Frederick A. Duffelmeyer
Anne E. Kruse
Donna J. Merkley
Stephen A. Fyfe

Further validation and enhancement of the Names Test

This article describes a revision of the Names Test, an easy-to-administer phonics assessment.

To become proficient readers, students must develop and successfully apply strategies for decoding unfamiliar words. Among the three major strategies for deciphering new words—knowledge of letter-sound correspondences, word structure clues, and context clues—knowledge of letter-sound correspondences, or phonics, appears to be the most crucial (Adams, 1990; Perfetti, 1991). Although many children induce letter-sound correspondences on their own, others are dependent upon direct, systematic instruction (Adams, 1990; Ehri & Wilce, 1985; Stahl, 1992). Thus, at any given grade there will exist among students a wide range in phonics ability. This underscores the importance of assessing students prior to implementing phonics instruction, regardless of the overall nature of the reading program (e.g., basal, whole language).

However, it appears that the assessment-prior-to-instruction practice is seldom followed, due mainly to the absence of an easy-to-administer, reliable, and valid test of students' phonics ability (Groff, 1986). The validity requirement is particularly important. Most phonics tests are group paper and pencil tests which require students to select from among several options the letter, letter combination, or word that corresponds to either a picture or to a word spoken by the examiner. A task of this sort does reveal something about students' knowledge of letter-sound correspondences. As Pikulski and Shanahan (1980) have pointed out, however, it is the exact opposite of the task students face in reading: When reading, students convert written symbols into spoken sounds, whereas in group paper-and-pencil tests, it is the other way around. In other words, group paper and pencil tests assess encoding (converting sound to print) rather than decoding (converting print to sound).

A more valid way to assess phonics ability is to have students attempt to read printed words. This is not as easy as it sounds, however. If high frequency (common) words are used, students may know them at sight, in which case one is assessing whole word recognition rather than the ability to apply

knowledge of letter-sound correspondences. On the other hand, if low frequency (uncommon) words are used, they may not be in the students' listening vocabulary, in which case students are deprived of the positive reinforcement of arriving at a pronunciation of a word they know. (The latter disadvantage also applies to the use of nonsense words).

To sidestep this high/low frequency problem, Cunningham (1990) developed an easy to administer phonics assessment, called the Names Test, which requires decoding rather than encoding. As Cunningham states:

> There is one type of word that is not often seen in print but can be found in most children's listening vocabularies: persons' names. As children watch television and movies and interact with peers and adults in their neighborhoods and schools, they are constantly hearing first and last names they don't see in print. As a result, most children have many more names in their listening vocabularies than in their reading vocabularies. This provides an ideal source of words for use in assessing decoding skills. (p. 125)

Briefly, Cunningham's test (see top half of Table 1) consists of 25 pairs of first and last names selected to meet four criteria: (a) they are not some of the most common names; (b) they are fully decodable (i.e., they sound the way they are spelled); (c) they represent a sampling of the most common phonics elements (e.g., consonant blends, short vowels); and (d) they represent a balance of shorter and longer namers. Admittedly, several of the names (e.g., Jay, Tim, Chuck, Glen) could be sight words for many students, older children in particular. Therefore, the previously mentioned high frequency problem is not avoided altogether. However, it would appear that a large majority of the names would not be in most students' sight vocabulary, and are therefore appropriate for their intended use.

The Names Test is administered individually. As the student reads the names aloud, the examiner records a check mark on a scoring sheet (protocol) for each name read correctly (i.e., according to English spelling rules) and phonetic spellings for names which are mispronounced. Afterwards, the examiner ana-

Table 1
Original and augmented versions of the Names Test

Original version (25 pairs of first and last names)

Jay Conway	Cindy Sampson	Flo Thornton
Tim Cornell	Chester Wright	Dee Skidmore
Chuck Hoke	Ginger Yale	Grace Brewster
Yolanda Clark	Patrick Tweed	Ned Westmoreland
Kimberly Blake	Stanley Shaw	Ron Smitherman
Roberta Slade	Wendy Swain	Troy Whitlock
Homer Preston	Glen Spencer	Vance Middleton
Gus Quincy	Fred Sherwood	Zane Anderson
		Bernard Pendergraph

