


5-1996

Language Interactions between Parent and Child During a Shared Reading Storytime

Lynda S. Krens
The College at Brockport

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/ehd_theses

 Part of the [Early Childhood Education Commons](#), [Elementary Education Commons](#), and the [Language and Literacy Education Commons](#)

To learn more about our programs visit: <http://www.brockport.edu/ehd/>

Repository Citation

Krens, Lynda S., "Language Interactions between Parent and Child During a Shared Reading Storytime" (1996). *Education and Human Development Master's Theses*. 1066.
https://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/ehd_theses/1066

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Education and Human Development at Digital Commons @Brockport. It has been accepted for inclusion in Education and Human Development Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @Brockport. For more information, please contact kmyers@brockport.edu.

Language Interactions Between Parent and Child
During a Shared Reading Storytime

Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Committee of the
Department of Education and Human Development
State University of New York
College at Brockport
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Science in Education

by

Lynda S. Krens

State University of New York
College at Brockport
Brockport, New York
May 1996

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the language interactions between a parent and child during a shared reading storytime. Children from a Head Start program were videotaped with a parent "reading" a wordless picture book. Transcripts were taken from these videos and the language between the parent and the child was examined. Positive and negative interactions were noted, as well as child initiated and parent initiated interactions. The data were analyzed and implications for further research and classroom practice were discussed.

Table of Contents

Chapter I

Need for the Study

Purpose

Research Questions

Definitions

Limitations

Chapter II

Review of the Literature

Chapter III

Study Design

Purpose

Questions

Methodology

Subjects

Materials

Procedure

Chapter IV

Analysis of the Data

Purpose

Findings and Interpretations

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Chapter V

Conclusions and Implications

Purpose

Conclusions

Implications for research

Implications for Classroom Practice

References

Appendices

Chapter I

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine language interactions between parent and child during a shared reading storytime.

Need for the Study

Reading aloud is an activity that is good for children. There are many benefits to reading to children. These benefits include vocabulary development, language development in prereaders and motivation to read. Other benefits include hearing oral language modelled by an adult, learning "book language", exposure to new experiences and information, hearing correct syntactic patterns and sentence structures, and use of higher level thinking skills to predict and comprehend material (Teale, 1981). Reading aloud may also extend beyond the read aloud experience itself and help children expand and extend their use of oral language, especially during the

preschool years when language develops the fastest.

Other studies by Many (1989) and Warren, Prater, and Griswald (1990) have also shown that parental involvement in helping children experience "book language" through the read aloud experience can bring about motivation and reading readiness before formal schooling begins. It is not enough for parents to just read to their children, though. A positive, nurturing atmosphere which involves the child interactively and promotes the use of language between the parent and the child during the activity is a safe environment for learning to take place (Manning & Manning, 1988; Many, 1989; Silvern, 1985).

The more studies of one-to-one reading experiences that can be observed between a parent and child, the more we may be able to see how a child's use of language may be enhanced through the read aloud experience.

Research Questions

- 1.) What kinds of responses does a child give when there is positive interaction with the parent?

- 2.) What kinds of responses does a child give when there is negative interaction with the parent?

- 3.) When parents involve the child in higher level thinking skills, what kinds of responses does the child give?

Definition of Terms

Positive interaction: In this study positive interaction is defined as any response by the parent that acknowledges an interaction initiated by the child and/or asks the child to respond with language in an encouraging and supportive way.

Examples of this type of interaction include:

1. Answering a question the child has asked.
2. Acknowledging a statement the child has made.
3. Expanding on a statement the child has made.
4. Asking the child questions.

Negative interaction: In this study, negative interaction is defined as any response (or non-response) by the parent that ignores an interaction initiated by the child and/or does not require the child to respond with language.

Examples of this type of interaction include:

1. Ignoring a child when a statement is made or a question is asked.
2. Correcting the child in a negative way.
3. Parent answers own question.

More examples may be included in both of these interactions.

Higher level thinking skills: In this study higher level thinking skills are defined as those cognitive skills needed to answer questions which deal with predicting outcomes, stating opinions, evaluating how others feel, and elaborating on the story.

Lower level thinking skills: In this study lower level thinking skills are defined as those cognitive skills needed to answer questions which deal with labeling pictures, describing an action and recalling information.

