1992

Early Socialization as a Foundation for Bilingual Literacy Development

Erica Rae Sufritz
Loyola University Chicago

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Department of Counseling and Educational Psychology

EARLY SOCIALIZATION AS A FOUNDATION FOR BILINGUAL LITERACY DEVELOPMENT

by

Erica Rae Sufritz

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Chicago, Illinois

January, 1992

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to Raya Dunayevskaya (1910-1987), whose body of work and philosophic world view have taught me a great deal about what is truly important in this life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... v

LIST OF TABLES..... x

CONTENTS OF APPENDICES..... xii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE..... 9

1) The Social Foundations of Literacy

A) Social interaction in literacy development..... 11
B) Play as a "bridge" to literacy..... 16
C) Peers and adults in the development of literacy..... 19
D) Dictation and dramatization in literacy development..... 24
E) Developing a community of readers and writers..... 31

2) Literacy Development in Bilingual Children

A) Research on bilingualism..... 33
B) Social foundations in bilingual literacy development..... 38
C) Bilingualism and biliteracy..... 42
D) Conclusion, research questions and hypotheses..... 49

III. METHODS..... 53

Hypotheses..... 53
Subjects..... 53
Classroom environment..... 55
Procedures..... 56
Measures..... 59

IV. RESULTS..... 64

Quantitative results..... 64
Qualitative results..... 86
Conclusion..... 92

V. DISCUSSION..... 95

1) Quantitative Assessment:
The Pre-Language Assessment Scale.... 96

A) "Choose a Picture (English)"..... 97
B) "Let's Tell Stories (Spanish)"..... 100
C) Conclusion..... 102

2) Qualitative Assessment:
Stages of Narrative Development..... 102

A) The development of community themes.. 104
B) Use of the physical and social environment..... 110
C) Use of English and Spanish words..... 121
D) Impact of narratives on Pre-Language Assessment Scale post-test..... 126
E) Conclusion..... 140

3) Other Possible Reasons for Non-significant Findings..... 141

VI. CONCLUSION..... 157

APPENDICES..... 165

REFERENCES..... 177

VITA..... 183

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

An enormous investment of time and thought is required to complete a doctoral dissertation. One can easily get lost in a sense of individual accomplishment which loses sight of how much others have contributed to obtaining that goal when it is finally reached. This point in my own development would have never been possible were it not for the support I have received from others. Not all have contributed equally in time and/or effort but each has been an integral part of the process.

First, I must acknowledge my committee. Dr. Carol Harding provided my first encounter with the School of Education at Loyola University and tried to calm my fears about so many unknowns when I decided to make the big jump and leave the familiar, comfortable life I had known in Detroit to move to Chicago and begin my graduate studies. She may have gotten tired of seeing my face in all her courses but I learned much from her knowledge of language development in children. I was her graduate assistant over many semesters as I worked to complete my doctoral coursework. She then served as my major adviser on this dissertation, providing assistance and support at critical points in my work.

Dr. Jack Kavanagh has been invaluable in helping me sort out relevant information for my research from piles upon piles of statistical printouts. He did this numerous times, always

with the same thoroughness and clarity of thought. His patience and calm during times of great stress did much to help me maintain a clear vision of the tasks which remained to be done and the best way to complete them.

Dr. Gillian McNamee provided the inspiration for this dissertation; it is her research which was replicated to a large extent. She has been a mentor in the fullest sense of the word. At one and the same time she has been the thorn in my side and the beacon of light at the end of the tunnel. Her professionalism is beyond reproach. She always took me seriously. She read every draft of each chapter (sometimes seven versions!) always giving insightful comments and returning them promptly. She was constantly available to me, in person or on the phone, even on Sunday night! She never told me what I should think but instead tried to help me develop my own thoughts in a thorough and logical way. She always took the view of the objective reader unfamiliar with the study and insisted on clarification of my position.

I cannot neglect the agencies, teachers and parents who contributed to this investigation. My thanks go to Jane Garza, the Executive Director of El Hogar del Niño Cuidar Day Care Program and to Karen Morris, the principal of María Saucedo Magnet School. They were among the first to support the idea of this research and get the ball rolling by providing me access to the preschool classrooms for my comparison and treatment groups. Of course there would have been no study

without the help of the teachers. At El Hogar, where the comparison group for the research was located, I must thank the Director of the Day Care Program, Lety Moya and the teachers -- Marie Gomez, Rosario Rivas and Janet Torres. At María Saucedo, where the treatment group was located, Barbara Connolly, head teacher, and Rosa Estes, teacher assistant, were very gracious to allow me into their classroom. Barbara completely reorganized her curriculum to allow for my study. Rosa's help was invaluable in occasionally helping me to figure out exactly what a child was trying to say in children's Spanish. The parents at both locations were very enthusiastic and supportive. One hundred percent of the parents consented to have their children participate in the study. They asked thought-provoking questions and, at home, incorporated some aspects of the literacy activities which were developed in school.

Other assistance provided during this investigation was related specifically to the mechanics of the dissertation. John Boland and Sharon Marquez of Loyola University's Academic Computing Center helped greatly in the ability they had to expedite progress through administrative obstacles. Irina Krop of DePaul University's Academic Computer Service was extremely efficient and helpful in the guidance she offered during the execution of various statistical analyses required in this study.

Vicki Bakowski, employed in the Reference Section at

Loyola University's Cudahy Library, provided access to a variety of resources during development of the major idea for my dissertation, and made my work easier by doing searches for me at times when it was necessary to locate a vague or partial reference.

A special note of thanks goes to Sheila Kerwin who helped with the coding of narratives and Clara Cardenas who served as my assistant during the administration of the Pre-Language Assessment Scale at both pre-test and post-test. Haydee Mojica provided editorial and translation assistance on the various questionnaires and forms used in the investigation.

It was necessary for me to have partial employment during the data collection and writing of this dissertation. I had the incredible good fortune to encounter two individuals who provided this support. I am indebted to Dr. Charles Kyle who found a place for me in his research projects at a time when things looked pretty bleak. His human compassion, appreciation for my work and sensitivity to the constraints on my schedule during data collection, are greatly admired. My current employer, Mr. Jess Levine, has expressed an uncommon understanding of the many demands placed on me. This has resulted in a generosity and kindness on his part which I will never forget.

And then there is my family. Without their support there is no doubt I would have remained "ABD." I search hard to find the words to adequately express my gratitude to them. At times

my mother and father have been parents. They have also been my best friends. When times were really rough they were my comrades in arms. Both have provided social, emotional, and psychological support. In the case of my father, especially, the support has been financial as well. I do not think I can ever fully repay what their love has meant to me, but I will spend the rest of my days trying.

Finally, what can I say to Ronald, my Pooks, the love of my life? I have loved him since high school. We parted and had a decade to learn and grow. We found each other again, but so much better. His unending unselfish support of my work has expressed itself many ways -- doing dishes and laundry, making cheer-up phone calls to brighten my day as I barricaded myself indoors with the computer, holding me when I was in tears, listening to me and arguing points, editing chapters, being my "table-meister", recovering deleted files at 3:00 a.m. I look forward to so many new experiences together that have yet to unfold.

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	t-test Values for the Pre-Language Assessment Scale	66
2.	Table of Means for the Scale "Choose a Picture (English)"	67
3.	Analysis of Covariance for the Scale "Choose a Picture (English)"	68
4.	Table of Means for the Scale "Choose a Picture (Spanish)"	69
5.	Analysis of Covariance for the Scale "Choose a Picture (Spanish)"	70
6.	Table of Means for the Scale "What's in the House? (English)"	71
7.	Analysis of Covariance for the Scale "What's in the House? (English)"	72
8.	Table of Means for the Scale "What's in the House? (Spanish)"	74
9.	Analysis of Covariance for the Scale "What's in the House? (Spanish)"	74
10.	Table of Means for the Scale "Finishing Stories (English)"	76
11.	Analysis of Covariance for the Scale "Finishing Stories (English)"	77
12.	Table of Means for the Scale "Finishing Stories (Spanish)"	78
13.	Analysis of Covariance for the Scale "Finishing Stories (Spanish)"	79
14.	Table of Means for the Scale "Let's Tell Stories (English)"	81
15.	Analysis of Covariance on the Scale "Let's Tell Stories (English)"	81

LIST OF TABLES (CONTINUED)

16. Table of Means for the Scale "Let's Tell Stories (Spanish)"..... 83

17. Analysis of Covariance for the Scale "Let's Tell Stories (Spanish)"..... 84

18. Narratives Dictated from Treatment Group..... 88

19. Comparison Group Narrative Scores..... 89

20. Treatment Group Narrative Scores..... 90

21. Comparison and Treatment Group Average Narrative Scores..... 92

22. Post-test Difference Scores for the Scale "Choose a Picture (English)"..... 98

23. Post-test Difference Scores for the Scale "Let's Tell Stories (Spanish)"..... 100

24. Use of Disney Characters in Treatment Group Narratives..... 114

25. Best Narratives Dictated from Treatment Group..... 151

CONTENTS OF APPENDICES

		Page
APPENDIX A	Description of the Pre-Language Assessment Scale	165
APPENDIX B	Description of Applebee's Stages of Narrative Development	167
APPENDIX C	Teacher Questionnaire (English and Spanish versions)	169
APPENDIX D	Parental Questionnaire (English and Spanish versions)	171
APPENDIX E	Guardian's Voluntary Consent Form (English and Spanish versions)	175

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This investigation extended research by McNamee and McLane (1984) on the social origins of literacy development. With English speaking children, McNamee and McLane were able to demonstrate that the dictation of children's narratives to an adult scribe and the subsequent dramatization of those narratives in the classroom with peers helped to promote the development of literacy.

The present study attempted to demonstrate the value of this method with low-SES urban bilingual children by showing that story dictation and dramatization activities can support the early literacy development of at-risk bilingual children.

This research is particularly relevant since illiteracy is a growing problem in the United States. While this problem affects many individuals in society, it is particularly severe for low-SES bilingual Hispanic children. The Children's English Services Study (United States Department of Education, 1978) found there were 1.7 million Hispanic limited English proficient children living in the country and predicted that number would grow to 2.6 million by the year 2000. It also noted that two-thirds of all children limited in English proficiency receive no special language services. Hispanics now represent one in ten elementary and secondary school

students. Public school enrollment is projected to rise to almost 44 million by the year 2000, and nearly all the increase will be in minority -- especially Hispanic -- enrollment (de la Rosa and Maw, 1990).

Kozol (1985) found that all literacy efforts combined (federal, private and volunteer) reach only four percent of the illiterate population in the nation. With illiteracy on the rise there is a great need for understanding the manner in which literacy develops and the types of home, school and community practices and programs that support this development.

There are various ways to look at the development of literacy in young children. Some define literacy as a series of isolated skills in the reading and writing process and thus see literacy as the rote memorization of specific sounds and letters. This view associates the learning of a particular sound with a particular letter as it is written on a piece of paper. From this perspective, literacy learning begins when a child formally enters elementary school and begins to participate in school instruction.

However, another line of research in the field of literacy development over the past decade has explored a different definition of literacy and the process by which it develops in young children (Anderson, Hiebert, Scott & Wilkinson, 1985; Holdaway, 1979; McLane & McNamee, 1990; Teale & Sulzby, 1986). This group of researchers defines literacy not as a series of isolated skills, but as a process of learning which centers

around reading and writing activities as they are tied to sharing meaning with significant individuals in a child's life (Ferreiro & Teberosky, 1982). This view maintains that early literacy development is tightly interwoven with daily social interactions, and that the work of becoming literate can begin before a child enters school, before even being able to hold a pencil "properly" or independently hold a book open.

It is this later view of literacy development which provides the theoretic framework for the current investigation. What follows is an overview of some ideas in this approach as related to a study of bilingual literacy development in at-risk bilingual preschool children.

In the early life of a child, the home and then school provide the first encounters with the world of reading and writing. It is within these settings that activities involving reading and writing begin to take on meaning which is shared socially between the child and other individuals. Vygotsky (1978) studied the process by which this occurs and concluded that adults and peers were crucial in this regard. He states that "meaning and functions are created at first by an objective situation and then by people who surround the child" (p. 56).

The study reported here is based on this theoretical premise set forth by Vygotsky and attempted to show the contributions which adults and peers make to the development of children's literacy. These contributions are revealed through

social interactions occurring in what Vygotsky (1978) called the "zone of proximal development," which he defines as that "zone" between which a child is already capable of doing something for him/herself and that in which s/he is not. For development to occur input from adults and peers is required.

There is a second important ingredient to consider in literacy development -- play. Development is a general term describing progress. But how this progress takes place may proceed in different ways. In early childhood play with others, regarded by Vygotsky as crucial for early learning in the zone of proximal development, and which McLane and McNamee (1990) have referred to as a "bridge to literacy," is one of the most important and earliest influences in progressing along various paths of development. It is a "bridge" because, while children may not actually be able to read and write in the way that adults recognize as literacy, they can start to work on the mechanics involved in those abilities through fantasy and pretend play. Play allows for the development of symbolic thought in the child (Piaget, 1962) and can contribute to the development of the zone of proximal development by allowing children many opportunities to try out ideas in the presence of adults and peers.

In trying out ideas during play with others, the main goal of children's efforts is to communicate effectively. This is achieved in the way they use language so that others may understand a story which is developing within the group. The

complexity of what children are achieving can be particularly noticed when examining the way that meaning and ideas are shared during such play in a bilingual classroom.

The term "bilingual" is relative depending on the varying degree of an individual's ability, or proficiency in a language (Diaz, 1985; Fantini, 1985). Much current research on bilingualism examines social interaction (John-Steiner, 1986; Vygotsky, 1935) and play (Ervin-Tripp, 1981; Fillmore, 1979) as they contribute to language learning.

Vygotsky (1935) studied bilingualism explicitly as he attempted to understand the role of language in thought. He found it to be a dynamic process involving social and educational factors. John-Steiner (1986) has pointed out the importance of social and educational models for younger children to imitate in learning a second language. Interaction with adults and with peers in play situations is a key component in this process.

Ervin-Tripp (1981) examined how young learners of another language try to attract their partners in play by maximizing their communicative abilities. Fillmore (1979) found that children in a bilingual classroom are very creative in their play with others and find various ways to make their ideas known.

In a study such as this, which measures literacy development in terms of the way ideas are shared and meaning is developed among peers and adults in a bilingual preschool

classroom, it is important to consider the cultural context of social interaction.

Mackey (1970) points out a distinction between bilingualism and what he terms "biliteracy." Biliteracy, he argues, involves more that just the study of language development. Biliteracy implies knowing what is appropriate and what is not in two cultures, and that is determined by the social context in which one develops literacy abilities involving the two languages.

The use of oral language in early childhood as part of the reading and writing process in two languages is tightly interwoven through complex social interactions with others which remain crucial throughout development. Sometimes these interactions involve guidance from others more competent in the use of language, reading and writing, such as adults. In other instances it is interaction with those of equal abilities, such as peers in play situations, which promotes literacy development in two languages.

With an understanding of this literature and research, the methods and procedures for the current investigation were selected as follows. The comparison and treatment groups for this study were comprised of Hispanic children between three and five years of age from the Mexican-dominant area of Chicago known as Pilsen. This group is at-risk for learning to read and write in both Spanish and English. The majority of the children involved were limited in English proficiency at the

time data collection took place.

The investigation was designed as a treatment group intervention with pre-post test measures for the comparison and treatment groups on how children's language development in English and Spanish changed over time as measured by the Pre-Language Assessment Scale. In addition, children's narrative skills were assessed by examining the dictation and subsequent dramatization of their stories using Applebee's Stages of Narrative Development (1978).

The intervention with the treatment group involved children dictating narratives to the investigator (scribe) in their language of choice (English or Spanish). These stories were later dramatized during a group time in the classroom on that day.

In conclusion, following the work of McNamee and McLane (1984), this study attempted to help create, as its primary goal, what they have called, "a community of readers and writers" (McLane & McNamee, 1990) at the preschool level. In research focusing on the social origins of children's early writing development, Gundlach, McLane, Stott & McNamee (1985) formulated this concept to describe how individuals come to be drawn into common and shared literacy practices involving reading and writing activities which help in communicating effectively with others in the group, or "community."

Thus, the major research question which this investigation sought to answer was, "Can a program comprised primarily of

story dictation and story dramatization in the bilingual preschool classroom be effective in promoting early literacy development in those at-risk children"?

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This study attempts to demonstrate that the social interaction which occurs during story dictation and dramatization in low-SES bilingual preschool classrooms can contribute to the foundations of children's early literacy development. There are two areas of research relevant to this investigation: 1) the theoretical and empirical studies supporting the notion of early literacy development through social interactions, and 2) studies addressing the language and literacy needs of bilingual preschool children.

Part I: The Social Foundations of Literacy

Research in the field of literacy development over the past decade has brought a new understanding of how it develops in young children (Holdaway, 1979; McLane & McNamee, 1990; Teale & Sulzby, 1986). This new understanding reveals that the development of literacy in the early years of a child's life is tightly woven into social interactions with caretakers, peers and siblings which are a part of daily life, and that the work of becoming literate begins before a child enters school, before being able to hold a pencil "properly," or independently hold a book open. Literacy is not viewed as a collection of skills aimed at deciphering words (Ferreiro &

Teberosky, 1982). Instead it is being defined as a means of communication -- a process of speaking (writing) and listening (reading) among a group of people through the use of print.

McLane and McNamee (1990) define literacy as:

> ...both an individual intellectual achievement and a form of cultural knowledge that enables people to participate in a range of groups and activities that in some way involve writing and reading. It is closely tied to specific relationships and specific social and cultural contexts and activities. (p. 3)

They also note:

> The development of literacy, then, is a profoundly social process, embedded in social relationships, particularly in children's relationships with parents, siblings, grandparents, friends, caretakers, and teachers. These people serve as models, provide materials, establish expectations and offer help, instruction, and encouragement. Literacy development begins in children's relationships with their immediate caretakers, and is expressed and elaborated in increasingly wider communities -- at home, in the neighborhood, and in preschool, daycare, and kindergarten settings. (p. 7)

Rather than the rote memorization of letters and sounds, literacy is instead connected to the social relationships which make up daily experience. Therefore, it is important to examine the nature of these interactions in early childhood within differing social contexts and how they may contribute to literacy. At a most fundamental level, what is communicated and understood in any social interaction is tied to meaning shared between individuals and the activities in which they participate.

A) Social Interaction in Literacy Development

The idea of sharing meaning is an important consideration for many researchers currently studying the relationship of social interaction and literacy development, and is fundamental in Vygotsky's work. In his discussion of how a child begins to develop communication, Vygotsky (1978) states "meaning and functions are created at first by an objective situation and then by people who surround the child" (p. 56). Meaning is a concept which is not easily quantified or measured, and yet getting at the meaning of words is what it means to be literate. Words take on meaning for children because they are shared and learned socially. It is understanding that relationship of how the individuals in a child's life use words to communicate and how that is represented symbolically in a way that the child grasps as reading and writing which is crucial in an investigation of early literacy development.

The making and sharing of meaning and the development of literacy are inevitably entwined. This relationship is documented in recent research in several ways. Ferreiro and Teberosky (1982) believe that reading comprehension and meaning go together. They found that early readers use something more than just the print on a page in order to comprehend the material which is read. They conclude this additional information which aids understanding has its basis in meaning.

Holdaway (1979) found that when children are asked to remember stories they remember very little related to the words

themselves. Instead, what they remember most is their meaning. According to Holdaway, they are working at reconstructing the message of the story using the rhythms and sounds of language in which they first heard that message. This reconstruction is tied closely to the people with which the children were interacting when the stories were shared.

As children have opportunities to share meaning within social activities focused around the reading and writing process, they come to understand how much more effectively they can communicate and express themselves through the use of language.

For Vygotsky this new understanding of language which evolves from activities engaged in with others contributes to the development of symbolic thought. Wertsch (1981) summarized Vygotsky's work by saying "he was concerned with how humans come to master sign systems and then use those sign systems to organize their activity" (p. 13). This view is important in a study on literacy development because reading and writing are based on the development of symbolic representation of thought.

The way in which Vygotsky conceives human activity is particularly noteworthy in this study because it is seen as "a unit of analysis that includes both the individual and his/her culturally defined environment" (Wertsch, 1981, p. viii). The study of the individual is not separated from the environment in which s/he lives and interacts with others. This theoretical framework, developed by Vygotsky, is unique because

it does not separate cognitive and social development (McNamee, McLane, Cooper & Kerwin, 1985).

Literacy development has both a cognitive and social component which is dependent upon the type of activities in which children participate. Bakhurst (1986) posed the question of how it is that the social activity of the child which has meaning for others in a particular context in turn becomes meaningful for the child to the extent that it becomes internalized? Part of the answer lies in relationships established with significant individuals in a child's life. At a most basic level, these relationships form the earliest foundation of education for the child.

Part of this early education involves literacy development by the manner in which the child becomes exposed to reading and writing through interacting with others and watching them engage in those activities. This understanding of how literacy develops is crucial in this investigation, and rests upon making a distinction between literacy skills and literacy activities.

As opposed to literacy skills which aim to teach reading and writing in isolation as a series of skills involving the memorization of letters and words and specific sound recognition, literacy activities involve a child in the process itself (Cole & Griffin, 1986). Literacy activities allow a child to participate in the reading and writing process in a way they can comprehend through preschool classroom projects

involving the use of books, paper and pencils. Children can become involved at various levels of understanding and feel a sense of control about the process. Adults can involve children in writing and reading skills in a variety of ways. By engaging the children in drawing, conversations about stories heard, or even talking about words on street signs or the labels on packages of food, children can demonstrate that they are actively trying to use (and make sense of) reading and writing long before they can actually read and write (McLane & McNamee, 1990).

This is <u>not</u> to say that it is ultimately unimportant to learn how letters are formed and their corresponding sounds are made. The need for acquiring basic skills is important. But, the notion of literacy activities views the child within an ongoing process that includes literacy development to the extent that written language is part of daily life. In other words, children come to learn and master skills in a meaningful context through social activities.

In literacy activities, reading is not seen as the reading of individual words so they sound right. Instead, it is a way of gathering meaning from a text based on social interaction with peers and adults which helps in the process of coming to understand and interpret the world. Children thus begin to internally work out conceptual problems involved in reading and writing as those more knowledgeable about these matters (for example, teachers, parents, older siblings) are able to read to

the child and write with the child, assisting when appropriate in working out the specifics -- for example, how to write by forming and spacing letters and words on a page, how to read left to right and top to bottom.

In studying this interweaving back-and-forth between the young child with peers and more competent adults, Vygotsky defined what he called, "the zone of proximal development," thus laying the groundwork for many of his writings on education (Wertsch, 1986). Vygotsky (1978) defines this zone as:

> the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers. (p. 86)

This idea has direct implications for teaching in general, and this study in particular, since the aim of teaching is to find that "zone" where a child is already capable of doing something for him/herself and the point at which s/he is not able to continue alone. Functioning in the "zone" requires help from people: adult input or the input of "more capable peers."

However, Vygotsky does not see one correct answer or idea as the input provided by these individuals. Instead, when all goes well, teaching occurs in the zone of proximal development so that, as a result of the social input from the adult and/or peer, the child is able to continue working out questions for him/herself. Without this input the child would be unable to

do so. In the zones of proximal development there are multiple paths to follow for working out the next step or level of skill and understanding. The following section discusses one of the most important paths.

B) Play as a "Bridge" to Literacy

One of the most important and earliest influences in making progress in one's zone of proximal development during early childhood is play with others. Play contributes to the development of the zone of proximal development by allowing children many opportunities to try out ideas (Vygotsky, 1978). This occurs particularly in pretend play with peers. By interacting with those children who are more and less competent in various abilities, a wide opportunity is provided to grow and develop. The same child can experience what it is like to be the student and teacher in one social activity.

