

Reading Instruction in the NCLB Era: Teachers' Implementation Fidelity of Early Reading Models

Ellen McIntyre
University of Louisville

Rebecca Powell
Georgetown College

Kelly Bright Coots
Jefferson County Public Schools

Deneese Jones
Longwood University

Sherry Powers
Western Kentucky University

Faye Deeters
Eastern Kentucky University

Joe Petrosko
University of Louisville

Abstract

In the past few years many states in the U.S. have moved toward full implementation of the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) act. In doing so, schools have adopted “research-based” early reading models to implement Reading First, a salient component of NCLB. Through structured observations and interviews, the study team examined the implementation of ten early reading models with the goal of understanding how various models were implemented and what enhanced and impeded implementation. Results illustrate variability in the implementation fidelity at the structural level, defined as how closely the teachers' implementation of the model matched the

intentions of the model. High implementers had much support, a practical, clear model, extensive professional development, or a combination of these. There was also great variability across teachers in terms of the focus of their instruction, interpreted through an examination of the primary instructional activities, the texts teachers used, and how teachers used time. These findings contribute to the growing body of literature on early reading instructional models as well as on school change and the variables critical for full implementation of new instructional models.

Introduction

The need for consensus on what constitutes good reading instruction in the early grades has become increasingly evident in the past two decades because of the many children who continue to struggle with reading. Some claim that “nearly 40% of all American children” struggle with reading or fail to learn to read (Walsh, Glaser, & Wilcox, 2006, p. 3). Recent reviews of research on effective instructional practices (Adams, 1990; NICHD, 2000; Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998) arose from these claims and the “reading wars” of the past two decades. These reviews provided a foundation for Reading First, a salient component of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) act. One required component of Reading First is the adoption of reading models that include a core reading program for all students, an intervention for struggling readers, and a supplemental reading program for those who need it. With this in mind, publishers have re-written materials to reflect the new guidelines, which have become the basis for the models teachers currently use in many states.

Even though the new models claim to be based on the research provided by the reviews, it is unclear what actually happens under the labels of these early reading instructional models. It is unclear which models are easily adopted, which are not, whether the models are adopted as intended, and if they are not, why they are not. School reform literature has illustrated that change occurs when there is much support for the change (Darling-Hammond, 1997; Glickman, 1998), when the local context matches the intentions of the goals of the reform (Barth, 1990; Hargreaves, 1994; Schlechty, 1990), and when the reform is simply easy to implement (Snyder, Bolin, & Zumwalt, 1992). Yet, these tenants of school reform may not apply when teachers adopt certain reading models, especially if the models are highly “scripted”

and “research-proven” (Shanahan, 2002). Clearly, understanding why some early reading models are implemented easily and others not is critically important in this era of federal mandates. Thus, the purpose of this study is to describe the “implementation fidelity” (Snyder et. al, 1992) of the reading models, defined as how closely the model was implemented according to the intentions of the model. The specific questions studied include: a) Which models were adopted as intended and which were not? b) How closely was instruction aligned with the original goals of the models? c) If the models were not implemented fully, why not?, and d) What can be learned about the implementation of early reading models to guide the field during the current NCLB accountability era?

These questions guide this study of the implementation of ten different early reading models recently adopted through a state grant program for the purposes of either raising reading achievement of all readers in the class (a core reading program or whole class models) or providing extra help for the struggling readers in the class (intervention models).

Implementation Fidelity of Early Reading Instructional Models

Studies in the last two decades of effectiveness of various instructional models revealed that implementation was often taken for granted (Snyder et al., 1992). Indeed, some models were assumed to have failed when they were not really implemented in the first place. Referred to by researchers of reform as “implementation fidelity” (Cuban, 1992; Snyder et al.), the concerns rested with: a) measuring the degree to which a particular innovation is implemented as planned, and b) identifying the factors which facilitate or hinder implementation as planned (Snyder et al.). Examination of these issues focuses on “why the implementation departs from the blueprint” (Cuban, 1998, p. 257).

This concern is not new, particularly with studies of reading models. In 1967, a series of studies were published that examined student achievement in light of instructional models (Bond & Dyskstra, 1967, reprinted, 1997). In these “First Grade Studies,” researchers examined a number of various instruction models such as the “Initial Teaching Alphabet,” (ITI) a highly phonics-based approach, the “Language Experience Approach,” (LEA) a more holistic approach, and the traditional basal approach. The synthesis revealed

that the non-basal programs (e.g., ITI and LEA) tended to be superior to basal programs for some aspects (e.g. phonics) of reading achievement. What arose from the synthesis, however, was the great variability in approaches, making the comparisons complex. Indeed, the “Follow Through” studies (Barr, 1984) yielded similar results. These studies replicated the First Grade studies and resulted in findings such as, “No model proved more effective on....reading comprehension” (Barr, 1984, p. 552) than any others. Project Follow Through evaluation indicated that there was no more variation within sites using the same program model than between sites using different models. Not surprising, a key government document resulting from an analysis of reading studies, *Becoming a Nation of Readers* (Anderson, Heibert, Scott, & Wilkinson, 1985), advocated a balance of meaningful interactions with books and code instruction for good reading instruction. The call during this period was to focus research on “teacher and learner situation characteristics rather than methods and materials” (Barr, p. 550).

One study of the effectiveness of several different externally created instructional programs illustrates the need to continue to look closely at implementation variability (Stringfield, Datnow, & Ross, 1998). This study attempted to “scale up”—extend the efforts of a reform model to see if it “works” in other places under other contexts. The study included the widely popular “Success for All” reform model, which is also one of the models examined in the present study. Implementation variability was a major determiner in the eventual effects, and the researchers concluded that only when models are fully implemented and in place for multiple years, can effects on student achievement be measured.

Thus, it is important to examine teachers’ instructional actions under the labels of various reading models in relation to the “intended curriculum” (Cuban, 1992), which is defined as what is written—what teachers set out to do, and the enacted curriculum, which is what teachers do. It is important to understand this relationship because many researchers have illustrated the long history of how reforms get changed by schools through the habits, dispositions, and attitudes of teachers, as well as the political and social environments in which the reforms take place (Hargreaves, 1994; Tyack & Cuban, 1995).

One variable on which most school reform scholars agree is that support of all stakeholders is essential if the change is to be sustained (Glickman, 1998; Hargreaves, 1994; Schlechty, 1990; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Glickman

emphasizes, “Comprehensive changes made without the understanding and support of at least a core majority of educators and parents will fail” (p. 38). Support is generated through participation of all the stakeholders. “Without a way for educators, parents, and citizens to understand, discuss, and participate in new possibilities, change efforts for the long term will be for naught” (Glickman, p. 39). Ideally, for changes in teaching and learning to occur, all members feel “in it” together (Glickman). As well, educators must hold the same understandings about where they are headed in the reform and believe the changes are practical and good for students.

The current study examines the implementation of ten early reading models. Importantly, for most of the teachers, the changes in teaching they were to make were “incremental” as opposed to “fundamental.” That is, “incremental changes are intentional efforts to enhance the existing system by correcting deficiencies in policies and practices” (Cuban, 1992, p. 218) without fundamentally changing the ways schools are run or the belief systems of teachers. The reading models examined in the present study provides new strategies, new materials, and sometimes new organizational structures for the teachers’ language arts periods. The models, for the most part (exceptions will be noted), fit within the teachers’ existing notions of what reading instruction should look like.

