

































Again, the authors also noted findings (Hayes & Grethers, 1983; Allington & McGill-Franzen, 2003; Berliner, 2009) that low-income children suffer greater losses in reading skill over the summer months than do their high-income peers. This is likely due at least in part to these lower-income students having limited access to motivating reading materials than their higher-income counterparts.

The availability of a camp program like that offered at the site of this study is unique, as campers attend at no cost to them, bucking the summer camp trend of populations that are overwhelmingly high SES. In fact, analysis of the literature reviewed found the majority of summer campers lived in two-parent households that were at least 200% above the poverty line. This is in direct opposition to the camper participants of the present study.

Terzian et al. (2009) were able to identify best practices for summer learning programs which included being affordable and accessible, involving parents and the community, improving social problem-solving skills, promoting character development and life skills, and rewarding good behavior. Typically, it was also found that those most successful summer learning programs included a multitude of elements.

In their study that also used a day-camp setting, Schacter and Jo (2005) again pointed to research that shows that while reading achievement increased or stayed the same for economically advantaged students, those students at an economic disadvantage suffer a loss in reading achievement during the summer months. Citing research that shows no significant increase in achievement scores for students who attend summer school, the researchers developed a summer reading day camp with the purpose of evaluating what impact, if any, a summer reading day camp intervention might have on



the performance of economically disadvantaged students. The intervention consisted of seven weeks of summer camp, with two hours per day devoted to reading instruction, while the rest of the day was spent in traditional camp activities.

Results showed that the intervention group performed significantly better than the control group in the areas of decoding and comprehension. Schacter and Jo concluded that their results show the potential benefits for a summer reading day camp program, despite the effects of that program being found to diminish over time.

White, King, Kingston and Foster (2013) looked at the Reading Enhances Achievement During Summer (READS) program to see what effects it might have on a lower SES population in terms of summer reading loss. Unlike the previous studies this study was meant to replicate, the majority of participants were from low-income households. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three groups: a control group, a group to receive the basic treatment with books and teacher lessons, and a group to receive treatment with books, teacher lessons, and teacher phone calls.

Results were measured using the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) Reading Comprehension Test, which was administered to students in the spring of third grade and again in the fall of fourth grade. Findings included significant positive differences in high-poverty schools for students who received teacher lessons and books and for those students who received teacher lessons, books, and teacher calls. However, negative results were found for students in moderate-poverty schools.

Given the wealth of research highlighted above showing the need for interventions to close the summer achievement gap, this study aimed to present one possible option to improve reader confidence and motivation.

## Methods

### Population and Sample

Participants were girls between the ages of six and fourteen, all from families living in poverty. While all 146 enrolled campers participated in the implementation of the book club, with interactions between all participating campers observed by camp counselors who took field notes, audio data was taken for only 24 campers in total. This residential summer camp operated in four two-week sessions. Because of the needs of the camp, data was taken for only three of the four sessions. In total the participants spent 11 nights and 12 days at camp.

All campers qualified for free or reduced lunch, as reported through the United States Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) application. In this way, the campers all had similar socioeconomic backgrounds, therefore, a similar point on which their backgrounds might align, reinforcing opportunities for situated language (Gee, 2004). It was anticipated that these shared experiences would likely be talking points for discussion as they work on their reading together.

Analysis of frequencies showed that there were 43 African American, 17 Caucasian, and 14 Hispanic campers in the older group. The mean age of the older group of campers was 10.86 years old. In the younger group of campers, or the little sisters, there were 44 African American, 18 Caucasian, and 10 Hispanic campers. Mean age for the younger group was 8.0 years old.

### Instruments and Materials

*Audiotaped camper interactions.* For each of the three sessions four pairs of readers were audiotaped as they read and as they completed the culminating activity paired with

each book. Analysis consisted of open-coding procedures and generating categories of characteristics of camper interactions.

***Counselor focus group.*** After training but prior to the implementation of the reading sessions, interviews were conducted with the counselors as a focus group (Appendix A). At the end of the summer, after all campers had received treatment, a second focus group session was conducted, with questions for the second focus group emerging from trends noted during the intervention. The purpose of the focus group with the counselors was to gain a different perspective on the book club program.

***Books for the book clubs.*** Books were chosen for this study based primarily on the content of their storylines, with a focus on characters and plots that in some way challenged or broke stereotypes that are negative toward girls. After much searching, four books were chosen that worked well together and were able to foster the inter-textual connections needed in order to tie the concepts of breaking stereotypes and strong female characters together.

