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Emergent literacy may be described as the process of learning about the environment that leads to the development of meaning and concepts, including concepts about the functions of reading and writing. Research supports certain practices that promote emergent literacy in young children, and federal legislation outlines requirements for Head Start programs with regard to specific activities that should be promoted to enhance children's emergent literacy skills. This study asked teachers from 318 Head Start programs in the Southeast United States to complete a survey that asked specific questions targeting the emergent literacy practices used in classrooms, as well as familiarity with recent Head Start legislation and knowledge of suggested practices to promote literacy. Two hundred teachers completed and returned the surveys. The percentages of teachers utilizing recommended practices in the Head Start classrooms are provided in this study. Data analysis also revealed that there is a significant correlation between a respondent's tendency to incorporate more practices into her classroom and her familiarity with the Head Start Act of 1998.
Introduction

Traditionally, it was believed that children do not have the ability to learn to read until they have reached the first or second grade. Children were seen as unable to learn valuable concepts that would aid them in learning to read later on. More recently, however, it was emphasized that these basic reading skills need to be developed at a much earlier age; for example when a child is in preschool, at the age of three or four (Teale & Sulzby, 1989). The idea that children learn basic reading skills at an early age is known as emergent literacy. The concept of emergent literacy has evolved in the past decade as a result of new information on how young children develop an understanding of reading and writing (Gibson, 1989; Hiebert & Fisher, 1990; Neuman & Roskos, 1993). According to these researchers, emergent literacy may be described as the process of learning about the environment that leads to the development of meaning and concepts, including concepts about the functions of reading and writing. The process of emergent literacy essentially begins at birth, involves all aspects of a child’s development, and continues throughout life. A child’s literacy skills continue to develop as the child gains an understanding of the functions of symbols and language, which can be accomplished through experiences with books, print in the environment, and with writing (Clay, 1991; Neuman & Roskos, 1993).

National professional organizations have stressed the importance of early literacy education. The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC, 1998) reported that early education opportunities are necessary if children are going to develop the language and literacy skills necessary to learn to read. Patten (1993) notes another organization stressing the importance of early education and literacy development is the National Network for Child Care (NNCC). “In early grades, performing below grade level expectations in reading is the primary reason for retention. Many children are referred to
special education programs largely because of reading failure" (p. 1). The NNCC also emphasizes that childcare providers who spend a lot of time with children can help foster the development of literacy in children.

The impact a child’s early literacy skills can have on the child’s later achievement was emphasized by the passage of the Early Education Act of 2001 (S. 157, 2001). The purpose of this act is to ensure that children are given the opportunity to attend an early education program. Within that legislation, early education refers to the time period at least one year before a child enters kindergarten. Part of the rationale behind the establishment of this act was that

Evaluations of early education programs demonstrate that compared to children with similar backgrounds who have not participated in early education programs, children who participate in such programs perform better on reading and mathematics achievement tests [and] show greater learning retention, initiative, creativity, and social competency. (Early Education Act of 2001, p. 2)

The National Head Start Association (NHSA, 2000) discusses the revisions that have been made to the Head Start Act of 1998 requiring children, at a minimum, to (a) develop phonemic, print, and numeracy awareness; (b) understand and use language to communicate for various purposes; and (c) develop and demonstrate an appreciation for books. Also outlined in the legislation as educational performance measures, the requirements for Head Start children are to (a) know letters of the alphabet are a special category of visual graphics that can be individually named, (b) recognize a word as a unit of print, (c) identify at least 10 letters of the alphabet, and (d) associate sounds with written words.

It is clear that much is known about the importance of developing emergent literacy skills in young children. Federal legislation outlines requirements for Head Start programs with regard to specific activities that should be promoted to enhance children’s emergent literacy skills. The purpose of the present study is to determine how the knowledge and
Federal requirements are being put into practice. Specifically, this study will assess the practices used to promote emergent literacy in classrooms by Head Start teachers in the Southeast United States. An assessment of the emergent literacy practices will be accomplished by sending out questionnaires to each Head Start program in the Southeast United States. The questionnaire was developed based on requirements set forth by the Head Start Act of 1998.
Emergent Literacy

Emergent literacy involves a number of different skills, knowledge, and attitudes that all combine to form the ability to read, write, and understand what has been read. It is centered on meaning and is a constructive, functional, and interactive process (Whitehurst & Lonigan, 1998). It is constructive in that it develops internally as the child builds concepts about the environment and culture on the basis of active explorations and meaningful language. It is functional, in that the purpose is to allow the child to perform activities in natural situations, such as reading directions, scanning a map, or recording a telephone message. Also, it is interactive because it involves feedback from adults or other children on child-initiated play and language (Clay, 1991; Neuman & Roskos, 1993; Strickland & Morrow, 1989).

The focus on emergent literacy can be seen in the school systems at the early grade levels. It is beginning to play a more important role in curriculum as schools move toward more advanced kindergarten classrooms and as more is expected of children in relation to their readiness to read when they become of school age. The term emergent literacy is best thought of as a continuum of learning experiences, starting out in early life, rather than the all-or-none phenomenon that begins when children start school (Whitehurst & Lonigan, 1998). The focus is now shifting to preschool classrooms and what can be done for children ages three and four to help promote their literacy skills (Teale & Sulzby, 1989).