Method

Background

In 1998 the state legislature in which this study took place passed a bill designed to improve literacy achievement, and this bill set the stage for the later implementation of Reading First. This bill provided an opportunity for schools to compete for grants to adopt instructional models designed to improve the reading achievement of primary grade students reading at low levels. Schools were to find programs to match their needs, and vendors of programs visited the state to “sell” their programs. State department employees rated the grants primarily on school need (low reading levels, high poverty). Consequently, a variety of models and programs were implemented.

The team of researchers included six professors of education, five of whom all teach courses on literacy methods, research, or both. All are familiar with the early reading models included in the study. The research team used the descriptions of the reading models described in the grant applications as

the ‘blueprint’ from which the implementation level was examined. None of the team members had links of any sort to any of the given models; however, in general the team members favored less “packaged” or non-scripted reading programs over those in which teachers made more professional decisions. This bias, however, had no implications for this study as the findings generally favored more scripted models in terms of implementation fidelity, and these findings were not related to student achievement or teachers’ attitudes.

Sites and Participants

The research team studied qualitatively ten different early reading instructional models within 17 different schools in 35 classrooms across two years. Teachers were invited through the principals, who selected teachers who were particularly successful at implementing the model awarded through the grant program. All teachers had between 3-27 years experience. Thirty-three teachers were women (White, except one African American) and two were White men. Table 1 (see next page) shows the models listed in the order described with the number of schools using the models, classrooms studied, observations per model, and the level of implementation (which is discussed in Results).

The models included both “packaged” and “non-packaged” programs. Five were whole class instructional models: Four Blocks (Cunningham, Hall, & Sigmon, 1999), Literacy Collaborative (Pinnell, 1999), Success for All (Slavin, Madden, Dolan, & Wasik, 1996), Carbo Reading (Carbo & Cole, 1996), and Breakthrough to Literacy (<http://www.breakthroughtoliteracy.com/>). The intervention models included Reading Recovery (Pinnell, Deford, & Lyons, 1988), a locally designed model based on Reading Recovery, Early Intervention (Taylor, Strait, & Medo, 1994), Book Club, also locally designed based on Oprah Winfrey’s television book club, and Early Success (Cooper, Piluski, Au, Calderon, & Comas, 1997). One whole class model (Carbo Reading) was also used as an intervention in school.

Data Collection

In this qualitative study, researchers employed many techniques of descriptive studies (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Miles & Huberman, 1994) and ethnographic studies (LeCompte & Priessle, 1993). Data were collected on instructional practices in three ways: a) by observing the teachers and taking field notes on what the teachers said and did, b) by filling out an “observation

Table 1

Summary of Implementation Models

Model	#Schools	#Observ	Structural Level	Focus Level
Four Blocks	2 schools	12	High	Varied
(whole class)	4 classrooms			
Literacy Collab	2 schools	15	High	Varied
(whole class)	6 classrooms			
Success for All	1 school	11	High	Varied
(whole class)	4 classrooms			
Reading Recovery	2 schools	4	High	Not varied
(intervention)	2 classrooms			
Early Intervention	3 schools	13	High	Varied
(intervention)	4 classrooms			
County Designed	1 school	3	High	Not Varied
(intervention)	1 classroom			
Carbo Reading	2 schools	11	Low	Varied
(intervention)	3 classrooms			
Book Club	1 school	6	Low	Varied
(intervention)	3 classrooms			
Break to Literacy	2 schools	13	Low	Varied
	4 classrooms			
Early Success	1 school	10	Low	Varied
(intervention)	4 classrooms			

instrument” (see Appendix A), and by c) interviewing the teachers (see below). Thus, the data included documentation of the similarities and differences between the observed behaviors of the teachers and the intended curriculum as described in their grant applications and the teachers’ perceptions of barriers and supports

to full implementation. The differences between the enacted and intended curriculum provided the data for our categorizations of implementation fidelity.

Field notes. To gather data on the similarities and differences between what teachers did and the intended curriculum, each model was observed between 3-15 times depending on the number of teachers' implementing the models, with most models being observed a minimum of 10 times across the two years. The exceptions were Book Club, Reading Recovery, and the Locally Designed Model, which had only one or two sites each. Researchers observed between 30-180 minutes during each visit, depending on how long "literacy instruction" was conducted in that classroom. Reading Recovery was only observed for 30 minutes, a typical session. The average amount of time observed was 95 minutes. Researchers sat in the room and recorded everything possible during the instructional period in the form of field notes which they later typed and filled in so that each account read like a story of what happened during the visit. Importantly, researchers kept careful track of the time, noting the time every five minutes in order to get a sense of how time was spent.

Observation instrument. The observation instrument helped document other aspects of instruction, including: a) organizational features (e.g., grouping patterns) of literacy instruction; b) texts used for instruction (e.g., basal readers, literature, decodable texts); c) the time spent on various activities within the observed lessons; and d) the general focus of instruction (either meaning-based, skill-based, or balanced) interpreted through an examination of texts used and how time was spent. Researchers were trained to use the instrument, and interrater reliability agreement of .80 or better on each component was achieved.

Interviews. To augment data gathered through field notes and the observation instrument, researchers interviewed the classroom teachers the same day the observations were made. Most questions focused on what was observed, including: a) How typical the observed lesson or lessons were; b) What else happened regularly in this classroom that was not observed during this visit; c) How closely the observed instruction matched the intended model, and d) How and why enactment may have been different. At least two researchers observed at each site.

As is common for many types of qualitative studies (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994), the researcher immediately reflected on the field notes and interview

after she left the school building and then completed the observation instrument. Thus, the field notes, observation instrument, interview, and artifacts collected became a “data set” from which the researchers holistically analyzed the instruction.

Analysis

Analysis of instruction. Data analysis involved common procedures for finding patterns among the data (Miles & Huberman, 1994). In the first phase of analysis, researchers gathered to examine the data sets. Using a form created by one of the project directors, the researchers summarized what happened during each of the visits (see Appendix B). From these summaries, a project director created a set of codes that reflected the instructional activities in much of the data (see Appendix C). Grouping patterns and texts used were gathered through the observation instrument.

Then the field notes were partitioned into “activity settings” (Tharp & Gallimore, 1993) in order to create smaller, bounded units of analysis. This meant that whenever there was a change in setting (the people, place, or primary activity), there was a new unit of analysis. Instances in which children had to leave a group early or when a lesson was interrupted was not included as a change in setting. Thus, the lessons were coded by setting. For example, one setting for analysis was a ten-minute, whole class lesson in which the teacher guided the children to “correct” a message written without punctuation. When the same teacher signaled to the children it was time to work in learning centers, a new unit of analysis was formed.

The development and refining of the codes occurred when the researchers gathered for the second phase of analysis. The team met for six hours a day for five continuous days to code all data sets using the codes described in Appendix C, and each set was coded by two different researchers. Next, the pair of researchers sat together and reviewed the coding, and discrepant codes were negotiated and agreed upon. When two researchers could not agree on how to code an activity setting, a third researcher (one of the project directors) joined the group to decide. The researchers then listed on a cover sheet, all codes that saliently characterized the teacher’s instruction.