Augmented version (35 pairs of first and last names)*

Jay Conway	Stanley Shaw	Bernard Pendergraph
Tim Cornell	Wendy Swain	*Shane Fletcher*
Chuck Hoke	Glen Spencer	*Floyd Sheldon*
Yolanda Clark	Fred Sherwood	*Dean Bateman*
Kimberly Blake	Flo Thornton	*Austin Shepherd*
Roberta Slade	Dee Skidmore	*Bertha Dale*
Homer Preston	Grace Brewster	*Neal Wade*
Gus Quincy	Ned Westmoreland	*Jake Murphy*
Cindy Sampson	Ron Smitherman	*Joan Brooks*
Chester Wright	Troy Whitlock	*Gene Loomis*
Ginger Yale	Vance Middleton	*Thelma Rinehart*
Patrick Tweed	Zane Anderson	

*Added names are in italics.

lyzes the results to determine the student's strengths and weaknesses in phonics. For example, a student may experience little or no difficulty with consonant blends, but moderate to serious difficulty with short vowels.

Cunningham's rationale for employing the Names Test and the ease with which it can be administered are appealing qualities. However, to truly be useful a test must be valid and reliable. Validity refers to how well a test measures what it claims to measure. One method of determining validity is to compare the results of the test under study with a second established instrument believed to measure the same ability. Reliability refers to how consistently a test measures the ability being evaluated. If a test is reliable, a person would receive the same (or nearly the same) score on repeated testings. A test's reliability can be estimated with a statistic called a reliability coefficient. One method of obtaining a reliability coefficient is to divide the test into odd-numbered and even-numbered items after it is administered, and then correlate the two sets of scores. This procedure is called a split-half reliability estimate.

A more valid way to assess phonics ability is to have students attempt to read printed words.

To gain information about its validity and reliability, Cunningham field tested the Names Test with 120 randomly selected students in Grades 2 through 5 (30 per grade). With respect to validity, Cunningham reported that second graders obtained an average score of 22.6, compared to an average score of 47.3 for fifth graders. This provided initial evidence that the Names Test is valid, since phonics ability has been shown to develop rather quickly in second grade and to peak in later grades. The Kuder-Richardson 20, a type of split-half reliability, yielded a reliability coefficient of .98, a very high reliability estimate.

After careful consideration of its rationale, development, and the results of the field testing, we concluded that the Names Test has the potential to become a useful diagnostic tool for classroom teachers as well as teachers who work in a remedial setting. At the same time, we felt that it could be strengthened in two areas: category reliability and usability. We also felt that it warranted further investigation concerning its validity. The remainder of this article describes what we did to increase category reliability, to further examine the test's validity, and to enhance its usability.

Category reliability

One of Cunningham's selection criteria was that the names represent a sampling of the most common English spelling patterns. More specifically, the intent was to include enough instances of a given phonics category, or subscale, so that a student's performance in relation to it could be considered reliable. Category reliability, then, refers to the reliability of a test's subscale scores. Generally, the more items there are on a test or within a subscale, the more reliable the test or subscale becomes.

The question is: How many instances of a phonics category should there be? Although there is no hard and fast rule, Schell and Hanna (1981) have proposed a ballpark figure of 20 for subscale scores in general. Our analysis of the 50 items that comprised the Names Test revealed that five phonics categories fell considerably short of that figure: consonant digraphs 8, long vowels 9, vowel consonant final-*e* 6, vowel digraphs 8, and the schwa 9.

We recognize that Cunningham intended the Names Test to enable a quick assessment of phonics ability, and that it was therefore desirable to keep the number of names to a minimum. On the other hand, since one of the stated features of the Names Test is that it can provide teachers with diagnostic information based on error patterns, we increased the number of examples in the aforementioned categories to a minimum of 15. This entailed adding 10 pairs of first and last names to

Cunningham's list of 25 (see bottom half of Table 1). Although this results in a less quick assessment of phonics ability (70 items versus 50), it seemed to us an acceptable trade-off for increased category reliability. The additional 20 items were obtained in the same manner as the original 50 (refer to pp. 125-126 in Cunningham's article).

