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ABSTRACT

This study addressed four questions about bilingual first graders' Spanish and English retellings. First, how do their retellings change over the period of one school year? Second, how do their own Spanish and English retellings of the same story compare and contrast? Third, do English retellings influence Spanish retellings? Fourth, do Spanish retellings influence English retellings? The retellings were scored using a holistic measure.

Nine bilingual first grade students were placed in two experimental groups based on teacher observation. The groups were comprised of a heterogenous mix of students and were similar to each other.

The first graders' Spanish and English retellings improved over the school year. Their Spanish retellings consistently scored higher than their English retellings. The findings did not indicate an influence of Spanish retellings on English retellings. There was no influence of English retellings on Spanish retellings, except in one domain of the measure used.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to present the background of the study, statement of the problem, significance of the study, assumptions underlying the study, limitations of the study, and definition of terms.

Background of the Study

Developing the language potential of children is a vital part of children’s education. The language children acquire and use in their everyday lives helps them develop a confident cultural identity. The language that children use may be English or a minority language, especially in the areas of the United States where a large concentration of people are of a language minority group. Cummins (1989) explains that language minority students who develop a confident cultural identity experience a sense of control over their own lives, and they develop the ability, confidence, and motivation to succeed academically.

In order for the students to succeed academically, they must be able to use their language at cognitively-demanding levels. Cummins (1989) refers to this as Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). In most cases, this may be occurring in the children’s first language. At the same time children may be acquiring English as their second language and
are able to function conversationally in English. Cummins (1989) refers to this level as the Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS).

As young children are functioning conversationally in English, their language use is context-embedded and cognitively undemanding. As this level becomes more sophisticated, children may begin to move into more cognitively-demanding English language use with context-embedded support. This development in the second language can occur only if the cognitively-demanding language is developing in the first language. This linguistic proficiency development in the first language also develops a deeper conceptual and linguistic proficiency in the second language. There is a common underlying cognitive/academic proficiency across languages (Cummins, 1989).

As children continue to use their first language at cognitively-demanding levels, their second language also continues to develop to more sophisticated levels. Because literacy-related strategies are cognitively-demanding, the children need the context-embedded support in virtually both languages. In this way, the children become more proficient bilinguals and eventually biliterate.

As young children try to make sense of the world around them they are focusing their attention on speech and print. The area of early literacy is another area with changing
views. As children learn to read and write in conventional terms they go through stages. It is during this time that they begin to develop strategies for reading and writing. The work of Clay (1991) suggests that "literacy activities can become self-managed, self-monitored, self-corrected, and self-extending" (p. 345). Teachers need to provide support for the emergent reader.

In order for students to view reading as a valuable activity they must be given the opportunity to read authentic texts. The authentic texts come in the form of children's literature books. "When we provide real, unabridged literature along with opportunities for choice and exploration, we can capture students’ interest, challenge them to explore new avenues, and encourage them to read for pleasure" (Freeman, 1990, p. 189). Children then have the opportunity to grow as readers with relevant material.

As young readers discover the pleasure of reading they need to be given the opportunity to present what they have learned to the world around them. There also exists a need for teachers to evaluate the comprehension of young readers. However, this evaluation must be appropriate and authentic. At the first grade level paper-pencil comprehension question tests are not appropriate. An appropriate evaluation activity is retelling.

Retellings are postreading and postlistening activities
in which readers or listeners tell their perception of the text. In retelling the readers present to the world their understanding of what they read. This is authentic in that it is the reader’s own perception of the text. Because retelling invites children to take charge of their comprehension it is an appropriate assessment tool. As emergent readers, their potential and creativity should not be stifled by detailed comprehension questions from the teacher.

In addition to being a good assessment tool, retelling also develops a range of critical literacy skills such as reading, writing, listening, talking, thinking, interacting, comparing, matching, organizing information, recalling and comprehending (Brown & Cambourne, 1987). First grade is a critical time for children to continue to develop these strategies. Therefore, retelling is appropriate for emergent readers.

Statement of the Problem

This study was designed to assess oral retellings of bilingual, Spanish and English, first graders over the period of one school year.

Specifically, the following research questions were investigated:

1. How do first graders’ retellings change over time with continued practice and opportunities to retell?
2. How do first graders’ own Spanish and English retellings of the same stories compare and contrast?

3. What are the differences in first graders’ retellings between those children who initially retell a story in Spanish and those children who retell the same story in Spanish following a retelling in English?

4. What are the differences in first graders’ retellings between those children who initially retell a story in English and those children who retell the same story in English following a retelling in Spanish?

Significance of the Study

Retellings are postreading or postlistening activities in which readers or listeners tell or write their representation of the text. As children become more proficient in retelling they are able to present their own representation of the story. In retelling, readers are involved in thinking and organizing their own comprehension, therefore this process integrates reflection, reaction and response to the entire text (Mitchell & Irwin, 1992).

This study of story retelling is important from the standpoint that it will examine bilingual first graders’ oral story retellings over time with continued practice and opportunities to retell. Furthermore, this study will compare similarities and differences of children’s first attempts at
retelling in Spanish and English. Finally, two more dimensions will be examined. This study will then compare and contrast retellings between children who initially retell a story in Spanish and children who retell the same story in Spanish following a retelling in English. This study will also compare and contrast retellings between children who initially retell a story in English and children who retell the same story in English following a retelling in Spanish.

This study may lead to new insights concerning evaluation of first graders' reading comprehension. In addition, this study may provide insights into the relationship between bilingual students' reading and retelling in Spanish and in English. Comprehension is inherent in the Spanish and English retellings of students. The relationship between emergent literacy and the current view on early biliteracy may be demonstrated in this study.

Assumptions Underlying the Study

Before beginning the study, several assumptions were made:
1. Retelling is an appropriate activity to measure reading and listening comprehension for first graders.
2. The students can learn to retell stories.
3. The students can retell orally in both Spanish and English.
4. In retelling, students may not tell all that they can
remember.
5. The text levels are appropriate for first graders.
6. The text levels as established for the children’s books used in this study are scaled according to reading difficulty. For the purposes of this study, these text levels are considered to be representative of the particular levels which have been assigned.
7. The two groups of first grade students in this study were roughly similar in regards to reading ability and language proficiency in both English and Spanish.
8. The students’ first language is Spanish, and English is their second language.

Limitations of the Study
The following limitations must be recognized within this study:
1. The students in this study were only from one first grade classroom.
2. The population of students were in an urban school district with a high transiency rate, which decreased the number of subjects in the study.
3. There were only four text samples used.
4. The children may not be equally proficient in both Spanish and English.
5. The researcher conducting the study was also the classroom
teacher who had other experiences with the children. These experiences may have affected the judgement of the researcher concerning the conduct of the study.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions of terms used often in this study is provided for the reader’s benefit.

1. Retelling A postreading or postlistening activity in which readers or listeners tell or write their representation of the text.

2. Emergence of Literacy The beginning stages of the gradual process in which reading and writing strategies are acquired.

3. Biliteracy Reading and writing strategies developed in two languages.

4. Retelling Profile A 12 item check-list developed by Mitchell and Irwin (1992, In preparation) for evaluating retellings in three areas: text-based comprehension, response and reaction to the text, and language use.

5. Cognitively-Demanding The ability to make academic complex meanings explicit in either oral or written modalities by means of language.

6. Context-Embedded Support of extraneous factors in language use such as immediate feedback, negotiation of meaning, expression, intonation, gestures, etc.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Four major areas of research will be examined to show how they relate to first grade bilingual children's oral story retellings. First, the emergence of literacy will be discussed in order to set a theoretical framework for oral retellings. Second, biliteracy will be examined in order to present the necessity for instructional programs that develop literacy in two languages. Third, the use of children's literature for reading instruction will be reviewed. Fourth, the use of story retellings of children's literature as a postreading activity and as an assessment of reading comprehension will be summarized.

Emergence of Literacy

Recently, the research in early childhood education has moved us away from the notion of readiness and moved toward the idea of emergent literacy. In the past it was believed that we must get students ready to read in kindergarten so that the first grade teacher could teach them to read. Through research we have come to learn that readiness programs greatly underestimated the development of the child in terms
of language learning and literacy development. It is the purpose of this section to examine the notion of emergent literacy.

According to Hall (1987) the word emergent is useful on four counts. First, it implies that development takes place from within the child. Second, emergence is a gradual process: it takes place over time. Third, for something to emerge there has to be something there in the first place, for example, the fundamental ability to make sense of the world is inherent to every child. Finally, things only emerge if the conditions are right. That is, there are contexts which support and facilitate enquiry, respect performance and provide opportunities for engagement in real literacy acts.

We will examine the third and fourth counts in greater detail by looking at the relationship of oral language to literacy development and by examining what the emergent reader and writer do given the appropriate setting.

First we will examine three views of how children learn and/or acquire language. The behaviorists believe that language is learned through environmental conditioning and imitation of adult models (Skinner, 1957). The behaviorists believe that children are programmable robots that repeat exactly what they hear; however, this does not take into account that children are curious, inquisitive people. Another view in language acquisition is represented by the
nativists who believe that language is native, natural and innate to human beings. Every child is born with a "built-in" device for acquiring language (Chomsky, 1965). This view takes environment into consideration, but language is inborn.

A third view of language acquisition is represented by the interactionists. These theorists propose that language is a product of both genetic and environmental factors (McCormick and Schiefelbusch, 1984). Furthermore it is Halliday (1973, 1975) who sees language acquisition as an active process. Children acquire language as they need it in order to make their presence known to those around them, to find out about things in their environment, to tell others their ideas, to accomplish goals, or to socialize. It is in Halliday's ideas about language acquisition that we examine emergent literacy.

It is children's ability to acquire language and attempts to make sense of the world that lead us to literacy development. Glazer (1989) views oral language as a vehicle for the development of reading and writing. Teale and Sulzby (1989) examined this relationship and concluded that children's oral language proficiency is related to their growth in reading and to the ways in which they write. Educators have long seen that a strong oral language base facilitates literacy learning.

Literacy learning begins prior to the child's entrance into school. The home environment and experiences therein
determine to a great deal the success of the child in entering the literate world. Strickland and Morrow (1989) state that learning literacy is seen as a continuous process, which begins in infancy with exposure to oral language, written language, books, and stories. It is a process that has its roots in the home, with branches extending to other environments. Because the roots are in the home, early contacts with print can be thought of as the beginning of a lifelong process of learning to read and write. Not only are children exposed to books but also to the print in the environment around them.

Hall (1987) defines environmental print as the items of print inside and outside the home other than books. This definition can be clarified to mean the signs and logos in the environment around the child. Children know the familiar golden arches as "McDonalds," and do not call it "Burger King." It is at this point that reading begins. This is an example of contextualized print. As children develop in their awareness of print they move to the more decontextualized print of books. Several studies by Goodman and Altwerger (1981), and Harste, Burke and Woodward (1982) suggest that experience with environmental print is an intrinsic part of becoming a literate language user, but that such experiences operate in conjunction with many other oral and written experiences. Hall (1987) concludes that the emergence of
literacy is facilitated by environmental print.