Analysis of implementation fidelity. To analyze the implementation fidelity of the models, all observations across models and for each individual teacher were examined. The observation and interview summary forms were

compared against the descriptions of the models in the grant applications. That is, an initial simple categorization of each *teacher* was made. The teachers who followed the model as defined in the grant application most of the time were categorized as *high implementers*, and those who did not were *low implementers*. To do this, the grant descriptions of the model were used as blueprints, or checklists, to search across observations to see if the teacher enacted the components in the description. For example, a high implementer of the Four Blocks model, who was observed four times, demonstrated word work, guided reading, and independent reading during all four observations, and this teacher demonstrated writing instruction three of the four times. These components are the “four blocks” of instruction of the Four Blocks model. These categorizations were checked by two researchers per teacher. An example of this coding procedure (comparing the notes against the blueprint) can be found in Appendix D.

As the research team worked on this simple categorization, however, it became clear that implementation fidelity was much more complex. That is, within the group of high implementers were teachers who implemented the model on the *structural* level, defined by the research team as how closely the implementation of the model matched the intended implementation as described in the school’s grant application. Another example of high implementation at the structural level was with the Success for All model. This model mandates ability grouping, whole class reading instruction with reduced class size, regular oral reading assessment, word work, writing, guided reading, and family involvement. Most or all of these components were observed in most or all of the observations of the Success for All classrooms; thus, these teachers were all categorized as high implementers. Fidelity was also determined by how well the teachers adhered to the time recommendations. For example, for the Early Intervention model, this meant 15 minutes each for word work, reading, and writing, as defined by the grant application; and most teachers implementing this model adhered.

It became clear to the team of qualitative researchers that these simple groupings did not tell the story of what was happening under the labels of the models. This led to further categorization of the teachers in the high fidelity models. There was great variability across teachers in the apparent *focus* of their instruction, which was either for the construction of meaning, the acquisition of skills, or a balance of the two. That is, while teachers could

often successfully implement all components of a model and adhere to general time allocations specified by the model, the details of their instruction, as illustrated by activities, materials used, and how time was spent, indicated the focus of instruction. Therefore, the teacher's instructional *focus* (Appendix E) was coded as well.

For those models that fell into the "low fidelity" group, the researchers searched the interviews for teachers' perspectives on why models were not implemented fully. Through coding and negotiations of codes during the five day analysis work, four reasons (described in the Results) emerged as reasons why some models were not fully implemented. The explanations of the low implementing models relied on the teachers' reasons, but also on interpretations of the literature on school reform.

Results

The goal of this study is to examine the implementation fidelity of ten early reading models in 35 classrooms. As expected in a study this size, some models of early reading instruction were implemented as described in their grant applications, and some were not. Six of the ten models were highly implemented at the structural level (the enactment followed the written blueprint), and four had low implementation fidelity. Importantly, even when a model was highly implemented according to the blueprint, the details of the instruction at times made the model appear very different in different classrooms. That is, of the models with high implementation at the structural level, there was still great variation in *focus* of instruction. Of the four models implemented at low levels, the teachers gave multiple reasons for not implementing the model fully, ranging from minimal attention to the model to seeing the need to offer more than the model recommended.

To illustrate these findings, the highly implemented models are described through a comparison of the observed behaviors to the blueprint for intended implementation. Then, an example is provided of one model that was highly implemented at the structural level, but which had much variation by teacher in overall focus of instruction. Finally, the low fidelity models are described and the reasons teachers gave for why the models were not implemented fully. Through the presentation of these results, the intention is not to communicate that high fidelity is necessarily a good thing and that low fidelity is always bad. Instead, the findings illustrate the complexity of implementation and the causes and barriers to full implementation fidelity.

High Implementation Fidelity at the Structural Level

The models with high implementation fidelity included three whole class models—Four Blocks, Literacy Collaborative, and Success for All, and three intervention models—Reading Recovery, Locally Designed, and Early Intervention. In all cases, the 19 teachers observed implementing these six models believed in what they were doing and worked hard to implement the models as intended. Most of these teachers followed the model guidelines *at the structural level* by including the required components of the literacy model (e.g., word work, guided reading, writing, and independent reading in the case of Four Blocks) in the designated time allotments (e.g. 15 minutes for each component in the case of Early Intervention or 30 minutes of daily instruction in the case of Reading Recovery). Most of the teachers could talk about the components of the model in their interviews. One teacher said she was a “model” for others, and several said they provide professional development on the model to others.

Each of these models is presented, first by the description in the grant application, including what the grant said the professional development was to include. Then the observations and interviews are summarized to present the overall implementation fidelity of each of the models. The whole class models are described first: Four Blocks, Literacy Collaborative, and Success For All.

Four Blocks. According to the grant application, this model is based on Cunningham, Hall, and Sigmon’s (1999) model. It is designed as a whole class method that divides the reading instruction block of time into four sections: a) guided reading, b) self-selected reading, c) writing, and d) working with words. In both schools, five days were dedicated to professional development to learn the model.

The study included four teachers in two schools who implemented Four Blocks. The research team made 12 observations across the four teachers. In nearly all of the observations, the structure of the model was adhered to fairly closely. That is, all the “blocks” of the model were in evidence for all teachers. Three of the teachers delivered the instruction in more or less equal parts, while one teacher spent considerably more time on “word work” than the other three. Another teacher seemed to integrate skill instruction across blocks. For example, during “word work” she played a game with the children in learning vowel patterns. These were the same words the children then

read during their guided reading time. This same teacher often had children write about what they read and practice their guided reading books during sustained silent reading time. The other three teachers kept the instruction in the blocks separate, with little connection among the blocks. All teachers used trade books for instruction, but two teachers used “leveled books” (a series of books with controlled vocabulary that get increasingly more complex) and two used literature. Three of the teachers taught guided reading in small groups, and one teacher operated her whole class as one guided reading group. Importantly, in both schools, Four Blocks was adopted school-wide. In one case, it was adopted district-wide.

Literacy Collaborative. According to the grant application, Literacy Collaborative is a long-term professional development program designed to provide a comprehensive, school-wide approach to literacy instruction in the primary grades. The goal of this program is to raise the base of instruction for all students. Participation in this program helps schools achieve this goal in three ways. First, the Literacy Collaborative lessons build connections between reading and writing. Second, the model provides small group guided reading instruction. Third, the developers require that the “safety net of Reading Recovery” be available for children in the first grade who are at-risk of reading failure. Professional development involved three days of summer training.

Six teachers in two schools implemented Literacy Collaborative as part of this study. Fifteen observations were made, and all but one teacher had high implementation fidelity of the model. All teachers had daily small group guided reading instruction, one feature of the model. Two teachers, however, used a basal reading series for instruction while four used trade books. Most of them also included writing lessons as an extension of the guided reading lessons, but one teacher (mentioned below) had a well implemented writer’s workshop (Graves, 1982). Both schools also had Reading Recovery teachers. Thus, this model was highly implemented at the structural level.