The augmented version of the Names Test, which yielded a Kuder-Richardson 20 reliability coefficient of .93, resulted in the following breakdown:

Phonics category	Instances
Initial consonants (InCon)	37
Initial consonant blends (InConBl)	19
Consonant digraphs (ConDgr)	15
Short vowels (ShVow)	36
Long vowels/VC–final *e* (LV/VC–*e*)	23
Vowel digraphs (VowDgr)	15
Controlled vowels (CtrVow)	25
Schwa	15

The two categories LV and VC–*e* were combined because even after the new names were added, neither category alone met the criterion of 15 instances: long vowels had 10 instances, while VC–final *e* had 13.

Validity

As mentioned earlier, Cunningham obtained initial evidence that the Names Test is valid in that the average score for fifth grade (47.3) approached the highest possible score (50), and was considerably higher than the average score for second grade (22.6). We sought further evidence of its validity through three methods.

First, we analyzed the performance of students in Grades 2 through 5 in each of the eight phonics categories as well as the entire test. We reasoned that a valid phonics test should yield minimal between-grade-level variation relative to phonics elements that typically are introduced early in a phonics curriculum, and greater variation relative to phonics elements that tend to be introduced later on.

Second, we kept a record of how long it took the students to read the names. Automaticity theory (LaBerge & Samuels, 1974; Samuels, 1979), predicts that older students, on average, will read the names not only with greater accuracy than younger students, but more rapidly; we investigated whether this hypothesis was borne out by our results.

Finally, we compared the students' performance on the Names Test with their performance on an established test of reading ability, in this case the Reading subtest of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. Using reading comprehension as a criterion variable was deemed justifiable in that decoding ability is positively associated with comprehension performance (e.g., Byrne, Freebody, & Gates, 1992; Freebody & Byrne, 1988).

Procedure. Our sample consisted of 140 students in Grades 2 through 5 from a single building in a Midwestern school district. The breakdown by grade level was as follows: second 34, third 34, fourth 33, and fifth 41. Prior to administering the augmented version of the Names Test in October, we analyzed all 70 names, reached consensus, with the aid of several phonics books (e.g., Baer, 1991; Cunningham, 1991; Heilman, 1993), on what phonics elements each name assessed, and organized this material into a matrix for scoring purposes.

In Cunningham's field testing, the 25 pairs of first and last names that the students read were arranged in two columns on a single sheet of paper. For our study, one of us (Fyfe) designed a computer program that automated the presentation of the names one pair at a time in 12 pt. boldface type on a Macintosh SE series microcomputer. After entering the student's name and grade level into the computer, the examiner said:

> I want you to pretend that you are a teacher who is taking attendance on the first day of school. But instead of reading your students' names from a list, you will read them from a computer screen. As you read the names, I will be taking notes to help me remember what you say.
>
> Here is how it works: When you press this key that has an orange circle on it [the RETURN key], you will see one of your student's names. After you read it out loud, press the key with the orange circle on it and another name will soon appear. Keep doing this until there are no more names to read.
>
> Some of the names may be hard for you to read. I won't be able to help you read them. But even if you're not sure what a name is, try to make a guess. It doesn't matter if you don't get all of the names right.
>
> Remember, after you read a name, press the key with the orange circle on it and another name will appear. Do you have any questions? All right, press the key with the orange circle on it and begin.

While the examiner kept track of the student's oral reading performance on a protocol

sheet, the computer program timed to the nearest 100th of a second the elapsed time between the presentation of a name pair and the key press executed by the students after it was read. One might anticipate that students would occasionally pause between the oral production of a word and the keying of the next one, thereby artificially affecting the rate at which the students read the names. However, we observed no such delays; furthermore, the quickness of the key pressing response itself did not appear to vary as a function of grade level.

Although the examiners (Duffelmeyer, Kruse, and Merkley) were prepared to discontinue testing if a student showed obvious signs of frustration with the name-reading task, testing had to be terminated with only one student; the remainder of the students stayed on task and completed the entire test, for which there was no time limit.