The decontextualized print of books is presented to the child by adults. There has been a great deal of research in support of parents reading to their children. Heath (1983), Teale (1984) and Wells (1986a) confirm that children's early experiences in sharing storytimes are significant to their future literacy development. If children enter school without the experiences of listening to stories it becomes the job of the teacher to provide these experiences. It is through listening to written stories that children are introduced to book language and story structures (Gibson, 1989). Furthermore, by listening to written stories children are learning about what readers do and how text works. Hall (1987) concludes that it is this learning which appears to be very helpful in the emergence of an ability to be a reader of continuous and decontextualized print.

Not only is it important for children to learn about what readers do and how text works, but they must also develop a sense of story. This, too, is developed through exposure to the written word. Cullinan (1989) states that children build their storehouse of language from their communicative experiences and develop their concept of story from the stories they hear. Through the repeated exposure to stories children develop the ability to tell their own stories. They borrow what they have learned from the stories read to them to
create their own story. Wells (1986b) states, "that making sense of an experience is . . . to a very great extent being able to construct a plausible story about it" (p. 196). Wells (1986b) further states, "constructing stories in the mind -- or storying, as it has been called -- is one of the most fundamental means of making meaning as such it is an activity that pervades all aspects of learning" (p. 196). Thus it can be concluded that as children acquire language they are making sense of their world and expressing this through storying which is possible due to the exposure to the story given by adults.

As children enter school they begin to apply their experiences to new settings. It is the job of the teacher to help children to perceive themselves as readers (Smith, 1983). This is important because reading is a natural language process involving the reader in linguistic, cognitive, and social strategies in order to process print directly for meaning (Smith, 1971). Thus to be successful the child must be a reader. Clay (1991) states, "As the child becomes familiar with the language of books that are read aloud his attempts at reading will become more 'book-like'" (p. 77). Children are beginning to apply their previous language experiences to the attempt at reading.

This is a stage of early reading behavior according to Clay. The child seems to begin to work toward conventional
reading; however, there are several stages established by Clay (1991, pp. 78-82):

Stage 1: Print can be turned into speech.
Stage 2: There is a special type of talking found in books.
Stage 3: The picture is the guide to the message.
Stage 4: Some sentences are memorized. At this stage a child reads a simple book relying on what his ear remembers of the text, prompted by the pictures, and usually in sentences.
Stage 5: Constructing the sentences. The child combines his ability to produce sentences, his half memories of the text, the picture cues to meaning, and visual cues from letters.

Clay (1991) further states that the child who will search, check, reformulate, correct and obtain some confirmation that he is right is making vital links in early reading and learning how to process language information.

As children become more aware of how text works they also begin to learn what readers do. They begin to develop strategies for reading. To be successful with these strategies, children must develop concepts about print. Clay (1991) asserts, "In learning to read a child must develop a clear understanding of: (1) the basic concepts such as letter, word, sound, drawing, writing and reading, (2) hierarchical
concepts such as collections of letters which make up words, and collections of words which make up sentences, and (3) terms for position like first and last, beginning or start and end, and next, when they apply within the direction constraints of the printer's code" (p. 141). That is to say that reading moves from left to right and from top to bottom of the page.

Once the concepts about print are internalized the child will be successful with the reading strategies. Clay (1991) has observed that the inner control of reading allows the reader to extract information in the text from any known source and to use such information to prime and guide inner strategic activities. Furthermore, she states, "during the reading acquisition phase the novice reader is not only learning words or letter-sound relationships but is also learning how to use each of the sources of information in texts, how to link these to stored knowledge, and which strategic activities make 'reading' successful" (p. 321). Thus the good reader learns to monitor his own reading, to self-correct, to use known information to make approximations. The good reader will use semantic cues to evaluate if the approximation makes sense in the sentence, syntactic cues to see if it sounds correct, and graphophonic cues to see if it looks correct. Thus an emergent reader must have concepts about print, strategies for reading and cuing systems in place
to monitor their reading.

While the majority of this section has focused on reading one must not overlook the development of writing. In some instances, writing in the early grades is often viewed as making the letters correctly. This assumes that children cannot write (compose) until they have mastered the mechanics. This, however, is not the view of writing in terms of emerging literacy. In an emergent literacy program children’s writing forms and functions are accepted and encouraged. Ferreiro and Teberosky (1983) claim to have identified five stages children pass through as they emerge as writers. The first stage is the intention to create a message. Children at the first stage make marks which may or may not be letters. At stage two the graphic forms of the characters are more clearly defined and resemble conventional forms. Stage three is characterized by the child beginning to assign a sound value to each of the letters that compose a piece of writing. Ferreiro and Teberosky call this the ‘syllabic hypothesis’, as they claim each letter stands for one syllable. Stage four marks the move to what is called the ‘alphabetic hypothesis’: "The child abandons the syllabic hypothesis and discovers the need for an analysis that goes beyond the syllable" (p. 204). The child uses aspects of the text such as length and letters. The child also understands that there is a relationship between oral reading of the text and the text. The final
stage is alphabetic writing. "Children understand that each written character corresponds to a sound smaller than a syllable and they systematically analyze the phonemes of the words they are writing" (Ferreiro and Teberosky, 1983, p. 209). At this point children’s invented spellings begin to move toward conventional spelling.

Writing has been determined to help reading because it helps children attend to print. Clay (1991) suggests that writing provides extra opportunities for the child to gain control of literacy concepts. Clay (1991) further states, "learning to read and write messages gives children information about common words from slightly different perspectives which seems to help them to understand more about the ways in which written words work" (p. 141). Thus reading and writing are important to the child who is learning in the literate society.

In this section we have examined oral language development and its relationship to emergent literacy, and what the emergent reader and the emergent writer do. We will conclude by examining Hall’s (1987) suggestions that a context for the continued emergence of literacy to operate in is to:

1) help children understand that literacy is about creating meaning and communicating meaning;
2) help children understand that literacy is a distinctly human activity. It enables people to communicate;
3) help children see that people engage in literacy acts because such acts are considered important and useful by those people;
4) help children recognize that literacy is a means to many kinds of ends— that it serves a wide range of real functions (p. 81).

And finally a definition of literacy by Scribner and Cole (1981), "Literacy is not simply knowing how to read and write but applying this knowledge for specific purposes in specific contexts of use" (p. 236). Children are capable literacy participants. Given the appropriate opportunities they will blossom and grow to become literate language users.

**Biliteracy**

Biliteracy is a term designating bilingual literacy. There is a great deal of evidence indicating that it is imperative that the initial learning of reading should be in the native language. Wong-Fillmore and Valadez (1985) address the importance of when and how to introduce reading instruction in the second language. They emphasize that initial reading instruction in the primary language has the effect of later success in second language reading; the skill of reading once acquired through the primary language is transferable. Krashen and Biber (1988) state that "once we learn to read in the first language, our mechanical knowledge
of reading rapidly transfers to other languages we acquire" (p.23). Once readers are able to exercise interpretative and inferential abilities of a higher order in comprehending texts, then many of the cognitive skills learned in reading can be transferred (Thonis, 1981). The goal of education must be for children to reach this level of literacy in their native language, whether it be English or another language.

Current theoretical frameworks assert that literacy happens when the learners are actively engaged in interaction that gives meaning to the symbols with which they are working (Hawkins, 1991). Current reading theory strongly indicates that insisting on detailed comprehension questions at the end of reading passages is counterproductive. The practice of insisting on detailed comprehension questions only ensures that students will focus on small points and will be prevented from reading overall meaning and thus from receiving any pleasure from reading (Krashen, 1985). It is essential to take the reading process to much higher levels of cognition. The role of the teacher is to enable and guide activities that involve students as thoughtful learners in socially meaningful tasks (Moll, 1990).

Krashen proposes that reading exposure or reading for genuine interest with a focus on meaning provides second language learners with reading comprehensible input similar to oral comprehensible input (Krashen, 1985). It is essential
that second language learners also engage in meaningful reading activities in the second language. There is an assumption discussed by Goodman, et. al., (1979) that has dominated curricular suggestions in bilingual literacy programs. This assumption has been that before children can learn to read, they must have oral proficiency in the language to be read. Clearly, this is the reasoning for why children should be taught to read in their native language. This also suggests that before bilingual children are introduced to English reading, they must have oral command of English. Goodman, et. al., (1979) claim that even some children who are already literate to some extent in their native language seem to be able to learn oral and written English simultaneously, using the two forms to support each other in developing control of English. "Reading as a receptive language process seems to develop more rapidly than speaking, a productive process" (Goodman, et. al., 1979, p. 21). Therefore, it is not uncommon for nonnative speakers of English to understand what they have read but not be able to retell it orally in English. Goodman, et. al., (1979) then suggest that reading need not follow oral development but may be parallel to it and contribute to general language control. Reading instruction, then, can begin simultaneously with oral language beginnings.

Still in the forefront is the strong evidence for gaining literacy in the native language. Krashen (1990) supports that
gaining literacy through the first language is a short-cut to gaining literacy in English. As first language literacy develops, second language acquisition of English can occur simultaneously with second language literacy.

Furthermore, Harste, et. al. (1984) describe individual reading, writing, speaking and listening encounters as all feeding into a common pool from which other encounters draw. All expressions of language support growth and development in literacy (Harste. et. al., 1984). Freeman and Freeman (1989) suggest that this concept of requiring bilingual students to master oral English skills before they write and read English actually can limit their learning potential. Edelsky (1982) further states that written expression in English may precede formal reading instruction, and that bilingual learners use knowledge of their first language and of their background and actively apply their knowledge as they write in their second language.

Cummins (1989) presents a model illustrating an underlying cognitive/academic proficiency which is common across languages. "This common underlying proficiency makes possible the transfer of cognitive/academic or literacy-related skills across languages" (p. 44).

Instruction that develops first or second language reading and writing skills is not just developing skills in one language, it also is developing a deeper conceptual and
linguistic proficiency that is strongly related to the development of literacy in another language (Cummins, 1989). Hornberger (1989) suggests that what appears to be interference from L1 (first language) in L2 (second language) is better construed as evidence for learning in that it represents the application of L1 knowledge to L2, and the stronger the foundation and continuing development in L1, the greater the potential for enhanced learning of L2.

To further support this theoretical perspective, Hudelson (1984) points out that children learning English as a second language can and do both read and write English before they have mastered the oral and written systems of the language. "The processes of writing, reading, speaking, and listening in a second language are interrelated and interdependent. It is both useless and ultimately, impossible to separate out the language processes in our teaching...or to try to present ESL [English as a Second Language] material in a linear sequence of listening, speaking, reading, and writing" (p. 234).

Ada (1986) presents Creative Reading Methodology for language minority children which proposes that reading be introduced, from the start, as a holistic process whose relevance goes beyond the transmission of the information provided by the text. A true reading act is an interactive dialogue with information proposed by the text (Ada, 1986). The child is exposed to the complexity of this dialogue even
before the child is able to recognize words or letters. The reading process is initiated through reading of picture stories or listening to stories read aloud. Discussion using the language of the story is essential and the basis for dialogue.

In creative reading, four phases of discussion occur concurrently and are interwoven. The first phase is a descriptive phase which basically is a questioning phase. The answers can be found in the text and are known by the teacher. These questions are important, but are not enough since this type of discussion stays at a level which suggests that reading is passive. The second phase is a personal interpretive phase in which the children bring into the reading their own experiences, feelings, and emotions. This allows for the reading to become more meaningful. The third phase is a critical phase, or a critical analysis, where the children begin to use generalized reflection. Inferences are drawn by the children about the text presented. The fourth phase is the creative phase in which the children can draw on this critical awareness in order to make decisions regarding the world around them. Once the children have received the information, compared and contrasted it with their own feelings and experiences, and arrived at a critical analysis, they will feel that their self-affirmation is such that they are in a position to make decisions for improving and
enriching their lives (Ada, 1986).