***Discussion questions.*** The discussion questions created to help guide the talk between the sisters were developed using Sipe's (2008) five categories of response. While questions were developed using only the analytical, personal, and inter-textual categories of reader response, it was anticipated that analysis of field notes may reveal spontaneous interaction with the literature that will fall into the categories of the performative and transparent.

### **Researcher's Stance**

It must be disclosed that the primary investigator was also the director of the camp that served as the site for the study. As such, best efforts were made to limit

influence. In particular, the primary investigator worked to train the counselors on how to implement the book club sessions, and was not a primary participant in these sessions.

### **Research Design and Data Analysis**

This study used a qualitative design. Data included audio recorded during the reading sessions. Recordings were transcribed with an open coding method (Strauss & Corbin, 1998), and were closely examined with a focus on the interactions between campers and between each camper and the texts to determine similarities and differences in behaviors and interactions. From the examination of the audio file transcripts, camper interactions and behaviors were categorized into trends. Those trends were used to develop theories that might help explain the interactions of the campers. Field notes and interviews were used to supplement the trends found after open coding was completed.

### **Procedure**

**Camper Training.** The big sisters were trained on their interactions with the little sisters, the use of questioning to prompt discussion, helping little sisters if the reading was too difficult, and the use of positive praise. Each book was equipped with discussion prompts, starred at several points throughout the book with corresponding discussion questions located in the back of the book (see Appendix B for book titles, brief summaries, discussion questions, and activity information).

**Observer Training.** While campers read, camp counselors served as observers, choosing a pair of readers at random and taking note of their interactions with the text and each other. Counselors were trained on their responsibilities as observers and how to take field notes. Data analysis consisted of looking for patterns and emergent themes in the field notes.

### **Book Club Sessions**

The pairs met twice per day, once in the morning for the reading portion of the project, and once in the afternoon for the development of artifact that aligned with and reinforced the lesson or theme of each book (Appendix B). Over the course of each camp session, which lasted approximately 12 days, the campers were able to complete the reading, discussion, and creation of artifacts for four books.

### **Morning Reading Session**

In pairs, the sisters read together. The campers had 45 minutes to read through a short picture book twice. The first time through the girls read the book with no planned interruptions. The campers decided together which of the pair, the big sister or little sister would do most of the reading. Because of time restrictions it was not possible to test the campers for reading level, so their comfort with reading aloud was likely a factor in deciding whether they wanted to read or not. Any spontaneous questions from the little sister were addressed by the big sister as they came up. The second reading was a stop-and-discuss reading. Each book was equipped with discussion prompts, starred at several points throughout the book with corresponding discussion questions located in the back of the book. As the camper came to a star, the big sister stopped the reading, looked to the back of the book for the prompt and guided the little sister through a discussion about the prompt.

### **Afternoon Application Session**

In the afternoon of the same day as the Morning Reading Session the campers met again to use what they learned through the self-esteem theme of the book that they discussed with their sister. Each camper worked individually and with the help of camp

counselors to create an arts and crafts project or written piece about the book of the day (Appendix B).

## **Results**

### **Audio Files and Observer Notes.**

In order to address the research question of this study, it was necessary to look at the data gathered through the transcribed audio tapes and counselor observations. After transcribing the audio files an open coding method (Merriam, 2009) was used to determine how the campers interacted with each other and the texts. From the open coding, several patterns of interaction were apparent (see Appendix C). These categories of interaction were then analyzed using a grounded theory approach (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) to help explain what campers focus on when discussing books and the characteristics of those discussions.

When viewed in terms of camper engagement in the book club project, trends can be broken up into three major categories: Indicators of engagement in the project by Camper 2 (big sister), indicators of engagement in the project by Camper 1 (little sister), and indicators of disinterest in the project by either partner.

### **Indicators of Engagement by Big Sister**

The highest number of occurrences for the first category, indicators of engagement in the book club project by Camper 2, was in the trends of Camper 2 giving praise and Camper 2 pushing Camper 1 for more complete answers to discussion questions or contributing considerably to the discussion (see Table 1). These categories indicate that the older sister was interested in the project and took her job of helping the little sister read seriously. Several trends emerged that demonstrated the older campers'

involvement in the book club project and specifically the leadership role they were encouraged to assume. These included Camper 2 pushing for more complete answers to discussion questions and contributing significantly to discussion generated by the questions. The older campers also frequently stopped to make sure the younger camper understood the book club plan and that they understood the discussion questions.