Teale and Sulzby (1989) identify five functions essential to acquiring emergent literacy. The first is to recognize that in a literate society, learning to read and write begins very early in life. Traditional views of teaching reading to children only ages six and above
need to be cast aside. The new focus should look to younger children, ages three and four, to begin the reading process. The second function is that literacy is an integral part of the learning process. Real life situations help promote emergent literacy most, and it is these types of situations that are influencing young children. A third point is that reading and writing develop simultaneously. Both areas must be promoted to ensure a literate child. Fourth, children learn actively by constructing their own understanding of how their written language works. Children display this understanding by invented spellings and their "pretend" reading. The final function states that the demonstrations of literacy by parents and teachers are very important for the development of emergent literacy skills.

Before discussing the practices that best promote emergent literacy, it is necessary that the skills involved with the concept be understood. According to Whitehurst and Lonigan (1998), there are two levels of processing that make up emergent literacy. There is the outside-in process, which represents a child's understanding of the context of a book or similar writing that they are trying to read. There is also the inside-out process, which is a child's understanding of rules used in reading and writing.

Outside-in processing. The three levels to outside-in processing are language, convention of print, and emergent reading (Whitehurst & Lonigan, 1998). First, at a very basic level, a child must have sufficient language skills in order to develop the process of reading. There are several aspects of language that are important at different levels in the process of emergent literacy. "Reading, even in its earliest stages, is a process that is motivated by the extraction of meaning" (Whitehurst & Lonigan, 1998, p. 50). This step includes a child being able to sound out each word by syllable and to combine all of the syllables to produce a meaningful word. Language also requires a conceptual knowledge aspect necessitating that the child have an understanding of the word as well. The lack of this understanding causes a word to have no meaning for a child. Not only must the child
have conceptual knowledge, but he/she must also have convention of print, which is the next step in the outside-in process.

Convention of print is another basic unit of outside-in processing. It includes common English rules such as reading from left to right and top to bottom, and understanding basic punctuation, such as commas and question marks. It also involves knowing differences between pictures, the cover of a book, and the print on the pages of a book (Whitehurst & Lonigan, 1998).

The third level of outside-in processing is emergent reading. Emergent reading is simply when a young child is pretending to read what is on a page of a book. This reading pretense is often demonstrated in young children. Young children will pick a colorful book and go through it either making up a story based on the pictures or actually telling the correct story from memory, especially if it is a favorite book of theirs. "This reading-like play rapidly becomes picture stimulated, page matched, and story-complete" (Holdaway, 1979, p. 40).

**Inside-out processing.** Inside-out processing is an aspect of reading that is a more involved procedure for a child as they learn to read. Whitehurst and Lonigan (1998) discuss five main areas of focus in the area of inside-out processing. These areas include the knowledge of the grapheme, syntactic awareness, phoneme to grapheme correspondence, phonemic awareness, and finally emergent writing. Grapheme understanding is simply understanding and using the letters of the alphabet for a particular language. According to Lesiak (1997), "children who know the names of letters tend to be children who succeed in reading" (p. 219). Also, Scott and Enri (1990) point out that learning letter-names is important; it is through learning these names that children learn to discriminate and remember shapes and learn many of the sounds commonly made by the letters in words. A child must have a basic understanding of letters and their names to learn to read.
The next area of the inside-out process is syntactic awareness. This area focuses on grammatical concepts in reading and is also known as structural awareness. It deals with one's knowledge of sentence structure. This knowledge of structure helps speed up reading because it allows a child to focus more on comprehension than on the separation of sentences and phrases.

Phoneme to grapheme correspondence is another area to inside-out processing. Phoneme to grapheme correspondence deals with a child beginning to understand that there is a link between phonemes and the alphabet. Phoneme to grapheme correspondence takes practice since there are many sounds that are the same in the English language.

The fourth area of inside-out processing is phonemic awareness. A child must be able to recognize a letter's corresponding sound and grouping of sounds. Phonemic awareness consists of conscious manipulation of phonemes in spoken language and involves an awareness of syllables, phonemes, and phonetic units of speech (Jenkins & Bowen, 1994).

The last skill described by Whitehurst and Lonigan (1998) is emergent writing. This skill occurs when a child invents spellings of words and pretends to write. It can be as basic as writing letters and claiming that they have written their name or as complex as writing words using invented spelling and claiming they have written a story.

Fostering emergent literacy. In order to foster the skills outlined by Whitehurst and Lonigan (1998), there are activities that teachers can engage children in to encourage emergent literacy. Appropriate teaching strategies include (a) preparing the environment for children to learn through active exploration and ties with others and materials, (b) allowing children to select many of their own activities from a variety of prepared learning areas, (c) having children work individually or in small groups most of the time, and (d) avoiding workbooks, dittoes, and flashcards (Lesiak, 1997; Moyer, Egertson, & Isenberg, 1987).
A Literate Environment

Optimal Head Start environments can facilitate the development of children’s emergent literacy skills. Researchers have found that within the Head Start classroom, separate reading centers are a useful tool to provide maximum development of literacy skills (Lesiak, 1997). The way the learning environment is structured is important. The Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) suggests several principles that are important (Moyer et al., 1987). These suggestions are as follows: (a) the room arrangement should accommodate individual, small group, and large group activities, (b) learning centers or interest areas need to be clearly defined, differentiated, and be arranged to facilitate activity and movement, and (c) materials should be displayed and arranged so that they are inviting, accessible, and changed as children develop. Lesiak (1997) also suggests establishing a corner where reading is promoted as an everyday activity, not as an instructional activity. Posters should be hung on the walls and a variety of books should be provided, including familiar books, newspapers, and magazines. The area should accommodate five to six children and have comfortable chairs and pillows for the children. It is important to introduce new books every other week to replace the others. Play-acting and puppets should also be encouraged as forms of emergent reading.