Literacy can only be relevant and functional in the context of a relevant and functional curriculum. Such a curriculum allows for the natural acquisition of literacy and biliteracy by building on what learners know, their language, culture, interests, and common experiences (Goodman, et. al., 1979). Built into the curriculum must be the element of reading to the children daily. Children can be read to from the literature of both languages that they are learning. This provides them with "fine literature they cannot yet read for themselves, and it tunes their ears to structures of language and knowledge they cannot get through reading on their own" (Goodman, et. al., 1979, p. 37). Furthermore, Goodman et. al. (1979) also suggest that lessons should take place in the reading of both languages. Reading could be done in one language and the discussion in the other. Moll and Diaz (1987) have provided a strategy labeled "bilingual communicative support" in comprehending English text for bilingual students. The teacher and the students may discuss, in Spanish, English text just read to clarify the meaning of the text. In such a situation, comprehension is the higher order goal of the reading lessons. "Reading and communicative resources can be strategically combined or mixed to provide the children with the support necessary to participate profitably in reading lessons" (pp.306-07).
The goal of a reading program for bilingual students must be to engage children in activities that stimulate their thinking and widen their intellectual horizons in both languages. It is essential for a biliteracy program to take advantage of the children's linguistic background and develop biliteracy to its fullest potential.

Using Children's Literature for Reading Instruction

A child's world should include rich language experiences. The wealth of language comes from "real" books which can be widely used in all parts of a school's literacy program. Cullinan (1989) asserts that "children's language development is enriched by exposure to literature" (p. 36). In addition, Tunnell and Jacobs (1989) state, "Immersion in natural text at an early age has the same effects on reading as immersion in aural and spoken language has on speech" (p. 474).

When children are not reading on their own, and teachers read aloud a great deal to children, then the children begin to tune their ears for the literacy language. Krashen (1990) expresses how reading out loud to children is very beneficial for language development, and further, children who are read to are superior in reading comprehension, vocabulary and in oral language ability. "When children are read to, they begin to acquire the special language of writing, its particular grammar and vocabulary, as well as knowledge about how stories
are put together; all this knowledge helps make their own reading much more comprehensible" (Krashen, 1990, p. xii).

In addition to reading aloud to children, reading with children is important. Children and adults reading together can convey the message of how reading is enjoyable. Furthermore, Tunnell and Jacobs (1989) conclude that the process of learning to read naturally begins at home when parents read to their children and the parents let the children handle the books. This process continues into the classroom where books are included naturally in the classroom. The opportunity is present to share a love of reading. During this shared reading time children learn such concepts of print as directionality, what constitutes a word, a letter and the purpose of punctuation (Huck, 1990). It is important that children get the opportunity to hear and read along with the teacher a story that is familiar to them. Many times they are learning something new from the story each time it is read. "Hearing repeated readings helps boys and girls to develop a sense of story. They learn how stories begin and end; they recognize the story structures" (Huck, 1990, p. 188).

Through shared reading we can provide for children, as adult models, the pleasure of reading. Gradually children join with the adult in reading a story. They become hooked on reading. Bird (1990) shares that "we help them further by talking about literature, sharing our experiences in the
literary worlds we’ve entered as readers, revealing and describing the almost limitless range of experiences that is possible within the pages of a book" (p. 196). By providing the model and showing our pleasure in reading literature we are helping children to bring what they have observed about reading into their realm of experience and to apply it to their own reading. Bird (1990) concludes, "Just as we trust that our youngsters will learn our ways of living in households and communities and become proficient language users in the process, so we must trust that our students will become sensitive, critical readers as they enter and explore, with our help, the world of books" (p. 196).

As children enter school the literacy program which began at home should continue. A literature-based reading program uses books naturally, introducing them in kindergarten and first grade the way they were shared in the literate home (Huck, 1990).

As children develop as readers, they also begin to see that subjects that interest them are also subjects in books. This shared interest helps children to connect to books. When choosing books for use in the classroom, "good literature is appropriate for any age level assuming there is interest" (Freeman, 1990, p. 189). Books that are of genuine interest to the reader are appropriate and provide children the opportunity to further explore their interests. Krashen
(1990) states, "a good literature program is one that deals with topics and themes of both universal and local interest, themes that encourage students to think about basic ethical questions" (p. vii). Furthermore, Krashen (1990) found strong evidence that "reading texts of genuine interest to the reader is the source of reading comprehension" (p. xii). Thus the research indicates strong support for children reading literature that interests them.

When children read books of interest to them they also bring a wealth of background experiences. The process of comprehending a text comes about because of our life experiences. Short (1990) states, "we can understand what we read only because of the connections we make between our current reading and our past experiences" (p. 194). As children gain a bank of experiences they can compare and contrast the new experiences with the previous experiences to make reading comprehension a more conscious strategy (Short, 1990, p. 194).

As the process becomes conscious, children are simultaneously developing cognitively. Krashen (1990) expresses that "literature is the source of language and cognitive development. If teachers and students focus on the ideas, on the stories and their meanings, language and cognitive development will follow" (p. xiii). As children’s language develops they begin to "read more than words and
‘extract meaning’; they create their own worlds” (Cairney, 1990, p. 201). Through discussion about the text, the children continue to develop cognitively. Bird (1991) concludes, "as the students enjoy good literature and develop their appreciation of it, they improve their reading ability; and through participation in open ended discussions, they reveal more about their understanding of books than one could ever pull out of them with lists of questions" (p. 196).

Thus the research supports the use of literature in the home and the classroom. By reading aloud and giving children time to read, using books across the curriculum and teaching reading with real book, we are able to create rich literary environments (Huck, 1990). It is up to the teacher to provide this environment "since children are ‘language sponges’ that soak up words around them, we want the language in their books to be worthy of emulation" (Cullinan, 1989, p. 37). "An indirect, but very powerful payoff of participating in a literature program . . . is that well-taught literature programs instill in students a love of books and desire to read on their own" (Krashen, 1990, p. x). The ultimate goal of reading in school is for children to develop an awareness that their horizons may be broadened through books.

**Story Retellings of Children’s Literature**

Simply assigning pieces of literature for the children to
read does not guarantee that the students will find them interesting or enjoyable. What teachers and students do with their reading is the key to successfully translating a literature-based approach into a means of enhancing reading performance and enjoyment. Deeper appreciation for literature will take place by the children once they find it personally meaningful and can relate it to their personal lives. The success of this occurrence depends greatly on the close interaction between the teacher, the book and the child.

Using retelling as a pre and post activity during a book discussion enhances the interaction between the teacher, the book and the child. Retellings are postreading or postlistening recalls in which readers or listeners tell what they remember either orally or in writing (Morrow, 1989). The retelling procedure involves participants in some intensive reading, writing, talking and listening, around a central theme (Brown and Cambourne, 1987). Retelling allows readers or listeners to structure responses according to personal and individual interpretations of text (Morrow, 1989). Production of individual interpretations of a text is an active procedure that involves children in the construction of text. This reconstruction of story meaning is the primary goal of retelling. "Retelling a story is an opportunity for a reader to present his or her ideas to the world and to have an additional opportunity to rehearse the story again and to
integrate it, modify it, and add to its comprehension" (Goodman, 1982, p. 305).

When retelling a story, children are mentally reconstructing events and arranging pictures, therefore, children build an internal representation of the story. A study by Zimiles and Kuhns (1976) found that retelling improved story comprehension in six to eight year olds who were asked to retell a story after it was read to them. Retelling can be used as a way to measure reading comprehension. Retellings of literature provide evidence for, and insights into, better understanding the reader's comprehension process. Retellings after reading provide another opportunity for the reader to continue to construct text (Goodman, 1982).

In a study done by Morrow (1985), children who improved most in comprehension also improved in their retellings. This finding suggests that a common factor was responsible for both types of gains and is consistent with the argument that retelling experiences enhance a sense of story structure leading to both improved retelling accuracy and greater comprehension (Morrow, 1985). The common factor may be simply that the children are actively involved with literature. When reading the original text of a story, children concentrate on meaning and the comprehension of meaning; this is what research consistently advocates as the proper focus of any
reading act (Brown and Cambourne, 1987). Reconstructing literature involves the process of identifying and labeling story structures. By going through this analysis and synthesis process, the children manipulate sophisticated language structures, and therefore, further develop background knowledge.

Background experience plays an important role in retellings. Goodman (1982) discusses how readers use information from the text for their retellings, but, what causes the differences among readers' retellings is the set of schemata and experiences which readers bring to their reading. Because retelling taps into background knowledge, it has enormous potential and is a powerful learning activity. Brown and Cambourne (1987) illustrate the use of retelling as incorporating a range of literacy skills such as reading, writing, listening, talking, thinking, interacting, comparing, matching and organizing information, remembering, and comprehending.

Retelling can be used for assessment purposes. "Retelling reveals what a child comprehends, or the product of comprehension, as well as how the child comprehends, or the process of comprehension" (Mitchell, 1992, p. 1). If reading is viewed as a process by which readers construct meaning, then the kind of reading assessment measures that are used to assess reading should be compatible with that view (Mitchell,
Retelling can be an appropriate measure for reading comprehension.

Retelling is a holistic way to evaluate reading because it involves whole texts and natural purposes for reading. The Retelling Profile developed by Mitchell and Irwin (1992) incorporates 12 items, four in each of three areas: reader's text-based comprehension, reader's response and reactions to text, and the reader's language use. The three areas in the Retelling Profile reflect a theoretical perspective of reading as an interactive/transactive language process involving both reader and text (Mitchell and Irwin, 1992).

Summary

In this chapter, the literature on the emergence of literacy, biliteracy, using children's literature for reading instruction, and the use of story retellings of children's literature have been reviewed. Emergent literacy is important because the children in the study are beginning readers, and it is a critical time for the development of literacy. A review of the literature on biliteracy is included because the study involved children who speak Spanish and English. Similarly, because the study involved children reading real literature, the use of children's books for reading instruction is important. The review of the literature on retelling is relevant since this study investigates the use of
story retellings of children’s literature in the classroom. Taken together, these literature reviews contribute to the understanding of the present study.
CHAPTER 3
DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the participants, teaching procedures and materials, testing procedures and materials, scoring and analysis of the data.

Subjects

The nine subjects who participated in this study were selected from a first grade bilingual classroom in an elementary school in an urban school district in Tucson, Arizona.

Originally, there were 14 participants, but three moved and two were absent during one of the four testing periods, and consequently these five exited the study. Of the nine participants, three were females and six were males.

All of the participants were entered into bilingual classrooms since kindergarten. The students were all of hispanic ethnicity and from Spanish speaking homes. According to the Language Assessment Scale (LAS), seven of the participants were Spanish dominant, and two were of equal dominance in Spanish and English. Two of the participants participated in Descubriendo la lectura program throughout the school year.

At the beginning of the study, the students were ranked according to their level of development in reading on the
Student Progress/Development as a Reader continuum (Hart-Hewins and Wells, 1990). The scale consists of the prereader, the beginning reader, the emergent reader, and the developing reader. According to teacher judgement, two students ranked at the developing reader level, four ranked at the emergent reader level, two ranked at the beginning reader level, and one ranked at the prereader level.