Limitations

There will be differences in the abilities of the parents to effectively “tell a story” with their child.

The researcher will serve as the sole coder thus limiting reliability.

The limited sampling of a child's language taken during the "shared reading" activity may or may not be representative of the child's ability to use language.

Finding a relationship between parental interaction patterns and the child's use of language does not necessarily mean that the parent's interactions are affecting the child's linguistic competence. Just as possible, the child's language skills may influence how the parent interacts with the child.

There may not be a true representation of how the parent and child interact due to the outside influence of the video camera and operator present during the reading activity.

Chapter II

Review of the Literature

Reading Aloud and Literacy Development

Language development is a prerequisite for literacy. Children learn many things through the use of language that they bring to the reading experience. Reading aloud to children exposes them to the syntactic patterns, or sentence structures, encountered in "book language". Through these experiences they are being prepared to meet the syntactic patterns they will use when reading independently (McCormick, 1977; Trelease, 1985).

Children who are not motivated to read and who lack reading readiness can benefit from read aloud stories. Reading aloud can be vital to the experience of a child who has not had experiences with books at home.

A Theoretical View

Judith Schickedanz (1978) explored read aloud activities and asked WHY parents and teachers should read to children. In her research she contrasted two views of reading aloud to children - a theoretical explanation and a cognitive explanation. In the theoretical view five areas of interest were identified. These included modeling, reinforcement, emotional security and confidence, language development and book knowledge, and knowledge of reading. She characterized these areas of interest as part of a learning theory model of learning, which views learning as a linear or additive process.

The benefits from reading aloud may allow the child to be receptive and motivated for actual reading instruction later on in a structured school setting.

An Interactive Approach

As a cognitive theory, Schickedanz (1978) showed that the read aloud activity is a source of information for children. They collect

data from experiencing these activities and in turn construct knowledge about the rules that govern the reading process. This knowledge may include learning the story line, locating print and matching letters and sounds. She emphasized HOW children learn these skills and proposed that in order to maximize the read aloud activity, a relationship needs to exist between the affective and cognitive explanations presented. Schickedanz (1978) believes that this read aloud relationship needs to be an interactive process between the affective (positive individual attention, physical closeness, oral praise) and cognitive (information for processing) elements and be flexible enough to meet the needs of the individual child being read to.

This idea of an interactive relationship was also reinforced in a study by Leslie Mandel Morrow (1990). In this study Morrow looked at the effects of small group story readings to see if children's responses to literature would affect a number of factors. One factor being, the effect that the nature of the adult interactive behavior had on this group and whether the benefits were similar to those found in

the interaction that occurs in one-to-one storybook readings. The findings strongly supported the use of small group instruction across many areas including verbal participation, complexity of verbal interchange and increased comprehension. These findings supported Schickedanz's (1978) premise that a relationship needs to exist between the affective and cognitive aspects of learning in order for true learning to take place.

Other research also supported the idea of a nurturing and interactive approach to reading with children. In one-to-one interactions of read aloud time, Many (1989) examined a shared reading experience between a mother and her two children. They read together while the researcher recorded the interactions between them. The adult reader used many non-interfering techniques that helped expand the read aloud experience. By asking questions, inferring information, asking the children to predict and relating story events to real life activities, the parent enriched the read aloud time for the children. The children were also in a pro-active setting in which they could interact with the pictures, ask direct questions about

them and get immediate feedback from the parent involved.

A study by Fagan and Hayden (1988) examined the interactions between parents and children reading with familiar and unfamiliar text. They found that when the story was familiar the children focused and interacted more with the text and when the story was unfamiliar they interacted more with the parent, looking for confirmation of understanding. This direct feedback given to the child helped the child know that he/she was understanding the text. This experience was also supported by a nurturing and positive atmosphere.

According to Yaden, Smolkin and Conlon(1989): Thus, although the parent's role in providing the initial scaffold upon which emerging literacy is supported has been identified as an important element of storybook reading, it may be that the child's own contribution to the process - via frequent questions and comments during the reading - is a more useful index of the rate and content of the child's acquisition of literacy knowledge (Altwerger, 1985; Cazden, 1983; Diehl, Fazon & Dockstader - Anderson, 1985; Snow, 1983; Teale, 1986).