The National Network for Child Care suggest that in order for an environment to be print-rich, it is necessary that there be multiple materials or areas for children to experiment with letters, words, and numbers (Patten, 1993). These materials include such items as books (for children of all ages), labels for children to see and read, newspapers, magazines, crayons, pencils, paper (of all kinds), envelopes, chalkboards, magnetic or stamp block letters, notes written for children, cooking or science recipes for children to use, lists for grocery shopping, directions for children to refer to in an obstacle course, graphs to read and use, and so on. They also suggest that children have many opportunities to use the materials. They suggest planned activities on a daily basis, such as
adults reading a variety of books to children, children reading on their own, children reading to other children or adults, reading recipes, and reading letters in a post office.

In support of the ideas suggested above, researchers point out that children need an opportunity to practice what they have learned about print with their peers and on their own. Studies suggest that the physical arrangement of the classroom can promote time with books (Morrow & Weinstein 1986; Neuman & Roskos, 1997). A suggested key area is a classroom library, a collection of attractive stories and informational books that provide children with immediate access to books. Neuman and Roskos (1993) also suggest that children learn about reading from labels, signs, and other kinds of print they see around them. Highly visible print labels on objects, signs, and bulletin boards in classrooms demonstrate the practical uses of written language. In environments rich with print, children incorporate literacy into their dramatic play (Morrow, 1990; Neuman & Roskos 1997).

In a study by Taylor, Blum, and Logsdon (1986), the hypothesis that high print classrooms create a more productive environment for the development of reading skills was supported. High print classrooms are places having significant amounts and varieties of reading materials for the students to use. Taylor et al. (1986) compared the emergent literacy skills of students in high print classrooms to students that were not in high print classrooms. Four areas surfaced as having an impact on the differences between low and high print classrooms: (a) type of language used in displays, (b) location of print in the room, (c) availability of print to children, and (d) time frame of ongoing written language play in the classroom. Results showed that the children in the high print environment scored significantly higher on a written language awareness test and school readiness test.

**Reading Aloud to Children**

Research has also suggested that one of the most important activities in enhancing a child's emergent literacy skills is reading aloud (Bus, Van Ijzendoorn, & Pellegrini 1995;
Wells, 1985). “The single most important activity for building the knowledge required for eventual success in reading is reading aloud to children” (Anderson, Hiebert, Scott, & Wilkinson, 1985, p. 23). However, it is important that this reading is done in a certain way and practiced frequently before a child enters kindergarten. Research has shown that children who have fewer literacy experiences in preschool tend to be poorer readers later in school. For example, Walker and Kuerbitz (1979) found that first grade reading achievement increased with frequency of story reading as preschoolers. Children who were read to everyday had generally higher achievement in first grade. Similarly, Scarborough, Dobrich, and Hager (1991) found that second grade students who were poor readers had less frequent preschool related reading experiences. These poorer readers had fewer activities with books, were read to less frequently, and had parents who did less reading.

As previously mentioned, reading aloud to children may be most helpful if conducted in a certain way. Teale and Sulzby (1989) suggest previewing the book, establishing a receptive story listening context, briefly introducing the book, reading with expression, and engaging children in discussion about what is being read. Strickland and Morrow (1990) suggest repeated readings where children read parts of the story in unison; teaching concepts of print by pointing to the text as it is read, pointing out text features such as repeated words or punctuation marks, and using cloze activities where children predict words to fit sentences in the story.

Whitehurst et al. (1994) also note that children should be active participants in reading. The researchers suggest that dialogic reading can produce substantial changes in preschool children’s language skills. Dialogic reading involves several changes in the way adults typically read books to children; there is a shift in roles. During most readings, the child listens and the adult reads. In dialogic reading, the child learns to become the storyteller. The adult assumes the role of an active listener, asking questions, adding
information, and prompting the child to increase the sophistication of descriptions of the material in the book. For younger children (2-3 years old), questions from adults focus on pages in a book, asking the child to describe objects, actions, and events on the page (e.g., “What is this?” “What is the duck doing?”). For children ages 4-5 years old, questions focus on the narrative as a whole or on relations between the book and the child’s life (e.g., “Have you ever seen a duck swim?” “What did the duck look like?”). This type of shared reading gives children a more active role in the reading process, thereby increasing their reading skills through active participation.

Smith and Dixon (1995) likewise suggest that children should be encouraged to talk about the pictures, retell the story, discuss their favorite actions, and request multiple readings. It seems that it is the talk that surrounds storybook readings that gives the reading power, helping children to bridge what is in the story and their own lives.

Purpose of the Present Study

A child’s exposure to reading and print is an important factor in determining his/her later reading achievement. Children in Head Start programs are typically at-risk for later academic difficulties. Providing Head Start children with opportunities to promote their emergent literacy skills should prove beneficial. The extreme importance of exposure to emergent literacy activities is stressed by the International Reading Association’s and the National Association for the Education of Young Children’s joint position statement (IRA, NAEYC, 1998). This position statement states that it is essential and urgent that children are taught to read competently in order for them to be able to achieve today’s high standards of literacy. Unfortunately, it is unknown as to what teachers in Head Start classrooms are doing to promote emergent literacy.