After the testing phase of the study was completed, the protocols were randomly divided into three sets; each set was then randomly assigned to and scored by one of the three examiners. Scoring involved counting and recording the number of names read correctly, and indicating for each name misread which phonics elements were mispronounced. For example, the last name *Brewster* was scored for the initial consonant blend *Br* and two controlled vowels, *ew* and *er.* One student misread *Brewster* as *Brownster;* thus, the student received credit for the initial blend and the second controlled vowel, but not for the first controlled vowel or the name as a whole. Interrater reliability was .99 and .93 for the names and the phonics elements, respectively. Each protocol was then scored a second time by a different examiner; any disagreements were resolved by the two examiners in question.

Results. For the 70 first and last names, the mean scores ranged from a low of 63% correct for second grade to a high of 92% for fifth grade; the mean scores for the third and fourth grades fell in between these two extremes at 73% and 89%, respectively. These results demonstrate that (a) the higher the grade level, the higher the score; and (b) the smallest grade level difference (3%) occurred between fourth and fifth grade, which is consistent with the observation that phonics ability peaks in later grades. Both results tend to validate the enhanced version of the Names Test.

The phonics category results provided further evidence of the test's validity. First, the mean scores increased as grade level increased for each phonics category. Second, there was very little between-grade-level variation for phonics elements that typically are introduced early in a phonics curriculum. For example, the mean percent correct scores for initial consonants ranged from 91% (second grade) to 98% (fifth grade), a difference of only 7%. Third, there was greater between-grade-level variation for phonics elements that typically are introduced later on. For example, the mean scores for vowel digraphs ranged from 74% (second grade) to 97% (fifth grade), a difference of 23%.

Next we analyzed the rate at which the students read the names. Recall that the computer program timed the interval between the onset of a first-name–last-name pair and the key press executed by the student immediately after the same pair was read aloud; thus, 35 time intervals were recorded for each student. Once all of the pairs had been presented, the program calculated the mean and standard deviation for the entire set of names. The means were later sorted by grade level and ranked from highest to lowest within each level. The mean rates in the top and bottom 10% of each grade level distribution were then discarded, leaving the middle 80%. This "trimming" procedure (Wainer, 1976) was employed to eliminate the contaminating effect of extreme scores on the grade level rate means. The mean of the remaining middle 80% in each distribution, called the "midmean" (Tukey, 1977), was then selected as being representative of the rate performance at each of the four grade levels.

The midmeans ranged from a high of 8.2 seconds per name pair for second grade to a low of 3.1 seconds per pair for fifth grade; the results for Grades 3 and 4 fell between these two extremes at 5.4 and 3.9 seconds, respectively. In other words, the higher the grade level, the faster the names were read. Furthermore, the largest grade level difference occurred between Grades 2 and 3 (2.8 seconds), and the smallest between Grades 4 and 5 (.8 seconds), which is consistent with

Table 2
Comparison of children's performance on the ITBS Reading subtest and on the Names Test

Score category on Names Test	Percentage of students, by grade and ITBS stanine score band								
	Grade 3			Grade 4			Grade 5		
	1–3	4–6	7–9	1–3	4–6	7–9	1–3	4–6	7–9
Upper third	-	-	100	-	18	82	-	-	100
Middle third	-	55	45	9	36	55	-	29	71
Lower third	9	82	9	18	55	27	-	79	21

ITBS = Iowa Test of Basic Skills.

the well-documented observation that older students are more proficient at word recognition than younger students. The fact that the Names Test was sensitive to this phenomenon provides additional evidence of its validity.

To further investigate the validity of the Names Test, we compared students' total raw score performance on it with their stanine performance (local norms) on the Reading subtest of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, which was administered 2 weeks following the administration of the Names Test in all grades except Grade 2 as part of the school district's ongoing assessment of student achievement. To effect this comparison, we first divided the students at each of the three grade levels into upper, middle, and lower thirds based on their raw scores on the Names Test. Then we determined the percentage of students in each third of the three grade level distributions that fell in the Iowa Test of Basic Skills stanine ranges of 1–3, 4–6, and 7–9.