When parental involvement in the read aloud experience goes beyond just reading the words, children experience more of the literature through cognitive stimulation. It is not enough for parents to just read to their children. The process needs to be an interactive, thinking process that involves the child in a positive nurturing atmosphere (Manning & Manning, 1988; Many, 1989).

Parental Involvement

By reading aloud, parents not only provide an interactive, nurturing and positive activity which involves the child, they can also help promote the child's interest in reading. Three important factors which helped promote children's interest in reading; reading out loud to children by parents, the need to provide books and other reading material in the home, and a positive role model set by the parents for reading for purpose and/or enjoyment were listed in a study by Leslie Morrow (1985). Some of these factors were further investigated by Morrow (1983) in another study in which early interest in specific activities and home influences showed to correlate with a high

interest in reading. Activities that were thought to lead to a high interest in reading were those that related to print/writing. Paper and crayon activities were shown to be preferred by children with a high interest in reading whereas playing outside and with blocks and trucks were preferred by those with low interest in reading. The parents of these high interest readers were also characteristically different. More of them were college educated, read more for enjoyment and read more novels than those parents of low interest readers. Over 75% of the parents studied also read to their children on a daily basis.

In another study, parental perspectives which focused on such questions as do you read to your child, how often do you read, why do you read to your child (purpose), is reading aloud a valuable activity, and many more questions that dealt with the read aloud activity itself showed that reading aloud was perceived by many parents as a valuable activity and contributed to children's attitudes toward reading and their increased use of language (Manning & Manning, 1988).

Parental styles was the topic of a study by J. Flood (1977). In this study, Flood (1977) identified and listed specific components which were most beneficial to the child during the reading activity. Those components included: 1) total number of words spoken by child, 2) number of questions answered by child, 3) number of task-related questions asked by child, 4) warm-up questions asked by parent, and 5) post-story evaluative questions asked by the parent to be of importance. He concluded that when there is verbal interaction, give and take, between the parent and the child, the child benefits the most (Flood, 1977).

Storytelling and Reading Aloud

An extension of reading aloud and a specific activity that has been shown to relate to and connect the language development/literacy acquisition relationship is that of storytelling. Storytelling improves comprehension, helps children learn sequencing, gives broader understanding of a story and is an aid in improving oral language.

Storytelling is considered an art form. It draws on that creative ability inherent in each of us to expand our imagination, use creative and descriptive language and use higher level thinking skills. When children are actively involved in storytelling they may gain confidence and learn to take the risks needed in new learning situations (Cooter, 1991).

Morrow (1985) investigated whether children who participated in a guided and instructional technique of story telling - retelling of stories read to them - had improved comprehension of the stories. The setting, theme and resolution of a story appear to carry the most meaning and were those elements of the stories recalled most frequently by the children. The results of this study showed improvement in both structural and traditional questions given on the posttest. It was found that the children in the experimental group who had undergone the treatment for retelling stories had significant increases in language complexity. This finding supported the premise that involving children actively in the learning process yielded improved learning. Those students whose storytelling improved the

most also improved the most in comprehension.

Blank and Frank (1971) also supported storytelling as an activity to help children improve comprehension and understanding of a story. When children retell a story by having to repeat it, the story is put into a larger and more relevant semantic and linguistic framework that may help the child elaborate its meaning. This may relate to a child's "creative" language (Blank & Frank, 1971).

Chapter III

Design of the Study

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine language interactions between parent and child during a shared reading storytime.

Research Questions

- 1.) What kinds of responses does a child give when there is positive interaction with the parent?

- 2.) What kinds of responses does a child give when there is negative interaction with the parent?

- 3.) When parents involve the child in higher level thinking skills, what kinds of responses does the child give?

Methodology

Subjects

The subjects for this study were 48 Head Start mother and child pairs from central Pennsylvania. The data for this study was taken from a larger research project done by Dr. Melissa Brown of the SUNY Brockport Psychology Department, which looked at the relationship between parenting strategies and social competence at a Head Start program. Parenting strategies were measured through interviews, videotaping parent and child interactions, looking at a wordless picture book activity, and sorting and playing with duplos, an interconnecting block game. This researcher chose to investigate the wordless picture book activity.