Following the ranking, two groups were made: group A and group B. Group A consisted of one developing reader, two emergent readers, and one beginning reader. Group B consisted of one developing reader, two emergent readers, one beginning reader, and one prereader. These rankings reflect the students' progress in development as readers at the beginning of first grade.

Teaching Procedures

The children in the classroom formed heterogeneous groups of five to seven members in each group for the language arts core time. The groups rotated around the room to centers for approximately 30 to 40 minutes each. The centers included spelling with a teaching assistant, independent journal writing, listening and reading with a recorded story in which the story was of a book read in a previous lesson, and finally a reading and writing center with the teacher. It is at this center that the reading instruction occurred. The teacher
selected stories at an appropriate level of reading difficulty for the children.

With each new story, the students normally experienced various prereading activities for approximately 20 minutes in preparation for reading a story or a poem. The activities consisted of such things as making predictions, discussing a theme, looking at pictures, making observations of realia, or experiencing an event from the story. When the children were ready to read, a copy of the story or book was provided. At first, they read independently. Second, the students read aloud with the teacher several times. Third, the students were given the opportunity to read the book to a partner.

When the children felt comfortable to discuss the story, post reading discussion occurred. After discussion, the group normally reread the story chorally. The students were introduced to retelling in a whole group setting. Initially, retelling was modeled by the teacher various times, and the students gradually joined in the retellings. The students then paired up again to retell the story to a partner. The students had the opportunity to get assistance with the retellings from their partners.

The next day, the children read their writing entries in their journals to the group. Usually, the students wrote something related to the story they had read the previous day. At this point, the group worked on editing, revising and
adding to their entries. Following the writing, the students retold the story of the day before as a whole group in which each person told a small part of the story. As the group finished with each story, the books were then left out for the students to read later to themselves during silent reading time. Enrichment and reinforcement activities were carried out during reading times on other days. Enrichment activities included creative drama, puppet making, creating of sceneries for a story, rewriting a story, and retelling to someone who has never heard the story read by the children.

Normally, two stories were introduced in one week. Oral retelling became a normal procedure in reading groups, and the children knew that they were expected to use retelling as part of their learning and understanding of the story. Because the children were introduced to approximately two new stories per week, the frequency of retelling was also approximately two per week.

Because the classroom was in a bilingual setting, the class was comprised of students who were dominant in the Spanish language learning English as a second language and students who were only English speaking. At different times and during different subjects throughout the day, both Spanish and English languages were used. Different lessons in mathematics and in content areas were specifically designed as English as a Second Language (ESL) lessons. Usually, this
lesson in English followed a lesson in Spanish in a small group.

Since the children in the study were dominant in Spanish, all of the small group reading instruction and reading materials were in Spanish. The children received reading instruction in English mostly during whole class shared readings. Because both Spanish and English versions of the same stories were available, the children were able to listen to, read, and discuss the books in both languages. Initially the students would normally read a story in Spanish and later read the same story in English in whole class shared reading. All of the books were available for the children to read during their self-selection for silent reading time.

**Teaching Materials**

The teaching materials which were used on a regular basis for reading instruction were mostly small books published by the Wright Group (1983). These books are from the Sunshine Books series and Storybox Books series. These books are specifically designed for emergent readers in that they are tailored to meet the range of reading difficulty levels that the children are reading at. The books have approximately eight to twelve pages with illustrations supporting the meaning of the text. These books are published as small individual student books and big books (approximately
12"x18"), and also are published in both English and Spanish. Other books which are used are picture trade books from various publishers. These books include titles similar to the ones used for the retelling testing periods. These books also come in small individual student books and big books, and are available in Spanish only, English only and both Spanish and English. The big books are used in the classroom as part of an introduction to a new story or a shared reading activity with the children. The big books as well as the individual student books contain illustrations on almost every page, are approximately 20 to 30 pages in length, and are of high interest to the children. Some of these books were provided through our school district's Chapter I Federal Program, some were purchased through a state literacy K-3 grant, and some were purchased by the teacher from various publishers and local book stores. Because the books are individual, and not part of a basal series or anthology, there is great variety among the materials.

Testing Procedures

Since the study took place over the time of an entire school year, each of the four testing periods took place near the end of each quarter; the first occurring in mid October, the second in the beginning of December, the third in mid February, and the fourth occurring in mid April.
Each of the four testing periods took place over a period of four days, specifically, Monday through Thursday of a week. The study was set up such that the teacher met with both groups A and B on each of the four days. The first day of the first and third testing periods, group A received both reading instruction and literature selection in English, and group B received both reading instruction and literature selection in Spanish. On the second day, group A retold the story in English, the language in which they had read the story. Group B retold the story in Spanish, the language in which they had read the story. On the second day, the teacher recorded their individual retellings, listened to the individual retellings and prompted accordingly.

The same occurred on the following two days except for the reversal of the languages. Specifically, group A received both the reading instruction and the literature selection in Spanish, while group B received both the reading instruction and the literature selection in English. The retellings on the fourth days were in Spanish from group A and in English from group B.

The second and fourth testing periods occurred the same except for the reversal of the language used initially in group instruction. Specifically, group B received both reading instruction and the literature selection in English initially, and group A received both reading instruction and
the literature selection in Spanish initially. The initial retellings for groups A and B were in English and Spanish respectively. When the students were to begin their retellings, they were instructed to retell the story. When students had difficulty, detail questions were asked as prompts. Comprehension questions were asked as probes.

Testing Materials

The books selected for each of the four testing intervals were representative of the books used in regular instruction in first grade. These books also appear on the 1990 Reading Recovery Booklist from Ohio State University. The scale based on text difficulty ranges from level one, being the least difficult, to level 20, being the most difficult. The text levels as established for the children's books used in this study are scaled according to reading difficulty. For the purposes of this study, these text levels are considered to be representative of the particular levels which have been assigned. As described in the 1990 Reading Recovery Booklist (Peterson, 1990), text features that influence the choice of a level for a particular book include: content in relation to children's personal experiences and interests; repetition of language patterns; vocabulary; illustration support for the meaning of the text; narrative style; and the size and
placement of print.

The lower levels have the content consisting of objects and actions, illustrations which have high support for the written text, repetition of one to two sentence patterns, natural conversational style language, concrete ideas, and little description. The middle levels have content consisting of more fantasy or imaginative experiences, illustrations of main ideas, some repetition of phrases, some written language style, and some descriptive language. The higher levels have content consisting of more fantasy and more abstract concepts, illustrations that complement the story, literary language, descriptive dialogue, elaboration and detail, and varied syntax.

The book for the first time interval was *Katie Did It* by Becky McDaniel and *Fue Carmelita* translated by Lada Kratky. The concepts in the story deal with family and family members, blame put on the younger sibling, and desirable and undesirable behaviors. The text has patterned language and matches the illustrations. The English version consists of 30 pages total, 20 pages of illustrations, 96 words, and the text difficulty level is seven according to the booklist from the Reading Recovery program. The Spanish version consists of an equal number of pages and illustrations as the English version, 101 words and the text difficulty level is 10 according to the booklist from *Descubriendo la lectura*.
The book for the second time interval was *Whose Mouse Are You?* by Robert Kraus and *De quien eres ratoncito?* translated by Argentina Palacios. The concepts in the story deal with being alone, being lost, and belonging. Important to this story is family membership especially a new addition to the family. The patterned text presents a question on a page followed by a response on the next with an illustration that matches the text. The English version consists of 28 pages total, 24 pages of illustrations, 105 words, and the text difficulty level is 11 according to the booklist from the Reading Recovery program. The Spanish version consists of equal number of pages and illustrations as the English version, 114 words, and the text difficulty level is 14 according to the booklist from Descubriendo la lectura program.

The book for the third time interval was *The Carrot Seed* by Ruth Krauss and *La semilla de zanahoria* translated by Argentina Palacios. The concepts in the story relate to family, how a seed germinates, how a plant grows, and that a carrot grows in the ground. The persistence of a young boy is an important theme. The text consists of patterned language. The English version consists of 22 pages total, 12 illustrations, and 101 words. The text difficulty level is 12 according to the booklist from Reading Recovery program. The
Spanish version has an equal number of pages and illustrations and 94 words. The text difficulty level is 14 according to the booklist from Descubriendo la lectura program.

The book for the fourth time interval was The Very Hungry Caterpillar by Eric Carle and La oruga muy hambrienta translated by Eric Carle Corporation. An important concept in the story is metamorphosis. The story also deals with quantity and quality of food intake for a caterpillar, and the days of the week give the story sequence and organization. The text matches the illustrations. The English version consists of 22 pages total, 22 pages of illustrations, and 224 words. The text difficulty level is 18 according to the booklist from Reading Recovery program. The Spanish version consists of an equal number of pages and illustrations and 221 words. The text difficulty level is 17 according to the booklist from Descubriendo la lectura program.

Spanish translations of all four English texts were used to offer children similar reading context and experiences in Spanish and English. It is recognized, however, that text difficulty and story predictability, among other factors, may vary according to the particular language used in the various texts.

Scoring and Analysis of the Data

The data consisted of 72 oral retellings. These
retellings collected on Tuesdays and Thursdays during each time interval comprised the data to be analyzed for this study. These data were tape recorded on audio as children did their individual retellings. The recorded retellings were then transcribed for the purpose of the analysis.

The retellings were evaluated according to the Retelling Profile developed by Mitchell and Irwin (1992, in preparation). The profile provides a holistic evaluation of retellings. It is divided into three domains: reader’s text-based comprehension, reader’s response and reactions to the text, and reader’s language use. The Profile contains 12 items, four in each of these three areas.

Two raters, the researcher and a knowledgeable teacher colleague, collaboratively determined whether each retelling reflected a high degree, moderate degree, low degree or no degree of performance for criteria judged in the profile. Prior to the scoring, the raters established criteria for each of the 12 items on the Reader Retelling Profile. Retellings which scored in the high degree range included rationale and explanation and were generally more elaborate and complete. Retellings which scored in the low degree range contained only mentions with sketchy details, and were generally incomplete. Retellings which scored in the moderate degree range contained more substance than those in the low degree range, but contained less substance than those in the high degree range.
These moderate degree retellings generally lacked elaboration of ideas.

To analyze the data for this study a descriptive data analysis will be used. Because of the small number of students in the study, a statistical analysis is not appropriate. To answer all four research questions, means and standard deviations of retelling scores according to the three domains of the retelling profile will be compared. Furthermore, major trends and patterns observed in the retellings will be described.

Specifically, the research questions are presented individually below together with a brief statement relative to the nature of the data analysis for each question.

(1) How do first graders' retellings change over time with continued practice and opportunities to retell?

To answer this question, group means and standard deviations for all Spanish and all English retellings, regardless of order of presentation, will be presented for the three domains over four time intervals, comparing the scores from the first interval to the last. General strengths and weaknesses of the children’s retellings according to the three domains over the four time intervals will also be described.

(2) How do first graders’ own Spanish and English retellings of the same stories compare and contrast?

To answer this question, group means and standard
deviations for children’s own Spanish and English retellings of the same stories will be compared for the pairs of means for the four time intervals. General strengths and weakness of the children’s retellings according to the three domains over the four time intervals will also be described.

(3) What are the differences in first graders’ retellings between those children who initially retell a story in Spanish and those children who retell the same story in Spanish following a retelling in English?