As mentioned in the previous section, Vygotsky was concerned with the discovery process itself in the way that children explored their environment. In play the focus is on exploration rather than on achieving a set goal. There is little pressure placed on a child to produce a correct or final answer (McLane & McNamee, 1990). In pretend play specifically, children can feel free to change relationships and roles they experience in every-day life. Some of those roles may involve reading and writing such as when a child pretends to be, for example, a school teacher reading a book to children or a mother making out a grocery list.

McLane and McNamee (1990) have referred to play as a "bridge to literacy" in pointing out two potential links to the development of literacy which play provides: 1) as a symbolic activity, pretend play allows children to develop and refine their capacities to use symbols, to represent experience, and to construct imaginary worlds, capacities they will draw on when they begin to read and write, and 2) as an orientation or approach to experience, play can make the various roles and activities of people who read and write more meaningful and hence more accessible to young children.

The following research is presented to elucidate this concept of play as a "bridge" to literacy.

Piaget's work (1962) describes how play supports the development of symbolic thought in the child and thus lays the foundation for thinking representationally. Symbolic thought is the internalization of an experience in such a way that a child begins to use "symbols" to develop thoughts and relate those thoughts to others beyond the immediate experience. A symbol may be a word or any kind of representation (such as a gesture or even a physical prop) which makes it possible to represent experiences, feelings and ideas.

Within a Piagetian perspective, play provides a child with the opportunity to experience both success and failure in communicating ideas to others, depending on whether the message is understood as intended or not, in a context which promotes higher levels of social and cognitive development. Through

play the child must find new ways of representing experiences to others which involve symbolic thought. For Piaget, the development of symbolic thought in the child involves the use of "signifiers" and "signifieds". Applying these concepts to the social aspects of early literacy development, Kozulin (1986) discusses the relevance of signifier and signified as one of the cognitive bases of writing in presenting how children use gestures and words (signifiers) to indicate important people and events (signifieds) in their lives.

Vygotsky (1978) understands symbolic play as "a very complex system of 'speech' through gestures that communicate and indicate the meaning of playthings" (p. 108). These activities which a child engages in shape thought and language. Development proceeds from the conversion of social relations into mental functions (Vygotsky, 1981).

Rubin (1980) found that the social context in which play occurs may be responsible for the explicit language which is used by children. In these situations children often compromise and clarify their meaning for others. Thus, through interacting with others in the form of play, the child must consider the motives behind and the results of his/her actions. S/he must pull essential features out of the environment and ignore others which are irrelevant at that moment. These are all important aspects of the road to literacy.

By engaging in play children are able to create problems and attempt to solve them in ways they might not conceive of

otherwise, or they can attempt to work out resolutions to existing problems at home and among friends. They are able to do this through the use of symbols, particularly talk (McLane & McNamee, 1990).

To summarize, within the context of literacy development, play is a crucial factor because by pretending to be competent and able to function in certain roles (such as pretending to be a school teacher) children can lay the groundwork for reading and writing; that is, communicating through shared and understood symbols. In early childhood, this is primarily done through talking and interacting in other ways with peers and adults at home and in the classroom. The discussion will now turn to what peers and adults offer to literacy development.

C) Peers and Adults in the Development of Literacy

As young children begin to expand their social surroundings from the home and immediate family to school, the interaction with a larger group of peers, especially within the context of play, becomes an important means of development (McLane & McNamee, 1990; Vygotsky, 1978). This exposure to a new physical environment, new friends, new social relationships allows for a variety of experiences which were not previously possible and which will ultimately influence development.

During the preschool years, when children develop by moving away from the parallel play of their earlier years and increasing their interaction with peers, they get more and more experience in relating their ideas through symbols so that

others can understand them, thus furthering their social development (Pellegrini, 1985).

Forman and Cazden (1986) discuss the importance of peer involvement in the development of literacy, particularly within the school environment where children commonly encounter limitations imposed on them. For example, in school teachers give verbal directions and children carry them out. Teachers ask questions and children answer them. This typically consists of only a word or a phrase. These roles are not often reversed; children do not typically give directions to teachers. The only context in which children can reverse and exchange these roles with others of equal intellectual ability, giving directions as well as following them, and asking questions as well as answering them, is with their peers. This occurs most commonly in play situations.

Remembering Vygotsky's zone of proximal development, the peer can serve as the "more capable" individual in the interaction if s/he possesses more knowledge than others about some topic, while at the same time collaborating with others as an equal to work out questions which are shared. Forman and Cazden (1986) explore this idea more fully by focusing on the continuum of experience which children have with peers, depending on the level of skill or knowledge which is shared.

There is no substitute for what peers provide in the development of literacy. Through play they may share in exploring and discovering new features about various stories

they have heard. They may pretend they are competent in the role of reader and writer and thus feel more comfortable with the process involved in becoming literate. They may ask and answer questions with those of basically similar cognitive ability resulting in unique formulations and insight which would not be possible when interacting with adults.

While it is true that there is no substitute for what peers can provide in the development of literacy, it is equally true that there is no substitute for what adults provide. Adults are, after all, the role models which children aim for in their imitations and literacy activities.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the move to literacy begins before the child enters school and depends to a large extent on the experiences which adults provide in the home environment. The degree to which the child is exposed to various media and print will differ depending on the individual differences of the child's background and family. Parents, siblings and other adults in the home can provide a head start for children prior to their ever walking into a classroom situation. Snow and Ninio (1986) suggest the adult plays a critical role in assisting the child's literacy development by promoting a relationship between reading and language. Reading with an adult helps provide learning the rules for reading as well as providing meaningful social contexts in which literacy can develop.

Adults can assist this developmental process in a number

of ways socially, particularly by reading aloud favorite stories, fairy tales and other printed material to children. The U.S. Department of Education (1984) posed that reading aloud to children at the preschool level is the single most important activity to encourage later success in school. And for low-SES children in particular, McCormick (1982) has investigated the benefits of being read to in terms of academic success.

Snow (1983) linked literacy development in young children with social activities involving the use of print. Anderson et al. (1985) point out that the benefits of reading aloud to children are greatest when the child is an active participant, engaging in discussions about the stories, learning to identify letters and words, and talking about the meanings of words. Reading in this context is a process of making meaning between people.

Books which are read aloud to children show the importance of using language to communicate and share experience. They can serve as the initial ground from which a child can construct new stories or create different ideas and fantasies which are explored in pretend play.

In reading aloud to children parents and other family members and friends serve as models of literate behavior (McLane & McNamee, 1990). Young children pay close attention to these important people in their lives. They want to please these individuals by imitating them and doing what they do.

Reading to children in general is but one effective way to promote literacy development and should not be seen as separate from the process involved in childrens' early writing abilities (McLane & McNamee, 1990). Children attempt to imitate writing activities from observing others writing in meaningful social contexts which occur in normal daily life, such as watching a parent make out a grocery list before a trip to the local store or making out checks to pay bills, etc.

Children do not just copy external models of writing (Ferreiro & Teberosky, 1982). It is the people in a child's life and not merely the print in the environment which help him/her learn how to write. The foundation lies in early social interaction which organizes these early print experiences in particular ways and encourages children in a process of discovery (Schieffelin & Cochran-Smith, 1984).

Once a child is in school, significant individuals in that child's life, such as parents and teachers, continue to influence how well s/he reads (Snow, 1983).

At school the classroom teacher becomes another significant caretaker in the child's life who also begins to influence the child's literacy development. As with parents, the efforts of the classroom teacher become important in promoting the social foundations of literacy for children in school and can influence attitudes toward the value of reading and writing.

Anderson et al. (1985) found that poor readers seem to get

a message from their teachers early in their education that they lack the ability to do any better. They conclude that a child should be praised for improvements in reading ability based on individual accomplishment. As children increasingly develop their skills, Gundlach et al. (1985) found that more experienced writers -- whether teachers, parents, older siblings, or friends -- functioned more as an appreciative audience, encouraging more than actually helping during the process of composition. After the process of composition was completed they then responded to the product of the child's labor.

In summary, the peers and adults in a child's life can greatly support and promote early literacy development, especially through activities related to stories. The next section will discuss some specific ways this can happen in a preschool setting.

D) Dictation and Dramatization in Literacy Development

Thus far this chapter has attempted to discuss the manner in which early social interaction may influence children's knowledge of the reading and writing process. As children move from home into a school setting there are a variety of new experiences and relationships which can promote the development of literacy.

In preschool, an effective way that teachers can motivate and involve children in literacy is through reading them stories. The importance and value of this activity cannot be

underestimated and has been noted earlier in this section. Another related activity that complements being read to and can also motivate literacy development in young children is giving them the opportunity to dictate their own stories to the teacher, and subsequently to dramatize those stories with peers in the classroom (Gundlach et al. 1985; McLane & McNamee, 1990; Paley, 1981, 1984, 1986). In these activities children can begin to see the symbolic representations of their ideas transposed onto paper in the form of writing, and come to understand that their words have new meaning when read to a group and shared with others.

The current study was designed to analyze social interactions around bilingual children's dictated stories and their dramatization of those stories. These activities create a situation in which ideas are shared not only in one direction, from teacher to child, but from the child to the teacher and back to the child's peers in the classroom. Thus, a unique configuration of interactions occurs that can be examined for evidence of children's literacy development.

During story dictation, the teacher becomes a scribe and friendly editor for the child author. S/he makes up the initial audience for children's ideas. As the dictation process continues over weeks and months, the teacher's questions and comments help children develop more complete and coherent narratives than they would be able to do by themselves (McLane & McNamee, 1990; McNamee et al. 1984; Paley, 1981,

1984, 1986).

During dramatization of the stories in the classroom, the teacher becomes a type of stage manager for the child who has told the story and the children become actors portraying characters in the narrative. The teacher can tell children where to stand and suggest ways to act out certain parts, enabling all the children to see and participate (McLane & McNamee, 1990, McNamee et al. 1984). In a bilingual classroom, this activity can also give the children an opportunity to see that the same action might be represented by the use of different words. Even though the spoken words change, the meaning stays the same. Children thus come to realize that there is more than one way to express ideas.

With both dictation and dramatization, the questions that teachers ask, as well as the comments and suggestions they make, can serve to challenge children to express themselves and the meaning of their stories as fully as possible. They can also help children make connections between their stories and other events inside and outside the classroom. Making such connections helps the child in the long run to better interpret the world in which s/he lives and in which s/he plays a part.

But, how does dictating a story and acting it out promote literacy development? How can childrens' narratives be interpreted as forms of early reading and writing?

Writing is composing a message using one's own words to communicate with other people (Anderson et al. 1985).

Dictation allows children to compose messages long before they are able to write such messages on their own. As children dictate stories they find that words can create a world of experience and build a context for thinking and talking removed from the immediate situation. In doing this they get a sense of narrative structure; they find that a story has a beginning, a middle and an end and that there is some problem or conflict that is described and then gets resolved (Applebee, 1978).

Children also begin to find out that the language which is written down and used in their stories is different than what is used in their everyday conversations with others (McLane & McNamee, 1990). Written language has its own rhythm and flow. Over time, from listening to teachers and other adults read story books, they see that stories can begin with "once upon a time" and end with "happily ever after." They begin to pay close attention to this and often object if these phrases are changed, forgotten or omitted when stories are read. In time, children come to incorporate these literary conventions quite naturally into their own narratives as they develop a sense of purpose in trying to convey meaning to a scribe by composing a message which they see getting written down. These writing activities lay a foundation that can assist reading development (Gundlach et al. 1984; McLane & McNamee, 1990).

For Applebee (1978) stories are representations of experience. He developed a rating scale of children's narratives by examining systematic qualitative changes in the

stories they told over time. Based on Vygotsky's stages of concept development, this six-stage model identifies the manner in which narrative form changes from a list of "free associations" in early childhood to one in which themes are developed, a climax is presented and stories have a moral.

In his work, Applebee points out that narratives are symbolic in that they represent systems of thought. What the language sounds like and what the language means are constantly involved in an interplay. Applebee (1978) believes that in the early years children start by looking "on", rather than participating "in" activities involving language. They adopt what Applebee calls the spectator role, which he claims may start as early in life as when children begin to babble. Children at this age "look on, testing... hypotheses about structure and meaning, but... do not rush in to interrupt -- to do so would obscure the relationships and spoil the effect of the whole" (p.16). As children grow older, however, Applebee argues they adopt the role of "participant" which involves qualifying, accepting or challenging what is said by another, offering a new perspective or simply expressing emotions. In this way telling a story represents something different when a child is experiencing it as a spectator or participant. For Applebee, a story gradually moves from being a different way to use language in a social interaction to a mode of communication in itself. This movement is based on the meaning which a child wishes to express in a particular social context.

Telling stories is a way of being told stories for what is dictated often reflects what has been heard and shared in previous social interactions. Paley (1981, 1984, 1986) was the first to use story dictation and dramatization, as described here, with preschool children. She found that dictation draws children into the composing process in a very direct way. It involves them in the sharing of a social action. As a result, children are willing to give up other activities and options in the classroom for a chance to tell a story, and/or children will rush to hurry and finish one activity so that there will be enough time to participate in the dramatization of the stories told that day from within their peer group.

Children view dramatization of their stories as an extension of play (Paley, 1981). In portraying characters they create and borrow from favorite books, television shows or movies, with time, as children develop and improve their play abilities and incorporate them in their stories, they become less dependent on physical props, gestures, and actions and rely increasingly on ideas, imagination and language to convey their meaning (McLane & McNamee, 1990). In some cases children will incorporate the act of reading and writing into their dramatic play or make reference to characters reading and writing in their story dictations. As they dictate and dramatize these activities, they can act as if they are already competent in them. They get a sense of control over what they are relating, and in so doing children have the chance to

experience the process of reading in the context of play.

When children begin to dictate narratives, their stories are often descriptions of events from their daily lives. The stories gradually develop a social purpose (Gundlach et al. 1985); their stories reflect a kind of dialogue with others in the group. In some cases children may borrow themes from others and develop that theme in a similar or different way in their own stories. Or, they may talk about a fight or source of tension between friends and attempt to resolve the conflict. Or, they may relate worries and fears they and others have and sometimes how to manage them. Or, they may celebrate a holiday or special event in their lives or explore ideas raised by others in stories and dramatization that occurred that day or even weeks before. The interconnection between the events in their lives and the way they can be expressed socially through the use of language becomes an extremely important form of communication. The dictation process ultimately helps broaden children's imagination and their ideas about different people, places and concepts.

In acting out dictated stories which include shopping for groceries or caring for a baby or fighting bandits or driving to work or following a recipe, children imagine themselves as competent in these roles and can share this vision of competence with others. This vision includes being an author and actor (and audience) of written stories that communicate messages among members of the peer group. The

result is a foundation for further literacy development which is tied closely to the social relationships -- the sense of community -- established among adult and peer members of the group.

E) Developing a Community of Readers and Writers

The ultimate goal of literacy activities and interventions which revolve around story dictation and dramatization is to establish "a community of readers and writers" (Gundlach et al. 1985; McLane & McNamee, 1990). This community is defined by Gundlach et al. (1985), as:

> ...a particular group of people drawn into common literacy practices, whether by vocational necessity, educational experience, family habit or tradition, political or social activity, participation in religious institutions, or some other form of personal, social, or business activity involving the use of written language. Members of such communities share an understanding of particular purposes for reading and writing and a knowledge of particular and perhaps specialized conventions, both textual and interactive, for easing written communication and for marking especially important written messages of valued verbal constructions... (p. 54)

One way in which individuals can become members of such a community is to participate in preschool and kindergarten classrooms where story dictation and dramatization are a part of the daily classroom routine, as in Mrs. Paley's classroom. Here children learn that the meaning of words, spoken and written, is what matters most to adults and peers in the classroom (McLane & McNamee, 1990; Paley, 1981, 1984, 1986). The classroom becomes a small scale culture that helps provide

support and a source of ideas for stories (McNamee & McLane, 1985). Words become one of the main cultural tools that bind community members together. And, telling stories is one of the many uses of language among participants in a culture (Applebee, 1978).

When having good ideas, learning to think clearly and expressing those ideas in writing and in conversation are shared pursuits and reasons for being together in this miniature culture, children learn what it can mean to be literate, and thus are likely to develop the motivation to become literate themselves (McLane & McNamee, 1990).

In school, if children have the opportunity to hear stories read by a teacher and can participate in classrooms where literacy activities (such as story dictation and dramatization) are a part of the curriculum, children develop a better understanding of the elements that make up a coherent story. They learn how to develop an idea with a beginning, middle and end. In particular, acting out story ideas helps them to recognize cause and effect, and to understand when actions make sense to the audience or when they are left undeveloped and unresolved. Because the scribe can only write so fast, children learn about how much time it takes to transpose an idea onto paper. In some instances children initially speak too rapidly to get every word down. With practice they develop patience with the rhythm of the process between the one dictating and the one putting the words into

print, giving them meaning and life for others to share.

Story dictation and dramatization represent one way in which children come to learn about reading and writing. Through the social relationships and events revolving around these activities, children come into their first contact with one, two, or even several distinct communities of readers and writers.

Part II: Literacy Development in Bilingual Children

A) Research on Bilingualism

In the existing literature, there is little consensus of opinion on a precise definition of bilingualism. Some assume that equal competence in both languages is necessary to be considered bilingual while others feel that if a child can create a meaningful utterance, s/he may be considered competent in a language (Pflaum, 1986). The concept of bilingualism is a relative one; it constitutes a continuum rather than an absolute phenomenon and persons may have varying degrees of skill or ability in the two or more languages involved (Fantini, 1985).

For the purposes of this study there were two major issues concerning bilingual development which were relevant to consider: 1) differences in the way that children can acquire two languages, and 2) considerations to be made when assessing proficiency in two languages.

There are two different ways that individuals may acquire two or more languages. In "simultaneous acquisition" the rate

and manner of development appear to be the same in two languages. Some research has indicated that in this situation, children may be hindered in their progress with language development by confusing different structures and grammatical forms due to the amount of time spent with speakers of different languages (Cummins, 1981; de Valdes, 1978). However, in a study on language development in bilingual children Padilla and Liebman (1975) found, "in spite of the linguistic 'load' forced on to them due to their bilingual environments, the children were acquiring their two languages at a rate comparable to that of monolingual-speaking children" (p. 51).

In "successive acquisition," a child learns a first language in one environment, such as the home, and then learns a second language in a different environment, such as within the community or at school. This was the case for the majority of children involved in this investigation. The research as presented in Section 1 of this literature review would support the importance of meaningful social interactions with individuals outside the home in this instance to assist in second language acquisition. Fillmore (1976) found that social interaction was a more important factor in language acquisition than the actual information being relayed in a bilingual environment -- whether in the home or at school. She concluded the social relationships that the child establishes with speakers of a language are crucial. Communication with others is the goal that children are striving for and they will start

saying anything possible to make that happen.

Tied to the manner in which children acquire two languages is the issue of their proficiency (or, how much they understand and are capable of communicating) in those two languages once they are acquired. There is a common assumption that the earlier children learn a second language, the more proficient they become. Grosjean (1982) feels it is a myth that earlier second language acquisition necessarily leads to increased proficiency in that language. He feels it has more to do with the attitude and identity of the child related to users of the second language as established through social relationships.

The effects of bilingual development on children's thought and language development remain unclear. Cummins (1976) states that there are thresholds in development such that cognitive growth in bilingual children will not occur until a minimum level of competency in the second language has emerged. However Diaz (1985) argues that, though there are thresholds in development, varying levels of ability in the second language must be considered. He claims bilingualism has a greater role in predicting metalinguistic and cognitive performance for children with lower levels of ability in the second language. For Cummins, thresholds are absolute. For Diaz the levels are relative according to first and second language proficiency.

Diaz points out the need for research to address the fact that there are children with varying levels of ability, or

proficiency, in their first and second language. As such, the level of bilingualism should be examined within a bilingual sample. Most studies have concentrated on balanced bilinguals (i.e., those who have equal proficiency in their first and second languages), but most bilingual children currently living in the United States do not have equivalent proficiency in two languages. Therefore, in the context of this study, it is necessary to distinguish and operationally define what is meant by the terms "bilingual proficiency" and "bilingual balance."

Both of these terms describe the degree to which a child varies in first and second language abilities related to understanding and communicating effectively in both languages. However bilingual proficiency refers to a child's abilities within each language related to such components as morphology, syntax and semantics, while bilingual balance refers to a child's choice of which language to communicate in with others, i.e., the language with which the child feels most comfortable (Diaz, 1985; Hakuta, 1986).

Recent research has shown that there is an unaccounted for factor which may be influencing research findings on proficiency and other aspects of language development in bilingual populations. Diaz (1985) points out that most studies tend to compare monolingual versus bilingual children and then draw conclusions about language development. However, differences may often be attributed to intervening variables which are not taken into account, such as social class.

Research studies with monolingual speaking children are more often done with upper and middle-SES samples while bilingual subjects are often from low-SES backgrounds. As such, any findings may result more as a function of social class differences than those involving language itself.

Some feel that a bilingual household is an advantage to a developing child regardless of social class (Lindholm, 1980), while others like deValdes (1978) claim that in low-SES families, bilingualism is a disadvantage, related to the stability of social context in which the child is acquiring language. In contrast, Field and Widmayer (1981) found that there are as many differences concerning child rearing practices and language development within a culture as there are between cultures, particularly regarding social class.

To reiterate, there is much debate yet little consensus concerning the process by which bilingual development occurs successfully and the pertinent variables to consider. In this study, while all children were from a low-SES background, they differed in their language development (expressed through their knowledge of vocabulary and ability to understand what was being said) and second language proficiency. These differences were viewed within the context of social factors and relationships contributing to development -- primarily the degree to which a child was or was not exposed to a second language in the home and/or at school.

B) Social Foundations in Bilingual Literacy Development

For Vygotsky, language is a societal tool to transmit knowledge (Hakuta, 1986). Following Bruner (1980), cultures do more than equip their members with skills, concepts and views about the world and life. They provide the context in which to view it. Kagan (1977) has discussed the importance of cultural context in the social motives and behaviors of children. Vygotsky (1981) poses this in his "general genetic law of cultural development," which states:

> Any function in the child's cultural development appears twice, or on two planes. First it appears on the social plane, and then on the psychological plane. First it appears between people as an interpsychological category, and then within the child as an intrapsychological category. This is equally true with regard to voluntary attention, logical memory, and formation of concepts, and the development of volition. (pg. 163)

In other words, for Vygotsky development is multilinear and the result of a transformation which occurs when two planes come together. There is constant interaction. It is not a unilinear, step by step progression. Each plane, the social and the psychological, changes the other. The result is that cognition is transformed. The discovery process itself is important to study in the development of language and thought. In early literacy development this is a particularly important concept due to the nature of social interactions with adults which focus on reading and writing and the way those interactions become internalized by the child.

For Vygotsky, the study of bilingualism was an important

context for the examination of the role of language in thought and he studied it explicitly. Vygotsky saw the unity of different processes which characterized the acquisition of a first and second language. In his writings he did not see only one path of development in language acquisition. For Vygotsky, the acquisition of a second language is dependent upon the level of development of the native language. However, the acquisition of a second language is represented by a different line of development than the first because, while both languages may express the same meaning, there are different verbal and written symbolic forms for communicating the same thought (for example, the words "banana" and "plátano" both mean the same thing; however they are spoken and written differently in English and Spanish). A child must therefore learn to discriminate meaning from its symbolic expression in different social contexts with peers and adults.

It is for this reason that bilingualism should be viewed dynamically, not statistically (Vygotsky, 1935). The relationship of language to thought is not one of static connections; it is a relationship which changes with the shifting lines of development in the two languages. One must understand the social and educational factors that shape the use of a second language. This requires a greater focus on the process of how children come to acquire a language, particularly early socialization in the home and with peers and adults in school.

Regarding patterns of second language acquisition in preschool children, younger children are more imitative in learning a second language than older children who have more developed concepts (John-Steiner, 1986). Thus, the impact of peer and adult models which children encounter in their everyday interactions are important influences.

Ervin-Tripp (1981) examined how young learners of another language try to attract their partners in play and found that the second-language learners practice using new forms in already-understood patterns and topics. Bilingual kindergarten children in a linguistically novel situation can plan, ask for information, announce intentions and engage in joking as well. Their linguistic development is slow but they maximize their communicative abilities in contexts that they understand.