Materials

The mother-and-child pairs were videotaped in their home "reading" Mercer and Marianne Meyer's wordless picture book One Frog Too Many. There were no specific instructions prior to the "reading" of the story. The pairs were asked to make up a story

together, based on the pictures in the book. The videotapes were transcribed by undergraduate research assistants at Penn State University. The data for this present study were taken from these transcripts. Of the 48 original transcripts, 39 were used for this study.

Procedure

Coding

From the transcriptions, the interactions between the mother and child were coded molecularly by the original researchers Brown and Benson. This coding was adapted from a study by Feagan, Farren and Hannen (1990) in which interactions were identified and coded. The quality of the responses and interactions were then compared with the transcripts according to criteria established in Dr. Brown's study and went through a second level of coding. This researcher was not involved in the coding of the transcripts. In this present study, the coded data was used to find the following information:

* total number of verbal responses made by the child

- * the mean length of utterance of the child's responses
- * the number of questions the child asked
- * the number of questions the parent asked
- * the level of questioning of the parent
- * types of child responses and initiations
- * types of parent responses and initiations
- * types of interactions, positive and/or negative, between the
parent and child

See the Appendix for descriptions of code labels.

An interaction sheet was developed to sort and analyze the coded dialogue between the parent and child. This information was taken directly from the coding sheet of Dr. Brown, and interpreted the dialogue in terms of types of narration and/or responses. Here is an interaction taken from the transcript as an example:

Dialogue from transcript	Code
Mother: What are they doing?	M: DA
Child: Riding on the turtle's back.	C: ADR
Mother: Not all of them.	M: RD, MAQ, CLR-

See, it looks like they're
going on a walk or something.

Again, these data are the same as the data from the original coding sheet of Dr. Brown's, but for the purpose of this report and for clarity, this researcher used this arrangement for sorting and analysis. Also on the interaction sheet, questions were noted and the word length of each child response was tallied.

A data sheet, developed by this researcher, was created to tally the number of verbal responses and number of words used by the child to calculate the mean length of utterance. Other information noted on the data sheet included:

- * the number of different words the child used
- * other non-verbal responses
- * other verbal non-word responses
- * inaudible responses

It was not known at the beginning of this study if all of the information on these data sheets was necessary, but was included just the same.

A sample of Dr. Brown's coding sheet and this researcher's data sheet and interaction sheet are included in the appendix.

Categorizing Codes

Taking the definitions from Chapter I, this researcher divided the codes into categories in order to produce a measurable criteria from which the research questions could be answered.

As explained in the definition of terms for this study, a positive interaction is defined as any response by the parent that acknowledges an interaction initiated by the child and/or asks the child to respond with language in an encouraging and supportive way. This definition recognizes two possibly separate interactions. The first interaction being, given the child initiated an interaction with the parent, did the parent respond in a positive way? The second interaction being, given the parent initiated an interaction with the child, was the interaction positive? The codes which were classified into positive response labels for both of these situations included the following codes: RST, RD, CLR, ACK, ELB, CR+, ADR, LP, DA, LIS, PH,

WHY, Q. Many times when the parent acknowledged (ACK) the child after asking a question, the acknowledgement was of another form such as a RST, CLR, or RD, not just an acknowledgement. The coder then simply coded it as RST, CLR, or RD. Other positive interactions that did not fall in either of the above situations but were included with these interactions as being positive were: ONN, COM.

There were also parental responses to children's responses which in many cases ended the interaction. These included ACK, ELB, COM, ADR. These were considered positive, but were not counted as responses because they did not prompt a child response.

When the parent interaction was more complex and had more than one code for an interaction, the transcript was referred to. The interaction had more than one code usually because the mother was trying to redirect or restructure her interaction in order to elicit another different response from the child.

An example: M: RD, ACK, ELB
C: COM

In this example, the mother's RD and ACK came before the ELB, and the ELB is what the child responded to. Therefore, the ELB was the code that was counted because the child responded to that parent interaction. For the purposes of this study, the child's responses dictated what the parent interaction code types were.

As explained in the definition of terms for this study, a negative interaction is any response (or non-response) by the parent that ignores an interaction initiated by the child and/or does not require the child to respond with language. The codes of interaction which defined these negative responses included MAQ and IGN. PRD, COM- and CR- should have been considered negative interactions, but were in fact positive because they elicited response from the child. In some instances, MAQ were considered positive interactions also because of response from the child.