Also indicating the extreme importance of emergent literacy and its incorporation into Head Start classrooms is the Head Start Act of 1998 (NHSA, 2000). As previously mentioned, the Head Start Act outlines requirements for Head Start teachers to follow when
designing their classroom curriculum. It is essential for Head Start teachers to understand the requirements they are expected to incorporate into their classrooms; however, it is unknown how familiar these teachers are with this important legislation.

The intent of this research is to determine how well the practices supported by research and required by the Head Start Act of 1998 (NHSA, 2000) are incorporated into the everyday activities of Head Start classrooms in the southeastern United States. Such findings will provide information as to whether or not children enrolled in Head Start are getting the necessary exposure to emergent literacy they need in order to develop reading skills. The exposure to emergent literacy activities a child receives in the classroom should be assessed so that it can be determined if more effort should be placed on training Head Start teachers of the beneficial aspects of emergent literacy and how to incorporate such practices in their classroom. The Early Education Act of 2001 (S 157 IS) and the Head Start Act of 1998 gives support to the idea that fostering emergent literacy skills is not only a concept supported by research, but one supported by our government as well.

As a result of this study, an overview of the practices teachers are using to encourage emergent literacy skills in Head Start classrooms across the Southeast United States will be gained. In addition, information about teachers' familiarity with the Head Start Act of 1998 will be obtained. It is hypothesized that those Head Start teachers who are familiar with the Head Start Act of 1998 will be the teachers who are incorporating more emergent literacy activities into their classrooms. This study will also attempt to answer specific questions regarding emergent literacy and its usage in classrooms across the southeast United States. The research questions are as follows:

Hypothesis 1: What are Head Start teachers doing to promote emergent literacy in their classrooms? Specifically, are the teachers practicing the research-based requirements the Head Start Act of 1998 outlines?

Hypothesis 2: How familiar are Head Start teachers with early literacy requirements in the Head Start Act of 1998?
Hypothesis 3: Does familiarity with the Head Start Act of 1998 promote increased incorporation of literacy activities in the classroom?

Hypothesis 4: How does a teacher's knowledge of practices to promote emergent literacy in the classroom relate to their actual utilization of the suggested practices?
Method

Participants

A list of all the Head Start programs in the Southeast United States was obtained to identify potential participants. Information about the research project was sent to every Head Start program in eight Southeastern states (Georgia, South Carolina, Mississippi, North Carolina, Florida, Kentucky, Alabama, and Tennessee). Each program director was asked to identify one teacher from each program that teaches four to five year old children and would likely participate in completing the questionnaire. A total of 200 Head Start teachers completed and returned the surveys used in this study for a response rate of 62.9%. A description of the participants is provided in Table 1. The teachers were predominantly female. Their years of experience as a Head Start teacher ranged from less than a year to 34 years. Many of the respondents had only a GED or high school diploma as their highest degree. Many of the participants, however, have received additional training by obtaining their Child Development Associate degree or are working toward an advanced degree.

Instrument

The questionnaire (see Appendix A) was developed by this investigator upon completion of a literature review of emergent literacy practices and the Head Start Act of 1998 (NHSA, 2000). The aspects of emergent literacy that were stressed most often in the research and legislation were incorporated into the survey questions concerning practices in Head Start classrooms. The Head Start Act of 1998 sets forth requirements for Head Start teachers to follow in their classrooms. The questions in the survey were designed to assess exactly what requirements from the Head Start Act that teachers are addressing in their classrooms.
Table 1

*Characteristics of the Sample of Head Start Teachers (n=200)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Experience</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-34</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School/GED</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate of Arts</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Training</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Development Associate Degree</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in coursework</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The questions adapted from the literature review are necessary in order to attain information on how teachers are reading to their students, what "print" they have available to the students, the materials they deem important to fostering a print rich environment, and other related activities. The requirements set forth by the Head Start Act of 1998 that primarily focused on developing reading skills were the foundation for the questions contained in the current questionnaire.

Procedure

Each Head Start program director was sent a cover letter describing the purpose of the study (see Appendix B), a cover letter for the teacher (see Appendix C), and the questionnaire for the teacher to complete. The directors were asked to distribute the materials to a teacher of four to five year olds who would be most likely to complete the questionnaire. The teachers were asked to complete the questionnaires and mail them back within two weeks. The materials also included a pre-addressed and stamped envelope in which to mail the questionnaires. In order to increase the incentive for teachers to complete the questionnaire and mail it back, there were two drawings for $20 among the teachers who completed the questionnaires. In order to maintain the teachers' anonymity, a separate slip of paper for the drawing was included with each questionnaire. The teacher filling out the questionnaire was given the opportunity to put her name and address on the paper if she chose to do so. The teachers were then asked to mail the slip of paper back with the questionnaire. Upon receipt, this slip of paper was immediately separated from the questionnaire and placed in a separate pile, so that each teacher's anonymity was protected. The two drawings for $20 were done after receipt of the questionnaires. The winning teachers were then mailed his/her money. This study did not include a follow-up because the returned questionnaires were not identified by program or participant. The study was approved by the Human Subjects Review Board at Western Kentucky University (see Appendix D).
Results