Fillmore (1979) has also examined the development of a second language in the context of play. She found that children do the following:

1) they assume that what people are talking about is directly relevant to the situation at hand, i.e., guess and limit talk to that situation
2) they get command of a few expressions they understand and start talking
3) they look for recurring parts in the formulas they already know
4) they make the most of what they've got by "stretching repertoires" and testing them to see if they fit different

situations

5) they work on the big things first and save the details, like proper word order, for later.

What this study by Fillmore chiefly shows is that children are very creative in their play with others and find various ways (or paths) to make their ideas known.

Seawell (1985) found that low-SES, Spanish-speaking kindergarten children became greatly involved in a literature and puppet activity over a twelve-week period designed to promote literacy in Spanish and English. Over the course of the study children were read two new stories per week (for example, The Three Little Kittens and The Little Engine That Could). Stories were then dramatized using hand puppets which Seawell constructed from paper bags. A tape recording was made of the stories and these materials were available for children to listen to and play with independently over the course of the research. Upon conclusion of the investigation the "puppet shows" given by the children involved total use of both their first and second language. Seawell observed three emergent literacy patterns:

1) pretending - "engaging in conventional reading behavior such as holding a book upright, turning pages, and/or pointing to the text while retelling a story" (p. 125)
2) matching - "showing an awareness of the relationship between the written word and its oral counterpart" (p. 128)
3) anticipating - "showing an awareness of reading as a

desirable accomplishment" (p. 132)

Thus, recent research indicates that social foundations are important to consider in the language development of bilingual children. The communicative abilities of bilingual children result from a multilinear development in the two languages which occurs within the context of social relationships. These children wish to communicate their intentions to adults and peers in their lives. In school they do this primarily in play situations where they learn to express the meaning of their thoughts and communicate in the most effective way possible so they can understand each other. That way will change depending on the language which is understood most.

Having discussed the concept of bilingualism in childhood as rooted in the social foundations of development, the next section will present how bilingualism in children is tied to their literacy development.

C) Bilingualism and Biliteracy

There is a wide body of research associated with bilingual issues, but this investigation did not study bilingualism in and of itself. It looked at the social foundations of literacy within a bilingual sample. This is not a study focused only on increased English and Spanish language development in bilingual children, though it is an important consideration. It is a study of how children shared meaning through social interaction involving words, some of which happened to be English and others which happened to be Spanish and how that promoted

literacy in the two languages among bilingual preschool children. The social foundations and methods by which this occurs are important to consider.

When a child first enters school, oral language abilities provide the primary basis from which to develop literacy (Pflaum, 1986). There are individual differences in what those language capabilities are which children bring to the classroom based on whether the child comes from a monolingual or bilingual family (children will vary in the degree to which they are proficient in two languages), the type of exposure the child has to written material (such as books, newspapers, magazines, etc.) and the context in which language is used at home (how parents and other family members engage children in conversation).

Oral language experience in the classroom is especially important for children who have not grown up with oral language that resembles the language of schools and books. To promote literacy the child must also have experiences with print in the environment (McLane & McNamee, 1990). The dictation of their narratives provided that experience.

In a bilingual context, a child's understanding of writing, reading or language system used within a culture are examples of how a child actually comes to relearn that language in different contexts.

The idea of relearning and reconstructing previous knowledge was central for Piaget. Ferreiro and Teberosky

(1982) discuss the relevance of the Piagetian concept of "constructive error" for literacy development, meaning that learning occurs through error. Mistakes should not be seen as something to be avoided, as something "wrong" which a child has done but as part of the process of development and learning, as necessary to arrive at the correct answer. The work of Ferreiro and Teberosky considered literacy in the general sense, that is with monolingual children. But, the following quote also has special implications for a study focusing on bilingual children.

> In Piaget's theory, objective knowledge appears as an end result rather than as an initial piece of information. The path toward this objective knowledge is not linear. We do not move toward it step-by-step, adding bits of knowledge one on top of another. We reach it through great global reconstructions, some of which are erroneous (with respect to the ultimate goal) but constructive (in the sense that they allow us to reach it). This notion of constructive error is essential. In associationist psychology (and pedagogy) all errors are alike. In Piagetian psychology it is essential to be able to distinguish those errors which constitute necessary prerequisites for arriving at the correct solution. (p.16)

In this study reading and writing were seen as a way of transcribing oral language into a symbolic form, a way of relearning it -- as a conceptual task which required the coordination of cognition and interpretation within a social context involving the child and the scribe.

The relevance of Piaget's concept of constructive error for a study on bilingual literacy development in childhood means that instead of seeing a child as speaking in "incorrect

forms" requiring immediate correction, whether that involved first or second language usage, it was assumed that participants in the literacy process were responding mostly to the content and meaning of what the child was saying. A child was not immediately corrected by the scribe or told s/he was wrong in any verbal mistakes which were perhaps made. Contrary to seeing these verbal constructions as errors in need of immediate correction for one acceptable answer, they were seen as increasingly progressive attempts and different paths of development on the road toward literacy.

There was an understanding that children would learn to dictate and eventually write with standard grammar and spelling by listening to good story books, talking, dictating and writing with people who speak and write in grammatically correct forms and provide models for children. Over time, by listening to stories, dictating stories and acting them out with others, children can learn which language forms provide the clearest expression of their ideas. With sensitive guidance and attention to words from their teacher, children's skill with language (grammar, vocabulary and expression) can grow dramatically through the preschool years (McLane & McNamee, 1990).

Teaching a second language to adults typically focuses on four major factors: listening, speaking, reading and writing. With adults these components may be taught and considered separately. Based on the social foundations of literacy in

childhood, listening (paying attention to others during story dictation and dramatization); speaking (using either Spanish or English to tell a narrative, make additional comments, or ask questions during story dictation); reading (watching the scribe initially write down and following along as the scribe reads the narrative back during story dictation) and writing (telling a story out loud to the scribe and peers) were not isolated. With children, all these factors taken together form the basis for comprehending text.

What the child eventually brings to and learns from the literacy process are based on the way that listening, speaking, reading, and writing are presented through social interaction with significant individuals in the child's life.

At this point it is important to make a distinction between a study examining bilingualism and one such as this which examines biliteracy.

Bilingualism is not biliteracy. Biliteracy is more than the knowledge of two languages. In addition to reading and writing, it implies knowing what is appropriate and what is not in two cultures and that is determined by the social context.

Two decades ago Mackey (1970) wrote:

> Bilingualism cannot be described within the science of linguistics; we must go beyond. Linguistics has been interested in bilingualism only in so far as it could be used as an explanation for changes in a language, since language, not the individual, is the proper concern of this science. Psychology has regarded bilingualism as an influence on mental processes. Sociology has treated bilingualism as an element in culture conflict. Pedagogy has been concerned with bilingualism in connection with

> school organization and media of instruction. For each of these disciplines bilingualism is incidental, it is treated as a special case or as an exception to the norm. Each discipline, pursuing its own particular interests in its own special way....But it seems to add little to our understanding of bilingualism as such, with its complex psychological, linguistic, and social interrelationships.
>
> What is needed, to begin with, is a perspective in which these interrelationships may be considered. (p. 583).

Mackey (1970) places the emphasis on the social domain as the starting point of this phenomenon:

> Bilingualism is not a phenomenon of language; it is a characteristic of its use. It is not a feature of the code but the message.
>
> If language is the property of the group, bilingualism is the property of the individual. An individual's use of two languages supposes the existence of two different language communities; it does not suppose the existence of a bilingual community. (pg. 554)

In other words, bilingualism is an ability people have that makes them understood in different cultural contexts; it is understanding what is required to get a "message across" and how to utilize that understanding to communicate effectively with others.

Since bilingualism is a relative concept, it is important not only to consider group characteristics, but also how well individuals know a language. To do that requires addressing the social conditions under which language is acquired. Mackey hopes that this will help in avoiding some of the narrower definitions of bilingualism in the past and thus create a fuller description.

From the beginning, the task of literacy is to communicate by representing and sharing ideas with others through the most effective means available whether that involves oral language, reading or writing. In its earliest form communication begins through oral expression reflected in a child's ability to talk. As the child goes to school, s/he is given an opportunity to learn new ways of sharing information by refining existing abilities and practicing new ones, such as expansion of vocabulary, and coming to understand the processes involved in reading and writing.

In a bilingual setting, the learning, use, and subsequent differentiation of two languages to achieve communication with others appears to be related to the social need to talk and be understood in situations using the two different languages.

Fantini (1985) points out, "language is the child's passport for entry into a social group, or a cultural community. Two languages permit the child to enter into and acquire the world view of two communities" (p. 197).

Lindholm (1980) found increased cognitive flexibility associated with bilingualism as children come to understand that there is more than one way to "think" when faced with solving a problem. Having more than one way to think may even have implications for creative abilities by opening the mind to a wider range of possibilities to pursue than is the case for the thought processes of those who speak only one language.

The ideas and research in this section have attempted to

present factors which are central to a study of bilingual literacy development. These factors involve oral language, reading and writing interwoven through complex social interactions with others which remain crucial throughout development. The concept of "biliteracy," as expressed by Mackey (1970), is an especially important vantage point for literacy research focused on social relationships in early childhood. This view makes it possible to not only examine cultural differences in the ways that bilingual children utilize their first and second languages to express ideas and communicate, but it also allows for studying universal social foundations of development which all children share.

D) Conclusion

The foundation for early literacy development in children has been studied from a new vantage point within the last decade. This vantage point is one which focuses on meaningful interaction in the social relationships the child encounters during early childhood through parents, peers and classroom teachers (Anderson et al. 1986; Holdaway, 1979; McLane & McNamee, 1991; Teale & Sulzby, 1986) and has been greatly influenced by the theoretical perspective of Vygotsky (1962, 1978; 1981). Of particular interest in this new approach to studying literacy has been Vygotsky's concept of the "zone of proximal development," as the area where teaching should occur.

In the preschool classroom this "zone" can be effectively developed through play with others (Piaget, 1962; Rubin, 1980;

Vygotsky, 1978). Play may even be seen as a "bridge to literacy" (McLane & McNamee, 1990), particularly in activities such as story dictation and dramatization.

Within a bilingual preschool classroom, the foundations of literacy as promoted through social relationships with adults (deValdes, 1978; Field & Widmayer, 1981; Padilla & Liebman, 1975) and with peers, primarily through play (Ervin-Tripp, 1981; Fillmore, 1976, 1979; John-Steiner, 1986), take on an even greater complexity involving the study of culture (Applebee, 1978; Bruner, 1980; McLane & McNamee, 1991) and the way that a child improves communication in two languages (Cummins, 1976; Diaz, 1985; Padilla and Liebman, 1975; Vygotsky, 1935).

Mackey (1970) poses the concept of "biliteracy" as a necessary one in addressing the development of literacy in two languages. Following Mackey, the study of biliteracy must not only address the words involved in using a language, but also how individuals come to understand what is and is not appropriate in different cultural contexts. For that understanding to occur, he concludes, it is important to consider the social conditions under which those aspects of development occur.

This investigation sought to examine these relationships through developing a "community of readers and writers" (McLane & McNamee, 1990) in the bilingual preschool classroom. This community was based on the ability for children to communicate

or English language for either the more Spanish or English dominant bilingual groups as measured quantitatively by the Pre-Language Assessment Scale (Pre-LAS) before and after a 14 week intervention composed of story dictation and dramatization.

2) There will be no significant difference between comparison and treatment groups on story coherence and complexity in the Spanish or English language for either the more Spanish or English dominant bilingual groups as measured qualitatively the Applebee Stages of Narrative Development before and after a 14 week intervention composed of story dictation and dramatization.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Major Hypotheses

There are two major hypotheses tested in this research investigation. They may be stated in null form as follows:

Hypothesis 1: There will be no significant difference between comparison and treatment groups on proficiency in the Spanish or English language for either the more Spanish or English dominant bilingual groups as measured quantitatively by the Pre-Language Assessment Scale (Pre-LAS) before and after a 14 week intervention composed of story dictation and dramatization.

Hypothesis 2: There will be no significant difference between comparison and treatment groups on story coherence and complexity in the Spanish or English language for either the more Spanish or English dominant bilingual groups as measured qualitatively by the Applebee Stages of Narrative Development before and after a 14 week intervention composed of story dictation and dramatization.

Subjects

Sixty children, recruited from the low-SES Hispanic community of Chicago known as Pilsen, participated in this study. The comparison group consisted of 20 children, recruited from a Title XX day care program, with a mean age of

4.05 years (range: 3.10.9 to 5.1.11; s.d. = .224). There were 12 males and 8 females. The treatment group, recruited from a Head Start Day Care Program, was comprised of 40 children initially. There were six cases of attrition over the course of the study, resulting in a final total of 34 with a mean age of 4.06 years (range: 3.6.20 to 5.0.13; s.d. .239). There were 17 males and 17 females. All children, except for one female in the treatment group, had Hispanic surnames. From the findings of McNamee and McLane (1984), on which the method for this study is largely based, it was determined that a comparison group comprised of 20 children would be sufficient to determine post-test differences in language proficiency and narrative structure development. Forty children were chosen for inclusion in the treatment group in order to highlight differences with the comparison group concerning the social context of acquiring literacy abilities in two languages. The acquisition of bilingual literacy abilities was not addressed by McNamee and McLane (1984).

To recruit subjects for the study an initial telephone contact and subsequent meeting was made with the director of each program. Upon obtaining their support for the project, further meetings were held with head teachers and other teaching staff. When they agreed to participate in the project a letter describing the study and consent form, in both English and Spanish, were distributed to all parents in the comparison and treatment groups (see Appendix E). In cases where a parent

was illiterate or was confused in understanding the nature of the research, the study was explained verbally in the dominant language of the parent. All parents in both groups agreed to allow their children to participate in the study.

Classroom Environment

The comparison group staff was comprised of a female bilingual head teacher, a female bilingual aide and a female monolingual Spanish aide. The aides frequently interacted with the children.

The treatment group staff was comprised of a female monolingual (English) head teacher and a female bilingual aide. Though she was within the physical environment of the classroom, the aide had very little social interaction with the children and primarily attended to administrative duties, such as phone calls, record keeping, conversations with Spanish speaking parents and preparing materials for various classroom activities.

The comparison group was one of three groups of preschool children situated in a large room at a local day care center. The room was subdivided into three sections by a hallway created from the arrangement of lockers and shelving. The areas were open and sounds from various activities could be heard between groups. There were some cartoon characters on the walls. In the area where the comparison group was located there was a large rug on which children sat to do various group activities, a play house area, an easel with paper for

individual drawing and painting, a sand and water table, and a few children's books were on bookshelves in a different section within the area.

The treatment group was situated in a self-contained classroom at a local public school. There were a number of Disney cartoon characters engaged in various activities which were hung on the walls in the area where story dictation occurred. In the room there was a large rug on which children sat to do various group activities, a play house area, an easel with paper for individual drawing and painting, a sand and water table, and children's books were on bookshelves in a section the teacher called the "story book area." When children entered the class each day, while waiting for attendance to be taken, the teacher instructed them, in English, to get a book and "read." The story book area was in close proximity to where story dictation took place. On one wall, immediately over the story dictation area, there was a brightly decorated bulletin board which was used to display each child's dictated story during the week. At the end of the week the story was taken down and given to the child to take home. This resulted in a blank bulletin board at the beginning of each week which became filled with stories by the end of the week.

Procedures

During the Summer of 1989 the investigator familiarized herself with administering the Pre-LAS and Applebee assessments

used in the study. Ten children were selected from a Title XX day care program in the Pilsen area of Chicago. Results obtained during this period were not statistically analyzed and are not included in this study.

The data collection for this investigation began in September, 1989 and continued through January, 1990. In September, the English and Spanish forms of the Pre-LAS were administered to all children in the comparison and treatment groups. In October the intervention was begun with the treatment group and continued until the beginning of January with a Christmas break of two weeks. The second administration of the Pre-LAS was then administered to both comparison and treatment groups. The data collection was completed by the end of January.

For the comparison group, each child dictated a story in the language of choice at the beginning (pre-test) and the end (post-test) of the study. No other contact was made with this group by the investigator.

During the course of the 14 week intervention, with the treatment group, the investigator spent three days per week in the classroom and children were invited to dictate stories in their language of choice. The dictated stories were later dramatized during a group time in the classroom on that day.

For the first four weeks of the study, the stories were read aloud in the group during dramatization only in the language dictated by the children. However, at Week 5, the

investigator began reading the stories in both languages during dramatization. Simultaneous translations were done sentence by sentence. This was done to determine if that aspect of communication would have an effect on the quality of story dictation and dramatization in the remaining weeks of the investigation. The head and assistant teachers were included in the activities to provide assistance during both the dictation and dramatization of stories by helping to clarify a child's words or an idea.

With each class of children, a set place was designated for children to dictate their stories. A small table and two chairs (one for the investigator and one for the child) were placed in the corner of the classroom so that the child would not be totally removed from the sense of community in the room and yet slightly removed from the major activities so the child and investigator could communicate effectively without major disruptions. On the table were placed a tape recorder and other written and related materials belonging to the investigator. Children were invited to dictate in their language of choice.

For story dramatization, a certain area of the carpet in the classroom was marked off with masking tape to serve as the stage, beyond which no child could sit, enabling all to see the action. The children sat in a semicircle around the "stage" while the child who had dictated a story on that particular day came up to stand by the investigator who read the child's story

aloud for all to hear. The investigator then assisted the author in choosing children from the class to be the characters in the story being dramatized.

Measures

Language Proficiency

The children in the McNamee and McLane study (1984) were monolingual (English), and therefore language was not a variable. For the purpose of this study it was necessary to assess the child's proficiency in Spanish and English, thus establishing a base measure from which bilingual literacy development could be examined.

Quantitative Analysis - Language proficiency (addressed in Hypothesis 1), was tested by using the English and Spanish forms of the Pre-Language Assessment Scale (Pre-LAS). This quantitative instrument assesses the relative language abilities in children between the ages of four and six years. It has both English and Spanish forms. Comprised of six scales, the Pre-LAS can determine whether a student is a proficient, limited or non-speaker of English and Spanish. For the purpose of this study, four of the six scales were used. The four scales were chosen based on their relevance to the investigation of childrens' narratives. Validity and reliability of the instrument was maintained since each scale was independently normed and had established its own validity and reliability.

The first scale, "Choose a Picture," measures a child's

receptive vocabulary in Spanish and English by looking at how well the child can understand and follow oral instructions given in English and Spanish.

The second scale, "What's in the House?," measures a child's expressive vocabulary in Spanish and English by looking at how well the child can orally express him/herself in Spanish and English by identifying certain items pointed to in a picture.

The third scale, "Finishing Stories," asks the child to finish a sentence in such a way that it makes sense based on the first part of the sentence given in English or Spanish.

The fourth scale, "Let's Tell Stories," requires that a child listen to a complete story in English and Spanish and then retell it in the same language (see Appendix A for a fuller description of the four scales which were used).

The Pre-LAS was administered on a one-to-one basis as a pre-post test to all children participating in the study. The scores were then analyzed to determine differences in English and Spanish proficiency at the beginning and end of the study.

The English form of the Pre-LAS was administered by the experimenter at pre and post-test to all children. The Spanish form of the Pre-LAS was administered by an undergraduate assistant who spoke Spanish as her first language and was a native of Mexico. In meetings prior to data collection, the assistant was trained in the procedure to follow and mock forms of the assessment were given to ensure accuracy in coding. The

assistant served to check the English Pre-LAS protocols at pre and post-test, and the investigator served to check the Spanish Pre-LAS protocols at pre and post-test. Initially, reliability was established at 85 percent for pre and post-test. Consensus was achieved through discussion between the assistant and the primary investigator.

Narrative Development

Qualitative Analysis - The testing of story coherence and complexity, or choice (addressed in Hypothesis 2), lends itself to a more qualitative method of analysis and was assessed in the social context of the classroom based on the child's ability to dictate and act out stories in English and/or Spanish. Language balance (English or Spanish) was determined at pre-test based on: a) how well a child comprehended directions given for story dictation in English or Spanish and b) the language in which a child chose to dictate his/her first story.

Applebee's Stages of Narrative Development (1978) were used to analyze how the narrative structure of children's dictated stories changed over time (see Appendix B for a fuller description of Applebee's Stages adapted from McNamee & McLane, 1984). A trend analysis was undertaken to determine the development in coherence and complexity of narrative structures between the first story and last story dictated.

All dictated stories were coded three times to ensure accuracy -- by the primary investigator, by Dr. McNamee (one of

the co-authors of the study from which this investigation was adapted), and by a bilingual research assistant from the original McNamee and McLane study. Initially, reliability was established at 80 percent. Consensus was achieved through discussion between the coders and the primary investigator.

Questionnaires

Two questionnaires were used to gather basic demographic background information. The Teacher Questionnaire was comprised of questions related to language use in the classroom (see Appendix C). The Parental Questionnaire was comprised of questions related to language use and literacy activities in the home (see Appendix D). Both questionnaires had English and Spanish forms. Individuals chose the version they preferred. This data provided supplementary information when combined with the two major assessments, the Pre-LAS and the Applebee Stages of Narrative Development.

Tape Recordings

Audio tape recordings were made of all story dictation activities with comparison and treatment groups to assist in analysis of the narratives.

Field Notes

Field notes were written by the investigator at the end of each day describing the interactions of children with their peers and teachers during pretend play, story dictation and story dramatization. Special attention was given to the

following factors:

a) which language(s) were used by the children and teachers during various activities

b) the quality of language used during interactions, such as changes over time in theme, complexity and coherence during story dictation and dramatization, and

c) any significant events occurring during dramatization.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter is divided into two major sections. The first section presents the statistical results obtained for the comparison and treatment groups on the Pre-Language Assessment Scale (Pre-LAS) -- the quantitative instrument used to measure language proficiency -- before and after a 14 week intervention composed of story dictation and dramatization. The second section presents the results obtained for the comparison and treatment groups using Applebee's (1978) coding scheme -- the qualitative instrument used to measure narrative structure -- before and after a 14 week intervention composed of story dictation and dramatization.

Part I: Quantitative Analysis of Language Proficiency

In Chapter III, the hypothesis used to test the difference in language proficiency at pre and post-test for the comparison and treatment groups was stated as follows:

There will be no significant difference between comparison and treatment groups on proficiency in the Spanish or English language for either the more Spanish or English dominant bilingual groups as measured quantitatively by the Pre-Language Assessment Scale (Pre-LAS) before and after a 14 week intervention composed of story dictation and dramatization.

This hypothesis was tested by using four of the six scales

on the Pre-LAS. The results of testing using all four scales were investigated using a factorial analysis of covariance in the MANOVA sub-routine of SPSSx, where the pre-test scores served as the covariate. The post-test scores served as the dependent variable. The group factor was comprised of two levels, the comparison group and treatment group, which were subdivided into English and Spanish dominant.

A t-test performed on all data at pre-test found no significant difference between comparison and treatment groups.

Table 1 contains the means, standard deviations and t-values for the English and Spanish versions of the four scales used -- "Choose a Picture" (CPE = "Choose a Picture/English," CPS = "Choose a Picture/Spanish"); "What's in the House?" (WHE = "What's in the House?/English," WHS = "What's in the House?/Spanish"); "Finishing Stories" (FSE = "Finishing Stories/English", FSS = "Finishing Stories/Spanish"), and "Let's Tell Stories" (TSE = "Let's Tell Stories/English", TSS = "Let's Tell Stories/Spanish").