One interesting case of a Literacy Collaborative teacher was with a teacher called “Laura.” She, like a few others, saw the grant as an opportunity to get materials and professional development needed in their building to continue with what they were doing. When Laura was invited to participate in the study and was asked whether she would allow us to observe, she said, “What grant was that? . . . Oh, the guided reading books we got.” This school

had a principal who scrambled to get resources any way she could—for the purposes of improving literacy instruction overall. So, even though she and most of the others implemented this model at high levels, they did not necessarily view it as a “model.”

Success for All. Success for All (SFA) is a program developed by researchers at Johns Hopkins University. According to the grant application, it is an all-school restructuring program that includes a whole class reading instructional approach with the goal that all children succeed the first time. It provides a curriculum complete with methods, materials, professional development, and a parent outreach program. The method includes assessment of children every eight weeks and additional tutoring for those who fall behind. It provides an explicit, scripted guide for teachers. Children are ability-grouped, and reading (and related) instruction lasts for 90 minutes daily. Strategies include, but are not limited to, guided reading, shared reading, listening comprehension, and writing activities.

Importantly, while this model appears structurally similar to Four Blocks and Literacy Collaborative, SFA comes with materials teachers are to use in a strict fashion. The school is required to buy the materials (the model is viewed as the materials by some), and there was a special room in the buildings for the materials, and teachers were to check them out as needed. Professional development involved five days of training during the summer given by professionals at the publishing company. In addition, two coaching visits from the professionals at the company were made during the year following adoption.

Four teachers in one SFA school participated in this study. Eleven observations across the four classrooms were made. In all settings the classes were ability grouped, and the whole class (between 15-20 children) read from the basal readers or trade books provided by the company while the teachers guided the children’s reading through prompts from the teacher’s manual. In all observations, at least one child was assessed through an oral reading. In most of the observations, the components of the lessons described above were implemented, with the exception of home reading, which was documented through the interviews.

The following three models, also highly implemented at the structural level, were small group intervention models. In each of these models, the students were taught one-on-one or in small groups, and the children also

received regular literacy instruction. Reading Recovery is presented first because the other two, the Locally Designed and Early Intervention models are similar in pedagogy to Reading Recovery.

Reading Recovery. Reading Recovery is based on the work of Marie Clay (1991; 1995) and developed by researchers at the Ohio State University. According to the grant application, Reading Recovery is a one-to-one tutoring program for low achieving, first-grade children. The program is designed to bring these children up to grade level. Teachers work with children every day for 30 minutes on reading strategies, rereading, decoding, sentence writing. Children are also expected to practice at home. The training in Reading Recovery involved teachers enrolling in graduate level courses taught by a certified teacher leader. Through clinical and peer critiquing experiences facilitated by a teacher leader, teachers were coached on refining their instruction.

Two Reading Recovery teachers in two schools were observed twice each. Of the ten models, this one was categorized into the high implementation fidelity group most easily. Both teachers in both observed lessons followed the model description very closely; instruction across lessons and across teachers looked remarkably consistent in structure, pedagogy, and even discourse. Across all observations, students engaged in reading and writing tasks using magnetic letters to learn how words work. Each lesson involved the student rereading one or more leveled books they had read previously. All lessons included the student composing a story, a sentence or two about the book intended to help students encode sounds. The children in these lessons were introduced to a new book in each lesson and were expected to read this book unaided the following day. When reading aloud, students were often prompted to use the reading strategies had been taught.

Locally Designed. This model was designed by literacy specialists in two schools in one district, using the Reading Recovery model as a general pedagogical design, with adaptations made in order to access a greater number of 'at-risk' students. According to the grant application, some of the important components of this model are: a) letter/sound work, b) shared reading, c) rereading leveled books, d) miscue analysis, and e) writing. According to the grant, the teacher will work for 45 minutes daily with the children in small groups, rather than one-to-one tutoring. This model is a an ability-grouped, pull-out program.

One teacher in one school participated in the study, and an instructional aide served as the teacher. She was trained by a Reading Recovery teacher, although it was unclear how much training she received. She was observed three times over the two years. This teacher adhered closely to the components of the instructional model above, using the materials and strategies described above for Reading Recovery.

Early Intervention. This model is based on a study by Taylor et al., in Heibert and Taylor's (1994), *Let's Begin Reading Right: Effective Early Literacy Interventions*. According to the grant application, this model is adapted from the original study. Teachers work for 45 minutes daily in the regular classroom with the 4-6 most struggling readers. Instruction was to include teaching comprehension strategies, repeated readings of engaging literature, word study and phonics, and writing in response to the literature and be organized to focus for one third of the lesson on word work, one third on reading whole texts, and one third on writing. According to the grant, the professional development included five days during the summer and four additional days on weekends for professional development on state-of-art assessment practices, comprehension, phonics, and fluency strategies, and classroom organization techniques for managing small-group instruction with an entire class. During the years of the grant, the teachers received coaching from an expert, and teachers held family workshops to teach strategies for helping with reading at home. In this model, teachers also participated in training to be leaders in their building in reading instruction. Thus, the goal of the model was to build capacity for sustaining the intervention.

Four teachers in three schools implementing this model were observed a total of 13 times. In all observations, teachers met daily with small groups of the lowest achieving children in the class for reading instruction. Like Reading Recovery, the instruction was supplemental and children exited the program when their reading achievement improved significantly. While all of the teachers included the components of the model, there were differences in overall focus of instruction.

Variation in Focus

Some of the models were implemented with high fidelity at the structural level, but with a very different focus for different teachers. Through analysis

of instructional activities, materials used, and how time was spent, an overall focus of the instruction was discerned by the research team. Variations in focus were found in all models except Reading Recovery (there were only two teachers), and the Locally Designed and Book Club models, in which only one teacher was studied.

As stated earlier, differences in focus in the Success for All model were found, even when implementation at the structural level was high. In this model, all the teachers appeared to be caring, dedicated, enthusiastic teachers who were committed to the implementation of the model and to the success of their students. Thus, the differences of focus were not due to poor teaching or low expectations on the part of the teachers. But, the focus of instruction did make the implementation of this very structured, “scripted” reading model look quite different across teachers. In the following lesson, this second grade teacher includes all the components of the model as described by the grant.

The four second grade teachers in one school spent the first 20 minutes or so with their “homeroom” students where they took roll, and got organized for the day. Then, the children moved around the school, so that all children in any given classroom were reading on the same level. In one classroom, the 19 children who were present sat in desks that were organized in a semi-circle. The children each had a copy of a nonfiction book about Russia. At 9:15, the teacher began the lesson by enthusiastically saying that they were going to read a story about Russia. She told the students to open their books, and she guided the children through the oral reading of the book in round robin fashion (children take turns reading a section aloud while the others follow). The teacher asked questions about the story from the teacher’s guide and students responded as they moved through the text. Most children seemed to follow the text and were engaged with the story, although some were clearly off task. The frustrated teacher stopped periodically and gently reminded two boys and a girl, “What are you supposed to be doing?” “Where are we? [in the text]?”