To answer this question, group means and standard deviations will be compared over the four time intervals between retellings of children who initially retold a story in Spanish and retellings of children who retold the same story in Spanish after an initial retelling in English. Descriptive data from individual retellings will be used to further explain the comparisons and contrasts.

(4) What are the differences in first graders’ retellings between those children who initially retell a story in English and those children who retell the same story in English following a retelling in Spanish?

To answer question, group means and standard deviations will be compared over the four time intervals between retellings of children who initially retold a story in English and retellings of children who retold the same story in English after an initial retelling in Spanish. Descriptive
data from individual retellings will be used to further explain the comparisons and contrasts.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of this study. First, a discussion of the means and standard deviations will be presented, and then the findings will be interpreted as they relate to each of the four research questions.

Research Question #1
How do first graders' retellings change over time with continued practice and opportunities to retell?

This question examined the first graders' progress by finding out if scores on both English and Spanish increased over time. The rationale was that scores should go up as children demonstrate better comprehension and higher language fluency in both languages even though the stories increased in level of text difficulty.

Findings for Research Question #1

In Table 1, the means and standard deviations of all the scores on the first domain, text-based comprehension, of the retelling profile are presented for the four time intervals.
Table 1

Text-based Comprehension Means and Standard Deviations of all English and Spanish Retellings Across Four Time Intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 8.33$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 9.67$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 9.56$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 9.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 9$</td>
<td>$s = 2.50$</td>
<td>$s = 1.87$</td>
<td>$s = 1.33$</td>
<td>$s = 0.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 9.78$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 10.00$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 9.78$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 9.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 9$</td>
<td>$s = 1.92$</td>
<td>$s = 1.12$</td>
<td>$s = 1.30$</td>
<td>$s = 0.00$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 1, the means of the scores for the English retellings slightly increased from the first interval ($\bar{X} = 8.33$) to the fourth interval ($\bar{X} = 9.00$). A slight decrease is noted in the means of the scores of the Spanish retellings from the first interval ($\bar{X} = 9.78$) to the fourth interval ($\bar{X} = 9.00$). Fluctuation was observed in the means of the scores for both languages at the second and third time intervals, which could perhaps be traced to text effects.

In addition to the means, the standard deviations are presented. A consistent decrease in the standard deviations for the English retellings was noted indicating less variance. In the fourth time interval the standard deviation was zero for both English and Spanish scores indicating no variance in the retelling scores for either language. At the first time interval the lowest English retelling score was two standard deviations below the mean, while the highest English retelling score was less than two above the mean. The lowest and
highest Spanish retelling scores were less than two standard deviations from the mean. This indicates the variability in the scores for the first time interval. This variability diminished at the fourth time interval. At the fourth time interval the scores were homogeneous.

In Table 2, the means and standard deviations of all the scores on the second domain, response and reactions to texts, of the retelling profile are presented for the four time intervals.

Table 2
Response and Reaction to the Text Means and Standard Deviations of all English and Spanish Retellings Across Four Time Intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 0.78 )</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 1.78 )</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 1.89 )</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 1.44 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( s = 1.72 )</td>
<td>( s = 1.30 )</td>
<td>( s = 1.17 )</td>
<td>( s = 1.01 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 0.67 )</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 2.44 )</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 2.22 )</td>
<td>( \bar{X} = 0.67 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( s = 0.87 )</td>
<td>( s = 1.24 )</td>
<td>( s = 1.39 )</td>
<td>( s = 0.71 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 2, the means of the English retelling scores increased slightly from time interval I (\( \bar{X} = 0.78 \)) to time interval IV (\( \bar{X} = 1.44 \)), with the exception of time intervals II and III. The means of the Spanish retelling scores were the same for time intervals I and IV (\( \bar{X} = 0.67 \)). At time intervals II and III, there was fluctuation in the mean scores. In general, the means of the scores for both the
English and Spanish retellings were substantially lower in this domain in comparison to the other two domains.

The standard deviations for the English retelling scores decreased across the four time intervals indicating less variability within the group scores. There was no consistent trend in the standard deviations of the scores for the Spanish retellings.

In Table 3, the means and standard deviations of all the scores on the third domain, language use, of the retelling profile are presented for the four time intervals.

Table 3
Language Use Means and Standard Deviations of all English and Spanish Retellings Across Four Time Intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 7.78$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 7.00$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 8.89$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 10.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 9</td>
<td>s = 2.44</td>
<td>s = 1.94</td>
<td>s = 0.93</td>
<td>s = 1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 10.00$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 9.11$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 9.33$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 10.89$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 9</td>
<td>s = 1.50</td>
<td>s = 2.26</td>
<td>s = 1.41</td>
<td>s = 0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 3, the means of the English retelling scores increased from time interval I ($\bar{X} = 7.78$) to time interval IV ($\bar{X} = 10.00$) indicating substantial growth. At time interval II a slight decrease is noted. The means of the Spanish retelling scores increased slightly from time interval I ($\bar{X} = 10.00$) to time interval IV ($\bar{X} = 10.89$), with the exceptions of time intervals II and III where slight decreases
were observed.

The standard deviations for the English retelling scores showed less spread from the first time interval (s = 2.44) to the fourth time interval (s = 1.23) indicating a decrease in variance in the scores. The standard deviations for the Spanish retelling scores decreased from the first time interval (s = 1.50) to the fourth time interval (s = 0.93) indicating a decrease in variance in the scores.

Discussion for Research Question #1

Across the three domains, text-based comprehension, response and reactions to texts, and language use, children showed growth in scores and in some cases maintained their scores, and their retelling text length increased. The growth was a result of a combination of variables such as: maturation, acquisition of a second language, and reading strategies, and the use of retellings as an instructional activity which develops language fluency and literacy strategies. The development of language fluency and literacy strategies by the children was measurable by the retelling profile.

Furthermore, while the text difficulty level of the four stories increased over time the students were able to maintain and/or increase their scores in retellings. In general, as time progressed, the means increased and the standard
deviations decreased which indicated that the lower scores progressed closer to the advancing means. For example, in the third domain, Oscar's English retelling scored a 4.00 at time interval I, where the mean was 7.78. At time interval IV, Oscar's English retelling scored a 9.00, where the mean was 10.00. In the third domain, Cynthia’s Spanish retelling scored a 7.00 at time interval I, where the mean was 10.00. At time interval IV, Cynthia’s Spanish retelling scored a 12.00, where the mean was 10.89. Therefore, most children progressed substantially in their retelling scores in both English and Spanish.

As previously noted, at time interval II there was an inconsistency possibly due to text effects. A major difference in this story as compared to the other three stories was the narrative style in which the story was written. Whose Mouse Are You? is a personal narrative in which the reader participates to create dialogue between the story's main character and the reader. This narrative stance may be responsible for the increased scores in the text-based comprehension domain and the decreased scores in the language use domain. It was observed that the children attempted to memorize the exact dialogue of the story which aided in recall of events yet hindered the language fluency.

The retelling profile measured children's performance in the following domains: text-based comprehension, response and
reactions to text, and language use. In general, the children did better in the domains of text-based comprehension and language use, and did not perceive response and reactions to the texts as important to include in a retelling. This may be due to first graders' understanding of reading and retelling in the learning-to-read situation whereby they concentrate more on the text message and less on their own responses. Additionally, lack of reader response could also be traced to the use of highly predictable texts as well as limited teacher modeling of this phenomenon.

In general, at the first time interval the students' retellings were dialogues between the teacher and the individual students. At the fourth time interval the students' retellings were uninterrupted, complete, and comprehensible stories in and of themselves. A surprising finding in the domain of language use was that the English language use mean increased to such a degree that at time interval IV it equalled the initial Spanish language use mean for these initially Spanish-dominant children.

First graders' retellings demonstrated positive change over time with continued practice and opportunities to retell.

Research Question #2
How do first graders' own Spanish and English retellings of the same stories compare and contrast?
This question examined the similarities and differences between the two languages of retellings in this study. The rationale was that bilingual children at this level of development are more proficient in their first language. Therefore, their Spanish retelling scores should be higher than their English retelling scores.

Findings for Research Question #2

In the tables below, data from Tables 1, 2 and 3 are presented again as tables 4, 5 and 6, respectively for the reader’s convenience.

In Table 4, the means and standard deviations of all the scores on the first domain, text-based comprehension, of the retelling profile are presented for the four time intervals.

Table 4

Text-based Comprehension Means and Standard Deviations of all English and Spanish Retellings Across Four Time Intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 9</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 9</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 4, the means of the Spanish retelling scores were higher than the means of the English retelling scores, except for the fourth time interval, in which the
means were identical ($\bar{X} = 9.00$). The standard deviations of the Spanish retelling scores showed less spread than those of the English retelling scores, except for the fourth time interval in which the standard deviations were identical ($s = 0.00$). This indicates that the scores within each group were homogeneous.

In Table 5, the means and standard deviations of all the scores on the second domain, response and reactions to text, of the retelling profile are presented for the four time intervals.

Table 5

Response and Reaction to the Text of all English and Spanish Retellings Across Four Time Intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 0.78$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 1.78$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 1.89$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 1.44$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 9$</td>
<td>$s = 1.72$</td>
<td>$s = 1.30$</td>
<td>$s = 1.17$</td>
<td>$s = 1.01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 0.67$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 2.44$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 2.22$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 0.67$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n = 9$</td>
<td>$s = 0.87$</td>
<td>$s = 1.24$</td>
<td>$s = 1.39$</td>
<td>$s = 0.71$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 5, there is inconsistency between the mean scores of the English and Spanish retellings. The mean scores for both the English and Spanish retellings were consistently and substantially lower in this domain in comparison to the other domains. The standard deviations of the Spanish retelling scores were lower than those of the English retelling scores, except for time interval III.
In Table 6, the means and standard deviations of all the scores on the third domain of the retelling profile are presented for the four time intervals.

Table 6
Language Use Means and Standard Deviations of all English and Spanish Retellings Across Four Time Intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 9</td>
<td>X = 7.78</td>
<td>X = 7.00</td>
<td>X = 8.89</td>
<td>X = 10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s = 2.44</td>
<td>s = 1.94</td>
<td>s = 0.93</td>
<td>s = 1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 9</td>
<td>X = 10.00</td>
<td>X = 9.11</td>
<td>X = 9.33</td>
<td>X = 10.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s = 1.50</td>
<td>s = 2.26</td>
<td>s = 1.41</td>
<td>s = 0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 6, the means of the Spanish retellings were consistently higher than the means of the English retelling scores. The difference between the mean scores of the English and Spanish retellings at the fourth time interval was less than the difference between the mean scores at the first time interval. There was no consistent trend in the comparison of the standard deviations between the English and Spanish retelling scores.

Discussion for Research Question #2

Across the three domains, text-based comprehension, response and reactions to texts, and language use, children demonstrated higher performance on the retelling profile in
Spanish than in English. Children developed their Spanish proficiency through the use of retellings. However, their proficiency in English increased to a greater degree than their proficiency in Spanish through the use of retellings, which would indicate that the students are developing their bilingualism. Therefore, retelling appears to be useful language development practice for second language learners.

An example of such growth was observed with Oscar who initially scored a 4.00 on the English retelling for language fluency. During this English retelling, Oscar began in English and immediately switched to Spanish after one sentence. Therefore, only his English was scored for the English retelling. His initial Spanish retelling score was 9.00. For the final interval in the third domain, language use, Oscar’s English retelling was 9.00, and his Spanish retelling score was 10.00. During this English retelling, Oscar was able to retell the story completely in English. This illustrates how Oscar’s language proficiency in both languages were initially dissimilar, yet were more similar at the final time interval.