For example: M: RD
C: INR
M: MAQ
C: ELB

In this interaction, the child responded after MAQ and so the

interaction was considered positive rather than negative.

As explained in the definition of terms for this study, higher level thinking skills are those cognitive skills needed to answer questions which deal with predicting outcomes, stating opinions, evaluating how others feel and elaborating on the story. Those codes of interaction which defined these characteristics included: LIS-o, WHY, PH, and ELB.

As explained in the definition of terms for this study, lower level thinking skills are those cognitive skills needed to answer questions which deal with labeling pictures, describing and action and recalling information. Those codes which described lower level thinking skills included: LP, DA, and LIS-c.

This researcher then went through each of the transcripts and tallied each of the different categories. An example of this tally sheet is included in the appendix.

Analysis of the Data

The researcher developed a table of interactions between

parents and children in order to show the types of interactions that took place during the shared storybook reading time. This table represents the total number of responses from all of the transcripts as a combined group. Positive and negative responses were reported, as well as higher level and lower level thinking skills. Child initiated interactions are also noted by color.

Chapter IV

Analysis of the Data

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine language interactions between a parent and child during a shared reading storytime.

Findings and Interpretations

Table A in the Appendix shows the combined totals of all parent/child interactions of all the transcripts analyzed in this study. Coded response/initiations for the child are given along the left hand side of the table, with totals for each coded type listed along the right hand side of the table. Parent initiation/ response codes are listed along the bottom, with totals listed just above the codes.

Question 1: What kinds of responses does a child give when there is positive interaction with the parent?

According to the definition of terms for this study, a positive interaction is defined as any response by the parent that acknowledges an interaction initiated by the child and/or asks the child to respond with language in an encouraging and supportive way. The codes representing positive interactions included all the codes in Table A listed under the child interactions along the left hand side.

Most of the interactions that took place were of a positive nature and most interactions were also initiated by the parent. See Table I below for totals.

Table I

Total number of interactions and % of positive, negative, parent initiated and child initiated interactions

total interactions	positive	negative	parent initiated	child initiated
958	881	77	885	73
% of interactions				
%100	92%	8%	92%	8%

According to Table A in the Appendix, certain types of responses were given more frequently by certain types of parent interactions. When the parent initiates consisted of DA, LP, LIS, CLR, WHY, PH, and RST, which totaled 529, 335 (63%) of the child responses were ADR, with the remaining 151 (29%) being coded as INR, AMR, or IDK. The rest of the 43 responses (8%), were other responses.

When the parent initiates consisted of ONN, ELB, RD, ACK, or CR, which totaled 280, 268 (96%) of the child responses were ACK, ELB, COM, CLR, WHY, CR, DA. All of these interactions were defined as positive and allowed the child to respond with language.

Of the 73 interactions that were initiated by the child, 51 (70%) of those interactions were positively acknowledged by the parent.

There were many times that the parent commented positively to a child's response, but these are not shown on the table because there was no further child response as shown by Dr. Brown's coding system and for the purposes of this study were not considered interactions.

Question 2: What kinds of responses does a child give when there is negative interaction with the parent?

According to the definition of terms for this study, a negative interaction is defined as any response (or non-response) by the parent that ignores an interaction initiated by the child and/or does not require the child to respond with language.

In Table A, the negative interactions are IGN and MAQ. Of the total 958 interactions, 77 (8%) were negative. Of the 77 negative interactions, 33 (43%) of the interactions were IGN. Of the total 33 IGN shown, 22 (67%) were child initiated, which means that the child directly asked a question or made a comment that should have elicited a response from the parent, but didn't. The remaining 11 IGN (33%) were non-responses by the parents which, according to Dr. Brown's coding, should have been appropriate responses made by the parent to the child, rather than ignores. The other 44 (57%) of the negative interactions were MAQ. There were 54 MAQ listed in the table, 10 (19%) of the MAQ responses were already discussed as being positive because they drew a child response. The rest, 44 (81%) were

considered negative, because the mother answered her own question and there was no further response from the child.