The results of this comparison are shown in Table 2. One approach to analyzing these data is to examine the pattern of results in the upper (7–9) stanine range. If the Names Test is valid, one should expect the upper third to be better represented than the middle third, and the middle third to be better represented than the lower third. Indeed, this pattern was evident at each grade level: Grade 3 (100%–45%–9%); Grade 4 (82%–55%–27%); and Grade 5 (100%–71%–21%). Similar patterns of performance were found for the middle (4–6) and lower (1–3) stanine ranges. Thus, students' performance on the Names Test proved to be a reasonably good predictor of their performance on an established measure of reading ability, which provides additional evidence of the Names Test's validity.

Usability

In conjunction with our study, we developed two forms that should make the Names Test more convenient for teachers to use: A Protocol Sheet and a Scoring Matrix.

For a Protocol Sheet, Cunningham suggested typing the list of names in a column and following each name with a blank line to be used for recording a student's responses. While not finding specific fault with this suggestion, we decided that arranging the names in rows, leaving sufficient space between the rows for recording students' responses above the names, would be an improvement (see Table 3). This format makes it easier for the examiner to keep his/her place, particularly when it is necessary to write a phonetic spelling for a word that the student has mispronounced. It also makes it easier to compare a student's mispronunciation with the stimulus word, and then to identify the phonics element(s) on which the student erred.

Notice also that the Protocol Sheet includes a section for tabulating the test results. To facilitate tabulation, we developed the reproducible Scoring Matrix shown in Table 4. Below the space for the student's names, all 70 names are listed alphabetically along the left side; the eight phonics categories appear across the top. The phonics elements for which the names are scored appear in the cells. For example, the Scoring Matrix indicates that *Anderson* is scored for a short

Table 3
Protocol sheet for the Names Test

Name _____ Grade _____ Teacher _____ Date _____

Jay Conway	Tim Cornell	Chuck Hoke	Yolanda Clark
Kimberly Blake	Roberta Slade	Homer Preston	Gus Quincy
Cindy Sampson	Chester Wright	Ginger Yale	Patrick Tweed
Stanley Shaw	Wendy Swain	Glen Spencer	Fred Sherwood
Flo Thornton	Dee Skidmore	Grace Brewster	Ned Westmoreland
Ron Smitherman	Troy Whitlock	Vance Middleton	Zane Anderson
Bernard Pendergraph	Shane Fletcher	Floyd Sheldon	Dean Bateman
Austin Shepherd	Bertha Dale	Neal Wade	Jake Murphy
Joan Brooks	Gene Loomis	Thelma Rinehart	

Phonics category	*Errors*
Initial consonants	/37
Initial consonant blends	/19
Consonant digraphs	/15
Short vowels	/36
Long vowels/VC-final *e*	/23
Vowel digraphs	/15
Controlled vowels	/25
Schwa	/15

vowel *A*, a controlled vowel *er*, and a schwa *o*; *Austin* for a vowel digraph *Au* and a schwa *i*.

The scoring procedure is as follows: The teacher locates on the Protocol Sheet each name that the student mispronounced, circles on the Scoring Matrix which phonics elements were mispronounced, sums the number of circled elements for each phonics category, and transfers the error scores to the Protocol Sheet.

A Protocol Sheet for a hypothetical third-grade student is shown in Table 5. The bottom section reveals that Jimmy experienced difficulty with long vowel patterns, vowel digraphs, and controlled vowels. It would appear that Jimmy is in need of direct and systematic instruction in the aforementioned phonics areas. Lest our readers misunderstand us, we are not advocating "skilling and drilling," but rather phonics instruction that focuses on the internal structure of words rather than rule learning, and that is integrated into text reading (see Stahl, 1992).

Conclusion

At the outset, we expressed our belief that the Names Test has the potential to become a useful diagnostic tool. Having improved its category reliability by increasing the number of first-name–last-name pairs from 25 to 35, having obtained additional evidence of its validity via scores by grade level, the rate data, and stanine comparisons with the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, and having enhanced its usability with the creation of a revised Protocol Sheet and a Scoring Matrix, we are even more confident of its potential than before.