After 20 minutes of reading and answering questions, the teacher assigned spelling work from a textbook. The children were supposed to work independently. Some of them completed the work quickly and read books or worked at the computer, while most seemed to work slowly and grudgingly. A few did not complete

even the first exercise in the 30 minutes that was devoted to this work. This period was followed by “Shared Reading” in which the teacher read a story to the students. Before the students moved back to their home room teacher, they were given an assignment for home reading.

In the same school, another second grade teacher also taught a lesson with the same book about Russia. She too included all the components of the Success for All model.

Before reading to the children, the teacher asked the children what they knew or had heard about Russia. She asked them if they knew where it was, and she proceeded to show them on a map. She explained how the borders of the country have changed a bit in recent years and why. She then handed out the books and allowed the children to take a “picture walk” through it. She invited them to think about what questions they had while they were exploring. After a few minutes of looking and talking, the teacher asked the children what questions they have about the book. Several children asked questions related to the photographs in the book and the teacher answered them. She showed her excitement, saying, “Oh yes, that’s interesting part of the story! I was amazed when I read that!” and “You will like that....” Then, she told the children to either read the story to themselves or with a partner. She encouraged them to do the best they could when they came to words they did not know, and that the class would go over the words after the first reading. The children all read the book, apparently eagerly.

After the reading, the teacher lead a discussion of the book using questions from the teacher’s guide, and then the class read the book aloud a second time, in round robin fashion. When children came to words they did not know, the teacher prompted with “sound it out” or “what would make sense?” After the discussion, the children did some independent work on an SFA worksheet that related to the story (the skill was unclear) for about twenty minutes while the teacher assessed children’s oral reading. This period was followed by “Shared Reading,” which in this case, was also simply a time for the teacher to read to the students. This teacher,

like the one before, also assigned reading for home practice.

Both of these teachers fell into the categorization of high implementers. Both used the published materials, taught in a whole class, ability-grouped fashion, followed the reading with skill work, shared reading (read aloud), and assigned home reading. But the two classes differed significantly. In the first classroom, the teacher followed the script, asking comprehension questions as directed by the guide and having students take turns reading orally. This teacher had students independently completing tasks for more time (30 minutes) than she spent teaching reading (20 minutes). In the second classroom, the teacher also asked questions from the guide, but she helped students build background knowledge before reading the story by using pictures, maps, and discussion asking students about their questions. The students read the text more than once, first either alone or with a partner and then orally. Reading instruction lasted more time (30 minutes) than the independent work (20 minutes). These simple differences in the second teacher illustrated the category of “transcending” the model; she added to the curriculum as she saw the need.

Low Implementation Fidelity at the Structural Level

The models that had low fidelity of implementation included two whole class instructional models (Carbo Reading and Breakthrough to Literacy) and two intervention models (Book Club and Early Success). As stated, Carbo Reading (Carbo & Cole, 1996) was implemented as an intervention. These models varied in both implementation fidelity at the structural level and, for the most part, enactment of the model in terms of overall instructional focus. According to the perceptions of the teachers, there were four reasons for low implementation fidelity: a) Teachers barely knew the model was in the building or they knew about the model but were not provided professional development; b) Teachers were “trained” but only so minimally that they were not sure what they were supposed to be doing in the name of the model; c) Teachers were trained and had implemented the model to some extent, but the implementation was not sustained; and d) Teachers reported that they had been provided intense professional development, but they chose not to implement the model as intended, and adapted their instruction because they believed the model lacked what their students needed. These reasons will be discussed in light of studies on school reform.

Carbo Reading. According to the grant applications, Carbo Reading is a literacy program developed by Marie Carbo and focused on meeting the individual needs of learners through assessment and attention to students' particular learning styles. According to one grant, a "Carbo Coach" will be designated, and the coach will work with 25 students who seem to need him/her the most. Thus, in this school the model was an intervention for struggling readers. In the other school, the grant read, "All 30 primary teachers will receive Carbo training that will focus on 'learning-style lessons' that teachers can implement with their students. Many of the lessons will be 'arts-related' as they attempt to tap into the multiple intelligences of students."

Three teachers in two schools were observed and 11 observations were made across the three teachers. This was one of the models that fell into reason b, in which several teachers said they had received some professional development, but not much, and they were unclear where the money from the grant was spent. One said, "Books, we bought books and the tapes. But is that all? I don't know." Several teachers mentioned using audio-taped books, but little else as described by the grant. The school with the Carbo Coach however, was somewhat different in that the grant paid for this teacher's salary, and she did know what she was expected to do. The teachers with whom she was to collaborate, however, either knew little or nothing about the grant. The Carbo Coach said:

I work with small groups of kids every day, some in the classroom and some out. The [materials such as books on tape] have been a terrific help, and the kids love them....I don't know if they are doing the same sorts of things in the [regular] classroom or not because I am busy teaching the kids and can't watch [the regular teachers].

According to the teachers associated with the Carbo Reading model, the primary reason for lack of full implementation was minimal professional development. This may not, however, have been the only factor. This model is open-ended and flexible with only general guidelines. Without a guide, teachers used the materials (books and tapes) as one activity rather than incorporating the materials into an arts-based literacy model, as described in the grant.

Book Club. The Book Club model is a locally-designed instructional model that has as its goal getting children to join book clubs led by teachers. According to the grant, this model will help children improve their reading

by becoming members of a school-based book club in which children would read popular literature and discuss them in ‘Oprah’ fashion. Teachers will use a state-of-art assessment package [Developmental Reading Assessment] and assess students’ progress regularly. The Book Club intervention will involve community sharing, reading strategies, writing, and joining clubs to select and discuss trade books with peers and teachers. The focus will be on immersing children, particularly struggling readers, in good literature—to move them from reading words in isolation to truly engaging with texts. According to the grant, professional development occurred in the summer, although it was unclear how many days it occurred.

This model was considered the lowest in implementation fidelity. Originally, three teachers in the school adopted the Book Club model, one first grade and two second grade teachers. These teachers agreed to participate in the study. When researchers observed instruction, however, very little activity in the classrooms resembled a book club. When interviewed about this discrepancy, all teachers admitted not being successful at implementation, with one speaking for all saying they “hadn’t been able to get it going.” One second grade teacher said she “didn’t know anything about it” (even though she had talked about it earlier), and the other said she hadn’t received professional development on the model. The first grade teacher said she had received professional development on the model, but she added that the professional development was minimal and she was unsure what to do. She did, however, have a Book Club, which met once or twice a week for part of the school year, and she asked students to read at home every night. The observed lesson with five students was engaging, and the students appeared happy with the book. But the discussion was limited to traditional style classroom discourse (Cazden, 1988).

Breakthrough to Literacy. According to the grant application, Breakthrough to Literacy is a computer-assisted program for pre-kindergarten through first grade children. It includes skill work on phonemic awareness, alphabet knowledge, phonics, and word recognition. Instructional components include comprehension strategies, daily time on the computer, daily writing, and “Take-Me-Home” books. It includes one-to-one and small group assistance. Professional development for the grantees included one day of summer training and follow up meetings throughout the year.