There were also other times when the parent's interaction was coded negatively by Dr. Brown, but these elicited a child response, so for the purposes of this study these interactions were considered positive.

To answer the question then, when there is negative interaction, the child does not respond with language. When there was no response by the child, the interaction was coded as negative.

Question 3: When parents involve the child in higher level thinking skills, what kinds of responses does the child give?

According to the definition of terms of this study, higher level thinking skills are defined as those cognitive skills needed to answer questions which deal with predicting outcomes, stating opinions, evaluating how others feel, and elaborating on the story.

Higher level thinking interactions were coded as LIS-o, ELB, PH, and WHY. LIS responses were divided into two categories, o-open and c-closed. The LIS-o responses were considered higher level thinking skill responses because they enlisted the children's ability to think about feelings and come up with answers of their own. The LIS -c responses were responses that the child was given a choice about. For example, an LIS-o interaction by the mother could have been - How do you think the frog felt? This interaction gave the child the responsibility of coming up with valid feelings based on the pictures. An LIS-c interaction by the mother could have been - Do you think the frog is happy or sad? In this interaction the child was given a choice of happy or sad and only needed to pick which answer he thought was best. They both dealt with feelings and what the child thought, but one allowed the child to decide on the response.

Of the 958 total interactions, 155 (16%) were higher level thinking interactions that were tallied under LIS-o, ELB, WHY, and PH. After analyzing the data, this researcher added ONN to the higher level thinking category. The reason for doing this was based on the

numbers and types of responses given by the child in response to this parent initiate. When compared to ELB, which had 70 child responses including 35 ACK, 16 ELB, 14 COM, 2 CLR, 1 WHY, 2 CR; ONN had 141 child responses including 60 ACK, 41 ELB, 9 COM, 9 CLR, 10 WHY, 8 CR, and 2 DA. Given that the child responses to ELB initiates by the parents corresponded to the child responses given to ONN initiates by the parents, and given that these responses made use of higher level thinking skills, ONN was included and analyzed as being in the higher level thinking category. Therefore, of the 958 total interactions, 296 (31%) were considered higher level thinking interactions. Of these interactions, 141 (48%) were ONN, 28 (9%) were LIS-o, 70 (24%) were ELB, 32 (11%) were WHY and 25(8%) were PH. All of these interactions were initiated by the parent. There were times when the child did ask why or asked for clarification. These interactions are not reported here because they fall into the negative interaction category because most often these requests by the child were ignored by the parent.

Case Study

In addition to the information above, the data sheet, interaction sheet and tally sheet for one transcript has been included in the Appendix as a case study of one parent/child reading session. All the information was analyzed, coded, sorted and checked by Dr. Brown, her assistant and this researcher.

Chapter V

Conclusions and Implications

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine language interactions between a parent and child during a shared reading storytime.

Conclusions

The researcher observed that the shared reading storytime was an interactive time for a child to use language in a positive and nurturing atmosphere. Although not all interactions were positive and allowed the child response time, most of the time the interactions were positive and the child used language. This researcher concluded that most parents "told" the story through labelling, describing action, and ongoing narration, mostly lower level thinking skills. Even though ONN was later changed to higher level thinking skills, it was the child responses, not the parent initiates that prompted this change because the parent did not initiate use of higher level thinking skills,

but the child used them in response. Higher level thinking skills were used less than lower level thinking skills and not consistently by those who did incorporate them into their "stories".

The researcher also concluded that it is not only vital to have a positive and nurturing atmosphere when reading with children but also to involve the child with interactions that help them expand and extend their use of language. Asking open ended questions and knowing how to ask them, elaborating on the story, allowing the child to "read", giving the child time to answer questions or comment on the story and interacting more with the child than with the story may be motivating factors for the child to read. With the help of a supportive and nurturing adult or parent, children become engaged and are motivated to participate in the reading process. If parents or other adult readers only ask children to label pictures and describe action, children may not be motivated to read. Children need to be engaged mindfully as well.

There were times when this researcher needed to make judgement calls as to the selection of interaction code types based on

the transcripts. These were done with much thought and careful analyzing of the transcripts.