Table 4
Scoring matrix for the Names Test

Name_____ Date_____

Name	InCon	InConBl	ConDgr	ShVow	LngVow/VC-e	VowDgr	CtrVow	Schwa
Anderson				A			er	o
Austin						Au		i
Bateman	B				ate			a
Bernard	B						er, ar	
Bertha	B		th				er	a
Blake		Bl			ake			
Brewster		Br					ew, er	
Brooks		Br				oo		
Chester			Ch	e			er	
Chuck			Ch	u				
Cindy	C			i	y			
Clark		Cl					ar	
Conway	C			o		ay		
Cornell	C			e			or	
Dale	D				ale			
Dean	D					ea		
Dee	D					ee		
Fletcher		Fl	ch	e			er	
Flo		Fl			o			
Floyd		Fl				oy		
Fred		Fr		e				
Gene	G				ene			
Ginger	G			i			er	
Glen		Gl		e				
Grace		Gr			ace			
Gus	G			u				
Hoke	H				oke			
Homer	H				o		er	
Jake	J				ake			
Jay	J					ay		
Joan	J					oa		
Kimberly	K			i	y		er	
Loomis	L					oo		i
Middleton	M			i				o
Murphy	M		ph		y		ur	

(continued)

Table 4
Scoring matrix for the Names Test (cont'd.)

Name_____ Date_____

Name	InCon	InConBl	ConDgr	ShVow	LngVow/VC-e	VowDgr	CtrVow	Schwa
Neal	N					ea		
Ned	N			e				
Patrick	P			a, i				
Pendergraph	P		ph	e, a			er	
Preston		Pr		e				o
Quincy				i	y			
Rinehart	R				ine		ar	
Roberta	R				o		er	a
Ron	R			o				
Sampson	S			a				o
Shane			Sh		ane			
Shaw			Sh				aw	
Sheldon			Sh	e				o
Shepherd			Sh	e			er	
Sherwood			Sh			oo	er	
Skidmore		Sk		i			or	
Slade		Sl			ade			
Smitherman		Sm	th	i			er	a
Spencer		Sp		e			er	
Stanley		St		a		ey		
Swain		Sw				ai		
Thelma			Th	e				a
Thornton			Th				or	o
Tim	T			i				
Troy		Tr				oy		
Tweed		Tw				ee		
Vance	V			a				
Wade	W				ade			
Wendy	W			e	y			
Westmoreland	W			e			or	a
Whitlock			Wh	i, o				
Wright					i			
Yale	Y				ale			
Yolanda	Y			a	o			a
Zane	Z				ane			

Table 5
Sample protocol for a third-grade student

Name Jimmy Smith Grade 3 Teacher Ms. Brown Date 10-9-93

✔ Conver Jay Conway	✔ Carnell Tim Cornell	✔ ✔ Chuck Hoke	Yondolada ✔ Yolanda Clark
✔ ✔ Kimberly Blake	✔ ✔ Roberta Slade	✔ ✔ Homer Preston	✔ Quancy Gus Quincy
Kindy ✔ Cindy Sampson	✔ ✔ Chester Wright	Ging Yell Ginger Yale	✔ ✔ Patrick Tweed
Standly ✔ Stanley Shaw	Wendell Swan Wendy Swain	✔ ✔ Glen Spencer	✔ Steward Fred Sherwood
Floy Thonton Flo Thornton	✔ ✔ Dee Skidmore	✔ Bowster Grace Brewster	✔ ✔ Ned Westmoreland
✔ ✔ Ron Smitherman	✔ ✔ Troy Whitlock	✔ ✔ Vance Middleton	Zan ✔ Zane Anderson
Barnid Pedugraph Bernard Pendergraph	✔ ✔ Shane Fletcher	✔ ✔ Floyd Sheldon	✔ Batmin Dean Bateman
Astin ✔ Austin Shepherd	Betha ✔ Bertha Dale	Ned ✔ Neal Wade	✔ ✔ Jake Murphy
Jane ✔ Joan Brooks	Glen ✔ Gene Loomis	Clemitha Rainhart Thelma Rinehart	