Descriptive Statistics

The surveys were analyzed to assess the percentage of teachers who utilize required emergent literacy practices in their classrooms, the practices being utilized the most and least in classrooms, ratings of familiarity with the Head Start Act of 1998, and perceptions of need for additional training in the area of emergent literacy. A detailed description of the findings from the survey is found in Table 2. In order to get a more complete picture of the overall usage of suggested practices in Head Start classrooms today, a detailed description of the findings for questions on the survey is provided below. Analysis of the completed surveys revealed that the majority of those surveyed modeled how to sound out words as an instructional activity daily. While reading aloud to their class, only half of those surveyed stopped to sound out words with which their students were unfamiliar, but most explained the meaning of words with which their students were unfamiliar. The majority of teachers stopped to point out pictures in the stories they were reading, but just over half pointed out words that corresponded to the pictures in the story. The majority of teachers stopped while reading to ask their students to predict what would happen next in the story. While reading to a small group or individual only about half of those surveyed encouraged their students to read along with them. Almost all of those surveyed had a designated reading corner in their classroom changed the book assortment in their reading corner 2-4 times a month. Most of those surveyed read to their students everyday. Of those surveyed, there were more who said that they taught the letters of the alphabet to their students than those who said they taught the sounds of letters. Not all of those who teach the names of letters to their students also teach the sounds of the letters. Many teachers
read to their students as a fun activity or way of rewarding good behavior and also spend time with their students pointing out the rules of reading. When asked what types of "print" they have available to the students in their classroom, the most common types available were books, posters, bulletin boards, and labels on objects in the classroom. The materials that teachers reported having the least were graphs and newspapers.

Respondents’ answers to the comparison questions of how familiar they are with the Head Start Act and how knowledgeable they feel they are about practices to promote emergent literacy are found in Table 3. When asked how familiar they are with the Head Start Act of 1998, there was a range of responses. Almost half of the respondents felt they had quite a bit of knowledge, but very few felt that they had extensive knowledge of the act. When asked how knowledgeable they perceived themselves regarding practices to promote emergent literacy in their classrooms, 78% of the respondents felt they had quite a bit of knowledge or had extensive knowledge. Most of the respondents (88.5%), however, felt that they needed more training as regards incorporating early literacy activities in the classroom.
Table 2

*Descriptive Results of Head Start Teacher's Emergent Literacy Practices (n=200)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require verbal expression of wants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely/Never</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound out words for instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely/Never</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 times a month</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last time read a story to class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read without stopping</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sounded out unfamiliar words to class</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained meaning of unfamiliar words</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped to point to pictures</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointed to words that matched a picture</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked students to predict what would occur next</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged students to read along (in small group)</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading area in room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Item</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow students to “pretend” read</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change assortment of books in reading area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a Year</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 times a year</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 times a month</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puppets or play props accessible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency students see teacher reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 times a week</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often read to students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 times a week</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Item</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach letters of alphabet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach sounds of letters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read as fun activity or reward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage “pretend” reading and writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point out <em>rules</em> of reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of <em>print</em> available in classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin Boards</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Printouts</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructions/Directions for Activities</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphs</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labels for objects</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Teacher’s Familiarity with the Head Start Act and Knowledge of Emergent Literacy Practices (n=200)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity with Act</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of practices</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scoring

In order to correlate the participants' level of emergent literacy activities with other variables, each survey was scored as a means to obtain a total score for comparison. Each Yes/No question was given a score of “4” or “0.” The “Yes” answers reflecting the appropriate emergent literacy practice were given a “4” and the “No” answers not reflecting the appropriate practice were given a “0.” There is one exception to this type of scoring. The last question on the survey asked if the teachers used a published curriculum. The use of a published curriculum is not specified in the Head Start Act of 1998; therefore, this question was given a score of “1” for Yes and “0” for No in order to avoid giving this question too much weight in the total score. The questions answered on a Likert scale were scored beginning with “0” for the least desirable answer and continuing to “3” or “4” for the most desirable answer, depending on the number of possible responses for each respective question. Each possible answer on the two questions that included check lists was scored a “1” if checked and a “0” if not checked. An exception was made with question “3a” (I read to my students without stopping.), which was reverse scored due to the fact that an affirmative answer on this item would not be beneficial to promoting emergent literacy.

Due to the fact that answers following the requirements set forth by the Head Start Act of 1998 would receive the highest score, a larger total on the survey indicates more utilization of emergent literacy practices. In order to analyze the tendency for Head Start teachers in this survey to incorporate literacy practices in their classrooms, two total scores were computed. Total 1 addresses the number of appropriate emergent literacy practices and includes all questions with the exception of Question #16, which asks how familiar the teachers are with the Head Start Act of 1998. Total 1 excluded Question #16 so that the number of appropriate emergent literacy practices and the teachers’ familiarity with the Head Start Act of 1998 could be compared to determine if a participant’s total score was
affected by their familiarity with the act. Total 2 excluded Question #16 and Question #17, which asked how knowledgeable the teachers perceived themselves to be regarding practices to promote emergent literacy in their classroom. These two questions were excluded so that the participants’ totals could be compared to their familiarity with the Head Start Act of 1998, as well as how knowledgeable they feel they are regarding practices that can promote emergent literacy in their classrooms.

**Correlational Analysis**

In order to test the hypothesis that those teachers who are more familiar with the Head Start Act of 1998 would be more likely to promote emergent literacy practices in their classroom, the number of appropriate emergent literacy practices (Total 1) was compared to the teacher’s familiarity with the Head Start Act of 1998 (Question #16). The highest score possible for Total 1 was 74. The mean of all participants for Total 1 was 65.09 ($SD = 5.69$). Comparison of Total 1 to the teacher’s ratings of their familiarity with the Head Start Act of 1998 (Question #16) revealed that there is a significant correlation between a participant’s total score and their familiarity with the Head Start Act of 1998 ($r = .27, p < .01$).