Table 1

t-test values for the Pre-Language Assessment Scale

					Pooled Variance Estimate		
Scale	Group	Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	t value	Degrees of Freedom	2-tail Probability
CPE	Comparison Treatment	20 34	6.25 5.38	2.34 2.40	1.30	52	0.20
CPS	Comparison Treatment	20 34	5.70 6.65	3.73 2.63	-1.09	52	0.28
WHE	Comparison Treatment	20 34	3.95 2.03	3.85 3.55	1.86	52	0.07
WHS	Comparison Treatment	20 34	7.90 8.09	1.65 1.31	-0.46	52	0.65
FSE	Comparison Treatment	20 34	4.95 2.24	5.56 4.53	1.95	52	0.06
FSS	Comparison Treatment	20 34	7.00 8.12	5.64 4.93	-0.76	52	0.45
TSE	Comparison Treatment	20 34	3.20 1.62	3.32 2.90	1.83	52	0.07
TSS	Comparison Treatment	20 34	4.05 4.35	3.20 2.72	-0.37	52	0.71

Scale 1: "Choose a Picture"

A) "Choose a Picture (English)"

"Choose a Picture" is the Pre-LAS scale which measures receptive vocabulary in English and Spanish as demonstrated by how well a child understands spoken language and instructions given.

Table 2 presents the respective means for a factorial analysis of covariance on the scale, "Choose a Picture (English)."

Table 2

Table of Means for the Scale "Choose a Picture (English)"

Group	Dominance	Observed Mean	Adjusted Mean
Comparison	English	8.36	8.19
	Spanish	6.00	6.27
Treatment	English	9.00	8.61
	Spanish	6.31	6.60

Table 3 presents the tests of significance using an analysis of covariance on the scale, "Choose a Picture (English)."

Table 3

Analysis of Covariance for the Scale "Choose a Picture (English)"

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squared	F	Sig. of F
Within Cells	182.87	49	3.73	-	-
Regression	7.88	1	7.88	2.11	0.15
Group	1.30	1	1.30	0.35	0.56
Dominance	26.15	1	26.15	7.01	0.01
Group by Dominance	0.02	1	0.02	0.00	0.95

Examination of the data in Tables 2 and 3 indicates that there was no significant interaction for group by dominance and no significant main effect for group. There was a significant main effect for dominance on the scale, "Choose a Picture (English)," meaning that English dominant subjects in both the comparison and treatment groups scored higher on this scale than Spanish dominant subjects in those groups. This would be expected among these children, due to the primary language spoken in the home and their limited level of exposure to the second language among teachers and peers at preschool.

Further examination of the adjusted means in the Table of Means (Table 2) on the scale, "Choose a Picture (English)," indicates that for both the English and Spanish versions of this scale, the treatment group scored slightly higher than the

comparison group. However, this difference is not statistically significant.

In summary, the results obtained on the scale, "Choose a Picture (English)," do not lend statistical support for rejection of the null hypothesis.

B) "Choose a Picture (Spanish)"

Table 4 presents the respective means for a factorial analysis of covariance on the scale, "Choose a Picture (Spanish)."

Table 4

Table of Means for the Scale
"Choose a Picture (Spanish)"

Group	Dominance	Observed Mean	Adjusted Mean
Comparison	English	4.55	4.97
	Spanish	8.33	7.05
Treatment	English	2.60	5.18
	Spanish	8.45	6.73

Table 5 presents the tests of significance using an analysis of covariance for the scale, "Choose a Picture (Spanish)."

Table 5

Analysis of Covariance for the Scale "Choose a Picture (Spanish)"

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squared	F	Sig. of F
Within Cells	53.87	49	1.10	-	-
Regression	213.23	1	213.23	193.96	0.00
Group	0.03	1	0.03	0.03	0.87
Dominance	21.75	1	21.75	19.78	0.00
Group by Dominance	0.61	1	0.61	0.55	0.46

Examination of the data in Tables 4 and 5 indicates that there was no significant interaction for dominance by group, and no significant main effect for group. There was a significant main effect for dominance on the scale, "Choose a Picture (Spanish)," meaning that Spanish dominant subjects in both the comparison and treatment groups scored higher on this scale than English dominant subjects in those groups. This would be expected among these children, due to the primary language spoken in the home and their limited level of exposure to the second language among teachers and peers at preschool.

Further examination of the adjusted means in the Table of Means (Table 4) on the scale, "Choose a Picture (Spanish)," indicates that the English dominant subjects in the comparison group scored slightly lower on this scale than their cohorts in

the treatment group while the Spanish dominant subjects in the comparison group scored slightly higher on this scale than their cohorts in the treatment group. However, the differences are so small that they are statistically insignificant.

In summary, the results obtained on the scale, "Choose a Picture (Spanish)," do not lend statistical support for rejection of the null hypothesis.

Scale 2: "What's in the House?"

A) "What's in the House? (English)"

"What's in the House?" is the Pre-LAS scale which measures expressive vocabulary in English and Spanish as demonstrated by how well a child is able to make him/herself understood through talking to others and answering questions.

Table 6 presents the respective means for a factorial analysis of covariance on the scale, "What's in the House? (English)."

Table 6

Table of Means for the Scale
"What's in the House? (English)"

Group	Dominance	Observed Mean	Adjusted Mean
Comparison	English	8.45	6.54
	Spanish	0.78	4.00
Treatment	English	9.80	5.48
	Spanish	1.10	4.12

Table 7 presents the tests of significance using an analysis of covariance on the scale, "What's in the House? (English)."

Table 7

Analysis of Covariance for the Scale "What's in the House? (English)"

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squared	F	Sig. of F
Within Cells	80.28	49	1.64	-	-
Regression	91.50	1	91.50	55.85	0.00
Group	1.69	1	1.69	1.03	0.31
Dominance	7.09	1	7.09	4.33	0.04
Group by Dominance	2.87	1	2.87	1.75	0.19

Examination of the data in Tables 6 and 7 indicates that there was no significant interaction for group by dominance and no significant main effect for group. There was a significant main effect for dominance on the scale, "What's in the House? (English)," meaning that English dominant subjects in both the comparison and treatment groups scored higher on this scale than Spanish dominant subjects in those groups. This would be expected among these children, due to the primary language spoken in the home and their limited level of exposure to the

second language among teachers and peers at preschool.

Further examination of the adjusted means in the Table of Means (Table 6) on the scale, "What's in the House? (English)," indicates that the English dominant subjects in the comparison group scored higher than their cohorts in the treatment group on this scale, though not significantly higher. This difference may be attributed to the difference in language dominance of the two groups. In the comparison group 55% of the children were either bilingual or monolingual in English, as compared with only 14% who were bilingual or English dominant in the treatment group. This would cause results to favor the comparison group. Among Spanish dominant subjects, the mean was slightly higher on this scale for the treatment group, though not statistically significant.

In summary, the results obtained on the scale, "What's in the House? (English)," do not lend statistical support for rejection of the null hypothesis.

B) "What's in the House? (Spanish)"

Table 8 presents the respective means for a factorial analysis of covariance on the scale, "What's in the House? (Spanish)".

Table 9 presents the tests of significance using an analysis of covariance on the scale, "What's in the House? (Spanish)".

Table 8

Table of Means for the Scale "What's in the House? (Spanish)"

Group	Dominance	Observed Mean	Adjusted Mean
Comparison	English	7.82	8.12
	Spanish	8.67	8.67
Treatment	English	7.80	7.41
	Spanish	8.66	8.74

Table 9

Analysis of Covariance for the Scale "What's in the House? (Spanish)"

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squared	F	Sig. of F
Within Cells	69.98	49	1.43	-	-
Regression	67.01	1	67.01	46.92	0.00
Group	0.91	1	0.91	0.64	0.43
Dominance	8.05	1	8.05	5.64	0.02
Group by Dominance	1.39	1	1.39	0.98	0.33

Examination of the data in Tables 8 and 9 indicates that there was no significant interaction for group by dominance and no significant main effect for group. There was a significant

main effect for dominance on the scale, "What's in the House? (Spanish)," meaning that Spanish dominant subjects in both the comparison and treatment groups scored higher on this scale than English dominant subjects in those groups. This would be expected among these children, due to the primary language spoken in the home and their limited level of exposure to the second language among teachers and peers at preschool.

Further examination of the adjusted means in the Table of Means (Table 8) for the scale, "What's in the House? (Spanish)," indicates that the Spanish dominant subjects in the comparison and treatment groups received virtually the same scores while the English dominant subjects in the treatment group scored lower than their cohorts in the comparison group. This difference is understandable considering the difference in language dominance of the two groups. In the comparison group 55% of the subjects were either bilingual or monolingual English speaking as compared with only 14% of the subjects in the treatment group who were either bilingual or English dominant.

In summary, the results obtained on the scale, "What's in the House? (Spanish)," do not lend statistical support for rejection of the null hypothesis.

Scale 3: "Finishing Stories"

A) "Finishing Stories (English)"

"Finishing Stories" is the Pre-LAS scale which measures a child's ability to complete a sentence in English and Spanish

as demonstrated by completing the sentence so that it makes sense based on the first part of the sentence given. This scale attempts to obtain a more accurate reflection of a child's natural abilities.

Table 10 presents the respective means for a factorial analysis of covariance on the scale, "Finishing Stories (English)."

Table 10

Table of Means for the Scale "Finishing Stories (English)"

Group	Dominance	Observed Mean	Adjusted Mean
Comparison	English	11.64	9.39
	Spanish	2.11	5.75
Treatment	English	13.40	8.44
	Spanish	1.07	4.63

Table 11 presents the tests of significance using an analysis of covariance on the scale, "Finishing Stories (English)."

Examination of the data in Tables 10 and 11 indicates that there was no significant interaction for group by dominance and no significant main effect for group. There was a significant main effect for dominance on the scale, "Finishing Stories (English)," meaning that English dominant subjects in both the comparison and treatment groups scored higher on this scale

than Spanish dominant subjects in those groups. This would be expected among these children, due to the primary language spoken in the home and their limited level of exposure to the second language among teachers and peers at preschool.

Table 11

Analysis of Covariance for the Scale "Finishing Stories (English)"

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squared	F	Sig. of F
Within Cells	306.66	49	6.26	-	-
Regression	139.84	1	139.84	22.34	0.00
Group	8.74	1	8.74	1.40	0.24
Dominance	28.93	1	28.93	4.62	0.04
Group by Dominance	0.06	1	0.06	0.01	0.92

Further examination of the adjusted means in the Table of Means (Table 10) on the scale, "Finishing Stories (English)," indicates that both the English and Spanish dominant subjects in the comparison group scored higher than their cohorts in the treatment group. This difference may be explained by the difference in language dominance between the two groups. The comparison group had 55% of its subjects who were either bilingual or English dominant while the treatment group had approximately 14% of its subjects who were either bilingual or

English dominant.

In summary, the results obtained on the scale, "Finishing Stories (English)," do not lend statistical support for rejection of the null hypothesis.

B) "Finishing Stories (Spanish)"

Table 12 presents the respective means for a factorial analysis of covariance on the scale, "Finishing Stories (Spanish)."

Table 12

Table of Means for the Scale "Finishing Stories (Spanish)"

Group	Dominance	Observed Mean	Adjusted Mean
Comparison	English	6.73	7.04
	Spanish	10.22	9.51
Treatment	English	2.60	3.96
	Spanish	10.86	9.90

Table 13 presents the tests of significance using an analysis of covariance on the scale, "Finishing Stories (Spanish)."

Examination of the data in Tables 12 and 13 indicates that there was no significant interaction for group by dominance and no significant main effect for group. There was a significant main effect for dominance on the scale, "Finishing Stories

(Spanish)," meaning that Spanish dominant subjects in both the comparison and treatment groups scored higher on this scale than English dominant subjects in those groups. This would be expected among these children, due to the primary language spoken in the home and their limited level of exposure to the second language among teachers and peers at preschool.

Table 13

Analysis of Covariance for the Scale "Finishing Stories (Spanish)"

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squared	F	Sig. of F
Within Cells	713.20	49	14.56	-	-
Regression	219.18	1	219.18	15.06	0.00
Group	16.41	1	16.41	1.13	0.29
Dominance	145.50	1	145.50	10.00	0.00
Group by Dominance	27.01	1	27.01	1.86	0.18

Further examination of the adjusted means in the Table of Means (Table 12) for the scale, "Finishing Stories (Spanish)," indicates that the English dominant subjects in the comparison group scored higher than the English dominant subjects in the treatment group. This may be attributed to the difference in language dominance of the two groups. In the comparison group 55% of the children were either bilingual or monolingual in

English, as compared with only 14% who were bilingual or English dominant in the treatment group. This would cause results to favor the comparison group. Among Spanish dominant subjects, the mean was slightly higher on this scale for the treatment group, though not statistically significant.

In summary, the results obtained on the scale, "Finishing Stories (Spanish)," do not lend statistical support for rejection of the null hypothesis.

Scale 4: "Let's Tell Stories"

A) "Let's Tell Stories (English)"

"Let's Tell Stories" is the Pre-LAS scale which measures a child's ability to retell a story in English and Spanish as demonstrated by listening to a complete story and then retelling it in the same language. This scale attempts to obtain the most accurate reflection of the child's natural abilities.

Table 14 presents the respective means for a factorial analysis of covariance on the scale, "Let's Tell Stories (English)."

Table 14

Table of Means for the Scale
"Let's Tell Stories (English)"

Group	Dominance	Observed Mean	Adjusted Mean
Comparison	English	6.64	5.62
	Spanish	1.44	3.36
Treatment	English	8.80	5.78
	Spanish	0.90	3.01

Table 15 presents the tests of significance using an analysis of covariance on the scale, "Let's Tell Stories (English)."

Table 15

Analysis of Covariance on the Scale
"Let's Tell Stories (English)"

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squared	F	Sig. of F
Within Cells	89.56	49	1.83	-	-
Regression	60.69	1	60.69	33.21	0.00
Group	0.08	1	0.08	0.04	0.84
Dominance	16.82	1	16.82	9.20	0.00
Group by Dominance	0.50	1	0.50	0.27	0.60

Examination of the data in Tables 14 and 15 indicates that there was no significant interaction for group by dominance and no significant main effect for group. There was a significant main effect for dominance on the scale, "Let's Tell Stories (Spanish)," meaning that English dominant subjects in both the comparison and treatment groups scored higher on this scale than Spanish dominant subjects in those groups. This would be expected among these children, due to the primary language spoken in the home and their limited level of exposure to the second language among teachers and peers at preschool.

Further examination of the adjusted means in the Table of Means (Table 14) on the scale, "Let's Tell Stories (English)," indicates that there is virtually no difference in the scores achieved among English and Spanish dominant subjects in the comparison and treatment groups. Though not statistically significant, this finding is worth noting considering the difference in language dominance between the two groups. In the comparison group 55% of the children were either bilingual or English dominant, as compared with only 14% who were bilingual or English dominant in the treatment group. It would therefore be expected that results would favor the comparison group. However, that is not the case in this instance. This may suggest the intervention with the treatment group was successful in increasing their English language proficiency.

In summary, the results obtained on the scale, "Let's Tell Stories (English)," do not lend statistical support for

rejection of the null hypothesis.

B) "Let's Tell Stories (Spanish)"

Table 16 presents the respective means for a factorial analysis of covariance on the scale, "Let's Tell Stories (Spanish)."

Table 16

Table of Means for the Scale "Let's Tell Stories (Spanish)"

Group	Dominance	Observed Mean	Adjusted Mean
Comparison	English	3.91	4.23
	Spanish	5.33	4.26
Treatment	English	2.40	4.08
	Spanish	6.55	5.62

Table 17 presents the tests of significance using an analysis of covariance on the scale, "Let's Tell Stories (Spanish)."

Table 17

Analysis of Covariance for the Scale "Let's Tell Stories (Spanish)"

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Squared	F	Sig. of F
Within Cells	129.22	49	2.64	-	-
Regression	248.06	1	248.06	94.07	0.00
Group	3.24	1	3.24	1.23	0.27
Dominance	4.92	1	4.92	1.87	0.18
Group by Dominance	5.18	1	5.18	1.97	0.17

Examination of the data in Tables 16 and 17 indicates that there was no significant interaction for group by dominance and no significant main effect for group and no significant main effect for dominance.

This is the only Pre-LAS scale administered during the course of this study which found no significance for any of the variables under study. And yet, this is the one scale which found the greatest degree of difference in scores favoring the treatment group.

The reason for non-significant findings on this scale may be attributable to the large source of variability within the data (Regression Sum of Squares = 248.06; F = 94.07).

In summary, the results obtained for the scale, "Let's Tell Stories (Spanish)," do not lend statistical support for

rejection of the null hypothesis.

Conclusion

To conclude this section, regarding the statistical results obtained on the Pre-LAS, the findings were rather uniform.

For three of the scales -- "Choose a Picture (English/Spanish)"; "What's in the House? (English/Spanish)"; and "Finishing Stories (English/Spanish)" -- both the English and Spanish versions found no significant interaction effects for either the comparison or treatment groups. One significant main effect was found for the variable of "dominance." However, that occurred only when comparing the English and Spanish dominant children in both groups combined, thus failing to make any distinction for the role of dominance on either the treatment or comparison group.

On the fourth scale, "Let's Tell Stories (English/Spanish)," the English version found a main effect on the variable of "dominance" while the Spanish version found no significant interaction or main effects.

Thus, it is not possible to statistically discern, at the .05 level of significance, that the intervention of story dictation and dramatization had a significant favorable effect on the language dominance of the treatment group as assessed using the Pre-LAS.

To state these findings in the context of the null hypothesis, there was no significant difference between

comparison and treatment groups on proficiency in the Spanish or English language for either the more Spanish or English dominant bilingual groups as measured quantitatively by the Pre-LAS before and after a 14 week intervention composed of story dictation and dramatization.

However, additional examination of the data obtained on the Pre-LAS revealed findings which are meaningful, especially on the scale, "Let's Tell Stories (Spanish)". These findings will be discussed further in Chapter V.

Part II: Qualitative Analysis of Children's Narratives

The analysis in this section of Chapter IV focuses on the qualitative analyses made of the narratives dictated in the comparison and treatment groups over the course of the study.

A) Descriptive Data

With the comparison group, two narratives were dictated: one at pre-test and one at post-test. Other than the Pre-LAS measures of language proficiency taken at pre-test and post-test, the investigator had no other contact with these children.

With the treatment group, the investigator was involved in the daily life of the classroom and undertook the dictation and dramatization activities as described in Chapter III.

In Chapter III, the hypothesis used to test the difference in narrative structure at pre-test and post-test for the comparison and treatment groups was stated as follows:

There will be no significant difference between comparison and treatment groups on story coherence and complexity in the Spanish or English language for either the more Spanish or English dominant bilingual groups as measured qualitatively by the Applebee Stages of Narrative Development before and after a 14 week intervention composed of story dictation and dramatization.

With the comparison group a total of 38 narratives were dictated. There were 20 children in the comparison group. At pre-test 18 dictated narratives, with two children not responding; 7 narratives were dictated in English and 11 were dictated in Spanish. At post-test 20 children dictated narratives; 11 narratives were dictated in English and 9 were dictated in Spanish.

With the treatment group a total of 247 narratives were dictated. Initially there were 40 children in the treatment group. There were 6 cases of attrition, resulting in 34 children whose narratives were analyzed for this study. A total of 38 narratives were dictated in English and 209 narratives were dictated in Spanish.

While an attempt was made to obtain an equal number of narratives from all children, the number for each child varied due to absence caused by illness or family trips and other factors related to the life of the classroom, such as school assemblies, special programs, a dental check-up, holiday activities, etc. Table 18 presents the total number of

narratives obtained from the treatment group.

Table 18

Narratives Dictated
from Treatment Group

Number of Children	Number of Narratives Dictated by Children	Number of Narratives Obtained
1	4	4
2	5	10
3	6	18
12	7	84
13	8	104
3	9	27

Total = 247

B) Narrative Scores

Table 19 presents the pre-test and post-test narrative scores for the comparison group following Applebee's Stages of Narrative Development (1978).

Table 19

Comparison Group
Narrative Scores

Language of Dictation	Narratives Dictated	
	Pre-Test	Post-Test
English	2	3
English	*	2
Spanish	1	3
English	3	2
English	3	2
Spanish	*	2
Spanish	1	2
English	2	2
Spanish	2	2
English	2	2
Spanish	2	1
Spanish	1	3
Spanish	3	2
English	2	3
English	3	2
Spanish	3	3
English	3	3
English	2	3
Spanish	2	3
English	2	3

* = No Response

Table 20 presents the narrative scores, over the course of the 14 week intervention composed of story dictation and dramatization, for the treatment group following Applebee's Stages of Narrative Development (1978).

Table 20

Treatment Group
Narrative Scores

Language of Dictation	Narratives Dictated								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Spanish	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	3	-
Spanish	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	-	-
Spanish	1	1	1	1	2	3	2	3	-
Spanish	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	-
Spanish	2	2	1	2	2	3	2	2	-
Spanish	2	2	2	2	2	2	-	-	-
Spanish	1	2	2	3	3	3	2	-	-
Spanish	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	-
Spanish	2	2	2	1	3	3	3	3	3
English	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	-
Spanish	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	3	1
English	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	-
Spanish	1	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	-
Spanish	3	2	2	3	1	3	3	3	2
Spanish	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	-

Table 20 - Continued

Language of Dictation	Narratives Dictated								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Spanish	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	-
Spanish	2	1	1	3	2	3	2	-	-
Spanish	1	2	2	2	2	3	3	-	-
Spanish	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	-	-
Spanish	2	1	2	3	3	3	2	2	-
Spanish	2	2	2	3	2	-	-	-	-
Spanish	2	2	1	2	2	3	2	-	-
English	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	-
English	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	-	-
Spanish	2	2	2	2	4	2	3	-	-
Spanish	*	*	1	1	1	1	2	2	-
Spanish	*	*	1	1	2	1	-	-	-
English	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	-	-
Spanish	1	1	1	2	1	2	3	-	-
Spanish	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	-	-
Spanish	2	2	1	3	1	3	1	2	-
Spanish	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	-	-
Spanish	2	2	2	2	2	2	-	-	-
Spanish	3	2	2	2	3	-	-	-	-

* = No Response

Table 21 presents the average pre-test and post-test scores for English and Spanish dominant subjects in the comparison and treatment groups.

Table 21

Comparison and Treatment Group
Average Narrative Scores

Group	Dominance	Average Score	
		Pre-Test	Post-Test
Comparison	English	2.20	2.45
	Spanish	1.87	2.33
Treatment	English	2.20	2.60
	Spanish	2.03	2.24

C) Conclusion

The narrative scores for the comparison and treatment groups were analyzed to determine the difference in scores at pre-test and post-test for all subjects participating in the investigation.

Based on the scores obtained for the comparison group it was found that 10 subjects had higher scores at post-test, 5 subjects had lower scores at post-test and 5 subjects had the same scores at pre-test and post-test. At pre-test two children gave no response when an attempt was made to obtain a dictated narrative.

Based on the scores obtained for the treatment group it

was found that 12 subjects had higher scores at post-test, 4 subjects had lower scores at post-test and 18 subjects had the same scores at pre-test and post-test. At pre-test two children gave no response when an attempt was made to obtain a dictated narrative.

Looking at pre-test and post-test averages, it was found that there was no real difference between comparison and treatment groups on the narrative scores obtained at pre-test and post-test which would indicate a greater effect of the intervention in favor of the treatment group. The narrative scores for comparison and treatment groups at post-test for both English and Spanish dominant subjects were very similar (Comparison Group [English Dominant = 2.45, Spanish Dominant = 2.33]; Treatment Group [English Dominant = 2.60, Spanish Dominant = 2.24]).

Thus, it is not possible to discern that the intervention composed of story dictation and dramatization had a significant favorable effect on the narrative structure of stories dictated by the treatment group as assessed using Applebee's Narrative Stages of Development (1978).

To state these findings in the context of the null hypothesis, there was no significant difference between comparison and treatment groups on story coherence and complexity in the Spanish or English language for either the more Spanish or English dominant bilingual groups as measured qualitatively using the Applebee Stages of Narrative

Development before and after a 14 week intervention composed of story dictation and dramatization.