In general, the students’ English retellings were shorter and required more prompting than their Spanish retellings. This may be due to the fact that Spanish is their first language. English retellings may be more difficult than Spanish retellings for children whose first language is
First graders' own Spanish retellings scored higher than their own English retellings of the same text. Because of the contextualized print of the stories in both languages, children demonstrated similar text-based comprehension in both languages, supporting Krashen's (1988) comprehensible input theory. The most noticeable differences between the English retellings and Spanish retellings occurred in the language fluency use domain.

Research Question #3
What are the differences in first graders' retellings between those children who initially retell a story in Spanish and those children who retell the same story in Spanish following a retelling in English?

This question examined the effect of initial English retellings on subsequent Spanish retellings. Specifically, the mean scores of the initial Spanish retellings are compared to those mean scores of those subsequent Spanish retellings. The rationale was that the subsequent Spanish retelling mean scores should be higher than those of the initial Spanish retellings. The initial English retellings should serve as a rehearsal for the subsequent Spanish retellings.
Findings for Research Question #3

In Table 7, the means and standard deviations of the Spanish retelling scores in the order of presentation are presented for the first domain, text-based comprehension, of the retelling profile for the four time intervals.

Table 7

Text-based Comprehension Means and Standard Deviations of Spanish Retellings in the Order of Presentation Across Four Time Intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Presentation</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish 1</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X = 10.20</td>
<td>X = 10.25</td>
<td>X = 9.40</td>
<td>X = 9.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s = 2.49</td>
<td>s = 1.50</td>
<td>s = 1.52</td>
<td>s = 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish 2</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X = 9.25</td>
<td>X = 9.80</td>
<td>X = 10.25</td>
<td>X = 9.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s = 0.96</td>
<td>s = 0.84</td>
<td>s = 0.98</td>
<td>s = 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 7, the means of the scores of the initial Spanish retellings (Spanish₁) were higher than the means of the scores of the Spanish retellings which followed an English retelling (Spanish₂) for time intervals I and II. Conversely, the mean of the scores for the Spanish retellings which followed an English retelling was higher than the mean of the scores for the initial Spanish retellings for time interval III. For time interval IV, the mean scores are identical (X̄ = 9.00) for both the initial Spanish retellings
and the Spanish retellings which followed an English retelling.

There was no consistent trend in the standard deviations of the retelling scores for the four time intervals, except for time interval IV which had the same standard deviation of 0.00. This indicated that the scores within each group of Spanish retellings became homogeneous.

In Table 8, the means and standard deviations of the Spanish retelling scores in the order of presentation are presented on the second domain, response and reactions to texts, of the retelling profile for the four time intervals.

Table 8
Response and Reaction to the Text Means and Standard Deviations of Spanish Retellings in the Order of Presentation Across Four Time Intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Presentation</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish 1</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X = 0.60</td>
<td>X = 3.25</td>
<td>X = 1.80</td>
<td>X = 0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s = 0.89</td>
<td>s = 1.50</td>
<td>s = 1.30</td>
<td>s = 0.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish 2</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X = 0.75</td>
<td>X = 1.80</td>
<td>X = 2.75</td>
<td>X = 0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s = 0.96</td>
<td>s = 0.48</td>
<td>s = 1.50</td>
<td>s = 0.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 8, there was inconsistency between the mean scores of the Spanish retellings. The mean scores for the Spanish retellings were consistently substantially lower.
in this domain in comparison to the other domains. There was no consistent trend in the standard deviations of the scores for the Spanish retellings.

In Table 9, the means and standard deviations of the Spanish retelling scores in the order of presentation are presented on the third domain, language use, of the retelling profile for the four time intervals.

Table 9
Language Use Means and Standard Deviations of Spanish Retellings in the Order of Presentation Across Four Time Intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Presentation</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish 1</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x = 9.80</td>
<td>x = 9.00</td>
<td>x = 9.00</td>
<td>x = 10.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s = 1.92</td>
<td>s = 2.16</td>
<td>s = 0.71</td>
<td>s = 1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish 2</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x = 10.25</td>
<td>x = 9.20</td>
<td>x = 9.75</td>
<td>x = 11.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s = 0.96</td>
<td>s = 2.59</td>
<td>s = 2.06</td>
<td>s = 0.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 9, the mean scores of the Spanish retellings which followed an English retelling (Spanish 2) were consistently higher than the mean scores of the initial Spanish retellings (Spanish 1) for the four time intervals. There is not a consistent trend in the standard deviations of the scores of the Spanish retellings for this domain.
Discussion for Research Question #3

Across two of the three domains, text-based comprehension and response and reactions to texts, there was no consistent trend to indicate that initial English retellings had an influence on the Spanish retellings. The two domains, text-based comprehension and response and reaction to texts, were not affected by the order of language presentation of the stories. However, the language use domain was greatly influenced by the order of presentation of the stories.

As noted earlier, the means of the scores for the text-based comprehension domain indicated no trend in the order of language presentation. This may be due to children being actively involved with the meaning of the stories regardless of the language in which the stories were presented. Because the presentation of the stories incorporated meaningful prereading activities, the contextualized print became comprehensible for the children regardless of the language. This is especially apparent in time interval IV since all of the Spanish retellings scored a 9.00 in the text-based comprehension domain.

The language use domain demonstrated a consistent trend in the order of language presentation. For all four time intervals, the mean scores were higher for the Spanish retellings which followed English retellings than the initial Spanish retellings. This may have occurred because the
children who retold the story in English first had an opportunity to internalize the major events of the story and then they were able to focus their attention to the language in the Spanish presentation of the story.

The only conclusive trend in first graders' retellings between those children who initially retold a story in Spanish and those children who retold the same story following a retelling in English was in the language use domain. There was no consistent trend in the order of language presentation for the other two domains, text-based comprehension and response and reactions to texts. Therefore, initial English retellings only influenced Spanish retellings in the language use domain.

Research Question #4
What are the differences in first graders' retellings between those children who initially retell a story in English and those children who retell the same story in English following a retelling in Spanish?

This question examined the effect of initial Spanish retellings on subsequent English retellings. Specifically, the mean scores of the initial English retellings are compared to the mean scores of the subsequent English retellings. The rationale was that the subsequent English retelling mean scores should be higher than those of the initial English
retellings. The initial Spanish retellings should serve as a rehearsal for the subsequent English retellings.

**Findings for Research Question #4**

In table 10, the means and standard deviations of the English retelling scores in the order of presentation are presented on the first domain, text-based comprehension, of the retelling profile for the four time intervals.

**Table 10**

**Text-based Comprehension Means and Standard Deviations of English Retellings in the Order of Presentation Across Four Time Intervals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Presentation</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English 1</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X = 9.25</td>
<td>X = 8.80</td>
<td>X = 9.00</td>
<td>X = 9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s = 0.96</td>
<td>s = 2.17</td>
<td>s = 1.63</td>
<td>s = 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 2</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X = 7.60</td>
<td>X = 10.75</td>
<td>X = 10.00</td>
<td>X = 9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s = 3.21</td>
<td>s = 0.50</td>
<td>s = 1.60</td>
<td>s = 0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 10, the mean of the scores of the initial English retellings (English₁) was higher than the mean of the scores of the English retellings which followed Spanish retellings (English₂) for the first time interval only. Conversely, the means of the scores for the English retellings which followed Spanish retellings were higher than the initial
English retellings for the second and third time intervals. The means of the scores for both English retellings were the same at the fourth time interval.

There was no consistent trend in the standard deviations of the scores for the first and second time interval. But in the third time interval, the standard deviations were similar, and in the fourth time interval, they were the same. This indicates that for both English retellings, the scores were homogeneous on the fourth time interval.

In Table 11, the means and standard deviations of the English retelling scores in the order of presentation are presented on the second domain, response and reaction to texts, of the retelling profile for the four time intervals.

Table 11
Response and Reaction to the Text Means and Standard Deviations of English Retellings in the Order of Presentation Across Four Time Intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Presentation</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English 1</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X = 1.75</td>
<td>X = 1.00</td>
<td>X = 2.50</td>
<td>X = 1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s = 2.36</td>
<td>s = 0.71</td>
<td>s = 1.00</td>
<td>s = 0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 2</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X = 0.00</td>
<td>X = 2.75</td>
<td>X = 1.40</td>
<td>X = 1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s = 0.00</td>
<td>s = 1.26</td>
<td>s = 1.14</td>
<td>s = 1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 11, the means of the scores for the
initial English retellings (English₁) were higher than those of the English retellings which followed Spanish retellings (English₂) for the first and third time intervals. Conversely, the means of the scores for the English retellings which followed Spanish retellings were higher than those of the initial English retellings for the second and fourth time intervals. This may be due to group differences which will be discussed later in this section.

There is no consistent trend in the standard deviations of the scores on this domain. In general, the scores on this domain were substantially lower in comparison to the other two domains.

In Table 12, the means and standard deviations of the English retelling scores in the order of presentation are presented on the third domain, language use, of the retelling profile for the four time intervals.
Table 12
Language Use Means and Standard Deviations of English Retellings in the Order of Presentation Across the Four Time Intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of Presentation</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English 1</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X = 8.50</td>
<td>X = 6.20</td>
<td>X = 9.25</td>
<td>X = 9.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s = 1.73</td>
<td>s = 1.48</td>
<td>s = 1.26</td>
<td>s = 1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 2</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td>n = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X = 7.20</td>
<td>X = 8.00</td>
<td>X = 8.60</td>
<td>X = 10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s = 2.95</td>
<td>s = 2.16</td>
<td>s = 0.55</td>
<td>s = 1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 12, the means of the scores for the initial English retellings (English₁) were higher than those of the English retellings that followed Spanish retellings (English₂) for the first and third time intervals. Conversely, the means of the scores for the English retellings which followed Spanish retellings were higher than those of the initial English retellings for the second and fourth time intervals. This may be due to group differences which will be discussed later in this section.

There was no consistent trend in the standard deviations of the scores on this domain.

Discussion for Research Question #4

Across the three domains, text-based comprehension, response and reactions to texts, and language use, there was
no consistent trend to indicate that Spanish retellings influenced children’s English retellings. However, group differences became apparent when these findings were examined. The composition of the groups changed throughout the four time intervals of this study.

At the beginning of this study both groups contained a heterogeneous mix of students based on teacher observation, and the two groups appeared to be similar to each other. However, as time progressed, students were dropped from the study for reasons previously described in Chapter 3. Because mean scores are compared in these tables, the loss of certain students could have either positively or negatively influenced these mean scores. With small sample sizes, the loss of even one student from a group can have a major influence on the means and standard deviations of the scores.

According to group means, in the domains of language use and response and reaction to texts, it was apparent that one group’s English retelling scores, regardless of the order of presentation, were consistently higher than those of the other group. This is contrary to the rationale that Spanish retellings serve as rehearsals for English retellings in these two domains for this study.

For the text-based comprehension domain, all of the retellings scored the same on the last story for both English retellings. This indicates that the order of language
presentation had no influence on the text-based comprehension domain. This may be due to the reasons previously described in question three.