Implications for Research

Further investigations into shared reading storytime could include the following:

1. Compare a shared reading time without and with specific instructions on using higher level thinking skills to see whether child responses would increase, in terms of length of response.
2. Use a picture book with words and use the same methodology.
3. Using someone other than a parent, find out if the child responds as freely and as much during a shared reading storytime.

4. Do a longitudinal study that involves children's comprehension and use of vocabulary after a number of years of having been read to, to see if there is any significant difference between those read to and those not read to.

5. Change other variables within the study such as reading a different type of book or reading somewhere other than at home.

Implications for Classroom Practice

Reading aloud to children has many benefits, as earlier suggested. As children grow up more and more in homes where parents take an active part in reading to their children, why should that responsibility rest only with parents and not teachers? Teachers sometimes feel guilty "just reading" to kids, but reading to students may be as important a part of curriculum as any worksheet. Teachers should read to their class daily and consistently, and without

fail engage students in language relating to books that deal with thinking and feeling. Without this, we may be bringing up a whole generation of unfeeling, unthinking human beings!

Appendix

Contents

A: Code Definitions

B: Dr. Brown's Coding sheet

C: Data Sheet

D: Interaction Sheet

E: Tally Sheet

F: Table A

Appendix A

CODE DEFINITIONS

- LP - label picture
- DA - describe action
- LIS-o - label internal state open (think, feel)
- LIS-c - label internal state closed (given specific choices such as happy, sad)
- PH - predict what happens
- WHY - a WHY question
- COM - comment
- ONN - ongoing narration
- ADR - adequate response
- AMR - ambiguous response
- INR - inadequate response
- IGN - ignore
- PRD - prod
- RST - restructure
- RD - redirect
- CLR - clarify
- ACK - acknowledge
- ELB - elaborate
- MAQ - Mom answers her own question
- CR+ - positive correct
- CR- - negative correct
- NVR - non-verbal response
- IDK - I don't know

Appendix B

Dr. Brown's Coding Sheet

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB	
1	SS# 75																												
2	INT/IN	LP	DA	LIS	PH	WHY	CQ	COM	ONN	ADR	AMR	INR	IG/P	IG/N	PRD	RST	RD	CLR	ACK	ELB	MAQ	SE	CR	NVR	IDK	NI			
3	1	m							ONN																				
4		c																			ACK								
5		m																			ECB								
6		c																									NVR		
7		m	CP																										
8		c								AOR																			
9		m	(CP)															RST											
10		c								AOR																			
11		m	(CP)																										
12		c								AOR																			
13		m																			ACK								
14																													
15	2	m	CP																										
16		c								AOR																			
17		m																											
18																					ACK								
19	3	m	CP																										
20		c								AOR																			
21		m																											
22																													
23	4	m	CP																										
24		c								AOR																			
25		m																											
26																													
27																													
28																													
29																													
30																													

Appendix C

Data Sheet

Subject number: 75

Total number of words: 221 (18)

Number of verbal responses: 37

Number of verbal non-word responses: 5

Number of non-verbal responses: 3

Number of inaudible responses: 2

Number of different words:

1. once turtle couldn't hollers kicked you're till nobody pond "morn"
2. upon dog open says today playin nice likes gives we
3. a present the get off in to no book dont
4. time for year away you baby nope it like
5. there him posey from hey house so I'm anymore
6. was load his my you forever there done cryin bed
7. little he's crying cause know aint went real surprise
8. boy sad bite dont what gonna big way jumps
9. and because foot like get come kids down find up
10. frog he then bad me out said now

$$MLU = \frac{\text{total number of words}}{\text{number of verbal responses}} = \frac{221}{37} = 5.97$$

of child? - 0
 # of parents? - 43
 # of interactions - 23

of parent? w/child
 verbal response RTB - 23
 * - 3 VNW

(Related to book)
 # of words RTB - 203
 # of VR RTB - 30
 MLU RTB - 6.77

hahaha
 told 12 10
 well
 be
 friends
 yes
 amen.
 that's
 all
 29

Appendix D

Interaction Sheet

Interaction Rate: #15

of words - 203

1- M: ONN
 C: ACK 9
~~M: ELB ?~~
~~M: LP ?~~
 C: ADR 8
 M: LP, RST+ ?
 C: ADR 3
 M: LP, RST+ ?
 C: ADR 3
 M: ACK

~~6- M: ONN
 C: MVR
 (UNQ)~~

7- M: LP
 C: ADR 3
 M: ACK

8a- M: DA ?
 C: ADR 3
 8b- M: DA, RST+ ?
 C: ADR 3

2- M: LP ?
 C: ADR 2
 M: ACK

9- M: DA, RD ?
 C: ADR 11

3- M: LP ?
 C: ADR 2
 M: ELB

10a- M: ONN ?
 C: ACK 1
 10b- M: Why
 C: ADV 5
 M: ELB (MAR)