The highest score a teacher could receive regarding her usage of literacy practices (Total 2) was a 70. The mean of all participants for Total 2 was 62.17 ($SD = 5.55$). Analysis indicated that there is a significant correlation between the participants' total scores and their perceived knowledge of emergent literacy activities in their Head Start classrooms ($r = .16, p < .05$).

A moderated multiple regression analysis was conducted in order to examine the relations between the participants' total scores measuring their usage of literacy practices (Total 2), the teachers' perceived knowledge of literacy practices (Question #17), and the teachers' familiarity with the Head Start Act of 1998 (Question #16). Table 4 presents the analysis which revealed a significant increment in $R^2$ for the addition of the interaction term.
Thus, perceived knowledge of emergent literacy behaviors moderates the relations between emergent literacy practices and familiarity with the Head Start Act of 1998.

Table 4

*Moderated Multiple Regression Analysis of Teacher Familiarity with the Head Start Act of 1998 and Perception of Knowledge about Emergent Literacy Practices + Rating of Usage of Literacy Practices (n=200)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage of Literacy Practices</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived knowledge</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage of Literacy Practices</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Knowledge</td>
<td>-3.064</td>
<td>1.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage of Literacy Practices x Perceived Knowledge</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R^2 = .114$ for Step 1. $\Delta R^2 = .05$ for Step 2 ($p < .05$).
Discussion

The Head Start Act of 1998 is important legislation that outlines the requirements teachers should follow to ensure that their students are receiving the proper emergent literacy exposure needed to develop literacy skills. One of the purposes of this study was to gain information regarding what practices Head Start teachers are using to promote emergent literacy in their classrooms.

Analysis of the data revealed that, for the most part, teachers are reporting that they are using research-based practices in their classrooms. Research suggests that children who are exposed to print rich environments, including a designated reading corner, are more likely to gain emergent literacy skills (Lesiak, 1997; Taylor et al., 1986). The vast majority of teachers have a specific area in their room geared toward reading, and they change the assortment of books in this area weekly. This finding is a positive one for today’s Head Start classrooms. It is also encouraging that most of the teachers surveyed read to their students everyday, most stopped when reading to point out pictures that the words in the story described, and paused to ask the children what they thought might happen next in the story. Reading aloud that involves activities such as stopping to point out pictures and asking children to develop ideas about what might happen next are part of a type of reading called *dialogic* reading. This type of shared reading gives children a more active role in the reading process, thereby increasing their reading skills through active participation. Smith and Dixon (1995) likewise suggest that children should be encouraged to talk about the pictures, retell the story, discuss their favorite actions, and request multiple readings. The researchers have suggested that dialogic reading can produce substantial changes in preschool children’s language skills. It appears that many
Head Start teachers are incorporating some of these important dialogic reading practices into their classrooms.

Analysis of the survey results also suggests that there are areas in need of improvement as regards many teachers’ incorporation of literacy activities into their classroom. Only half of those teachers surveyed stopped when reading to sound out words with which their students were unfamiliar. It was also found that only about half of teachers encouraged their students to read along with them (when reading to a small group or individual). Another unfortunate finding was that not all teachers showed their students words that corresponded to the pictures illustrating the story they were reading. The aforementioned activities are important for teachers to engage in so that their students are active participants in the reading process. This active participation is stressed repeatedly in the research. Strickland and Morrow (1990) suggest readings where children read parts of the story in unison; teaching concepts of print by pointing to the text as it is read and pointing out text features such as repeated words or punctuation marks. This active participation promotes greater acquisition of emergent literacy skills (Teale & Sulzby, 1989).

The finding that very few teachers felt they had extensive knowledge and less than half felt they had quite a bit of knowledge of the Head Start Act of 1998 is not necessarily unexpected; however, this study is the first to provide verification that many Head Start teachers are unfamiliar with the relatively recent legislation that should directly affect their teaching strategies. Also of importance is the finding that few teachers surveyed felt that they had extensive knowledge of good emergent literacy practices to incorporate in their classroom. Of those surveyed, the vast majority indicated that they would want more training as regards incorporating emergent literacy activities in their classroom. These findings reveal that Head Start teachers across the Southeast do not seem to feel that their knowledge of how to promote emergent literacy in their classrooms is adequate. They lack
an extensive depth of knowledge of the Head Start Act of 1998, which outlines the practices required in their classrooms. Given the extreme importance of emergent literacy skill acquisition, the fact that most teachers in the Southeast feel they need more training regarding the promotion of emergent literacy in their classrooms is a noteworthy finding.

It was hypothesized that the more familiar a teacher was with the Head Start Act of 1998, the more emergent literacy practices he/she would incorporate into his/her classroom. There was a significant correlation between teacher familiarity with the act and their use of emergent literacy practices, which supports the hypothesis. Teachers' ratings of how knowledgeable they felt they were about emergent literacy practices also resulted in a significant correlation with their use of emergent literacy practices. The moderated multiple regression analysis revealed that the more familiar a teacher is with the Head Start Act of 1998, the more knowledgeable they perceive themselves to be about emergent literacy activities to incorporate into their classroom and the more emergent literacy activities they report using in their classrooms. This finding could prove beneficial to those directing Head Start programs. The results suggest that the more Head Start teachers are informed about the Head Start Act and the more knowledgeable they feel they are as regards emergent literacy promotion, the greater the promotion of emergent literacy seems to be in the classroom.