However, additional examination of the data obtained during the course of this intervention revealed findings which are meaningful and point to the efficacy of this method for developing literacy in bilingual preschool children. These findings will be discussed further in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

In this investigation literacy has been viewed as a means of communication -- a process of speaking (writing) and listening (reading) among a group of people through the use of print. The development of literacy is a "profoundly social process" (McLane & McNamee, 1990). It cannot occur without help from the participation of adults and peers in the "zone of proximal development" (Vygotsky, 1978) helping a child develop new ways of understanding what it means to be literate. Knowledge of the reading and writing process is closely tied to understanding the meaning of words as presented and shared among individuals in a social context. As Ferreiro and Teberosky (1982) and Holdaway (1979) have found, children understand and remember what has been read not by understanding individual words in isolation but through the social context in which they were used to communicate.

The material presented in this chapter will provide evidence which supports the hypothesis that bilingual children do benefit from literacy activities based on story dictation and dramatization in the preschool classroom. These activities are built on social foundations which can, in fact, contribute to the development of early literacy in bilingual children.

To offer support for this hypothesis various types of data

will be presented. The more "conventional" data will support the classroom intervention undertaken with the treatment group as related to the quantitative and qualitative assessments used. The other evidence provided, more "nonconventional" in nature, is related to the literacy activities done with the treatment group over the course of the research and was compiled by the author in the context of the theoretical framework presented in Chapter II.

This chapter is divided into three major sections. The first two sections present comments relevant to Chapter IV findings, concerning the statistically non-significant quantitative and qualitative results of this investigation as related to the Pre-LAS and Applebee (1978) assessments. The third section discusses further possible reasons for non-significant findings.

Section I: The Pre-Language Assessment Scale

Chapter IV presented that using a factorial analysis of covariance in the MANOVA sub-routine of SPSSx resulted in no significant statistical difference between comparison and treatment group scores on any English or Spanish Pre-LAS scale at post-test. However, there were other findings and observations which make it difficult to completely accept the null hypothesis in this instance.

Prior to undertaking the statistical analysis, pre-test and post-test difference scores were calculated for comparison and treatment groups to get an initial sense of whether the

dictation and dramatization intervention had some impact on outcome when measured using a standardized quantitative assessment. When these calculations were completed there was found to be a difference favoring the treatment group on two sub-scales: "Choose a Picture (English)," and "Let's Tell Stories (Spanish)." Upon completion of the statistical calculations finding no significant differences between groups, what became apparent was that, due to the large degree of variability within the data, differences emerging between the two groups were being "washed out" or "lost." This required examination of the data on a case by case basis to determine change from pre-test to post-test for each child. Means were then obtained for Spanish dominant subjects in the comparison and treatment groups.

"Choose a Picture (English)"

In calculating difference scores for comparison and treatment groups on the scale, "Choose a Picture (English)," it was found that a total of 9 out of 20 children (45%) in the comparison group improved on this scale at post-test. For the treatment group 22 out of 34 children (65%) improved on this scale at post-test. When the Spanish dominant children were considered, it was found that a total of 4 out of 9 comparison group children (45%) improved on this scale at post-test compared with 20 out of 29 treatment group children (69%).

The mean increase for Spanish dominant comparison group children on this scale at post-test was +1.0. The mean

increase for Spanish dominant treatment comparison group children on this scale at post-test was +1.45.

Table 22 presents individual improvement comparing pre-test and post-test scores for Spanish dominant subjects in the comparison and treatment groups.

Table 22

Post-Test Difference Scores
for the Scale "Choose a Picture (English)"

	Increase in Post-test Difference Scores					
Group	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5	+9
Comparison	-	2	1	-	1	-
Treatment	4	7	4	2	2	1

Based on the difference scores obtained for the comparison and treatment groups on the scale, "Choose a Picture (English)," it is difficult to conclude that there was no improvement for the treatment group as measured at post-test. This scale measures receptive vocabulary development, that is, how well a child understands what is spoken or asked in English or Spanish. This difference in favor of the treatment group was not found, however, when calculating difference scores for the scale, "What's in the House? (English or Spanish)," which measures expressive vocabulary development, i.e., how well

children can make themselves understood in conversation.

Thus, these data demonstrate that the Spanish dominant children in the treatment group did improve their English receptive vocabulary development to a greater degree than Spanish dominant children in the comparison group. The findings indicate that Spanish dominant children in the treatment group were capable of understanding more in English than they themselves were able to express verbally in that language. A possible reason for this finding is that the majority of interactions in which Spanish dominant children verbally expressed themselves with the investigator and peers in classroom (usually during dictation, dramatization and asking questions during other classroom activities) occurred in Spanish. This may have played a role in the degree to which children felt more comfortable in expressing themselves in Spanish than English. However, these children were also exposed to English in the context of daily socialization concerning the dictation and dramatization of stories. This was done through continual interaction which the investigator (scribe) established with the children in this "community" (McLane & McNamee, 1990) by taking down narratives in their dominant language. This socialization extended further to the entire group when reading their narratives aloud during dramatization, first in the language dictated by the child and then in the second language. Thus, while the Spanish dominant children may not have felt comfortable enough to express

themselves in their second language over a fourteen week period of time (Diaz, 1985; Pflaum, 1986), they did understand more spoken English at post-test.

"Let's Tell Stories (Spanish)"

In calculating difference scores for comparison and treatment groups on the scale, "Let's Tell Stories (Spanish)," it was found that a total of 9 out of 20 children in the comparison group (45%) improved on this scale at post-test. For the treatment group 23 out of 34 children (67%) improved on this scale at post-test. When the Spanish dominant children were considered, it was found that a total of 4 out of 9 comparison group children (44%) improved on this scale at post-test compared with 21 out of 29 treatment group children (72%).

The mean increase for Spanish dominant comparison group children on this scale at post-test was +0.33. The mean increase for Spanish dominant treatment group children on this scale at post-test was +1.72.

Table 23 presents individual improvement comparing pre-test and post-test scores for Spanish dominant subjects in the comparison and treatment groups.

Table 23

Post-Test Difference Scores
for the Scale "Let's Tell Stories (Spanish)"

	Increase in Post-test Difference Scores			
Group	+1	+2	+3	+4
Comparison	-	3	1	-
Treatment	2	10	3	6

Based on the difference scores obtained for the comparison and treatment groups on the scale, "Let's Tell Stories (Spanish)," it is difficult to conclude that there was no improvement for the treatment group as measured at post-test. This scale measures a child's natural speaking abilities and attempts to provide a more realistic assessment of a child's capabilities concerning communication in English and Spanish.

This finding, that the Spanish dominant majority of children in the treatment group improved to a greater degree on this scale than their cohorts in the comparison group, would tend to indicate a favorable effect of the intervention undertaken in the classroom. The narratives dictated in Spanish and dramatized by the children over the course of the intervention contributed to a larger increase in the post-test scores obtained on the Pre-LAS scale which most closely parallelled that interaction.

Conclusion

To conclude this section, calculating difference scores on the Pre-LAS scales, "Choose a Picture (English)," and "Let's Tell Stories (Spanish)," indicates a larger degree of improvement in favor of the treatment group subjects which was "lost," due to the large degree of variability among scores, when using a factorial analysis of covariance in the MANOVA sub-routine of SPSSx as presented in Chapter IV.

Findings favoring the treatment group which resulted from calculating difference scores on the scale, "Choose a Picture (English)," support other studies which indicate that children learning another language are capable of understanding what is being asked of them in a second language before they are able to comfortably express it themselves in that language (Fillmore, 1979; Pflaum, 1986).

Findings favoring the treatment group which resulted from calculating difference scores on the scale, "Let's Tell Stories (Spanish)" -- the Pre-LAS scale which most closely resembled the intervention done in the classroom -- point to the importance of early socialization in the development of literacy and support the efficacy of this literacy intervention (McNamee et al. 1984; McLane & McNamee, 1990) with bilingual children as related to their natural abilities.

Section II: Stages of Narrative Development (Applebee, 1978)

Chapter IV presented evidence that no significant difference between comparison and treatment groups on story

coherence and complexity was found following Applebee (1978). However, there were a number of other findings and observations which make it difficult to completely accept the null hypothesis in this instance.

The major question addressed in this study was, how does social interaction during story dictation and dramatization contribute to literacy development in bilingual preschool children? Based on the work of McNamee and McLane (1984) and McLane and McNamee (1990) there are numerous ways in which to obtain evidence showing the impact of social interaction on the development of children's stories.

One of the ways involves examining the development of "community themes" (McLane & McNamee, 1990). These themes develop in the context of sharing ideas with the scribe and others over the course of dictation, but particularly through story dramatization within the group. During story dictation children will create particular characters and/or actions to put in their narratives which are then shared with others in the group, or "community," during dramatization of the narratives. Some of these characters and actions take on special meaning in the community and are incorporated into subsequent stories told by other children.

A second way to detect the impact of these literacy activities is by examining the way that children use surrounding aspects of the environment in their narratives. This may come from looking around the story area at the

physical environment and incorporating those objects or features into a narrative. Or, it may even involve the social environment, such as including other individuals and objects associated with them (like the scribe's tape recorder, for example) in a narrative. By incorporating these objects or features, which are shared with others, into their stories, children are attempting to involve them in a dialogue based on meaningful social interactions which they have in common.

The third feature singled out for study in the literacy development of this budding community of readers and writers was related specifically to bilingual literacy development in the way that certain Spanish and English words were used in some childrens' narratives. These words held special meaning for bilingual children in a social context when sharing ideas through dictation and dramatization in two languages.

Finally, the fourth element considered was the manner in which the children actually extended some aspects of the narratives developed during the classroom intervention beyond the classroom community and incorporated them into the standardized post-test measure used to assess language proficiency -- the Pre-Language Assessment Scale (Pre-LAS).

These additional factors comprise crucial components of literacy development which occurred over the course of the research and will be discussed in this section.

A) The Development of Community Themes

One of the more important aspects of literacy development

which this study attempted to show was that, within the treatment group, certain ideas took on special meaning for the children. These ideas first appeared in one child's narrative and were subsequently shared in the context of story dramatization. By dramatizing the dictated narratives within the group, peers were able to experience another child's creativity first-hand in a very concrete manner by helping to act out the story. They actually participated in the unfolding of events as the scribe read the story aloud. In so doing they were able to establish a clearer understanding of what was being presented and share that knowledge in a social context through their acting out of different characters and actions being described in the story.

As various children dictated and dramatized their narratives, some ideas and characters were particularly meaningful to the group and were "picked up" by others to be incorporated into their own narrative(s) at a later date. Within the community there emerged <u>three</u> themes in particular which are worthy of mention here.

<u>1) "Falling in the garbage"</u> - This theme appeared on the very first day of the intervention with the treatment group. In Spanish, a four year girl dictated the following:

> There was a mouse. They stepped on him. A man hit him with sticks. The mouse died. The man threw the mouse in the garbage...

As this story was dramatized, the children all laughed when the mouse got thrown in the garbage. It was obvious that

this idea had struck a pleasing cord with the group. Over the course of the study, this notion of "falling in the garbage" was repeated specifically in ten narratives and variations on the theme appeared in 26 others. The variations involved characters falling down in general (such as "then they fell down" or "the witch fell" or "the ninja turtles fell down") or having characters falling in a particular context (such as "the man fell in the house" or "the cow fell in the snow" or "the cat fell in the trap" or "the Care Bears fell on the stone" or "Bambi fell on the ice") or having things fall on characters (such as "the apples fell on Goofy" or "the soda pop fell on the baby"). With the dramatization of each story involving "falling," the child actors would exaggerate the activity of falling, causing more laughter from the audience and thereby further rewarding the inclusion of this shared social idea, or group symbol, in the narratives.

2) "The police and going to jail" - Seeing police in the neighborhood and seeing people taken to jail is not an uncommon occurrence in the lives of these children. In their narratives it was possible to see them trying to reconcile the view of the police which they would see on television or in cartoons and that which was a part of their everyday lives. The first narrative dictated which portrayed the police taking someone to jail was dictated in Spanish by a four year old boy:

> A man went inside a house and fell down. There was a little car and the police came and killed the man and took him to jail. And the policeman had a key and the man in the jail ate it.

Over the course of the intervention the theme of police taking someone to jail was repeated specifically in 20 narratives and variations on the theme occurred in 16 others. The variations involved actions which were punished by going to jail (such as "the police got robbed, then they took the guy to jail" or "the lion went to jail because he bit the policeman" or "Robocop took the gang bangers to jail") or escaping from jail, sometimes with the use of key, which became a mini-theme ("the police snatched Batman but he escaped through the door because he didn't want to go to jail" or "The police came and took the lion to jail but the lion had a key so he went to the door and left" or "They put the Mario Brothers in jail then some kids gave 'em a key"), or in many instances the police just appeared at the beginning of the narrative and took someone to jail for no reason (such as "The police went to the house and took the boy to jail..." or "The police killed Mickey Mouse and took him to jail..." or "The police took the kids to jail..." or "The police threw the wolf in jail..."). As in the "falling" theme, with the dramatization of this particular idea children would exaggerate being carted off or have very gloomy faces while being locked up. These portrayals helped clarify the actions being dramatized and acted to further cement this symbol as a means of important communication among members of this group.

3) "The lion" - The use of the lion in the children's narratives was particularly fascinating to examine because it

provided the opportunity to see different characteristics which children attributed to lions. Some were based on reality and others on fantasy. In support of Applebee's argument (1978) that narratives can help children begin to learn to differentiate reality from fantasy by being exposed to various depictions of the same character, the lion first appeared as evil and ferocious. The lion was angry, ate people, hurt people, trapped people, wanted to bite people, frightened people and chewed the police. The first narrative with the lion as central character was dictated in Spanish by a five year old boy during Week 1 of the intervention:

> There was a lion. He's eating the people. He was in the forest and he was eating the people in the forest.

The lion made an impact. Over the course of the investigation the lion was a central character in 35 narratives dictated by the children in the treatment group. In the initial weeks of the study, there was one child who was hesitant to tell a story. Numerous attempts resulted in him running away or sitting at the story table but not saying anything. However, it was often possible to see him standing a few feet away from the story table, closely watching the scribe interacting with other children who were telling their stories. He always paid careful attention during the dramatization of stories, though initially he was unwilling to participate in acting them out. At the end of Week 2 he finally felt comfortable enough to sit quietly at the story

table with the scribe. When asked by the scribe, in Spanish, what he wanted to tell a story about, he said only two words: "un león" (English: a lion). Though he did not dictate anything else on that day, it was possible to see the influence the literacy activities had for him. Over the first two weeks of the study, even though his participation could not be directly observed, he had obviously been closely watching the dictation and dramatization of the stories among the other children.

The community reached a turning point in Week 10 of the investigation when one of the better story-tellers in the group went to Circus Vargas and saw lions in reality. He chose to include them in his narrative for that week. In Spanish, he dictated:

> I went to Circus Vargas yesterday... there were elephants chained together by their tails... there were many tigers and lions. They were walking in a circle. There was Mickey Mouse...

In this context, the lions are seen as having another side to their existence. They were a small part of a larger picture. At Circus Vargas they were able to coexist with other animals and people without killing everything in sight. During the dramatization of this narrative, the "lions" (portrayed by various children) walked in a very orderly fashion around in a little circle and not one let out a roar or acted in ferocious manner.

After the dictation and dramatization of the "circus" narrative, of the remaining twelve stories dictated with lions

as characters, six portrayed the lion in a different light (such as "Mickey Mouse let the lion in his house" or "the lion took He-Man for a ride" or "Mickey Mouse and Donald Duck and the lion were sitting down" or "Batman and Superboy flew with the lion" or "Goofy and the lion went in the water to get away from the sun").

In summary, through careful examination of the narrative data, it is possible to see that themes evolved in the community via dictation and dramatization within the group. By sharing ideas and meaning with each other in the context of dictation and dramatization, children not only learned how to communicate more effectively in their narratives by choosing to dictate about topics and characters which were most important to the group, even incorporating variations on the themes in many instances. They learned as well to reshape and rethink their ideas in order to establish new understandings and conceptualizations about the world around them.

B) Use of the Physical and Social Environment

As children get acquainted with literacy activities centered around narrative dictation and dramatization, they are often hesitant and unsure of what is expected. Utilizing "props" from the surrounding area in their stories has two major functions. First, in the early stages of story dictation activities, props may provide an anchor around which to build an idea by creating an opportunity for a child to get started and become more familiar with the process of story telling.

second, they can provide an opportunity to share with others (McLane & McNamee, 1990). This sharing occurs because the others in the group will be familiar with and able to relate to the objects which become ingredients in the story. In this way the children can utilize those same objects in different ways in other stories, which opens many doors to improved communication.

Props may be physical, such as objects which are in a classroom, especially in the surrounding area where story dictation occurs (for example, wall hangings or a chair). They may also be social, in the sense that some objects are tied to specific individuals, such as the scribe or other peers in the classroom. Without that individual, a particular prop would not be present (for example, the scribe's tape recorder).

In the initial days of the research, before the community themes had been developed, children were searching for material to serve as the subject for, and be incorporated into, their stories. Almost immediately children began to look around the classroom at what was on the walls and in the physical area by the story table.

In one area close to the story table there were displays made out of two dimensional cardboard figures created by the teacher and aide which portrayed various seasonal motifs (such as a witch, goblins and pumpkins for Halloween; a turkey, pilgrims and Indians for Thanksgiving; Santa Claus, presents and reindeer for Christmas). Children found ways to

incorporate these characters into their stories:

Halloween:

> The boy came in the house with a knife. Then the wicked witch eat him. Then he eat the sopa [English: soup] and the milk and the juice. The cat was fighting with the pumpkin because he wants to eat the pumpkin. Then he went back home. Then he wanted to go with his mother because he wanted to take a bath. (Dictated in English)

Thanksgiving:

> The turkey is eating up all the food. Then he ate up the mouse. Mickey Mouse went to the stars. (Dictated in Spanish)
>
> There were many Indians that shot a bunch of arrows to kill the kids because they were in the Indians' tomb. Then they tied them up with rope. Then they stuck them with the arrows. Then they put them in the fire. Then they took them out and put them in the water. They threw hot water on them. They stuck them again with the arrows. (Dictated in Spanish)

Christmas:

> Once upon a time there was Santa Claus. Then he got in his sleigh. Then he brought some people what he makes toys. Then the reindeers came and they flied and then that's it. The end. (Dictated in English)

In these instances, it is possible to see the importance attributed to these "props" by the children in the way they are included in their narratives. Sometimes they provide the focus for a child's creative wanderings (such as the story about the kids in the Indians' tomb). In other cases it can be seen that the children consider these characters important enough to place in their narratives even if they are not exactly tied integrally to a particular context (such as the Halloween story or the Thanksgiving story about the turkey and Mickey Mouse).

In still other narratives, the child looked at the various figures and constructed a narrative just based on taking the visual images and arranging them chronologically (such as the Christmas story).

But, within the surrounding area, the most long lasting impact on the narratives told by the treatment group children came from their encounters with some different characters.

Immediately overhead and on the walls which joined to form a corner, known as the "story area", there were several two-dimensional, brightly colored, cardboard figures of various Disney characters involved in doing certain actions. There was a figure of Mickey Mouse dressed in a wizard's cloak with a background of stars behind him; a figure of Donald Duck dressed in a chef's outfit making a large wedding cake; a figure of Goofy standing under an apple tree; a figure of Jimminy Cricket trying to open an umbrella; and a figure of some chipmunks scrambling to get acorns in a tree.

The vast appeal that these characters held for these preschool children could be seen on the first day of Week 2 when one child chose to start a story in Spanish with, "Mickey Mouse went to the stars..." From that point on, children incorporated the Disney characters on a continual basis in their stories throughout the fourteen weeks of the investigation.

Table 24 presents the number of times children used the various Disney characters in their narratives.

Table 24

Use of Disney Characters
in Treatment Group Narratives

Disney Character	Times Used
Mickey Mouse	72
Donald Duck	55
Goofy	34
Minnie Mouse	11
Chipmunks	11
Jimminy Cricket	6
Pluto	5
Daisy Duck	2

Over the course of the intervention, as the community themes developed and children grew more comfortable with the scribe, their peers and the process of story telling, the activities the Disney characters engaged in developed from initially being confined to the activities portrayed on the classroom wall (such as "Mickey Mouse went to the stars..." or "Donald Duck was making a cake" or "Goofy got some apples," etc.) until these characters were eventually experiencing many escapades and adventures which were only limited by a child's imagination. One narrative in particular represents this, dictated in Spanish by a five year old toward the end of the investigation:

> Once upon a time, Donald Duck was walking and came across an alligator and he ran and he fell in the water, and the crocodile too. Donald Duck took off

> walking and the crocodile couldn't see him. Then Mickey saw Donald Duck was running all of the sudden and he said to him, "Why are you running?." Then Donald Duck said there were two crocodiles! Then Donald Duck and Mickey Mouse ran away. The end.

From the earliest stages of the research, children were constantly trying to improve on their story telling abilities. This was shown in the way children attempted to clarify their ideas and make themselves better understood to the scribe and their peers. For example, one key factor in this development was describing a sound or an action to the scribe, which they were unable to effectively express, in order that the scribe put it into clear and coherent language which all could share and understand. The first instance occurred in Week 3 when one child suddenly stopped in the middle of dictation, looked at the scribe, clasped his hands together to demonstrate a closing motion, and said, "para hacer así" (English: to go like this), in order to describe how a trap would clamp down on a mouse in his story. Several children were standing around watching.

This opened the floodgates for a whole new way to get one's point across. By sharing ideas with one more competent in describing certain actions (the scribe), new territory was being opened up for exploration.

Numerous stories followed which involved showing the scribe an action to be put into words: "las arañas andaban así" (English: the spiders were walking like this); "the Ninja turtles went like this --"szhhhzzh" -- with their swords"; "la bruja estaba como..." (English: the witch was like... [and

then the child demonstrated a stirring motion]); "Goofy hizo..." (English: Goofy went... [and then the child demonstrated how Goofy was shaking something]).

One child even "told" an entire story by demonstrating. She started off by saying, "Había cucui..." (English: There was a boogey man) and then proceeded to show the boogey man eating, falling, running, carrying a chair, playing with dolls and blocks, walking on its knees and finally dying. As she would demonstrate, the scribe would put her actions into words and say them out loud. She would then agree or disagree with how something was said. If the wording wasn't quite right, she would then correct it.

The scribe was useful in another aspect of children's story telling, by providing material which could be used in the stories. Sometimes this was done unconsciously.

On the story table were pieces of paper on which to write the dictated stories, a red pen, red construction paper sheets (which served as a frame for stories once they were dictated so they could be put on the "wall of stories" for the week), a stapler, a roll of masking tape, and, of particular interest for the children, the tape recorder (which allowed daily verification of stories dictated in order to make sure they had been transcribed correctly).

On the first day of story dictation, all the children were gathered in a circle and it was explained that the tape recorder was there to make sure that their stories were heard

correctly. However, it was very important that they never touch the tape recorder because it could be easily broken. This point was emphasized and the children were asked to repeat out loud together the main rule when telling stories: "no tocar la máquina" (English: don't touch the recorder). Because the children would forget, this regulation would be repeated periodically, sometimes on a one-to-one basis and other times with the group.

This really had an impact on many of the children who found interesting ways to incorporate a tape recorder in their narratives. Sometimes a tape recorder would just appear in the stories and other times it would fall and/or get broken.

Through a close, warm, mentoring relationship established around composition and editing of the children's stories the scribe herself influenced what children chose to incorporate into their narratives, though unintentionally, because of a tendency to wear jewelry which often caught the attention of some children. These social "props" would also occasionally appear in the stories.

One four year old girl in particular seemed to capture in her narratives, dictated in Spanish, several dimensions of narrative development at the same time -- a sense of the community themes, described in Part A of this section, combined with the physical and social props in the environment. Following the progression in this one child's narratives over the course of the investigation can serve as an example of what

was happening in varying degrees to all children involved in the study.

In her earliest narratives, the influence of the community theme of "falling in the garbage" is apparent as well as the focus on the scribe's tape recorder (relevant phrases have been underlines).