There were four participating teachers in two schools, and 13 observations across the teachers were conducted. Three teachers said they did not know

about the model or were not trained in it. The other said she was trained to use the model but only minimally, “We got PD [professional development] on this, but it was like 1, 2 days last year. Some of us got the books, but we have to share. Some teachers don’t bother....I don’t know where all the money [from the grant] went.” No observation of this teacher included all of the features of instruction as described above.

Early Success. According to the grant application, Early Success is a small-group instructional model designed for those in first and second grade who need additional help. The school personnel who wrote the grant claimed it is structured as an intervention model that pulls children out of the regular classroom (in small groups) every day for thirty minutes. Instruction includes rereading, take-home books, word building, and sentence writing. According to the grant, the professional development provided by this model included the intervention teachers and the regular classroom teachers as well. The intervention teacher was provided with materials and three days of training by the text publishers prior to the beginning of the school year, and the regular classroom teachers were provided one day of professional development on support strategies to use in their classrooms.

This model was observed 10 times in 4 classrooms in one school. Like Book Club and Breakthrough to Literacy, teachers in the school that adopted this model varied in their levels of implementation. Three of the four teachers implemented the model, but they could not talk about the model as one of the school’s missions. It simply was not a priority. The fourth teacher was able to articulate the purposes of the model and was particularly enthusiastic about the model. This teacher’s instruction, however, seemed to transcend, or go beyond, the expectations of the model. Through analysis of his instruction and subsequent interviews, it seemed he added to what was expected of the model, illustrating our reason d, in which teachers reported that they had been provided enough professional development, but they adapted their instruction because they believed the model lacked what their students needed.

The teacher works with a small group of six children outside the regular classroom. As the children enter the room, they select a book and sit down to read (as if they know the routine). After three minutes, the teacher calls the children together at a table and introduces a new book. It is called “Going to the Fair” and the teacher elicits from the children their experiences going to a state fair. The children mention animals, rides, games, and food

they experienced at a fair. The teacher guides them through a “picture walk” to elicit the students’ expectations for this book. Then the teacher introduces the title page, incorporating phonics in the context of reading the title. The teacher asks, “What’s the title again, Billy?”

Billy says, “Going to the fair.”

“Can you sound out the author’s name for me?”

The child makes an attempt.

“Break it down into small parts that you know”

“The child says, “Vack er all.”

The teacher goes over it, “/vack ack/, we know that, /er/, we know that....Then we sound out the name of the illustrator.”

A child says something.

“Good, ‘Leach’, rhymes with ‘beach’.”

Then the teacher guides the children through the rest of the book, asking several comprehension questions such as, “What about this picture makes you think it is a grandmother?” “How many of you have grandmothers who make jellies and jams?” and “What is this girl getting ready to do here?”

In addition to posing questions, the teacher explains and demonstrates what a raffle is (this concept is dealt with in the story). Then there is more phonics work using a sign in the book that says “refreshments” and the teacher has children write the word on lap boards—individual wipe-off boards. This sequence of book introduction, skill lessons, and discussion takes 22 minutes.

Then the teacher has the children read the book individually and silently, while he circulates and helps as needed. After a few minutes, he asks a child to come to his desk and read aloud while he listens and scaffolds the child’s reading. This goes on for about ten minutes, during which all the children finish their readings. Before the children leave the room the teacher introduces a book they will read the next time they come—one of his favorites. The lesson has lasted about 35 minutes.

In the lesson above, the teacher included the rereading and word building as defined by the model, but he also included components not required by the model: discussion, building of background knowledge and silent reading.

Further, he adapted the lesson by following the students' leads, he claims, by focusing on individual differences. He told the researcher that he liked the program a lot, but he also said he had some concerns. He has had to enhance the model by incorporating more comprehension techniques into it, because as he claims, the texts do not lend themselves to higher level thinking and "the program doesn't call for it." He had recognized this flaw in the program, and he believes that more comprehension instruction is what his children needed. So, he adapted the model to better meet the needs of the students by adding more discussion. This teacher also noticed some confusing parts to the model. For example, the book introduces 'ow' words and then immediately jumps to 'ough' words which "would confuse the children" according to the teacher, with that immediate jump. But he has been able to avoid confusing the children with these problems by changing his instruction. This teacher was categorized as a low implementer because he included other components not required of the model, changed the sequence of instruction, and he did not closely adhere to time allocations as recommended by the model. This teacher was also categorized as a "transcender" (reason d).

Discussion

Understanding why some early reading models are implemented easily and others not is critically important in this era of federal mandates. Indeed, educators should be cognizant about how easily models are or are not implemented and the reasons (some highly professional on the part of the teacher) some teachers do not implement models as intended. In the present study, three primary variables affected how fully the models were implemented: the support teachers received from professional development to leadership; and the practicality and clarity of the models; and how teachers adapted the models to fit their local contexts, including teachers highly cognizant about what they were doing and those who seemed to be simply scrambling to get the job of teaching accomplished. Each of these points is elaborated.

Teacher Support

In the present study, the six models that had high implementation fidelity had some commonalities. First, there was a core majority of educators in each of the schools attempting the same kind of practice who provided support for

one another. In the cases of one Four Blocks site, there was even a district-wide mandate to implement the model. Teachers in this district provided professional development to others in their district. In the case of Success for All, the commitment was on the school level, required by the publishers of this model. With Early Intervention, 45% of all primary teachers in a three-district area received the professional development on this model. Glickman (1998) has illustrated that support of all stakeholders is what sustains change. The teachers felt “in it” together and held many of the same understandings about where they were headed, also a requirement for change (Darling-Hammond, 1997). In contrast, the teachers in the schools with the Early Success and Book Club grants rarely talked about the models as the schools gave them little attention.

In all six models, there was extensive professional development, from three days in the summer with follow-up meetings during the year (Literacy Collaborative) to a year of graduate work (Reading Recovery). In contrast, some models with low implementation had as little as one day of professional development. Scholars of reform agree on the importance of professional development. Many suggest that helping teachers understand the reading process (Paris, Wasik, & Turner, 1991), children’s literacy development (McIntyre, Rightmyer, Petrosko, Powell, Powers, 2006), and a wide variety of strategies (Pressley, Allington, Wharton-McDonald, Collins-Block, & Morrow, 2001) are key to instructional change. Expert teachers produce readers regardless of the reading series they are mandated to use (Pressley et al., 2001). Thus, investing in the development of teachers may be what produces highest achievement (Darling-Hammond, 1997). Teachers and teacher expertise matter much more than which reading series a school district might choose (Anders, Hoffman, & Duffy, 2000). Professional development also communicates to the teachers the commitment the leadership has on the model.

Practicality and Clarity of the Models

The models successfully implemented were practical, another feature of successful reforms (Snyder et al., 1992). That is, they involved only incremental changes (Cuban, 1992) that allowed reading instruction to build on what teachers already did. With the case of Success for All, the model also provided the materials. Additionally with Success for All, children were

grouped by ability, a practical feature of the model, according to the teachers. In contrast, Book Club differs dramatically from traditional reading instruction. Although attracted to the idea of “Oprah” style book clubs in the classroom, the teachers did not know enough to fit this new feature into their existing instruction. The model was simply not practical within their more traditional instruction. In order to be successful, the teachers would have needed much more professional development.