Contrary to the rationale, it was apparent that Spanish retellings did not serve as rehearsal for English retellings in the three domains. There were no conclusive trends in first graders' retellings between those children who initially retold a story in English and those children who retold the same story in English following Spanish retellings. Therefore, in this study Spanish retellings did not influence English retellings.

Summary

This study was designed to assess Spanish and English retellings of first graders over the period of one school year. Over the school year the first graders' Spanish and English retellings demonstrated positive change over time with continued practice and opportunities to retell. Not surprisingly, their Spanish retelling scores were consistently higher than those of their English retellings. The findings from this study did not indicate an influence of Spanish retellings on subsequent English retellings on any of the three domains of the retelling profile. However, the findings did indicate an influence of English retellings on subsequent Spanish retellings on one of the three domains of the
retelling profile. Overall, the first graders' retellings demonstrated positive results over the school year.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to present a restatement of the research problem, give an overview of the relevant research, review the design and procedures of the study, summarize the findings, and provide conclusions, implications and suggestions for further studies.

Restatement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to assess first graders' retellings over a period of one school year. Retellings are postreading or postlistening activities in which readers or listeners tell or write their representation of the text. As children become more proficient in retelling they are able to present their own representation of the story. In retelling, readers are involved in thinking and organizing their own comprehension, therefore, this process integrates reflection, reaction, and response to the entire text (Mitchell & Irwin, 1992). Retellings as used in this study, assessed bilingual first graders' Spanish and English retellings.
These retellings were examined in the research presented here. The four research questions addressed in this study were:

1. How do first graders' retellings change over time with continued practice and opportunities to retell?
2. How do first graders' own Spanish and English retellings of the same stories compare and contrast?
3. What are the differences in first graders' retellings between those children who initially retell a story in Spanish and those children who retell the same story in Spanish following a retelling in English?
4. What are the differences in first graders' retellings between those children who initially retell a story in English and those children who retell the same story in English following a retelling in Spanish.

**Literature Reviewed**

Four major areas of research related to this study were examined. First, the emergence of literacy was discussed in order to set a theoretical framework for the study. Second, biliteracy was discussed in order to present the rationale for instructional programs that develop literacy in two languages. Third, the use of children's literature for reading instruction was reviewed. Fourth, the use of story retelling of children’s literature as a post reading activity as
assessment of reading comprehension was summarized.

Design and Procedures

Nine bilingual students from the same first grade classroom participated in the study. The students were divided into two groups according to their ranking on the Student Progress/Development as a Reader continuum (Hart-Hewins & Wells, 1990). Both groups contained a heterogeneous mix of students, and the two groups were similar to each other.

The students were introduced to retelling initially in a whole group setting. The teacher read the story to the class and then modeled the retelling procedure several times, and the students gradually joined in the retellings.

Retelling was also included during the times the students met in small reading groups. During small group instruction, when the story was introduced, the students participated in prereading activities such as making predictions, discussing a theme, looking at pictures, making observations of realia, or experiencing an event from the story. After reading the story at various times, silently, chorally, or in pairs, the students practiced retelling the story to their group, their partners, or to somebody who had never heard the story. The students then had the opportunity to write about the story in their journals. Enrichment and reinforcement activities were
carried out during the reading times for the remainder of the week. Enrichment activities included creative drama, puppet making, creating sceneries for a story and rewriting a story.

Each of the four testing periods occurred near the end of each quarter; the first occurring in mid October, the second in the beginning of December, the third in mid February, and the fourth occurring in mid April. Each of the four testing periods took place over four days of a week, Monday through Thursday. The teacher met with both groups on each of the four days. The first day of the first and third testing periods, one group received both reading instruction and literature selection in one language, and the other group in the other language. On the second day, each of the group members retold the story in the language in which it was presented to them. On the third day, the language of instruction and literature selection was switched for the two groups. On the fourth day, each of the group members retold the story in the language in which it was presented to them. The teacher recorded the individual retellings and them transcribed them for the purpose of the analysis.

At the second and fourth testing periods, the order of language of instruction and literature selection was switched for the two groups, so that the order in which the language presentation occurred was opposite of the first and third testing periods.
The retellings were evaluated according to the Retelling Profile developed by Mitchell and Irwin (1992, in preparation). Two raters, one being the researcher and the other a colleague, collaboratively determined whether each retelling reflected a high degree, moderated degree, low degree or no degree of performance for criteria judged in the profile.

To analyze the data for this study, a descriptive data analysis was used. Because of the small number of students in the study, a statistical analysis was not appropriate. To answer all four research questions, means and standard deviations of retelling scores according to the three domains of the retelling profile were compared. Major trends and patterns observed in the retellings were described.

Summary of the Findings

The Spanish and English retellings of first graders were assessed over the period of one school year. Over the school year, the first graders' Spanish and English retellings demonstrated positive change over time with continued practice and opportunities to retell. Their Spanish retelling scores were consistently higher than their English retellings. The findings from this study did not indicate an influence of Spanish retellings on subsequent English retellings on any of the three domains of the retelling profile. However, the
findings did indicate an influence of English retellings on subsequent Spanish retellings on one of the three domains of the retelling profile. Overall, the first graders' retellings reflected positive results over the school year.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, conclusions can be made accordingly. Retelling is an appropriate activity to show first graders' growth over the period of one school year. Retelling appeared to be an effective way to document students' progress in reading in two languages. Specifically, retelling helped students improve their comprehension and language fluency in both languages. The findings were conclusive to show an effect of English retellings on Spanish retellings in language fluency only.

Although the findings were inconclusive to show an effect of English retellings on Spanish retellings, this may have been due to small sample size, the task of retelling and/or text effects.

Implications for Practice

The results of this study which assessed first graders' Spanish and English retellings indicate that retelling provided new insights concerning evaluation of reading comprehension for children at this age level. There is a need
for teachers to evaluate the comprehension of young readers. In addition, children at this age level are developing critical literacy strategies, and retelling affords them opportunities to further develop those strategies.

First, as an evaluation activity, retelling is appropriate and authentic. The readers present their own perception of the text. By doing so, they must think through the story and thereby take charge of their own comprehension.

Second, retelling develops critical literacy strategies because children are reading, writing about, listening to and talking about the story. The literacy strategies of reading, writing, listening and talking are developed through books and their literary language and story structures.

An implication for the classroom teacher is that retellings provide an insight into the children’s comprehension process as they develop literacy strategies. This insight allows the teacher to evaluate young readers and to observe growth in children’s strengths as readers and writers. A retelling is appropriate to include in a student’s portfolio.

Recommendations for Further Research

Although the process of retelling has been utilized in classrooms, and although the results have reportedly been positive, further research is needed. Recommendations for
further research are:

1. A larger sample size with a comparable control group.
2. Replicate this study with a group of students at a different age level.
3. Replicate this study to include written retellings.
4. Evaluate second language comprehension by the use of Spanish retellings of English text. Children may be able to discuss their second language reading comprehension if the discussion is carried out in their first language.
5. Conduct a longitudinal study to assess the effects of retelling on the comprehension and language fluency of children who have experienced retelling as emergent readers.
6. Rescore the English and Spanish data without the probes. Reanalyze the answers to the questions using rescored data. Look at free response retellings only.
7. Rescore data which includes Spanish and English together in both types of retellings to get scores for comprehension.
8. Do an item analysis of the profile for the four texts to further examine text effects.
9. Consider the results of the study through a qualitative analysis of reading performance in
Spanish and English and the social and cultural context of the children in the study and their community from which they come, perhaps in a case study format.

10. Consider reflecting on this study as an example of collaborative teacher as-researcher work, including the projects' effects on teachers' views of research and teaching.

11. Examine the language of the children's Spanish and English texts produced in their retellings.
APPENDIX A
RETELLING PROFILE

Directions: Indicate with a check (✓) the degree to which the reader's retelling reflects the reader's comprehension in terms of the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>none</th>
<th>low degree</th>
<th>moderate degree</th>
<th>high degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Retelling includes information directly stated in text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Retelling includes information inferred directly or indirectly from text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Retelling includes what is important to remember from the text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Retelling provides relevant content, concepts, and context.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Retelling indicates reader's attempts to connect background knowledge with text information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Retelling indicates reader's attempts to make summary statements or generalizations based on the text and apply them to the real world.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Retelling indicates reader's highly individualistic and creative impressions of or reactions to the text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Retelling indicates reader's effective involvement with the text.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Retelling demonstrates reader's language fluency (use of vocabulary, sentence structure, language conventions, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Retelling indicates reader's organization or composition abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Retelling demonstrates the reader's sense of audience or purpose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Retelling indicates reader's control of the mechanics of speaking or writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation: Items 1-4 indicate reader's text-based comprehension information; Items 5-8 indicate reader's response and reactions to text; Items 9-12 indicate reader's language use.

APPENDIX B
SAMPLES OF TWO STUDENTS SPANISH AND ENGLISH RETELLINGS FOR ALL FOUR INTERVALS

Natalie:
Katie did it.
Whenever the milk was spilled, Kris and Jenny said, "Katie did it." Whenever the ball was left out, Kris and Jenny said, "Katie did it." Whenever the light was left on, Kris and Jenny said, "Katie did it." Whenever the door was left open, Kris and Jenny said, "Katie did it." Whenever...That's all she heard. Katie did it, Katie did it. That's all Katie heard. Her mother called Kris and Jenny and Katie. She said, "Who gave me this pretty flowers?" And do you know what she did? Katie did it.
T: Is there anything more?
N: She was happy.
T: Who was happy?
N: Her mother.
T: Why do you think her mother was happy?
N: Because she gave her the pretty flowers.
T: Do you think Katie did all those things?
N: No.
T: Who do you think did all those things?
N: Kris and Jenny.
T: What do you think about the mother? Do you think she believes Kris and Jenny when they say 'Katie did it'?
N: No.
T: Why?
N: 'Cause Katie ain't bad.

Natalie:
Fue Carmelita. Cuando se tiraba la lechi, Samuel y Julia decian, -Fue Carmelita. Cuando se dejaba la pelota afuera, Samuel y Julia decian, -Fue Carmelita. Cuando se dejaba la puerta abierta, Carmelita...no..Samuel y Julia decian, -Fue Carmelita. Cuando se dejaba la luz prendida, Samuel y Julia decian, -Fue Carmelita. Ese dia Carmelita se pasaba oyendo, -Fue Carmelita, fue Carmelita. Un dia llamó mami, y le llamó a Julia, Samuel, y a Carmelita. Y les dijo, -¿Quién me dio estas bonitas flores? ¿Y sabes lo que hizo Carmelita? Dijo Carmelita, -Fue Carmelita.
T: ¿Qué piensas de Carmelita?
N: Que le dio las flores para que esté feliz.
T: ¿Qué piensa la mamá?
N: Que ella no hizo todo eso, que lo hizo Julia y Samuel.
T: ¿Porqué?
N: Porque la niña chiquita no es tan malcreada.
Natalie:

¿De quién eres ratoncito? No soy de nadie. Entonces ¿qué vas a hacer? Sacudir al gato y sacar a mamá, liberar a papá de la trampa y sacar a papá, encontrar a mi hermana y traerla a casa, y deesar un hermanito. Y entonces ratoncito, ¿de quién eres? Soy de mamá que me quiere tanto, soy de piez a cabeza soy de papá, soy de mi hermana que también me quiere. Soy de...deseare un hermanito. Y entonces soy de mi hermanito. ¿Qué? ¿Cómo? ¿De tu hermanito? Si, mi hermanito el recién nacido.