> There was a mouse. They stepped on him. A man hit him with sticks. The mouse died. The man threw the mouse in the garbage. The father hit the little girl because she was bothering him a lot. The girl hit her father and she wanted to grab the tape recorder.
>
> The cat ate the little girl. The lion bit the cat and threw him in the garbage. The lion has a table and the mouse ate the cat and bit him and threw him in the garbage. And the father hit the little girl because she had a cat. The girl hit her father and hit her little sister and brother and her mother.

In her next three narratives, it is possible to see the increasing influence of social props (tape recorder, papers, jewelry) related to the scribe as they appear throughout the stories.

> The mouse ate up the toy. The little girl hit her father because she went outside. She put rings on her hand. She broke them and the father hit the girl because she wanted to grab the tape recorder. She grabbed the toys and took them to the pool. She took the papers and took them to the pool.
>
> The father hit Mickey Mouse because he grabbed the book. Donald Duck was there. He was smelling the flower. An elephant grabbed the earrings and the elephant grabbed the book. The elephant grabbed the bracelet and necklaces and put them on.
>
> Once upon a time there was a girl and elephant. She did her finger nails. The elephant got the apples from the tree. He took them to cut them. The recorder got the girl's voice. The elephant got the papers. He got the pearls and he ripped some clothes.

On the day the following narrative was told, dental assistants, hired by the Board of Education to provide service to Head Start Programs, were in the room giving the children a dental check-up. The scribe's jewelry continues to hold attraction for this girl.

> The cat ate the toothpaste [the children had just had their dental check-up provided by the Board of Education]. The father hit the cat. The cat bit the girl because the girl hit the cat. The cat grabbed the pearls on the bracelet and the clown hit the girl because she grabbed the beads and the lights on the bracelet. The end.

In the next narrative, this girl is beginning to extend her point of reference beyond the immediate classroom to what she saw on television at home. She brings it in for others to share, however, she still finds a way to include a social prop of the scribe and return to a familiar idea expressed in previous stories ("grabbing").

> On Sesame Street there was a clown. He ate up everything. The clown grabbed the little girl and ate her because he loved her. She grabbed the tape recorder. The end.

After a period of absence for several weeks during the Christmas holiday, the girl returned and dictated her last narrative. It is possible to see how she returns to the familiar props in the area and even goes back to a Halloween theme as providing the focus, and anchor, for her story. The quality of the sentences are different in that they are not as complex or involved as before. The length of the story overall is also shorter than previous attempts. It is as though she is working at getting her feet on solid ground again.

> Once upon a time there was a witch. She frightened the little girl. The witch went home. She made some cake. A clown hit her with a stick and he ate up the cake. The end.

These narratives show a sense of the progression that many children made in their dictations. Some characters remain important to children (in this case, the father and the girl in particular) while others change. Certain activities remain constant (such as hitting this character or that) while others change. The community themes ("getting thrown in the garbage" and "the lion") were developed in the different ways that they were incorporated into the narratives. New elements of stories combined with old to create a different story that would be a new contribution based on familiar foundations established within the community. The impact of the physical environment (the Disney characters) as well as the social environment (the scribe's tape recorder and appearance) may also be seen in the way that they are included in the stories. The props figure prominently and usually are the reason for some action occurring (for example, the girl gets punished because she grabbed and/or broke things she was not supposed to touch, etc.). And, the actions, in turn, are often the consequences of bad behavior on the part of some character(s).

In this way, by incorporating various aspects of the physical and social life of the classroom into their narratives, the children in the treatment group were able to enrich their skills. By carefully thinking about what they were going to say before they spoke, they contributed something

new, while at the same time their story dictations were tied to the familiar daily experiences shared within the community (McLane & McNamee, 1990). They told more complex and coherent stories (Applebee, 1978). They told more interesting stories which captured the attention of their peers (McLane & McNamee, 1990). And, over time they told stories which were more meaningful to the group. They were able to quite naturally combine the physical and social elements of their community in order to improve their literacy skills and effectively tell their stories as part of the larger social relationships which contributed to that development.

C) Use of English and Spanish Words

Vygotsky (1935) argues that bilingualism is an aspect of development which is best studied dynamically rather than statistically. Since individuals differ in their levels of understanding and proficiency, it is important to not only examine group change but individual change in development over time based on the point where one began.

This idea is particularly relevant in this research since the children differed in their pre-test levels of English and Spanish language proficiency. However, what propelled the children to strive for a more complete understanding of the second language was the importance of social relationships and the meaning that developed among members of the group in the context of the dictation and dramatization activities. The way that children shared and used English and Spanish words in this

study seemed to be more a way of sharing experiences and meanings rather than sharing the words themselves. This sharing provided a way to view concepts about the world and life (Bruner, 1980). As the social relationships with the scribe and peers in the classroom developed, the most important thing was to communicate (Fillmore, 1976, 1979). With a scribe who spoke both English and Spanish, children were aware that their words would be understood, and thus they had no restrictions placed on their creativity in this regard.

This can be demonstrated with a few examples. In Week 4, one five year old girl who dictated primarily in English, told the following narrative.

> Lo llevaron a la cárcel. They took the kid to jail. [Then she said, "No, no wait, take that out" and continued] My brother got at the traffics. My landlord took me and my mom and Gumby and Carlos. Then we came home and then we dropped off Gumby by his house. Then we came home by ourself. Then we fall asleep. Then in the morning we came to school. My brother always gets in tension and punish because he's across the street from the boulevard. And he smells glue.

What is particularly interesting about this narrative is that she had been standing around the story table listening to other children dictate their narratives before it was her turn. She was so "pulled" by their stories, that she originally started with the community theme about getting carted off to jail. The other dictations had been in Spanish, so that is how she began. When she got the first sentence completed, she then realized that she would prefer to speak in English so she translated the first Spanish sentence into English. Then she

realized that she really did not want to dictate a story about someone going to jail after all, so she shifted again to tell her own story about significant events related to her daily life, especially concerning her brother.

In this girl's very next dictation, something completely different occurs. This time she is telling a narrative in English, but because of the impact that the social setting had on her as she witnessed a particular event (individuals gathering around a child found injured -- or killed -- in a car) she is no longer worried about the scribe understanding what she is saying and the need to translate.

> They picked up a kid. He was dead in the car and his name was Ernie. Someone beat him up. Then the ambulance came and they took him. They took him to the hospital. Then his sister came and his mother came and said, " Por qué le iba eso?" [English: Why did this happen to him?] Then the ambulance took him to the hospital. Then after tomorrow the mother will go to him. All the kids were there and my mother, grandmother, Lupe and Elsa and Freddie and Robert.

The exclamation made by the mother flows completely naturally in the context of her dictation, because that is the way she remembered it. She is relating what she experienced and wishes to share with the others in the community. There is a level of mutual understanding and trust which has developed.

The meanings of words can be especially seen in a bilingual study as children come to associate a newly learned word in a second language with a significant experience. One four year old girl had recently moved from Mexico and had just witnessed her first snow fall. She came to school quite

excited on one December day and asked the scribe to put her first on the list to tell stories that day. In her story, it is not clear whether the girl is confusing cows and horses for reindeer. What is clear is that having learned a new word to describe a new experience it is important for her to share this knowledge with the scribe and others through her narrative.

> Había una vez una vaca y un niño que lo vió a ventana y la vaca estaba cayendo en el snow y los tres vacas brincó y se fué arriba. El Santa Claus andaba volando con los caballos y le trajo muchos juguetes. El niño se hizo muy feo porque Santa Claus no le trajo nada y Santa Claus había bien contento. La mama y papa hizo "hah" cuando vieron a Santa Claus. Había mucha snow.
>
> [English: There was a cow and a little boy who saw it through a window and the cow was falling in the snow and three cows jumped and went way up high. Santa Claus was flying with the horses and brought lots of toys. The little boy was acting bad because Santa Claus didn't bring him anything and Santa Claus was very happy. The mother and father went "hah" when they saw Santa Claus. There was a lot of snow.]

In addition, the cow falling reflects one of the community themes and the excitement over Santa Claus is obvious. This child found a unique and creative way to share her new found knowledge with others by making it relevant to the community.

This same little girl also found a way to share some more new English words in the following story by relating another event which was important to her -- her birthday. In this narrative several things are happening. One of the children in the group had just had a birthday. Her mother had brought a cake to class for all the children to share and everyone sang "Happy Birthday". This must have had an impact. In addition,

this provided an excellent opportunity to try out two new English words she had just learned. The last two sentences in the narrative are especially noteworthy because they refer to the dramatization of stories which took place in class daily. She is saying that when it is her birthday, she wants to play the part of the birthday girl -- Angelica -- and her best friend in the class -- Janet -- will play the part of the birthday cake.

> Mi happy birthday mi mama dió un regalo y todas mis amigas me invitaron para mi happy birthday pero no ahorita porque no es mi happy birthday. Luego cuando era mi happy birthday me cierron en mi cuarto y le hicieron muy recio la puerta. Y cuando tengo mi happy birthday yo voy a querer a ser Angelica y Janet va a hacer el pastel.
>
> [English: My happy birthday my mother gave me a present and all my girlfriends invited me for my happy birthday but not right now because it's not my happy birthday. Then when it was my happy birthday they locked me in my room and closed the door real hard. And when I have my happy birthday I'm going to be Angelica and Janet is going to be the cake.]

In a very natural way, this little girl is incorporating a significant event in her own life with the everyday life of the classroom and is coming to understand that she can express this more effectively through the literacy activities at school. She is also attempting new ways of communicating by trying out new words in a social context where those words are given a shared meaning among the members of the community. In her example, it is possible to see the rich, complex life that ideas take on in the social network of this bilingual classroom.

These narratives are presented here to show that words and the way they are used are tied to social relationships which have been established over time. During the course of this investigation, children learned new words and exchanged Spanish and English through listening to other children dictate narratives, through hearing the scribe reread sentences and ask questions of those telling stories, through talking to peers about the parts they wanted to play, and through the daily dramatization of the stories in the classroom. Learning a second language flowed naturally out of these literacy activities. For these children, whether the words were initially English or Spanish was not as important as the sharing of experiences which developed through the scribe in a bilingual context and were meaningful to the community engaged in the dictation and dramatization of their own stories.

D) Impact of Narratives on Pre-LAS Post-test

At post-test for the Pre-LAS, one by one, each child was removed from the classroom where the research for this study took place. S/he was taken down a long hallway where the only other individual in the room was the investigator doing the post-test Pre-LAS assessment. In the small room were old empty bookcases, some stacks of folding chairs, various planks of wood off to the side, a large formica table which had the Pre-LAS assessment on it and two chairs. There were no brightly colored figures, no props, no peers, no story table, no familiar setting. And yet, the children still found a way to

incorporate their narratives into the assessment.

As discussed in Section I of this chapter, there were two of the four Pre-LAS scales used which approximated the intervention undertaken in the classroom -- "Finishing Stories (English/Spanish)" and "Let's Tell Stories (English/Spanish)." The children's responses to these two tasks offer another opportunity to examine the influence of the classroom intervention on their language proficiency and development at the time of the post-test.

1) Finishing Stories

The Pre-LAS scale, "Finishing Stories (English)," requires a child to finish five "stories," started by the investigator, in a manner which makes sense. There are two practice stories to help children get a better idea of what is being asked of them. The scale is administered as follows:

Practice: I lost my shoe and then...
Practice: Ralph was very hungry and so...

1) The little bear was very cold so...
2) My cat jumped up on the table because...
3) All the kids went to the park and then...
4) The blue dragon is very sad because...
5) Before it rained...

Nine children showed indications of extending the classroom literacy activities and incorporating them into the "Finishing Stories" post-test. The extent to which the children did this varied. To illustrate this, the following are some chosen examples of some post-test responses for this scale and are important to consider in the context of the

intervention undertaken in the classroom.

1) Physical and social props:

All the kids went to the park and then...
escribieron hojas de la maestra
[English: they were writing on sheets (of paper) from the teacher]

My cat jumped on the table because...
estaba rayando la mesa con la lápiz
[English: he was drawing lines on the table with a pencil]

Practice: Ralph was very hungry and so...
si me comes una grabadora me duele la panza
[English: if I eat the tape recorder my stomach is going to hurt]

2) Characters/animals dictated in narratives:

Before it rained...
un cocodrilo estaba comiendo
[English: a crocodile was eating]

All the kids went to the park and then...
vino Pato Donald
[English: Donald Duck came]

The blue dragon is very sad because...
vino una oveja
[English: a sheep came]

Before it rained...
vino uno coyote
[English: one coyote came]

3) Community theme of "falling down":

The little bear was very cold so...
que se cayó
[English: it fell down]

My cat jumped up on the table because...
que se cayó
[English: it fell down]

All the kids went to the park and then...
que se cayó
[English: someone fell down]

The blue dragon is very sad because...

que se cayó
[English: it fell down]

Before it rained...
que se cayó
[English: it fell down]

4) Lengthy response (mini-narratives), characters, props:

Practice: Ralph was very hungry and so...
le duele la panza y luego va a ir a la escuela porque en la escuela hay comer
[English: his stomach hurts and then he's going to go to school because at school there is food]

The little bear was very cold so...
tiene frío y buscó un abrigo y era de la señorilla y luego se vestió de un oso y cortó y mató un perro
[English: it's cold and it looked for a coat and it was from a lady and then it dressed up like a bear and cut up and killed a dog]

My cat jumped up on the table because...
porque en un traje de Halloween y luego salió la sangre fea
[English: because in a Halloween costume and then ugly blood came out]

The blue dragon is very sad because...
porque le dejan a comer dulce y porque los dientes picados
[English: because they let him eat a sweet and because his teeth hurt -- dental visit]

Before it rained...
hay nieve, para se quitar la nieve y luego puso un sombrillo y luego se rompió el sombrillo y era de un señorillo
[English: there is snow, to get rid of the snow and then he put on a hat and then he broke the hat and it was a man's hat]

The Pre-LAS scale, "Finishing Stories (Spanish)", requires a child to finish five "stories", started by the investigator, in a manner which makes sense. There are two practice stories to help children get a better idea of what is being asked of

them. They are:

Practice: Fuí al parque y luego...
[English: I went to the park and then...]
Practice: El caballo está contento porque...
[English: the horse is happy because...]

1) Si me levanto temprano...
[English: If I get up early...]
2) Los niños tenían hambre así que...
[English: The children were hungry so...]
3) Fuimos a la fiesta y luego...
[English: We went to the party and then...]
4) Antes de vestirme...
[English: Before I get dressed...]
5) Después de jugar un rato...
[English: After playing a while...]

Even though this post-test was not administered by the scribe, several children still extended their literacy activities into this setting. The following post-test responses by a number of the children on this scale are important to consider in the context of the intervention undertaken in the classroom because their responses show that they are thinking of themes and characters from their own previously dictated narratives or those told by others and dramatized in the classroom.

1) Characters dictated in narratives:

If I get up early...
sale un ratón
[English: a mouse comes out]

We went to the party and then...
se entró un caballo
[English: a horse came in]

We went to the party and then...
salió un lobo
[English: a wolf came out]

2) Community theme of "falling down":
The children were hungry so...

se cayeron
[English: they fell down]

We went to the party and then...
es que se cayó
[English: someone fell down]

After playing a while...
es que se cayeron
[English: they fell down]

It is particularly informative to see how one girl chose to dictate her narrative, line by line, as the scale was successively administered.

If I get up early...
cuento mi cuento
[English: I'm telling my story]

The children were hungry so...
Cinderella no los deja comer
[English: Cinderella didn't let them eat]

We went to the party and then...
le dijo Cinderella que no comiera
[English: Cinderella said not to eat]

Before I get dressed...
escribimos todo
[English: we're writing down everything]

The examples presented in this section show the impact of the classroom intervention on how some children chose to finish their stories at post-test using the scales, "Finishing Stories (English)", and "Finishing Stories (Spanish)". This impact occurred in the continuous social interaction between the adults and peers in the community who shared the special meaning of English and Spanish words through dictation and dramatization in the classroom over the course of the investigation. Children were able to expand their abilities to other situations and try out comfortable, familiar ideas in new

contexts. They began with the skills and ideas they had already mastered as their foundation and tried incorporating them into new situations. This served to expand their overall early literacy abilities and extend their community to include other new members, thereby increasing the number of significant individuals who would contribute to this development across a wider array of activities.

In some cases, children referred to props they had become familiar with in the classroom environment during the course of the research (such as sheets of paper, the tape recorder, pencils, making lines). In some instances they used community themes (falling down) or referred to fairy tales (Cinderella, the "wolf") or characters which had been part of the life of the classroom (crocodiles, Donald Duck, a coyote, the Halloween cat).

In the post-test assessment using the Pre-LAS scale, "Finishing Stories (English)," one child seemed to understand the task at hand within the context that he would tell stories in the classroom. He often needed help getting started. The scribe would start with a question or an idea and he would develop it. He would often include in his narratives phrases like, "Then (such and such a character) came..." (and then he would continue with what happened to the character). In this assessment, it is as though he was given the action and felt the need to put in the characters he wanted (All the kids went to the park and then Donald Duck came; The blue dragon is very

sad because a sheep came; Before it rained a coyote came).

Some children used this scale to develop lengthy endings to the stories and formulate narratives which went far beyond what was required. They also incorporated what they had experienced in the classroom. What is most significant is that these children finished several of the stories in a logical manner but did not receive any credit for a correct response because they spoke in Spanish -- the language of dictation they always used in the classroom with the scribe who was administering the English Pre-LAS. These children were aware that the scribe fully understood what they were saying when they spoke. They understood what was being said in English but automatically responded in the language they felt more comfortable using for oral expression. This created a difficult situation in scoring since many children received lower scores not based on their lack of understanding but simply because they chose to respond in their dominant language.

In the post-test assessment using the scale, "Finishing Stories (Spanish)," the responses given by the child who used it as an opportunity to tell her story about "Cinderella" are especially noteworthy. When this child was administered the English post-test on the scale, "Finishing Stories (English)," she indicated to the investigator several times that she wished to tell her story about Cinderella. The investigator (the author of this study who served as the scribe in the classroom

during the course of the investigation) indicated that there was not enough time to do it then and perhaps it could be arranged on another occasion in the classroom. This child wanted to tell her narrative so badly that she waited for the post-test assessment on this scale in Spanish with the assistant on this project (a totally different person in a totally different context) and then used it as a forum to tell her story. It is as though she takes each sentence and manipulates it to her own agenda (If I get up early I'm telling my story; The children were hungry so Cinderella didn't let them eat; We went to the party and then Cinderella said not to eat; Before I get dressed we're writing down everything).

2) Let's Tell Stories

The Pre-LAS scale, "Let's Tell Stories (English)," requires a child to tell a story back in the same language in which it has been heard (English or Spanish) in a manner that makes sense. The stories are told with accompanying pictures which a child can refer to as the story is retold. The stories are as follows:

> Story 1:
> Last spring Mr. Winkle planted some potatoes in his garden. The potatoes grew and grew. In the fall, Mr. Winkle dug up the potatoes and made vegetable soup. The soup had carrots and peas and tomatoes and potatoes. "I can't eat this soup all by myself," Mr. Winkle said. So he invited all his neighbors over to help him eat it up.
>
> Story 2:
> One afternoon Sally and Michael were playing ball in the front yard when they lost the ball. They looked everywhere. They looked in the bushes and under the

house. They even looked in Fluffy's dog house, but they couldn't find the ball. Finally, they saw that Fluffy was barking and jumping up in front of a tree. When they looked up in the tree, there was the ball. They couldn't find the ball, but Fluffy could.

The responses given by several treatment group children on this scale are worthy of mention because it is possible to see how children interpreted these stories in the context of the story dictation and dramatization which had occurred in the classroom.

1) Story 1: Estaban jugando con la pelota. Estaban buscandola. Estaban buscando la pelota en la casita del perrito. Ya le encontró Goofy.
[English: They were playing with the ball. They were looking for it. They were looking for the ball in the dog's house. Goofy found it.]

2) Story 1: Que se cayó, que se cayó, la tierra, manzanas, caldo, mesa, están comiendo, que se cayeron.
[English: He fell down, he fell down, the land, apples, stew, table, they're eating, they fell down.]

Story 2: Jugando la pelota, el wow-wow, que se cayó es que a matarlo, bote, bote, que se está cayendo.
[English: Playing with the ball, the wow-wow, he fell down to kill it, jump, jump, he's falling.]

3) Story 2: La pelota se quedó en el árbol y el perro quería agachar y no pudo porque estaba grande el árbol. Estaban jugando con la pelota y se cayó la nina. Se metieron para la pelota, estaba adentro.
[English: The ball stayed in the tree and the dog wanted to get it and he couldn't because the tree was too big. They were playing with the ball and the girl fell down. They went inside for the ball; someone was inside.]

4) Story 2: Están jugando la pelota. Están buscando la pelota; están viendo donde Goofy tiene escondido la pelota. Luego encontró. Play

to the ball; jumping; jugando.
[English: They're playing with the ball. They're looking for the ball; they're seeing where Goofy has hidden the ball. Then found it. Play to the ball, jumping, playing.]

5) Story 2: Jugando la pelota un niño; se cayó la niña; se cayó el niño para si hay ver mas perros; perro quiere la pelota para jugar solo. [English: Boy playing with the ball; the girl fell down, the boy fell down to see if there are more dogs. Dog wants the ball to play alone.]

It is also important to note that in these examples, with the exception of Story 2 as retold by Child # 4, all children received a score of 0 (out of 5 possible) on their retelling of narratives because they did not use English words. Child # 4 received a score of 1 (out of 5 possible) for using a few English words (play to the ball; jumping) which reflected a general understanding of part of the story. What is obvious from these examples, however, is that they did understand much of what was being told to them in English but chose to respond in their dominant language.

Of additional interest is the context in which they chose to incorporate the community theme related to falling. It will be remembered that in Story 1, "fall" is mentioned as a season. It is unclear whether the children heard the word "fall" (noun) and understood it as "to fall" (verb) then translated it when they retold the stories. However, examining the context of their responses it would seem more likely that they took the theme of falling, as initially shared in the classroom during the intervention, and incorporated it into

their narrative. In Story 2 there was no mention of the noun or verb "fall" and yet children still found a way to incorporate it.

It is also interesting to note that Child #1 and Child #4 used the Disney character, Goofy, in their responses. Each child saw him in a different light -- with Child #1 he saved the day by finding the ball; with Child #4 he was the one who hid it. This shows that they were extending into new situations what they had learned during the classroom intervention. They took the familiar character Goofy and yet were able to imagine him doing something completely different than anything previously attributed to him in the classroom. In this way they were extracting the essence (Vygotsky, 1978), the meaning of those interactions -- they took the familiar and were able to transfer it to a different situation where it would be shared with others in a new context (McLane & McNamee, 1990). In this way everyone learns. This was the whole point of the intervention.

The Pre-LAS scale, "Let's Tell Stories (Spanish)," presents two stories which children are to retell back in Spanish in a way that makes sense. The stories are as follows:

> Story 1:
> Había una vez una hormiguita muy bonita que se llamaba Martina. Un día Martina preparó una sopa muy rica para su marido, el guapo ratoncito Perez. Luego Martina salió. Perez olió la sopa, subió en un taburete, y ¡zas!, se cayó en la sopa. Cuando Martina regresó y vió a su marido flotando en la sopa, gritó muy fuerte. Vinieron corriendo todos los amigos y sacaron al ratoncito Perez. Todos estaban muy contentos y celebraron con una fiesta.

[English: Once upon a time a there was a pretty little lady ant named Martina. One day Martina prepared a very delicious soup for her husband, the handsome mouse Perez. Then Martina left. Perez smelled the soup, climbed up on a stool and, yow, he fell in the soup. When Martina came back and saw her husband floating in the soup, she let out a scream. All their friends came running and they saved Perez the mouse. Everyone was happy and they celebrated with a party.]

Story 2:
Había una vez un globo grande y amarillo que era amigo de una niña. Ella lo llevó a todas partes hasta que un día el viento se lo llevó. La niña estaba muy triste, pero el globo dijo, "Que bien, me voy de viaje!" Muy contento, el globo voló y voló y voló. Pero cuando llegó la noche el globo se sentía muy solito y decidió regresar a la casa de la niña. Así que voló toda la noche y cuando amaneció, el globo estaba otra vez con su amiga.

