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Reading First

This study is the first in series of studies that examines teacher and student learning arising out of the U. S. Department of Education’s *Reading First* in a western state in the U.S.

Reading First is designed to:

1) Help K-3 children in high poverty achieve at the rate of their more fortunate peers.

2) Reduce the rate of referral to special education.
Reading First

Conceptual Framework for Reading First

- Reading First fits within the context of school reform researched over the last 15 or 20 years.

- Several reviews of research on school reform demonstrate difficulty in changing instruction in schools.
Reading First

Focus of this study:

• Special interest in teacher knowledge, attitudes--including attitudes toward Reading First, outcome expectancy and self-efficacy.

• Special interest in how K-3 teachers spend their instructional time.
Participants

- Involves 16 schools in 6 school districts.
- 7 district coordinators.
- 16 literacy coaches.
- 16 principals.
- 233 teachers.
Teacher Measures

Teacher Knowledge of Reading First Survey (Torgesen, Florida Center for Reading Research, 2003).

- Measures participants’ broad and deep knowledge of reading and reading instruction.

- Measures six areas--phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, assessments.
  - Alpha reliability ---.846
Teacher Measures

Teacher Attitudes towards Reading First.

Two items asking for participants’ attitudes toward Reading First and how enthusiastic they were about participating in Reading First,

Scale of 1(low) to 6 (high).

Alpha reliability of .896
Teacher Measures

Outcome Expectancy about Early Reading Instruction (Adapted from Edmonds, 2000 and Bos, Mather, Dickson, Podhajski, & Chard, 2001).

- Measures participants’ beliefs that certain research-based teaching strategies result in improved reading instruction.

- I believe… “regularly regrouping students helps address their instructional needs.”
  - Alpha reliability -- .870
Teacher Measures

Self-Efficacy about Early Reading Instruction Survey (Adapted from Edmonds, 2000 and Bos, Mather, Dickson, Podhajski, & Chard, 2001).

- measures teachers’ and coaches’ beliefs about their own capabilities to organize and manage a reading program and effectively teach students.

- I believe I can… “monitor students’ understanding of what they read.”

- Alpha reliability -- .925
Teacher Measures

Instructional Content Emphasis-R2 (ICE-R2) (Adapted from Edmonds and Briggs, 2003).

• Records teachers’ use of time on instructional practice of 10 dimensions of reading.

• Observers take field notes and then code using coding scheme and coding book.

  - Interrater reliability -- .90
# Teacher Results

## Table 1
Reading First Teacher Knowledge Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th></th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts (n = 10)</td>
<td>27.70</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinators (n = 7)</td>
<td>22.57</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches (n = 15)</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>24.40</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals (n = 15)</td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>20.27</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (n = 233)</td>
<td>16.84</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.37***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number correct out of 29 items. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$. 

*SD = Standard Deviation, ES = Effect Size*
## Teacher Results

### Table 2
Reading First Teacher Attitude Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Fall M</th>
<th>Fall SD</th>
<th>Spring M</th>
<th>Spring SD</th>
<th>ES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinators (n = 7)</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches (n = 15)</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals (n = 15)</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (n = 233)</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scores range from low of 2 to high of 12.

1Effect sizes were not calculated for coordinators because of small n.
# Teacher Results

## Table 3

### Outcome Expectancy of Early Reading Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>ES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinators (n=7)</td>
<td>96.16</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>91.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches (n = 15)</td>
<td>96.86</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>98.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals (n = 15)</td>
<td>91.42</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>89.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (n = 233)</td>
<td>91.64</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>92.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a scale of 1-100.

\(^1\)Effect sizes were not calculated for coordinators because of low n.
Table 4
Self-Efficacy about Early Reading Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th></th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches (n = 15)</td>
<td>86.40</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>92.54</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (n = 233)</td>
<td>78.82</td>
<td>13.69</td>
<td>82.06</td>
<td>12.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants

On a scale of 1-100. * p < .05; ** p < .001.
Teacher Observations

Results of ICE-R2 - Grade 1

- Concepts of Print: 0%
- Phonological Awareness: 8%
- Alphabetic Knowledge: 1%
- Word Study / Phonics: 25%
- Spelling: 6%
- Oral Language: 1%
- Fluency: 11%
- Reading Text: 29%
- Comprehension: 11%
- Writing: 9%
Teacher Observations

Results of ICE-R2 - Grade 3

- 46% Comprehension
- 24% Writing
- 11% Word Study / Phonics
- 5% Spelling
- 4% Fluency
- 10% Reading Text
- 0% Oral Language
- 0% Alphabetic Knowledge
- 0% Phonological Awareness
- 0% Concepts of Print

0% 0%

24%
Conclusions

• Coaches and teachers appeared to gain knowledge across Year 1 of the project.

• No change in teacher attitudes and beliefs.

• No change in teacher outcome expectancy.

• Increase in self-efficacy of coaches and teachers.
Conclusions

- Teacher observations revealed how much teacher time was spent on each area of instruction at grades 1-3.
Into the Future

Additional Questions:

- How does teacher instructional time relate to student achievement?
- What are the best student/teacher predictors of student achievement?