This study has skimmed the surface of practices that are currently being used in Head Start classrooms across the southeast United States. The government has perceived the importance of incorporating emergent literacy into Head Start through the passage of the Head Start Act of 1998. Head Start teachers have expressed a desire to receive more training regarding teaching strategies that will promote emergent literacy. The findings of this study suggest that the more knowledgeable teachers have about the Head Start Act and the information contained within it, the more likely they are to feel that they are knowledgeable of practices to promote literacy in their classrooms and the more proficiently they actually will promote emergent literacy in their classrooms.
This information may be helpful to directors of Head Start programs when planning training programs for their teachers. It seems that educating teachers about current legislation is one way to improve their teaching strategies in the classroom. It may also give them more confidence regarding their ability to implement literacy activities into their curriculum. This approach could only lead to fostering a better education for those enrolled in Head Start programs.

**Limitations**

There are some limitations to this study. The fact that this investigator developed the questionnaire used in this study was a limitation in itself. Although the survey was developed based on research and federal legislation, there are no reliability or validity data to see if the questions used within the survey are the most appropriate questions to assess emergent literacy practices. There is also the possibility that those answering the survey were not always doing exactly what they said they were doing in their classrooms. Teachers may have responded that they engaged in the activities because they recognized the activities were appropriate practice. An additional limitation may be that the directors were asked to choose only one teacher from each program to complete the survey. We don’t know if all the teachers in the program are following the same practice as the one surveyed. We may have obtained an estimate of each program’s best candidate for completing the survey. Thus, this sample would not be representative of all Head Start teachers.

**Future Research**

Areas for future research could include a study to gather data concerning possible differences between Head Start programs in different regions of the United States. It would be beneficial if the survey questions were reviewed by experts in the field of emergent literacy in order to assess the content validity of the assessment instrument. There may be different practices that are promoted in different regions of the United States.
It would also be interesting to conduct a study that looks at the amount of emergent literacy practices in a Head Start classroom and the later achievement of the students receiving the literacy based instruction. Do students who have attended a Head Start program that incorporated many emergent literacy activities tend to excel in reading and writing later? Do students whose Head Start program encouraged emergent literacy develop a greater interest in reading books later? It might also be interesting to actually observe the emergent literacy practices in Head Start classrooms. Having the opportunity to physically observe the practices in the classrooms would allow for a more detailed description of the actual practices being utilized.
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APPENDIX A

Letter to Head Start Directors
January, 2002

Dear Head Start Program Director:

Your Head Start program is one of over 300 programs that is being asked to assist in a study about the promotion of emergent literacy in Head Start classrooms. This study is being conducted by Emily Seeger and Dr. Carl Myers of Western Kentucky University. The aim of the study is to get a better understanding of what activities are utilized in Head Start classrooms to encourage students to read. This study is being done in the form of a questionnaire, which is enclosed in this packet.

If you are not directly involved with your Head Start teachers you may want to forward this to your education director. We would like you to distribute the survey to one Head Start classroom teacher who teaches 4 to 5 year old children (and one you feel would likely complete and mail the survey back). The questions should only take a few minutes to answer. Instructions for the teacher and a return envelope are enclosed. There is also a slip of paper included, requesting the name and address of the person who completes the questionnaire. The inclusion of one's name is voluntary. If the teacher chooses to include her name and address with the questionnaire, her name will be separated from the survey so as to protect the teacher's anonymity. The names will be used for two random drawings for $20 for the teachers who complete and return the surveys.

We emphasize that your organization and teacher's participation is entirely voluntary. All questionnaire information collected in this study will be presented in summary format; no data will be identified by program or teacher.

The procedures in this study have been reviewed and approved by the Western Kentucky University Committee for the Protection of Human Research Participants. Any questions about this study may be directed to Emily Seeger at (270) 756-3028 or Dr. Carl Myers at (270) 745-4410. For administrative purposes, contact Dr. Phil Myers at (270) 745-4652. We urge you to call if you have any questions.

We hope that you will help us by taking part in our study. Thank you for your help!

Emily Seeger, B.A.
School Psychologist Intern

Carl Myers, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Psychology
APPENDIX B

Letter to Head Start Teachers
January, 2002

Dear Head Start Teacher:

You are being asked to participate in a study about the promotion of emergent literacy in Head Start classrooms. This study is being conducted by Emily Seeger and Dr. Carl Myers of Western Kentucky University.

We would greatly appreciate your cooperation. The questionnaire should only take a few minutes to complete. Upon completion of it, please place it in the enclosed return envelope and put it in the mail. There is also a slip of paper enclosed where you can write your name and address. The inclusion of your name and address is optional and is being used to encourage teachers to participate in this study. If you choose to include your name and address with the questionnaire, the paper with your name on it will be immediately separated from the survey upon receipt so as to protect your anonymity. **Two random drawings for $20 will be conducted for those teachers completing and returning the survey.**

Please complete and return the questionnaire by January 20th.

We emphasize that your participation is entirely voluntary. All questionnaire information collected in this study will be presented in summary format; no data will be identified by program or teacher.

The procedures in this study have been reviewed and approved by the Western Kentucky University Committee for the Protection of Human Research Participants. Any questions about this study may be directed to Emily Seeger at (270) 756-3028 or Dr. Carl Myers at (270) 745-4410. For administrative purposes, contact Dr. Phil Myers at (270) 745-4652. We urge you to call if you have any questions.

Thank you so much for taking part in our study!