[English: Once upon a time there was a big yellow balloon that was the friend of a little girl. She took it everywhere with her until one day the wind got a hold of it and carried it away. The girl was very say but the balloon said, "This is great, I'm going on a trip!" Happily the balloon flew and flew and flew. But when night came the balloon felt very lonely and decided to return to the girl's house. So, it flew all night and when dawn came, the balloon was once again with its friend.]

The following responses by several children on this scale are worthy of closer examination because here too children are providing further evidence of how meaningful the classroom intervention has been in their understanding of stories.

The examples above provide further evidence of the children extending what they learned during the course of the intervention into a new setting. That learning was based on the way that social interaction contributed to literacy development in the characters and themes that children chose to include in their stories.

1) Story 1: Este, el raton, se cayó aquí. Le sacaron sus amigos. Vino el ratón a se metió a su casa y vino lo cornejito y uno cocodrilo.
[English: This, the mouse, fell here. His friends got him. The mouse went inside his house and the bunny rabbit and one crocodile came.]

2) Story 1: Estaba una hormiga que se llama Caperocita y un ratoncito se fué a la sopa y cuando rellesaba le llamó a sus, los amigos y una fiesta.
[English: There was an ant named Little Red Riding Hood and a mouse went to the soup and when he got full he called to his, the friends and a party.]

3) Story 2: Se estaba cayendo un señor; se cayó; que hay un monitos.
[English: A man fell down; he fell; there are dolls (in this instance "dolls" does not refer to baby dolls but action figures such as GI Joe, Rambo, robots, soldiers, etc.]

4) Story 1: Se cayó este el amigo de la niña. Se cayó, esta cerrado, se cayó, se cayó.
[English: This, the friend of the girl, fell down. He fell down, it's closed, he fell, he fell.]

In these examples, the familiar classroom characters are again in evidence. Child #1 brings in a bunny rabbit and a crocodile in her retelling of Story 1. For Child #2, the ant's name was not Martina, as indicated in the story. It was Little Red Riding Hood, a character used often in the classroom narratives.

The influence of the "falling" community theme is obvious in the way that it is reflected in the Pre-LAS post-test. Even though the mouse, Perez, did fall into the soup in the beginning of Story 1, it is not just that these children remembered that occurring and were able to retell it. It is as

though they considered that the most important aspect of the story, retelling it again and again, instead of considering the rescue most important. The notion of "falling" was repeated several times. In some cases it was the only aspect of the story the children felt deserved to be mentioned.

Conclusion

This section has shown that though it was not possible to demonstrate a more favorable outcome for the treatment group following story dictation and dramatization as measured at post-test by either the Pre-LAS or Applebee scales, it can be demonstrated using a variety of other techniques.

Through close examination of the narratives dictated by the comparison and treatment groups, and by tracking progress for each child in the treatment group over the course of the research, it can be shown that there is a rich, complex life which was shared by members of the treatment group community (Gundlach et al. 1985; McLane & McNamee, 1990). The dynamic aspects of this community are not easily measured and quantified (Vygotsky, 1935), but the effects of the intervention were shown by examining, a) the development of community themes, b) the use of the physical and social environment in child narratives, c) the significance of certain Spanish and English words, and d) the extensions of the narratives in the Pre-LAS post-test measures on the scales, "Finishing Stories (English/Spanish)" and "Let's Tell Stories (English/Spanish)."

These results all point to literacy methods involving story dictation and dramatization as effective means for contributing to the literacy development of bilingual preschool children.

Section III: Other Possible Reasons for Nonsignificant Findings

The information presented thus far in Chapter V has attempted to show that the intervention used with the treatment group resulted in a level of increased literacy development. This was demonstrated in the way close social interaction among adults and peers in the bilingual preschool classroom influenced the dictation and dramatization of children's narratives. This type of development could not be adequately assessed with the quantitative and qualitative measures used in this investigation.

This third section addresses other possible reasons for finding no significant differences between comparison and treatment groups on the quantitative (Pre-LAS) and qualitative (Applebee, 1978) measures used.

Quantitative Assessment (Pre-LAS)

a) Length of investigation - This study was a cross-cultural replication of an investigation by McNamee and McLane (1984) and basically followed its time period -- approximately three months. Current research (Forman & Cazden, 1986; Pflaum, 1986) suggests that, though preschool children may understand what is being communicated in a second language, they will not

likely begin to speak that language within such a short period of time if they have a choice and if the exposure to the second language is limited (for example, the relatively short amount of time spent in contact with the second language in the preschool classroom versus the longer periods of time spent in contact with the dominant language at home).

b) Sample size - Initially the study was conceived to have 20 subjects in the comparison group and 40 subjects in the treatment group, a total of 60. Attrition reduced the total number to 54 subjects. When it became necessary to separately assess English and Spanish dominant children in each group, the numbers were reduced even further (Comparison Group: English Dominant = 11/Spanish Dominant = 9; Treatment Group: English Dominant = 5/Spanish Dominant = 29). These small sample groupings made it difficult to accurately assess the effects of the intervention undertaken with the treatment group.

c) Homogeneous groups - When the selection of groups was undertaken for this study, the variables of age and sex were considered and were controlled for within the comparison and treatment groups. Because the two sites being used were located in the same neighborhood of Chicago, and subjects were drawn from the same population, it was assumed that language dominance would be controlled for also. However, that was not the case. Within the comparison group 55% of the subjects were either English dominant or fairly bilingual, while within the treatment group 14% of the subjects were either English

dominant or fairly bilingual. Thus, non-homogeneous groups were created at pre-test. This caused statistical analysis of post-test findings to greatly favor the comparison group, especially on English Pre-LAS scales.

d) Pre-LAS limitations - In addition to the factors listed thus far, the Pre-LAS instrument was unable to capture many of the changes considered in this study. Children spontaneously creating narratives based on shared social themes; borrowing specific words, phrases and ideas from others; utilizing physical and social "props" in the environment; developing unique reconstructions -- the ability to determine language proficiency within this context of bilingual literacy development cannot be assessed using the Pre-LAS. With the Pre-LAS scales all children were responding to a set stimulus in an artificial situation, even if those scales involved story telling.

Qualitative Assessment

a) Physical surroundings - There were differences in physical surroundings which could have affected the ease and comfort which children felt when telling stories or during assessment of language dominance using the Pre-LAS.

The site of data gathering for the comparison group was a large building which housed several day care classrooms. When not being used for day care, it served as a meeting place for the community, providing counseling for individuals seeking information about amnesty, assisting individuals with filling

out tax forms, providing food packages to families in need, etc. It was a community center. Many children were familiar with the building, having entered it with parents or others prior to attendance in the day care program, and saw friends and family members visit regularly.

The site where data gathering took place for the treatment group occurred in a large magnet public school which served 1300 students from kindergarten through eighth grade. It was a large, imposing building with security guards in the hallways and was unavailable to the community after school hours. Children were brought into the school every day by their parents, who walked them down a long corridor to the Head Start classroom. Outside of peers and teachers in the classroom, the treatment group only saw friends and family members when they were dropped off or picked up.

b) Social surroundings - There were differences in teaching staff for the comparison and treatment groups which could have affected outcome.

In the comparison group, the head teacher was fully bilingual. She was very supportive, calm and sympathetic to the children and their needs. Of the two aides in the classroom, one spoke only Spanish and the other was bilingual. They were fully integrated in the activities the head teacher undertook with the children and were supportive.

In the treatment group, the head teacher spoke only English. She had a tendency to rush through activities and

consistently told the children to hurry because they were always "running late." The one aide in the classroom was fully bilingual and was very supportive of the children but was limited in her ability to interact with them because the teacher assigned her primarily administrative duties which constantly required her to be separated from the group. The head teacher chose not to participate in the story dictation and dramatization activities and viewed that time as an opportunity to take a break or get caught up on other tasks.

c) Applebee (1978) limitations - One particular difficulty emerged in discovering different levels of development <u>within</u> stages.

<u>Story coherence</u> - In looking at the coherence of narratives, for example, two stories may be coded as the same stage, but one may be more coherent. For example, one four year old boy dictated the following in Spanish:

> <u>Narrative 7</u>: Había una vez Mickey Mouse. Se quedó en la casa, jugando con los carritos. Se fué afuera para jugar con el patito. Se fueron con las ardillitas para comer cacahuates. Mickey Mouse hizo un pastel y se comieron. Se fueron en los carritos a comprar mas carritos. Jugaron en la casa.
>
> [English: Once upon a time there was Mickey Mouse. He stayed in the house, playing with cars. He went outside to play with the little duck. They went with the chipmunks to eat peanuts. Mickey Mouse made a cake and they ate it. They went in the cars to buy more cars. They played in the house.]
>
> <u>Narrative 8</u>: Había Mickey Mouse. Estaba con patito. Jugaron. Estaban jugando escondidas. Fueron a la escuela y hicieron una tarea. Se fueron para la casa y estaban durmidos. Fin.
>
> [English: There was Mickey Mouse. He was with the

little duck. They played. They were playing hide-and-seek. They went to school and did some work. They went home and went to sleep. The end.]

The above two narratives are both Stage 2, but there is a difference in the way the child is conceiving the stories. In Narrative #7 the child looks around at many "props" in the environment. They are loosely put together and there is some general progression through the events but they are not very connected. However, by examining Narrative #8, though shorter in length, it is possible to see the child thinking through what is being said so it makes more sense. It is apparent that the progression in the story is over the course of a day. It hangs together more than Narrative #7 and the inclusion of "the end" when this child is finished dictating clearly indicates that he realizes he is at the end of his story.

Story complexity - In looking at the complexity of narratives, while several may have a sense of beginning, middle and end, one may have a better example of these features. Consider the retelling of the following fairy tales in English by a five year old boy:

Narrative 1: The big bad wolf was after the three little pigs. He blew down the house. They burned his butt and he climbed up the chimney and fell inside. Then it was over.

Narrative 8: Winnie the Pooh was walkin' around eatin' his honey. Then Tigger came and it was his birthday and Winnie the Pooh said, "Happy Birthday." He went and got a bucket of honey and wrapped it up in happy birthday paper and he put it on the floor until his birthday started and everybody was there like all his friends. Then they were singing the Happy Birthday song. A big bad wolf came to the party too, but he was a nice one. The end.

In each case, the general idea is clear. Both of these narratives are at Stage 3. However, in the eighth narrative told by this child, there is a much fuller sense of what went into making up the beginning (Tigger's birthday), the middle (the events around the preparation of the present), and the ending (the birthday party celebration) of the story.

Moral development - One five year old boy dictated a total of seven narratives in Spanish over the course of the study. All narratives were rated as Stage 3. However, it is possible to see something new emerge in the last three -- the development of a moral.

In the fifth narrative, it is possible to see the victory of "good" (represented by Superboy) over "evil" (represented by señor Mario).

> Narrative 5: Había una vez Superboy. Un señor Mario que era mal pintado y Superboy no era pintado. El hombre estaba blanco feo. Superboy se levantado a hombre por la ventana. Quebraron los vidrios y llegaron la policía pero con Superboy no lo pasada nada y después Superboy tenía que quitar sus ojos pero son luces. Una mujer estaba y se la llevó el hombre pintado. Luego le pegó al hombre Mario con las luces. Otra vez ganó el Superboy y no el pintado.
>
> [English: Once upon a time there was Superboy. This guy Mario was painted all ugly and Superboy wasn't painted. The guy was ugly white. Superboy threw the guy through the window. The glass broke and the police came but nothing happened to Superboy and later Superboy had to take out his eyes but they're lights. A lady was there and the painted guy came. Then he hit Mario with the eyes. Superboy won again and not the painted guy.]

In the sixth narrative, confronting danger, the good deeds of Batman and Superboy are rewarded by Santa Claus.

Narrative 6: Una vez había un señor malo. Se salió Batman volando y lo mató y el señor se cayó después y se fué a su casa y se salió otra vez Batman. Era una persona. No se pasó nada a Batman porque tenía el cinto y el malo Mureo le pegó y no pasó nada. Batman tenía una flor para su esposa. Salió Superboy para ayudarle a su amigo Batman. Ganó Batman y no le mataron. Salió Santa Claus y tenía regalo por Batman y Superboy.

[English: Once upon a time there was a bad guy. Batman came flying and killed the guy and he fell down. Then he went to his house and Batman came out again. He was a person. Nothing happened to Batman because he had the belt and the evil Mureo hit him but nothing happened. Batman had a flower for his wife. Superboy came to help his friend Batman. Batman won and they didn't kill him. Santa Claus came out and he had a present for Batman and Superboy.]

In the seventh, and last, narrative dictated by this boy not only does good triumph over evil but we are given a reason for it. This is a feature which was missing in his other two previous narratives.

Narrative 7: Una vez había un avión y explotó porque el señor estaba borracho y estaba solito pero no explotó porque Batman vió al avión y que quería explotar y luego voló y cuando se le paró, dejo el avión a su cancha y luego Batman le sacó de allí y se llevo volando con el señor. Luego Batman vió al señor que se llama Joker y mató a Batman pero no mató a Batman. Mató a Joker porque Batman tiene muscles [dictated in English] y es bueno. Fin.

[English: Once upon a time there was an airplane and it exploded because the man was drunk and he was all alone but it didn't explode because Batman saw the plane and that it was going to explode and then he flew and when he stopped it he let the plane down on the landing strip and then Batman got him from there and then he was flying again with the man. Then Batman saw the guy called Joker and he killed Batman but he didn't kill Batman. He (Batman) killed Joker because Batman has muscles and is good. The end.]

In these examples it is possible to see how this boy is

coming to terms with the idea of a moral. In each instance a superhero comes to the aide of someone in distress and saves the day. In the fifth narrative Superboy wins out over evil. In the sixth narrative good deeds are rewarded. In the seventh narrative we are given a reason that good triumphs over evil: "because Batman has muscles and is good." In addition, Batman's "muscles" are so meaningful to this child, he remembers that one English word in an otherwise Spanish narrative.

Variability within narrative development - Following Applebee (1978), there is no way to distinguish the levels of development which have emerged within stages presented in the examples above.

As with the Pre-LAS, the analysis of narratives which Applebee (1978) provided was also limited in its ability to reflect the social origins of literacy development. The levels of development are designed to detect changes only in narrative structure (Appendix B). But, as was indicated in Section II of this chapter, there are other important factors in bilingual literacy development which require examination of individual progress. These include:

- story length within stages
- story coherence within stages
- story complexity within stages
- conflict resolution within stages
- presence of a moral
- social origins of story content

Taking the above factors into consideration, an examination was made of each child's narrative development by

considering individual progress and recording his/her "best attempts." These best attempts varied among the children. For example, with some children one particular narrative reflected the greatest development (in terms of social origins, or story coherence, or story complexity, or the presence of a moral, etc.). In those instances, just one narrative was recorded as the best attempt for that child. In other cases, however, several narratives dictated by the same child on different days may have reflected the greatest level of development for different reasons (for example, one narrative showed the best sense of social origins while another presented the best example of story coherence or story complexity, etc.). In these instances, two or three narratives were recorded as the best attempts for that child. These best attempts by the children were then charted to determine if a trend emerged over the course of the investigation which showed improved narrative development.

Table 25 presents results of the best attempts made by children in the treatment group over the course of the investigation.

Table 25

Best Narratives Dictated from Treatment Group

Treatment Group Subjects	Narratives								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
English Dominant						X	X		
				X				X	
						X	X	X	
						X			
					X				
Spanish Dominant							X		
						X			
								X	
				X					
				X	X				
					X				
					X	X	X		
			X						
						X			
						X			
					X	X			
							X		
					X	X		X	
							X		
						X	X		
						X			
							X		
						X			
					X				
						X			
			X				X		
					X				
								X	
					X		X		
				X			X		

In Table 25 it is possible to see that there is a trend

that emerged in narrative development which is similar for English and Spanish dominant subjects. The majority of best attempts occurred during the later half of the research.

It is interesting to note that 13 children had their best attempt with their last narrative; 9 children had their best attempt with their next to last narrative, 8 children had their best attempt with their second from last narrative; 3 children had their best attempt with their third from last narrative; and 1 child had her best attempt with the fourth from last narrative. There are several possible reasons for this finding.

First, the last narratives obtained from the treatment group, used for the post-test qualitative analysis, were dictated very close to the Christmas holiday or just following Christmas break. Several students had left to spend the holiday in Mexico with their families. In addition, there were various holiday activities and celebrations in progress. All these factors would affect the sense of community among the children and the attention which would be concentrated on story dictation. Taking the last narrative from many children following the two-week Christmas break would also tend to have an effect on the quality of the story dictation. This could contribute to the non-significant difference finding between comparison and treatment groups with the qualitative assessment used.

Second, in the first four weeks of the study, the scribe

used only the language of dictation to retell a child's story during dramatization. This meant that children who did not speak that language were probably unable to understand much of what was being said. In Week 5, the scribe began simultaneous translation of the stories, on a sentence by sentence basis, when retelling the stories during dramatization. This was done to see if that aspect of communication would have an effect on the quality of story dictation and dramatization in the remaining weeks of the investigation. The effects were immediate concerning the length of narratives dictated by the children. Following the beginning of simultaneous translation, almost every child greatly increased the length of his/her narratives. Approximately two weeks after simultaneous translation began, children began to more fully reflect the sense of social origins discussed in Part II of this chapter.

Concerning simultaneous translation, it was as though they got a sense of the general idea of the task to be undertaken and the behavior required for dictation and dramatization in the first four weeks of the study. They became familiarized with the rhythm and flow involved in the process of getting ideas onto paper.

In the next three weeks, with the onset of simultaneous translation, they came to understand more fully what was being communicated by others in the community and began to take more active roles in dramatization since what was being translated and read out loud by the scribe could be more fully understood.

In the last four weeks of the study they began to incorporate social origins emerging out of the process of regular story dictation and dramatization. Because they felt more comfortable within the community of readers and writers which was being created, children took chances at coming up with variations on a theme and they began to acquire more patience concerning reading and writing as they thought through how to make their stories more coherent or follow a story line or develop characters more fully.

Third, the variable nature of development itself played a role in the dictation and dramatization of narratives. Each and every child did not necessarily dictate his/her highest stage (following Applebee, 1978) or "best attempt" narrative at post-test. However, based on the criteria discussed in this section and as reflected in Table 25, each and every child did dictate one (or more) narrative(s) which demonstrated some improvement over the course of the study in the ability to communicate ideas more effectively with others.

Taking into account the findings presented in Sections I, II, and III of this chapter, it is concluded the two null hypotheses considered in this investigation cannot be fully accepted due to limitations in the instruments used. Even though there were no statistical differences determined between comparison and treatment groups at the .05 level of significance on the Pre-LAS sub-scales, it was possible to determine meaningful differences in English language

comprehension and natural spoken abilities between the two groups by calculating difference scores on those sub-scales. These differences were "lost" when submitted to standardized statistical analysis.

There was no difference found between comparison and treatment groups on narrative development scores following Applebee's method of assessment for narrative structure (1978). However, a wide array of additional data provided evidence for greater improvement resulting from the literacy intervention undertaken with the treatment group. This data was based on analysis of community themes; the use of the physical and social environment; and the use of Spanish and English words as reflected in the narratives dictated and dramatized by the treatment group children. Improved literacy abilities among treatment group children were also reflected in the manner by which they extended their new abilities into the Pre-LAS post-test.

Conclusion

The information presented in this chapter has attempted to present various reasons which could contribute to the finding of no significant differences between comparison and treatment groups following the quantitative and qualitative assessments used. At the same time it has attempted to provide a full and detailed account of other factors which should be considered in determining the efficacy of using dictation and dramatization activities to promote literacy in bilingual preschool children.

It will be recalled, from Chapter II, that the intervention undertaken in this research (the dictation and dramatization of children's narratives) followed Vygotskyian approach, highlighting play as an important social contributor to the zone of proximal development. McLane and McNamee (1990) see play as a "bridge" to literacy, by focusing on the symbolic manner by which children involve themselves in pretend play and the way that acting out various roles involving reading and writing can contribute to literacy. Extending this concept to literacy activities undertaken with bilingual children, it is particularly instructive to examine the way in which social interaction and meaning contribute not only to an understanding of the reading and writing process in general, but how a second language is learned. It involves making a distinction between bilingualism and biliteracy (Mackey, 1970).

This type of development is not easily measured. Chapter V has presented some alternative methods for examining literacy development which can become "lost" in standardized assessments. It is hoped that these findings provide support for conditional rejection of the null hypotheses regarding quantitative and qualitative differences between comparison and treatment groups. These differences provide evidence which supports the use of dictation and dramatization as a means for promoting literacy development in bilingual preschool children.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

The development of a strong foundation in literacy development for bilingual children living in the United States today is a major focus of much bilingual education research. The need is great. The Census Bureau reports that as of March, 1987 the Hispanic population was 18.8 million with a growth rate five times that of the population as a whole ("Hispanic Population," 1987). It has quickly become the fastest-growing minority population in the United States (Usdan, 1984). Out of 9.6 million Hispanic adults, it is estimated that 3.7-4.6 million (or between 39-49%) are illiterate. Eighty-six percent of the illiterate adults from non-English speaking backgrounds are illiterate in their native language as well.

The Children's English Services Study (1978) found 1.7 million Hispanic limited English proficient children and predicted that number would grow to 2.6 million by the year 2000. It also noted that two-thirds of all children limited in English proficiency receive no special language services.

In Chicago, Hispanic students make up 25% of the school system. Ninety-two percent of the city's severely overcrowded schools are in Hispanic neighborhoods (Solis and Gonzalez, 1989). Dropout prior to high school is a major problem for the Hispanic community (Chicago Public Schools, 1987; Kyle & Sween,

1989; Miller, 1990). Vargas (1986) and Hodgkinson (1985) have discussed the economic implications of an illiterate Hispanic population in the next century.

With these glaring statistics in mind, this investigation attempted to study the efficacy of promoting biliteracy in bilingual preschool children through the use of non-traditional teaching methods. This approach focused on teaching literacy through shared meaningful activities rather than as a series of isolated skills involving rote repetition and memorization. This was achieved primarily through the dictation and dramatization of children's narratives in the preschool classroom.

The activities which help to develop an early understanding of reading and writing involve a process of interpreting the world, a process which is highly dependent upon a child's social relationships. In the preschool classroom, these relationships primarily consist of interactions with adults and peers.

There are no simple instruments which measure this development. In Chapter V it was shown that though there was no statistical support to reject either of the null hypotheses addressed in this study, it was also not possible to completely accept the null hypotheses. Rejection or acceptance must be conditional.

Thus it became necessary to utilize additional qualitative measures developed by McNamee and McLane (1984); McLane and

McNamee (1990); and the author. These measures required examination of: a) individual progress on story coherence and complexity (extended from research by Applebee, 1978); b) the development community themes; c) use of the physical and social environment in narratives; d) use of Spanish and English words in narratives; and e) the manner in which the classroom intervention was reflected in treatment group post-test standardized assessments of language proficiency.

Through this qualitative analysis it was possible to demonstrate that the treatment group did improve their literacy abilities over the course of the research.

This study was initially conceived as a cross-cultural extension of work done on the social foundations of literacy development in monolingual preschool children by McNamee and McLane (1984), with this investigation focusing on the particular needs of bilingual preschool children in their development of literacy. This investigation found similarities with the original study:

1) Story dictation and dramatization were very popular activities in the classroom among boys and girls, regardless of whether they were more proficient in English or Spanish.

2) Over time the narratives dictated by the children increased in their level of coherence, complexity and sophistication. Children extended their new found abilities to their dramatizations as well by expressing themselves more fully and comfortably within the group.

3) Children borrowed ideas, themes and words from each other in dictating their stories which helped in developing knowledge of the reading and writing process as related to communicating with adults and peers in the group.

4) The scribe developed closer interaction with the treatment group over the course of the investigation which assisted literacy development by clarifying and enriching the stories.