In the cases of Success for All and Reading Recovery (and by extension, the Locally Designed model), the clarity of the model may have affected the successful implementation. Hoffman (1991) listed “clarity” as the number one area correlated with high achievement, and implementation fidelity must exist before achievement is obtained. Indeed, in a study of school reform models, Stringfield et al. (1998) found that the instructional models that were well defined were also implemented most fully. In the present study, Success for All, Reading Recovery, and Early Intervention had very definite written descriptions of what the model involved, including the materials to be used, the sequences of activities in lessons, even the kinds of questions teachers should pose. These models provided the clarity of goals and procedures necessary for successful reform (Snyder et al., 1992). In contrast, the Carbo Reading, Breakthrough to Literacy, and Book Club were flexible, open-ended models in which teachers decided the sequence of instruction, grouping, and materials to be used (some materials were provided by these models), and especially what to say.

One important caveat: While the practicality and clarity of some of the models affected implementation, it is clear that a “script” is not needed to fully implement a model. The teachers who implemented the Four Blocks model did not have the kind of strict guidelines as in Success for All or Reading Recovery. Four Blocks is more like Carbo Reading and Breakthrough to Literacy in that it is flexible and requires teacher decision-making, and yet, the teachers implemented it well, likely because they had participated in extensive professional development and enjoyed much school-wide support.

Further, it is important to emphasize that these models were implemented at the structural level, and that some of the authors of the models might not call these categorizations full implementation, which Stringfield et al. (1998) suggest is not likely after only one year. It may be that in some models, structural level implementation will occur first, with full implementation

occurring years later. Still, the implementation at the focus level varied, and it was not always because the teachers were still learning the model. Some teachers (e.g., the Four Blocks teachers) were cognizant of the model's intentions and structures and were confident in their practice, even though their practices appeared to be noticeably different from other equally confident teachers.

Local Context

In addition to having support and a clearly-defined practical model, the ability and opportunity to adapt the model to fit the local context affected implementation. In the case of the Literacy Collaborative model, where some teachers were categorized in the high fidelity level, the teachers were doing what they thought best, rather than focusing on the implementation of the model. Recall the teacher who applied for the Literacy Collaborative grant merely to obtain the guided reading books. Like Four Blocks, Literacy Collaborative was flexibly and broadly defined and included practices that can be found in many other models that many others implement. It may be that the teachers selected this model because it reflected what they already did, with the grant providing a way to get the materials they needed to implement what they perceived as best practices. In this way, these teachers were taking into account their local context. As researchers have shown, certain approaches are best with certain populations, and certain curricula are appropriate for some places but not others (Barth, 1990; Hargreaves, 1994; Schlechty, 1990). Hargreaves (1994) claims, "Teachers change based on what is practical and what they perceive will work....for *this* teacher in *this* context" (p. 12). In the case of the Literacy Collaborative, the model clearly reflected the values and expectations of those teachers and it allowed them build on their strengths (Schlechty, 1990).

Undoubtedly some teachers observed were experts prior to the implementation of the reading model, and thus adapted models to fit their contexts. The case of the Early Success teacher as well as some of the others, seemed to go beyond the expectations of the model. Some teachers also consciously chose not to implement certain aspects of a model when they believed that what the model dictated or suggested was not what was best for their students. These teachers obviously know children, teaching, and learning. They make decisions based on what they think their students need and use

the “model” resources as just that—resources for meeting the needs of their students. These teachers were metacognitive about their actions, adapting the model and knowing they were adapting it because they believed it was right to do so. Thus, it is clear that simply adhering to a guideline should not always be the goal of educators seeking the implementation of a new reading model.

Certainly, the local context affected the implementation of the Book Club model. Not only was there little professional development on the model, and the model differed dramatically from what the teachers were used to seeing in classrooms, but the model received little attention due to the serious illness of the principal. Much emotional energy was spent on worrying about him. As other studies have indicated (Cuban, 1998; Hargreaves, 1994; Tyack & Cuban, 1995) the social context of the reform affects the kind of commitment necessary for successful implementation.

Limitations of this Study

This kind of classroom study, while highly valuable due to the rich description, is always at risk for contextual constraints. First, because there were so many teachers and schools in this study, a limited number of observations had to suffice in order to make the interpretations about the various models. Had the research team observed each teacher monthly, for example, they may have seen aspects of each of the models that were not observed in the 2-4 visits per classroom. They may have seen more deviation from the models with additional visits as well.

Further, had the researchers studied the professional development of the teachers, their understanding of the differences in model implementation would be enhanced. In this study, researchers based analyses of the role of professional development on what was written in the grant. All grants required professional development, but the specifications were not strict in all cases. Further, it is likely the professional development was implemented with as much variability as the instruction. Thus the claims made about professional development have this limitation in mind.

Conclusion

As stated, high fidelity of a reading model is not necessarily a good thing and low fidelity is not always bad. Instead, it is evident that educators must be aware of the complexity of implementation and what is likely to happen when teachers implement new early reading models. Further, this study does not recommend either “well-defined” models or “flexibly-defined” models, but instead an awareness on the part of educators and policy makers that the adoption of reading models does not necessarily mean instruction will look the same from one classroom to another or that teachers will even implement the model at the structural level. It is recommended that policy makers think about the level of support, the practicality and clarity of the model, and the local context (including how well educated the teachers are about reading instruction) when looking at adopting models. Reading instruction is highly complex, and learning how to teach well is a life-long challenge. Schools should proceed with caution and an enormous amount of support when considering the adoption of a reading model.