Phonics category	*Errors*
Initial consonants	2 /37
Initial consonant blends	1 /19
Consonant digraphs	2 /15
Short vowels	1 /36
Long vowels/VC-final *e*	8 /23
Vowel digraphs	6 /15
Controlled vowels	9 /25
Schwa	1 /15

An often leveled criticism of phonics instruction is that a goodly number of children are taught phonics skills/patterns that they already seem to know. Consequently, as Groff (1986) has noted, the time spent needlessly reteaching and relearning them reduces the time available for reading itself. Groff goes on to state, "The inadequacy of this procedure reminds us that phonics teaching is desperately in need of a reliable and valid, quick-scoring test of children's [phonics] knowledge..." (p. 922). It is our belief that the augmented version of Cunningham's Names Test can satisfy this need.

Author notes

This project was supported by the Research Institute for Studies in Education, College of Education, Iowa State University. We would also like to acknowledge the staff and students at East Elementary School in Ankeny, Iowa.

Duffelmeyer and Merkley teach reading methods courses at Iowa State University, where Fyfe is a doctoral student. Kruse is the Chair of the Education Department of Grand View College in Des Moines, Iowa. Duffelmeyer can be reached at the College of Education, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011, USA.

References

Adams, M.J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Baer, G.T. (1991). *Self-paced phonics: A text for education.* New York: Merrill.

Byrne, B., Freebody, P., & Gates, A. (1992). Longitudinal data on the relations of word-reading strategies to comprehension, reading time, and phonemic awareness. *Reading Research Quarterly, 27,* 140-151.

Cunningham, P.M. (1990). The Names Test: A quick assessment of decoding ability. *The Reading Teacher, 44,* 124-129.

Cunningham, P.M. (1991). *Phonics they use: Words for reading and writing.* New York: HarperCollins.

Ehri, L.C., & Wilce, L.S. (1985). Movement into reading: Is the first stage of printed word learning visual or phonetic? *Reading Research Quarterly, 20,* 163-179.

Freebody, P., & Byrne, B. (1988). Word-reading strategies in elementary school children: Relations to comprehension, reading time, and phonemic awareness. *Reading Research Quarterly, 23,* 441-453.

Groff, P. (1986). The maturing of phonics instruction. *The Reading Teacher, 39,* 919-923.

Heilman, A.W. (1993). *Phonics in proper perspective.* New York: Merrill.

LaBerge, D., & Samuels, S.J. (1974). Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading. *Cognitive Psychology, 6,* 293-323.

Perfetti, C.A. (1991). The psychology, pedagogy, and politics of reading. *Psychological Science, 2,* 70-76.

Pikulski, J., & Shanahan, T. (1980). A comparison of various approaches to evaluating phonics. *The Reading Teacher, 33,* 692-702.

Samuels, S.J. (1979). The method of repeated readings. *The Reading Teacher, 32,* 403-408.

Schell, L.M., & Hanna, G.S. (1981). Can informal reading inventories reveal strengths and weaknesses in comprehension subskills? *The Reading Teacher, 35,* 263-268.

Stahl, S.A. (1992). Saying the "p" word: Nine guidelines for exemplary phonics instruction. *The Reading Teacher, 45,* 618-625.

Tukey, J.W. (1977). *Exploratory data analysis.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Wainer, H. (1976). Robust statistics: A survey and some prescriptions. *Journal of Educational Statistics, 1,* 285-312.

Reed E. Quinton

Quinton was a sixth-grade student in Lesley Yamauchi's classroom when he wrote this poem. He loves reading and writing and hopes to play in the National Hockey League. Yamauchi is a special education teacher at Airport Heights Elementary School in Anchorage, Alaska, USA.

I've seen just about everything

I've seen just about
everything,
I've seen a prince and some kings
in a crusade,
I've seen WWII A-bombs and Spit
Fires flying through the air,
I've seen horses galloping along
the sandy beach, aliens landing on
earth and Greek gods fighting
Romans,
When I want to see
more I read.