There were also new findings resulting from this study which revealed some specific needs of bilingual children. If literacy activities such as story dictation and dramatization are to be most effective in the bilingual preschool classroom there are some considerations which should be taken into account:

1) Children of the two different language communities should be afforded the opportunity to freely interact in non-structured activities within the classroom. In this way children may socialize with peers in a very natural manner and through play will be exposed to new words and expressions that allow for expressing the same meaningful experience in different ways.

2) The classroom staff, especially the scribe taking the dictations from the children, should be fully bilingual. In this way they will have the opportunity to develop a curriculum which is meaningful to children of both language backgrounds through the use of more structured teaching methods with the

group and individual experiences with each child which arise through dictation, dramatization and other activities in the classroom.

3) When stories are read aloud during dramatization, they should be initially read in the language dictated by the child and simultaneously translated, sentence by sentence, in the other language. By doing this the attention of all children will remain focused on the story being told and they will have immediate contact with the second language. Further, through sharing words in this way, the stories become very important means of communicating in a manner which is highly unique and socially meaningful to the group. Under such conditions, these activities can become a "bridge to literacy" (McLane & McNamee, 1990).

4) The classroom staff should be sensitive to the cultural background and needs of minority children. This requires intervention and interaction which shows an appreciation for diversity and difference, yet at the same time helps to create a common foundation for literacy development built around social experiences that promote a sense of community among the students and teaching staff which is specific and unique to that particular classroom. The classroom develops a supportive "small scale culture" (McNamee et al. 1985) of its own regardless of the larger cultural differences which exist outside the classroom.

Within this context it is helpful to remember what Mackey

(1970) posed as crucial in the study of bilingualism. The study of bilingualism is not the study of biliteracy. The study of bilingualism addresses change in a language. It does not address change, and development, in an individual. Being biliterate involves more than the knowledge of particular words and how they are ordered in a sentence or story. The development of biliteracy involves a knowledge of culture and that requires an understanding of the social context in which language is being used and shared. It ultimately involves how individuals from differing language backgrounds come to communicate and share meaning.

That was the key point in this study. The discussion in Chapter V showed that children in the treatment group not only learned to communicate more effectively at post-test than they had at pre-test through their dictated stories that were dramatized. They also learned how to extract meaning from what was being shared across cultures, across two languages, and create something totally new -- their own small culture of the classroom which was shared socially and by its very nature allowed for similarity and diversity at one and the same time.

In future research it will be necessary to develop even more sensitive instruments than those which exist today to assess strengths and weaknesses in language proficiency and language use by bilingual children. These instruments will need to take into account the special role of the social domain in language development.

In bilingual preschool classrooms, new curricula and methods of instruction should address ways of building on social interaction as a foundation for education in preschool and improve upon the wealth of possibilities for development represented when a group of preschool children from differing language backgrounds are combined together.

This study has addressed the role of the social domain as a foundation for literacy development in bilingual preschool children. Though such a focus is crucial in current bilingual education research, it is only part of a larger concern which faces us as a society.

Hunter and Harman (1979) define functional literacy as:

> ...the possession of skills <u>perceived as necessary by particular persons and groups</u> to fulfill their own self-determined objectives as family and community members, citizens, consumers, job-holders, and members of social, religious, or other associations of their choosing. This includes the ability to obtain information they want and to use that information for their own and others' well being; the ability to read and write adequately to satisfy the requirements they set for themselves as being important for their own lives; the ability to deal positively with demands made on them by society; and the ability to solve the problems they face in their daily lives. (p. 7)

To date no figures for illiteracy have been derived using <u>this</u> definition as a basis for measurement. And yet, this concept of literacy is most basic when ultimately considering what society should contribute to the education and individual development of its members. There is much work to do in the United States today to help this vision of literacy become reality. This study has attempted to make a contribution

toward that goal.

Appendix A

Description of
The Pre-Language Assessment Scale

English form developed by Sharon E. Duncan, Ph.D. and Edward A. DeAvila, Ph.D. (1985).

Spanish form developed by Sharon E. Duncan, Ph.D. and Edward A. DeAvila, Ph.D. (1986).

The Pre-Language Assessment Scale (Pre-LAS), the quantitative measure utilized in this investigation to determine language proficiency in the bilingual comparison and treatment group children, is comprised of six sub-scales which measure phonology, lexicon, syntax and pragmatics. For the purpose of this investigation both the English and Spanish forms of four Pre-LAS sub-scales were administered to subjects in the comparison and treatment groups. The use of the scales in this way was acceptable since each scale had been independently normed and had established its own reliability. The sub-scales are described as follows:

1) "Choose a Picture (English/Spanish)" is a measure of receptive vocabulary in understanding language which a child demonstrates by matching an oral stimulus, given by the investigator, to one of two pictures.
2) "What's in the House? (English/Spanish)" is a measure of expressive vocabulary which a child demonstrates by naming labels for household objects as presented by the investigator.

3) "Finishing Stories (English/Spanish)" is an open-ended measure of expressive language development in which the child supplies a spoken clause to complete a compound or complex sentence which is orally initiated by the investigator.

4) "Let's Tell Stories (English/Spanish)" is a measure of story retelling in which the child listens to two short stories, told by the investigator, and then retells them to the best of his/her ability. This sub-scale provides the most accurate measure of a child's natural linguistic abilities.

Appendix B

Description of Applebee's Stages of Narrative Development

(as taken from McLane & McNamee, 1985)

The hierarchical model of narrative development utilized in this study to assess qualitative change in bilingual children's dictations was developed by Applebee (1978, p. 57-67) and is based on Vygotsky's stages of concept development. This model is comprised of six stages which measure changes in narrative structure. Each stage is described as follows:

Stage 1: Stories comprised of "heaps" represent an organization of essentially unrelated elements. There is a conceptual "whole" which is organized by the linking of immediate perceptions.

Stage 2: Stories comprised of "sequences" contain concrete factual bonds between events. There is an arbitrary and superficial sequence in time. Associations between events are based on their similarity rather than on causality.

Stage 3: Stories comprised of "primitive narratives" have a concrete core (an object or event) rather than a conceptual one around which the child gathers other related concrete events.

Stage 4: Stories comprised of "unfocused chains" present incidents in a story leading directly from one to the next but the attributes which connect them keep shifting. The child can

manage a lot of story material but the story lacks a "central point" to which all the parts can be related back.

Stage 5: Stories comprised of "focused chains" have a central point which is concrete rather than conceptual. Events are linked around one central concrete attribute.

Stage 6: Stories comprised of "narratives" present incidents which are tied to a concrete perceptual or abstract core. Stories have a theme or moral; incidents develop out of previous ones and elaborate a new aspect of the theme or situation.

Appendix C

Teacher Questionnaire (English)

1) How long have you been a teacher in this program?

2) In the classroom, which language do you use more often?
_____ English
_____ Spanish
_____ Both equally

3 a) Are there any classroom situations when you always speak English or Spanish?
_____ yes
_____ no
If yes, please describe:

b) Are there some children you speak to only in Spanish or English?
_____ yes
_____ no
If yes, please list the names of those children:

English Only	Spanish Only

4) Have you or other classroom staff ever been involved in a situation where you experienced difficulty in understanding a child because of the language s/he used?
_____ yes
_____ no
If yes, how did you handle the situation?

5) On the average, about how many times per week do you read the children a story?

Cuestionario Para Las Maestras (español)

1) ¿Cuánto tiempo ha pasado en este programa como maestra?

2) En la clase, ¿cuál es el idioma que Ud. habla más?
_____ español
_____ inglés
_____ ambos iguales

3 a) ¿Hay situaciones en la clase cuando siempre habla en español o en inglés?
_____ sí
_____ no
Si responde que sí, favor de describir:

b) ¿Hay algunos niños que Ud. le habla solamente en español o en inglés?
_____ sí
_____ no
Si responde que sí, favor de escribir los nombres de los niños:

Solamente español Solamente inglés

4) ¿Ha estado en una situación en la clase cuando no entendió lo que dijo un niño/a por la razón del idioma?
_____ sí
_____ no
Si responde que sí, ¿cómo manejó la situación?

5) Por termino medio, ¿cuántas veces por semana le lee Ud. un cuento a los niños?

Appendix D

Parental Questionnaire

1 a) How long have you lived in Chicago?

b) If you have not lived here all your life, where else have you lived?

2 a) How many people live in your house?

b) Please list the people living in your house?

Sex	Age	Speaks Spanish	Speaks English

3) Which languages are spoken in the home?
_____ English
_____ Spanish
_____ Both

4) Do the adults in the household speak mainly in English or in Spanish?
_____ English
_____ Spanish
_____ Both

5) Are there any situations in which you always use one language or the other with your child? Please describe.

6 a) How many hours of TV does your child watch per day?

b) What language are the programs in?
_____ Spanish
_____ English
_____ Both

7 a) Do you read to your child at home?
_____ yes
_____ no

b) Does anyone else read to your child?
_____ yes
_____ no
If yes, who?

c) If someone does read to your child, in what language?
_____ Spanish
_____ English
_____ Both

8 a) If you do read to your child, please describe the kinds of things that you read:
_____ fairy tales
_____ bedtime stories
_____ comic books/comic strips
_____ others (please describe):

b) Are there any particular situations or times of day when you or someone else reads to your child?
_____ yes
_____ no
If yes, please describe:

9) If you have any other comments you would like to share concerning reading and writing activities done with your child that it would helpful to know about, please describe them here?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME!

Cuestionario Para Los Padres (español)

1 a) ¿Cuánto tiempo ha vivido en Chicago?

b) Si no ha vivido aquí por toda su vida, ¿cuales son los otros lugares donde vivió Ud.?

2 a) ¿Cuantas personas viven en su casa?

b) Por favor de escribir las personas que viven en su casa.

Sexo	Edad	Habla español	Habla inglés

3) ¿Cuales son los idiomas que se habla en la casa?
_____ español
_____ inglés
_____ ambos

4) ¿Hablan los adultos más en inglés o en español?
_____ español
_____ inglés
_____ ambos

5) ¿Hay situaciones cuando le habla Ud. a su niño/a en un idioma en particular? Por favor de describir:

6 a) ¿Cuantas horas por día ve su niño/a la televisión?

b) ¿En que idioma?
_____ español
_____ inglés
_____ ambos

7 a) ¿Le lee Ud. a su niño/a en casa?
_____ sí
_____ no

b) ¿Hay otra persona que le lee a su niño/a?
_____ sí
_____ no
Si responde que sí, ¿quién es esa persona?

c) Si alguien le lea a su niño/a, ¿en qué idioma?
_____ español
_____ inglés
_____ ambos

8 a) Si le lee a su niño/a, por favor de describir las clases de materiales que han leído:
_____ cuentos de hadas
_____ cuentos que han leído antes de acostarse
_____ libros cómicos
_____ otros (favor de describir)

b) ¿Hay situaciones particulares o hora del día cuando Ud. o alguien le lee a su niño/a?
_____ sí
_____ no
Si responde que sí, por favor de describir:

9) Si tiene Ud. otro comentario que quiere compartir en cuanto a actividades de leer o escribir que haga con su niño/a, por favor de describirlas aquí:

¡GRACIAS POR SU TIEMPO!

Appendix E

Guardian's Voluntary Consent Form

Project Title: Early socialization as a foundation for bilingual literacy development

Dear (Parent's Name):

We would like your child to participate in a study which is being conducted in his/her classroom.

This study is about bilingual literacy development and will help us in understanding how children think about things like reading and writing even before they start elementary school. We want to help the children become better prepared for school by doing activities in class that will encourage them in reading and writing. These activities will involve having the children tell us stories which we will write down and act out in the classroom.

The study will be done during normal school hours in your child's class while the teacher is present. If you agree to let your child participate, please sign below. You may withdraw your child from the study at any time.

****

I, _____, the parent or guardian of _____, a minor of _____ years of age, hereby consent to his/her participation in a research project being conducted by Erica R. Sufritz. I understand that no risk is involved, but that in any case, I may withdraw my child from participation at any time without prejudice. All questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

_____
(Signature)

_____
(Date)

Forma de Consentimiento (español)

Para el estudio: Socialización como fundación básica para el desarrollo de alfabetismo bilingue

Estimado(a) (nombre de padre):

Esta forma es para que Ud. de el consentimiento para que su niño(a) participe en un estudio. Este estudio tiene que ver con el desarrollo del alfabetismo bilingue. Las respuestas que su niño(a) provea nos ayudará a entender mejor como los niños(as) piensan acerca de actividades academicas como leer y escribir. Al tener este entendimiento queremos que ellos están mejores preparados. Las actividades que vamos hacer en la clase son la dictación y dramatización de cuentos que los niños van a relatar a nosotros.

Este estudio será conducido durante el día normal de clases y con la participación de la maestra. Si usted está de acuerdo que su niño(a) participe, favor de firmar y de este modo da su consentimiento. Si por alguna razón no desea que su niño(a) participe en este estudio, entonces no es necesario firmar.

Muchas gracias por su consentimiento e interés en este progresivo estudio.

****

Yo, _____, padre/guardiante de _____, un niño/a de _____ años de edad, estoy de acuerdo en que participe en este estudio conducido por Erica R. Sufritz. Entiendo que hay ningún riesgo pero, en cualquier momento, puedo negar la participación de mi niño/a.

_____
(Firma)

_____
(Fecha)

REFERENCES

Anderson, R. C., Hiebert, E. H., Scott, J. A. & Wilkinson, I.A.G. (1985). Becoming a nation of readers (Report of the Commission on Reading). Washington, DC: National Academy of Education.

Applebee, A. N. (1978). The child's concept of story: ages two to seventeen. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bakhurst, D. J. (1986). Thought, speech and the genesis of meaning: on the 50th anniversary of Vygotsky's Myslenie I Rec.' Studies in Soviet Thought, 31, 103-129.

Barnes, R. (1986, May). The English Language Proficiency Survey. Public presentation, Washington, DC.

Bruner, J.S. (1980). Afterword. In D. R. Olson (Ed.), The social foundations of language and thought: Essays in honor of Jerome S. Bruner. New York: W.W. Norton.

Chicago Panel on Public School Policy and Finance. (1989). A study of Hispanic students and third grade reading scores in Chicago public schools. Chicago.

Chicago Public Schools. (1987). Dropouts: a descriptive review of the class of 1985 and trend analysis of 1982-85 classes. Chicago.

Cole, M. & Griffin, P. (1986). A socio-historical approach to remediation. In A. Luke & K. Egan (Eds.), Literacy, Society and Schooling. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cummins, J. (1976). The influence of bilingualism on cognitive growth: a synthesis of research findings and explanatory hypotheses. Working papers on bilingualism, 9, 1-43.

de la Rosa, D. & Maw, C. E. (1990). Hispanic education: A statistical portrait, 1990. Washington, DC: National Council of La Raza.

de Valdes, M. E. (1978). Non-English speaking children and literacy. In S. Pflaum (Ed.), Aspects of reading education. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Diaz, R. M. (1985). Bilingual cognitive development: addressing three gaps in current research. Child Development, 56, 1376-1388.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1973). Language acquisition and communicative choice. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

_____. (1981). Social process in first and second language learning. In H. Winitz (Ed.), Native language and foreign acquisition. New York: New York Academy of Science.

Fantini, A. E. (1985). Language acquisition of a bilingual child: A sociolinguistic perspective (to age ten). Avon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Ferreiro, E., & Teberosky, A. (1982). Literacy before schooling (K. G. Castro, Trans.). Exeter, NH: Heinemann Educational Books.

Field, T. & Widmayer, S. M. (1981). Mother-infant interactions among lower SES Black, Cuban, Puerto Rican and South American immigrants. In T. Field, A. M. Sostek, P. Vietze & P. H. Liederman (Eds.), Culture and early interactions (pp. 41-62). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Fillmore, C. J. (1976). Frame semantics and the nature of language. In, S.R. Harnad, H.D. Steklis, and J. Lancaster (Eds.), Origins and evolution of language and speech. New York: New York Academy of Science.

_____. (1979). Individual differences in second language acquisition. In, C. J. Fillmore, D. Kempler and W. S-Y. Wang (Eds.), Individual differences in language ability and language behavior. New York: Academic Press.

Forman, E.A. & Cazden, C.B. (1986). Exploring Vygotskian perspectives in education: the cognitive value of peer interaction. In J.V. Wertsch (Ed), Culture, communication and cognition -- Vygotskian perspectives. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gundlach, R., McLane J. B., Stott, F. M., & McNamee, G. D. (1985). The social foundations of children's early writing development. In, M. Farr (Ed.), Advances in writing research: Vol. 1. Children's early writing development (pp. 1-58). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Grosjean, F. (1982). Life with two languages. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hakuta, K. (1986). Mirror of language: the debate on bilingualism. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Hispanic Policy Development Project, Inc. (1984). Make something happen: Hispanics and urban school reform. New York: National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics.

Hispanic population up in U.S. (1987, September). Chicago Tribune, p. 3.

Hodgkinson, H. (1985). All one system: Demographics of education -- kindergarten through graduate school. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Holdaway, D. (1979). The foundations of literacy. Sydney, Australia: Ashton Scholastic.

Hunter, C.S.J. & Harman, D. (1979). Adult illiteracy in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

John-Steiner, V. (1986). The road to competence in an alien land: a Vygotskian perspective on bilingualism. In J. V. Wertsch (Ed.), Culture, communication and cognition -- Vygotskian perspectives. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kagan, S. (1977). Social motives and behaviors of Mexican-American and Anglo-American children., In J. L. Martinez (Ed.), Chicano psychology. New York: Academic Press.

Kirk, R. E. (1982). Experimental design: procedures for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.

Kozol, J. (1985). Illiterate America. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press, Doubleday.

Kozulin, A. (1986). The concept of activity in Soviet psychology: Vygotsky, his disciples and critics. American Psychologist, 41(3), 264-274.

Kyle, C. & Sween, J. (1989). Lost! An initial study on the magnitude of and reasons for early school leavers from the Chicago public schools (Report to the Illinois Attorney General). Chicago: Loyola University.

Lindholm, K. J. (1980). Bilingual children: some interpretations of cognitive and linguistic development. In K. E. Nelson (Ed.), Children's language (Vol. 2). New York: Gardner Press.

Mackey, W. F. (1970). The description of bilingualism. In J. Fishman (Ed.), Readings in sociology of language. The Hague: Mouton and Co.

Macnamara, J. (1967). The bilingual's performance: a psychological overview. Journal of Social Issues, 23, 58-77.

McCormick, S. (1982). Should you read aloud to children? Language Arts, 54(2), 139-143.

McLane, J. B. & McNamee, G. D. (1990). Early literacy. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

McNamee, G. D., McLane, J. B., Cooper, P. M. & Kerwin, S. M. (1984). The origins of literacy during the preschool years (Final Report). Chicago: Erikson Institute.

_____. (1985). Cognition and affect in early literacy development. Early Child Development and Care, 20, 229-244.

Miller, A. (1990). Student characteristics and the persistence/dropout behavior of Hispanic students. In J. Lakebrink (Ed.), Children at risk (pp. 119-139). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

Padilla, A. & Liebman, E. (1975). Language acquisition in the bilingual child. The Bilingual Review, 2, 34-55.

Paley, V. G. (1981). Wally's Stories. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Paley, V. G. (1984). Boys and girls: Superheroes in the doll corner. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Paley, V. G. (1986). Mollie is three: growing up in school. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Pellegrini, A. D. (1985). Relations between preschool children's symbolic play and literate behavior. In L. Galda & A.D. Pellegrini (Eds.), Play, language and stories: the development of children's literate behavior (pp. 79-97). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corp.

Pflaum, S. W. (1986). The development of language and literacy in young children (3rd ed.). Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Piaget, J. (1923). The language and thought of the child. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, Inc.

_____. (1962). Comments on Vygotsky's critical remarks concerning, The Language and Thought of the Child, and Judgment and Reasoning in the Child. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Ramirez M. & Castaneda, A. (1974). Cultural democracy, biocognitive development and education. New York: Academic Press.

Rubin, K. (1980). Fantasy play: Its role in the development of social skills and social cognition. In K. Rubin (Ed.), Children's play. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Schieffelin, B. B. & Cochran-Smith, M. (1984). Learning to read culturally: literacy before schooling. In H. Goelamn, A. Oberg & F. Smith (Eds.), Awakening to literacy. Exeter, NH: Heinemann.

Seawell, R.P.M. (1985). A micro-ethnographic study of a Spanish/English bilingual kindergarten in which literature and puppet play were used as a method of enhancing language growth (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, DA8609424.

Solis, D. & Gonzalez, M. L. (1989, May). Voice of the People [Letter to the editor]. Chicago Tribune, p. 15.

Snow, C. (1983). Literacy and language: relationships during the preschool years. Harvard Educational Review, 53(2), 165-189.

Snow, C. & Ninio, A. (1986). The contracts of literacy: what children learn from learning to read books. In W.H. Teale & E. Sulzby (Eds.), Emergent literacy: writing and reading. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Teale, W.H. & Sulzby, E. (Eds.). (1986). Emergent literacy: writing and reading. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

United States Department of Education. (1978). Children's English Services Study. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

United States Department of Education, (1984). Becoming a nation of readers: report of the Commission on Reading. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Usdan, M. D. (1984). New trends in urban demography. Education and Urban Society, 16, 399-414.

Vargas, A. (1986). Illiteracy in the Hispanic Community. Washington, DC: National Council of La Raza.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1935). The question of multilingualism in childhood. In L. S. Vygotsky (Ed.), Children's mental development in the instruction process. Moscow-Leningrad: State Publishing House.

_____. (1962). Thought and language (E. Hanfmann and G. Vakar, Trans., Eds.). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

_____. (1978). Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes. (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

_____. (1981). The genesis of higher mental functions. In J. V. Wertsch (Ed.), The concept of activity in soviet thought (pp. 144-188). Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, Inc.

Wertsch, J. V. (Ed.). (1981). The concept of activity in Soviet thought. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharper, Inc.

_____. (1983). The role of semiosis in L.S. Vygotsky's theory of human cognition. In B. Bain (Ed.), The sociogenesis of language and human conduct (pp. 17-31). New York: Plenum.

_____. (Ed.). (1986). Culture, communication and cognition: Vygotskian perspectives. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

VITA

The author of this investigation, Erica Rae Sufritz, was born on July 29, 1958, in Morgantown, West Virginia.

She attended Wayne State University in Detroit for her undergraduate studies and graduated with high honors in May, 1981 with Bachelor of Arts degrees in Psychology and Spanish.

In the fall of 1981 Ms. Sufritz moved to Chicago to begin her doctoral studies at Loyola University of Chicago. She majored in Educational Psychology with minors in Child Development and Research. She was the recipient of four Graduate Assistantships from the School of Education to aid her in the completion of her coursework.

Ms. Sufritz took a leave of absence from her studies in the fall of 1986 in order to obtain a greater understanding of and work more closely with the Hispanic community in Chicago. She worked as the Research Assistant on a grant at St. Augustine College, the only bilingual post-secondary liberal arts college in the midwest United States, to help establish a Center for Bilingual Studies. At the college during that time she also taught, in Spanish, a course on early childhood development. Upon completion of the grant, she then served as Director of the Casa Central Day Care Program in the Logan Square area of the city. These research and employment experiences did much to supplement her formal education.

During the fall of 1988, Ms. Sufritz began to explore ideas and develop general questions to be pursued in her research and returned to seriously undertake work toward the completion of her doctorate in 1989 and began her investigation in the fall of 1990, which aimed to extend understanding of the role that early socialization plays in the literacy development of bilingual children at the preschool level.

At present Ms. Sufritz is involved in various projects within the Hispanic communities of Chicago and teaches undergraduate education classes at Loyola University of Chicago. She participates in several community and international civil rights organizations.

DISSERTATION APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Erica Rae Sufritz has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Carol Harding, Director
Associate Professor,
Counseling and Educational Psychology
Loyola University of Chicago

Dr. Jack Kavanagh
Professor, Counseling and Educational Psychology
Loyola University of Chicago

Dr. Gillian McNamee
Faculty
Erikson Institute

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

11/25/91
Date

Carol Harding
Director's Signature