11- M: LP ?
 C: ADR 2
 M: ELB 2

11- M: DA ?
 C: ADR 8
 M: ELB

5a- M: LIS-D ?
 C: ADR 2

12- M: ONN ?
 C: ACK 2

5b- M: Why ?
 C: JNK 6
 M: ACK
 C: ACK 1

13- M: DA ?
 C: ADR 31
 M: ELB (67)

(38)

References

- Blank, M., & Frank, S. M. (1971). Story recall in kindergarten children. Child Development, 42(1), 299-312.
- Brown, M. & Benson, M. Mother-child book reading interactions and social competence at Head Start. Unpublished research, Penn State University.
- Cohen, D. (1968, Feb.). The effect of literature on vocabulary and reading achievement. Elementary English, 45, 209-213, 217.
- Cooter, R. B., Jr. (1991). Storytelling in the language arts classroom. Reading Research and Instruction, 30 (2), 71-76.
- Elley, W. B. (1989). Vocabulary acquisition from listening to stories. Reading Research Quarterly, 24 (2), 174-187.
- Feagan, L., Farran, D., and Hannen, K. (1990). Bookreading discourse analysis coding manual. Unpublished, Penn State University.
- Flood, J. (1977). Parental styles in reading episodes with young children. The Reading Teacher, 31, 864-867.
- Fagan, W. T., & Hayden, H. R. (1988). Home and school correlates of early interest in literature. Journal of Educational Research, 76 (4), 221-230.
- Manning, M., & Manning, G. (1988). Reading aloud to young children: Perspectives of parents. Reading Research and Instruction, 27 (2), 56-61.

- Many, J. E. (1989). Interaction about text and pictures: What we can learn from a shared reading. Reading Research and Instruction, 28 (4), 48-59.
- McCormick, S. (1977). Choosing books to read to preschool children. Language Arts, 54 (5), 543-548.
- Morrow, L. M. (1983). Home and school correlates of early interest in literature. Journal of Educational Research, 76 (4), 221-230.
- Morrow, L. M. (1985). Developing young voluntary readers: The home - the child - the school. Reading Research and Instruction, 25 (2), 1-8.
- Morrow, L. M. (1985) Retelling stories: A strategy for improving young children's comprehension language complexity. Elementary School Journal, 85 (5), 647-660.
- Morrow, L. M. (1990). Small group story readings: The effects on children's comprehension and responses to literature. Reading Research and Instruction, 29 (4), 1-17.
- Silvern, S. (1985). Parent involvement and reading achievement: A review of research and implications for practice. Childhood Education, 62 (1), 44-50.
- Schickedanz, J. (1978). Please read that story again. Young Children, 33 (5), 48-55.
- Teale, William H. (1981). Parents reading to their children: What we know and need to know. Language Arts, 58 (8), 902-912.
- Trelease, J. (1985). Read aloud handbook. NY: Penguin Books.

Walker, G. M., & Kuerrbitz, I. E. (1979). Reading to preschoolers as an aid to successful beginning reading. Reading Improvement, 16 (2), 149-154.

Warren, J. S., Prater, N. J., & Griswold, D. L. (1990). Parental practices of reading aloud to preschool children. Reading Improvement, 27 (1), 41-45.

Whitehurst, G.J., Falco, F. L., Lonigan, C., Fischel, J.E., DeBaryshe, B. D., Valdez-Manchaca, M. C., and Caulfield, M. (1988). Accelerating language development through picture book reading. Developmental Psychology, 24 (4), 552-559.

Yaden, D., Smolkin, L., & Conlon, A. (1989, Spring). Preschooler's questions about pictures, print conventions, and story text during reading aloud at home. Reading Research Quarterly, 24, 188-214.