T: ¿Dónde estaba su mamá?
N: En la barriga del gato.
T: ¿Dónde estaba su papá?
N: Encerrado en una trampa.
T: ¿Cómo se siente el ratoncito?
N: Triste.
T: ¿En todo el cuento?
N: No. No, en el comienzo se sentía triste, y cuando sacó a su mamá se sintió bien feliz.

T: ¿De quién era el ratoncito?
N: De su familia.
T: ¿De quién eres tu ratoncito?
N: De mi familia.
T: ¿Me quieres contar más?
N: Soy de mi nana, tata, tía, tío, soy de mi mamá.

Natalie:

My name is Natalie. I’m gonna retell this story. His name is Whose Mouse Are You? Whose mouse are you? Nobody’s. Where’s your mother? I don’t have a mother. Inside the cat. Where’s your father? Trapped in a cage. Where’s your sister? Far from home. Where’s your brother? I have none. And what will you do? I will shake my mother out of the cat. I will free my father out of the trap. I will find my sister and bring her home. And I’ll wish for a brother as I have none. And whose are you well? Now whose are you? My mother. She loves me so. My father, from mouth to head to toe. My sister loves me too. My brother. What? Your brother? Yes, my brother, he’s brand new.

T: How did the mouse feel?
N: Happy when he got their mother out, and her brother, and her sister.
T: Whose mouse is he?
N: His mother, his sister, and his brother.
T: Whose mouse are you?
N: My mother, my grandma, my tata, my uncle, my cousins.
T: Why?
N: Because they love me so much.
Natalie:
I’m gonna tell you a story about a carrot seed. The Carrot Seed. One day there was a little boy that planted a carrot seed. His mother said, "I’m afraid it won’t come up." His dad said, "I’m afraid it won’t come up." His big brother said, "It won’t come up." Everyday the little boy pulled the weeds out around the seeds and sprinkles the ground with water, but nothing came up. And nothing came up. And nothing came up. And one day a carrot came up just as the little boy knew it would.

T: You said he had a father, a mother and a brother. What do you think the little boy will do with the carrot?
N: Eat it.
T: With who?
N: With his dad, mother and brother.
T: Did the little boy know it would grow?
N: Yes.
T: Did you know it would grow?
N: Yes.
T: Was it a surprise?
N: Yes, for his mother.

Natalie:
Un día un niñito sembró una semilla de zanahoria. Su mamá le dijo, -Me temo que no brotará. Su papá le dijo, -Me temo que no brotará. Y su hermano mayor dijo, -No brotará. Pero todos los días el niñito arrancaba la maleza que arrodeaba la semilla y regaba el suelo con agua. Un día una zanahoria salió tal como el niño sabía que brotaría.

T: ¿Qué le hace falta a una semilla para brotar?
N: Agua, sol, aire, viento.
T: ¿Qué va a hacer el niño con la zanahoria?
N: Se la va a comer.
T: ¿A quién se la va a enseñar?
N: A su mamá, a su papá, a su hermano.
T: ¿El niño sabía que iba a brotar?
N: Sí.
T: ¿Y tu sabías?
N: Sí.
T: ¿Cómo sabías?
N: Porque vi al último del libro.
The very hungry caterpillar by Eric Carle. La oruga muy hambrienta. Bajo la luz de la luna había un huevecillo. El sol caliente salió ¡pum! del huevecillo una orugita salió muy hambrienta. Él empezó a buscar comida. El lunes se comió a través de una manzana, pero todavía tenía hambre. El martes se comió a través de dos peras, pero todavía tenía hambre. El miércoles se comió a través de tres ciruelas, pero todavía tenía hambre. El jueves se comió a través de cuatro frezas. El viernes se comió a través de cinco naranjas, pero todavía tenía hambre. El sábado se comió un pedazo de pastel de chocolate, un pepino, un helado, un pepino, una rebanada de queso suizo, una rebanada de salami, una paleta, un pedazo de pastel, una salchicha, un panquesito, un pedazo de sandía. Esa noche tenía un dolor de estómago. El siguiente día fue domingo otra vez. La oruga se comió a través de una hoja verde buena. Se sintió mucho mejor. Y ya no era una orugita. Era una oruguta grande y gorda. Se construyó una casita llamada capullo. Se quedó por más de dos semanas. Luego mordisqueó un hoyo en el capullo. Y era una hermosa mariposa.

This is the Very Hungry Caterpillar by Eric Carle. In the light moon a little egg layed on the leaf. The next day was Sunday. Pop! out came a hungry caterpillar, so he started looking for some food. On Monday he ate one apple, but he was still hungry. On Tuesday he ate two pears, but he was still hungry. On Wednesday he ate three plums, but he was still hungry. On Thursday he ate four strawberries, but he was still hungry. On Friday he ate five oranges, but he was still hungry. On Saturday he ate one piece of chocolate cake, one ice-cream cone, one pickle, one slice of Swiss cheese, one slice of salami, one lollipop, one piece of cherry pie, one sausage, and one cupcake, and one piece of watermelon. That night he had a stomachache. The next day was Sunday again and he ate a nice green leaf. He felt much better. He wasn’t little anymore. He was big, so he built a little house named a chrysalis. He stayed for more than two weeks. Then he nibbled a hole and pushed his way out, and she was a beautiful butterfly.
Oscar:
Carmelita estaba chiquita y el hermano es más grande y la hermana es más grande. Cuando la leche se tiraba, -Es Carmelita. Cuando la pelota se quedaba afuera, -Fue Carmelita. Cuando la puerta estaba abierta, -Fue Carmelita. Y cuando la luz se quedaba prendida, -Fue Carmelita. Carmelita se llevaba oyendo. Llamó a Carmelita, al hermano y a la hermana, -¿Quién me trajo estas bonitas flores? -Fue Carmelita.
T: ¿Qué piensas de la mamá?
O: Que ellos fueron.
T: ¿Quién fue?
O: El hermano y la hermana.
T: ¿Porqué?
O: Porque ellos dejaban la puerta afuera y le echaban la culpa a Carmelita.

Oscar:
Katie. Katie did it....
T: Who’s in the story?
O: Katie.
T: What can you tell me about Katie?
O: ...
T: What happened in the story?
O: Katie did it.

Oscar:
Whose mouse are you? Nobody...
T: ¿Me la quieres contar en Español?
O: ¿Dónde está tu hermano? No tengo. ¿En donde está tu papa? En una trampa. ¿En donde está tu mamá? Adentro de un gato. Donde está tu hermana?...
T: ¿Dónde está la hermana?
O: En la sierra.
T: ¿Qué va a hacer el ratoncito ahora?
O: Voy a, voy a, con su papá. Luego...luego...
T: ¿Qué hizo el ratoncito?
O: Fue con su papá, luego, luego, tuvo un niño nuevo.
T: ¿Cómo termina el cuento?
O: Con el niño nuevo.
T: Y ¿de quién es el ratoncito?
O: De su mamá, de su papá, de su hermana, de su hermano.
T: ¿Cómo se siente el ratoncito?
O: Triste.
T: ¿Cuando?
O: Cuando preguntaba.
T: Y ¿de quién eres tu ratoncito?
O: De mi mamá.
Oscar:
¿De quién eres ratoncito? De nadie. ¿Dónde está tu mamá? Adentro de una barriga del gato. ¿Dónde está tu papá? En una trampa. ¿Dónde está tu mamá? Está en una... ¿Dónde está tu hermana? En una... lejos de casa. ¿Dónde está tu hermano? No tengo hermano. ¿En dónde está... T: Y que...
O: ¿Y que vas a hacer? Sacudir al gato y sacar a mamá.
¿Dónde está tu papá? Lo voy a sacar de la trampa. ¿Dónde está tu hermana? La voy a traer a casa. ¿Dónde está tu papá? De cabeza a pie. ¿Dónde está...
T: ¿Qué pasa al último?
O: Nació un hermanito.
T: ¿De quién es el ratoncito?
O: De su hermanito.
T: ¿Cómo se siente el ratoncito?
O: Feliz.
T: ¿Cuándo?
O: Cuando nació el niño.
T: Entonces ¿de quién es el ratoncito?
O: De su mamá.
T: ¿Porqué?
O: Porque si.
T: ¿De quién eres tu rantoncito?
O: De mi mamá.

Oscar:
La semilla de zanahoria. Un niñito sembró una semilla de zanahoria. Su mamá dijo, -Nosotros dijimos que no brotaría. Su papá dijo que no brotaría. El hermano mayor le dijo, -No brotaría. Y todo el mundo le dijo, -No brotaría. Y él le quitaba la maleza. Y un día estaba creciendo la semilla de zanahoria. Luego el niño... el sabía que iba a crecer.
T: ¿Qué va a hacer el niño con la zanahoria?
O: La va a sacar.
T: ¿A quién le va a enseñar la zanahoria?
O: A sus amigos, a su mamá, a su papá y a su hermano mayor.
T: ¿Tu sabías que la semilla iba a brotar?
O: Sabe. Luego estaba enseñando a su papá, a su mamá y a su hermano mayor. Pensaron ellos que no iba a brotar.
Oscar:
A little boy...one day one little boy...
T: What did the boy do?
O: ...
T: What did he do with a seed?
O: Carrot. Su mother said, "I’m afraid it won’t come up." Su brother said, "I’m afraid it won’t come up." Everyday he...le echaba agua, luego le quitaba la maleza. Y luego nada venia para arriba. Y nada venia para arriba. Un día una zanahoria creció tal como el ninito sabia que iba a crecer.
T: What does a seed need to come up?
O: Agua, quitar la maleza a la semilla.
T: Who can he show the carrot to?
O: Se la va a enseñar a su amigo.
T: Who else?
O: Su mother, su father, su big brother.
T: Did he know it was going to grow?
O: Yes.
T: Did you?
O: No.

Oscar:
The very hungry caterpillar. The egg.
T: What came out of the egg?
O: The little caterpillar. He looked for food. Monday he ate one little apple, but he was still hungry. Tuesday he ate two pears, but he was still hungry. Wednesday he ate three plums, but he still hungry. Thursday he ate four strawberries, but he was still hungry. On Friday he ate five orange, but still hungry. Saturday he ate cake, ice-cream, pickle, cheese, ..., lollipop, cake, sausage, cupcake, salami... and...
T: What happened?
O: Stomachache, una hoja, better.
T: What happened to him?
O: He was a big fat caterpillar. He stayed for two weeks in a cocoon. And he make a butterfly.
T: What kind of butterfly?
O: Beautiful.
Oscar:
Abajo de la luna hay un huevecillo y en el huevecillo salió un gusano...

T: ¿Qué hizo el gusano?
O: Andaba buscando comida. Y luego domingo, no, lunes se comió una manzana. El martes se comió dos peras. El miércoles se comió tres ciruelas. El jueves se comió cuatro frezás. El viernes se comió cinco naranjas, pero todavía tenía hambre. El sábado se comió un queki de chocolate, una nieve,..., un queso, un salami, una paleta, un pastel, una salchicha, un queki, una sandía. Ese día tenía dolor de estómago. Y luego ya no era una pequeña orugita y era una grandota oruga. Se encontró una casita que se llama capullo y se hizo un hoyo y se hizo una linda mariposa.

T: ¿Qué hizo para sentirse mejor?
O: Se comió una hoja.
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