Emily Seeger, B.A.
School Psychologist Intern

Carl Myers, Ph. D.
Associate Professor of Psychology
APPENDIX C

Head Start Survey
HEAD START SURVEY

Please answer the following questions based on what you typically do on a day to day basis.

General Information
What is the age range of the students in your classroom? _________
What age(s) are most of the students you teach in your Head Start classroom? _______
How many years have you been a Head Start or early childhood teacher? _______
Gender (please circle one): Male  Male  Female  Female
Highest Degree Received: _____ High School diploma or GED
(check one)  _____ Associate Degree  _____ Bachelors Degree  _____ Post Graduate Degree

Do you have the Child Development Associate degree?  Yes   No
Are you currently enrolled in coursework to gain a more advanced degree?  Yes   No

Specific Information
1. Do you require your students to verbally express what they want/need throughout the school day? (e.g., Tell them to say, I want the red pencil instead of allowing them to simply point to the pencil they want.) (circle one)
   Rarely/Never  Sometimes  Often  Always

2. On average, how often do you model how to sound out words as an instructional activity to the class? (circle one)
   Rarely/Never  Monthly  2-3 times/month  Weekly  Daily

3. Think of the last time you read a story to your class. Please check the choice or choices that best describe how you read the story.
   ___ I read to my students without stopping.
   ___ I stopped to sound out words that my students were not familiar with.
   ___ I explained the meaning of words my students were not familiar with.
   ___ I stopped to point to pictures that illustrated the story I was reading.
   ___ I showed my students some words that corresponded to pictures in the story.
   ___ I stopped and asked my students what they thought would happen next in the story.
   ___ I encouraged my students to read along with me (if reading to an individual or small group).

4. Do you have an area in your room designated as a place to spend time reading? (circle one)  YES   NO

5. Do you stop your students when they are pretending to read a book, but making up their own story? (circle one)
   YES   NO

6. How often do you typically change the assortment of books in your room? (circle one)
   Once a year  2-4 times a year  Once a month  2-4 times a month
7. Do you have puppets or other props accessible to the children in your classroom that they can use to act out stories? (circle one)  
   YES  NO

8. How often do your students see you reading a book, magazine, letter, etc. (circle one)  
   Daily  2-3 times a week  Weekly  Monthly  Rarely

9. How often do you read to your students? (circle one)  
   Daily  2-3 times a week  Weekly  Monthly  Rarely

10a. Do you teach the letters of the alphabet to your students? (circle one)  
   YES  NO

10b. If yes, how many letters of the alphabet do you try to teach your students?____

11. Do you teach the sounds of letters? (circle one)  
   YES  NO

12. Do you read to your students as a fun activity or as a way of rewarding good behavior? (circle one)  
   YES  NO

13. Do you encourage your students to engage in "pretend" reading and writing? (circle one)  
   YES  NO

14. Do you occasionally spend time with your students pointing out the rules of reading? (e.g., reading from top to bottom or from left to right) (circle one)  
   YES  NO

15. What types of print do you have available to the students in your classroom?  
   ___Magazines  ___Computer Printouts
   ___Books  ___Instructions/Directions for Activities
   ___Posters  ___Graphs
   ___Bulletin Boards  ___Labels for objects in classroom

16. How familiar are you with what the Head Start Act of 1998 says about the teaching of early literacy skills? (circle one)  
   Not at all  Just a little  Somewhat  Quite a bit  Extensive

17. Please rate how knowledgeable you perceive yourself to be regarding practices to promote emergent literacy in your classroom. (circle one)  
   Not at all  Just a little  Somewhat  Quite a bit  Extensive

18. I would like more training on how to incorporate early literacy activities in the classroom.  
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Not Sure  Agree  Strongly Agree

19a. Do you use a published curriculum in your classroom? (e.g., High Scope) (circle one)  
   YES  NO

19b. If yes, what is the name of the curriculum? _______________________

THANK YOU
APPENDIX D

Human Subjects Review Board Approval Letter
Dear Emily:

Your research project, "Emergent Literacy in Head Start Classrooms," was reviewed by the WKU HSRB and it has been determined that risks to subjects are: (1) minimized and reasonable; and that (2) research procedures are consistent with a sound research design and do not expose the subjects to unnecessary risk. Reviewers determined that: (1) benefits to subjects are considered along with the importance of the topic and that outcomes are reasonable; (2) selection of subjects is equitable; and (3) the purposes of the research and the research setting is amenable to subjects' welfare and producing desired outcomes; that indications of coercion or prejudice are absent, and that participation is clearly voluntary.

In addition, the IRB found that: (1) signed informed consent will be waived based on 45CFR46.116: the project is below minimal risk and could not be carried out without waiver; (2) Provision is made for collecting, using and storing data in a manner that protects the safety and privacy of the subjects and the confidentiality of the data; and (3) Appropriate safeguards are included to protect the rights and welfare of the subjects.

Your research therefore meets the criteria of Expedited Review and is approved.

Please note that the institution is not responsible for any actions regarding this protocol before approval. If you expand the project at a later date to use other instruments please re-apply. Copies of your request for human subjects review, your application, and this approval, are maintained in the Office of Sponsored Programs at the above address. Please report any changes to this approved protocol to this office. A Continuing Review protocol will be sent to you in the future to determine the status of the project.

Sincerely,

Phillip E. Myers, Ph.D.
Director, OSP and
Human Protections Administrator

C: Dr. Carl Myers, Department of Psychology
HS File 02-049R
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