References

- Adams, M. J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Anders, P. L., Hoffman, J. V., & Duffy, G. G. (2000). Teaching teachers to teach reading: Paradigm shifts, persistent problems, and challenges. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research, volume III* (pp. 719-742). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Anderson, R. C., Hiebert, E. H., Scott, J. A., & Wilkinson, E. A. J. (1985). *Becoming a nation of readers: The report of the Commission on reading*. Washington, DC: National Academy of Education.
- Barr, R. (1984). Beginning reading instruction. In P. D. Pearson, R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 545-582). New York: Longman.
- Barth, R. (1990). *Improving schools from within*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Bond, G. L., & Dykstra, R. (1967, 1997). The cooperative research program in first-grade reading instruction. Re-printed. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 32, 345-427.
- Breakthrough to Literacy (2004). Available http://www.breakthroughtoliteracy.com/index.html?phpsessid=&page=df_pr_home
- Carbo, M., & Cole, R. (1996). *The power of reading styles*. Syosset, NY: National Reading Styles Institute.
- Cazden, C. (1988). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Clay, M. M. (1995). *Observation survey*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Clay, M. M. (1991). *Becoming literate: The construction of inner control*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Books.
- Cooper, J. D., Piluski, J. J., Au, K. A., Calderon, M., & Comas, J.C. (1997). *Invitations to Literacy: Level 1.5 Discover*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Cuban, L. (1992). Curriculum stability and change. In P. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 216-247). New York: Macmillan Publishing.
- Cuban, L. (1998). How schools change reforms: Redefining reform success and failure. *Teachers College Record*, 99, 453-477.
- Cunningham, P. M., Hall, D. P., & Sigmon, C. M. (1999). *The teacher's guide to the Four Blocks: A multi-method, multi-level framework for grades 1-3*. Greensboro, NC: Carson Dellosa.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *The right to learn: a blueprint for creating schools that work*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Glickman, C. D. (1998). *Revolutionizing America's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Graves, D. H. (1982). *Writing: Teachers and children at work*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: teachers work and culture in the postmodern age*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Hoffman, J. (1991). Teacher and school effects in learning to read. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research: Vol 2*. (pp. 911-950) Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- LeCompte, M., & Priessle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. New York: Academic Press.
- McIntyre, E., Rightmyer, E. C., Petrosko, J. P., Powers, S., & Powell, R. (2006). How much should young children read? Reading instruction and student development. *Literacy Teaching and Learning: An International Journal of Early Literacy*, 11, 51-72.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (2000). Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching children to read. Retrieved 12/1/2006 from <http://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/nrp/findings.htm>
- Paris, S. G., Wasik, B. A., & Turner, J. C. (1991). The development of strategic readers. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research, II* (pp. 609-640). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Pinnell, G. S. (1999). *Literacy Collaborative 1999 research report*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.
- Pinnell, G.S., Deford, D.E., Lyons, C.A.. (1988). *Reading Recovery: Early intervention for at-risk first graders*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Pressley, M., Allington, R. L., Wharton-McDonald, R., Collins-Block, C., & Morrow, L. (2001). *Learning to read: Lessons from exemplary first-grade classrooms*. New York: Guilford.
- Schlechty, P. C. (1990). *Schools for the 21st century: Leadership imperatives for educational reforms*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Shanahan, T. (2002). What reading research says: The promises and limitations of applying research to reading education. In A.E. Farstrup, & S.J Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (pp. 8-24). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Slavin, R., Madden, N., Karweit, N., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B. (1996). *Success for all: A relentless approach to prevention and early intervention in elementary schools*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

- Snow, C. E., Burns, M. S., & Griffin, P. (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Snyder, J., Bolin, F., & Zumwalt, K. (1992). Curriculum implementation. In P. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 402-435). New York: Macmillan Publishing.
- Stringfield, S., Datnow, A., & Ross, S. M. (1998). Scaling up school restructuring in multicultural, multilingual contexts: Early observations from Sunland County. Report to the Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence. Retrieved 12/1/2006 from <http://crede.berkeley.edu/>
- Taylor, B. M., Strait, J., & Medo, M. A. (1994). Early intervention in reading: Supplementary instruction for groups of low achieving students provided by first grade teachers. In E.H. Hiebert & B. M. Taylor (Eds.), *Getting reading right from the start: Effective early literacy interventions*. Needham, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. (1993). *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning, and schooling in social context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Walsh, K., Glaser, D., & Wilcox, D. (2006). What education schools aren't teaching about reading and what elementary teachers aren't learning. National Council on Teacher Quality. Retrieved 12/1/2006 from <http://www.nctq.org/nctq/>

Appendix A

Observation Instrument

(Complete for each activity setting after taking field notes)

Section 1: Demographics and Organizational Features

Date _____ Teacher _____ School _____

Observer _____ Intervention Model _____

Setting Features _____ #Ss _____ Gr _____

Organizational Features (Check all that apply)

Grouping

One-on-one _____ Small Group _____ Whole Class _____ Pull-out program _____ In-class with regular T _____ In-class with asst/parent _____ Computer as T _____

Time Block ----:----to----:----

Section 2: Texts Used (Check all that apply. Please write titles in notes)

Narrative Literature _____ Non-fiction _____ Poetry _____ Predictable Text _____ Decodable text _____

Literature anthology _____ Basals _____ Isolated words or phrases _____ Children's own writing _____

Other _____

Section 3: Focus

Circle one: Meaning vs. Subskills Focus:

1.....2.....3.....4

Meaning

Skills

Don't Know

Section 4: Interpretations About Observation (Provide narrative)

Significant features: What do you think most promoted learning in this activity setting?

Perceived Challenges: What do you think most inhibited learning?

Appendix B

Summary Form for Qualitative Analysis of Field Notes

Directions: Read entire file for one visit (field notes, observation instruments, interviews, artifacts), answering the questions on this form as you go along. *One form per visit.* Reread your notes for clarity.

Date of Observation:

Target Children Observed:

School:

Teacher/s

Model:

Observer:

Narrative answers:

1. What is going on in this setting? (Put "TW" behind each term used that the teacher also used.)
2. What purposes does the teacher seem to have (based on statements or activities)?
3. What are the salient instructional activities?
4. How much time did the observer record instruction?

Appendix C

Codes for Activities
(activities can be double coded)

Read aloud	(RA)	Reader response activities	(RR)
Shared reading	(ShRead)	Art	(Art)
Guided reading	(GRead)	Drama	(Dra)
Round robin reading	(RRR)	Games	(Game)
Partner reading	(PR)	Other—reading	(O rea)
Choral reading	(ChR)	Other-writing	(O wrt)
Literature circles	(LC)	Other—skills	(O ski)
Readers' theatre	(RT)	Other	(O)
Independent reading	(IR)		
Discussion of story	(D)		
Computer work	(Comp)		
Worksheets/workbooks	(WB)		
Phonological instruction	(Ph)		
Oral lessons on skills	(Sk)		
Oral drill of skills	(Dr)		
Instruction on strategies	(Str)		
Writing instruction	(Wr)		
Independent writing time	(IW)		
Center time	(CT)		
Assessment	(A)		

Appendix D

Example of Highly Implemented Model: Four Blocks Model

Teachers	Model Components	Observation 1	Observation 2	Observation 3
Teacher A	Guided reading	x	x	x
High implement	Self-select read	x	x	x
	Writing	x	x	x
	Word work	x	x	x
Teacher B	Guided reading	x	x	x
High implement	Self-select read	x	x	x
	Writing	x	x	x
	Word work	x	x	x
Teacher C	Guided reading	x	x	x
High implement	Self-select read	x	x	x
	Writing	x	x	x
	Word work	x	x	x
Teacher D	Guided reading	x	x	x
High implement	Self-select read	x	x	x
	Writing	x	x	x
	Word work	x	x	x

Example of Low Implemented Model: Early Success

Teachers	Model Components	Observation 1	Observation 2	Observation 3
Teacher A	30-minute intervention	x	x	x
High implement				
Transcender	Rereading	x	x	x
	Take-home books	x	x	x
	Word building	x		x
	Sentence writing	x		
Teacher B	30-minute intervention	x	x	x
Low implement				
	Rereading	x	x	x
	Take home books			
	Word building		x	
	Sentence writing			
Teacher C	30-minute intervention	x	x	x
Low implement				
	Rereading	x		
	Take home books			
	Word building	x	x	x
	Sentence writing			
Teacher D	30-minute intervention			
Low implement				
	Rereading			
	Take home books	x	x	x
	Word building	x	x	
	Sentence Writing			

Appendix E

Codes for Focus

Focus of Activity:

ACTIV-mean—the activity appears to try to get kids to construct meaning

ACTIVE-flue—the activity appears to try to get kids to develop fluency

ACTIVE-phon—the activity appears to try to get kids to develop phonologically

ACTIV-other—the activity appears to try to get kids to learn something else