnston, P.A., Allington, R.L., & Afflerbach, P. (1985). The congruence of classroom and remedial reading instruction. *The Elementary School Journal*, 85, 465–478.
- Juel, C. (1988, April). *Learning to read and write: A longitudinal study of fifty-four children from first through fourth grade*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Morris, D. (1995). *First steps: An early reading intervention program*. (ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED388956)
- Morrow, L.M. (1993). *Literacy development in the early years: Helping children read and write*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Moustafa, M. (1997). Reconceptualizing phonics instruction. In C. Weaver (Ed.), *Reconsidering a balanced approach to reading* (pp. 135–157). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Neuman, S., & Roskos, K. (1989). Preschoolers' conceptions of literacy as reflected in their spontaneous play. In S. McCormick & J. Zutell (Eds.), *Cognitive and social perspectives for literacy research and instruction* (38th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference, pp. 87–94). Chicago: National Reading Conference.
- Pikulski, J. (1994). Preventing reading failure: A review of five effective programs. *The Reading Teacher*, 48, 30–39.
- Pinnell, G.S., Deford, D., & Lyons, C. (1988). *Reading Recovery: Early intervention for at-risk first graders*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Robbins, C., & Ehri, L. (1994). Reading storybooks to kindergartners helps them learn new vocabulary words. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 86, 54–64.
- Santa, C., & Hoen, T. (1999). An assessment of Early Steps: A program for early intervention of reading problems. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 4, 54–79.
- Scarborough, H.H. (1998). Early identification of children at risk for reading disabilities: Phonological awareness and some other promising predictors. In K. Shapiro, P.J. Accardo, & A.J. Capute (Eds.), *Specific reading disability: A view of the spectrum* (pp. 77–121). Timonium, MD: York Press.
- Shaywitz, B.A., Fletcher, J.M., & Shaywitz, S.E. (1995). Defining and classifying learning disabilities and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Journal of Child Neurology*, 10, S50–S57.
- Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Dolan, L.J., Wasik, B.A., Ross, S.M., Smith, L., et al. (1996). Success for All: A summary of research. *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk*, 1, 41–76.

- Snow, C.E., Barnes, W.S., Chandler, J., Goodman, I.F., & Hemphill, L. (1991). *Unfulfilled expectations: Home and school influences on literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Snow, C.E., Burns, M.S., & Griffin, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Stahl, S.A., & Murray, B.A. (1994). Defining phonological awareness and its relationship to early reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 86, 221–234.
- Stanovich, K.E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 21, 360–407.
- Stanovich, K.E. (1994). Romance and reality. *The Reading Teacher*, 47, 280–291.
- Stanovich, K.E., & Cunningham, A.E. (1998). What reading does for the mind. *American Educator*, 22, 8–15.
- Strickland, D.S. (1995). Pre-elementary programs: A model for professional development. In S.B. Wepner, J. Feeley, & D.S. Strickland (Eds.), *The administration and supervision of reading programs*. New York: Teachers College Press; Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Strickland, D.S. (1998a). Professional development models for program implementation. In P.D. Pearson (Ed.), *Final Report, New York State Reading Symposium*. Albany, NY: State Education Department.
- Strickland, D.S. (1998b). Differentiating instruction in the classroom: Tapping into the intelligence of every learner. In B. Presseisen (Ed.), *Teaching for intelligence*. Arlington Heights, IL: Skylight.
- Sulzby, E. (1986). Writing and reading: Signs of oral and written language organization in the young child. In W.H. Teale & E. Sulzby (Eds.), *Emergent literacy: Writing and reading*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Taylor, B., Strait, J., & Medo, M.A. (1994). An early intervention in reading: Supplemented instruction for groups of low-achieving students provided by first grade teachers. In E. Hiebert & B. Taylor (Eds.), *Getting reading right from the start: Effective early literacy interventions* (pp. 107–121). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Teddlie, C., Kirby, P., & Stringfield, S. (1989). Effective vs. ineffective schools: Observable differences in the classroom. *American Journal of Education*, 97, 221–236.
- Venezky, R.L. (1975). The curious role of letter names in reading instruction. *Visible Language*, 9, 7–23.
- Vogler, G.P., DeFries, J.C., & Decker, S.N. (1985). Family history as an indicator of risk for reading disability. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 18, 419–421.
- Wasik, B. (1998). Early literacy: Prevention and intervention. In P.D. Pearson (Ed.), *Final Report, New York State Reading Symposium*. Albany, NY: State Education Department.
- Wasik, B.A., & Slavin, R.E. (1993). Preventing early reading failure with one-to-one tutoring: A review of five programs. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 28, 178–200.
- Weiss, M.J., & Hagen, R. (1988). A key to literacy: Kindergartners' awareness of the functions of print. *The Reading Teacher*, 41, 574–578.
- Whitehurst, G.J., Epstein, J.N., Angell, A.L., Payne, A.C., Crone, D.A., & Fischel, J.E. (1994). Outcomes of an emergent literacy intervention in Head Start. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 86, 542–555.