The older campers took opportunities to offer praise to the younger campers either while the younger campers were reading or as they answered questions (Table 2). There were several examples where the older camper pushed significantly to draw the younger camper into the conversation and to help them understand (Table 3).

### **Indicators of Engagement of Little Sister**

The category that deals with the engagement of the younger campers during the book club consists of only a few trends. Most noticeable responses for this area deal with the campers' interactions with the text and illustrations (Table 4). One category, Spontaneous question or comment related to text or illustration, leads other trends by more than 50 occurrences.

### **Indicators of Disinterest by Either Partner**

Finally, some trends demonstrated that the campers were unhappy with having to participate in the book club or were frustrated with parts or all of the process. As seen in Table 5, the most prevalent trend here was neglecting to respond or correct a miscue. There were two pairs of campers in particular in which the younger camper did not want to adhere to the directions of the older camper, and most arguing and many incidences of frustration came from those pairs.

### **Counselor Focus Group**

The focus group with the counselors provided another perspective on the program. As expected, the counselors reported that some of the campers enjoyed the program, while others seemed to find it to be too much like school, and they felt many of the campers were frustrated with reading the books twice through. It was also reported that in some cases the younger sister was a stronger reader than the older, but as this study did not make use of participant reading levels there would be no way to determine that when assigning campers to work together. The counselors overwhelmingly stated that the campers preferred *Purplicious* and *The Paper Bag Princess* to the other two books. When asked to predict whether or not the campers might have experienced any change in confidence as readers they reported that they believed they would show improvements.

### **Discussion Question Analysis**

The questions used to prompt discussion between the campers were developed using Sipe's Categories of Response (2008). It was anticipated that campers would respond more readily to the Personal (self-to-text connection), Analytical (questioning or trying to figure out the words or actions of characters or the author or illustrator), and Inter-textual (text-to-text connection) types of questions, while Performative (when the reader acts out parts of the text) and Transparent (when the reader seems to have entered the world of the text) interactions might appear organically. Upon analysis, discussion question responses were deemed high quality if they featured participation by both the older and younger camper in a more extensive discussion following the asking of a question. Those responses that featured simple one-word, or "yes," "no," or "I don't know" answers were considered low quality. By these standards questions that fell into



the category of Personal had the highest frequency of high-quality responses, followed by the Analytical and then the Inter-textual. As can be seen in Table 6, low quality responses were often those where the older camper did not participate in the discussion. There were no incidences of camper responses that would fall in the categories of the Performative or the Transparent.

Further analysis of the spontaneous questions and comments made by the campers during reading showed findings similar to those of Sipe (2008), who found children's talk to be primarily composed of analytical responses in a read-aloud setting. The spontaneous comments and questions that arose during the reading between the campers fell into the analytical category 75% of the time.

### **Discussion**

The research question sought to examine the kinds of discussions campers had in relation to the books they were reading and the characteristics of those discussions. Several important categories of interaction were separated into three groups: Indicators of big sister engagement, indicators of little sister engagement, and indicators of camper disinterest.

Most of the trends that emerged during analysis showed big sister engagement. It was found that big sisters gave praise, pushed for more complete answers to discussion questions, and contributed to the discussion more than anything else. This is important because while many times the older sister did contribute to the discussion, there were also times (as shown in the category of camper disinterest) that the older sister allowed one word or "I don't know" answers, which created a dynamic where the campers weren't really interacting with each other, but were just going through the motions of reading and

questioning. The idea that positive discussion interaction behaviors were the highest in number shows that for the most part the older campers were engaged in the process.

Other trends that emerged showing the older camper's engagement included the correction of attention or miscue, and redirection or explanation of the discussion question. All these point to the leadership role taken by the older camper and echo Halliday's (1994) theory of socialization as an external motivator.

The category of indicators of little sister engagement included trends such as spontaneous question or comment related to text or illustration, camper using evidence to support their response to discussion questions, and directly asking for help. The most prevalent of these trends was that of the younger camper spontaneously asking a question or commenting on the text or illustrations. More than the other trends, this shows camper engagement with the text and with her partner, as the reading of the books and the discussion questions are in a social setting. While the older campers were given the job of interacting with their partners, spontaneously asking questions or commenting demonstrated the younger campers making a choice to be social and interactive, which supports the theories of Gee (2004), Vygotsky (1962), Halliday (1994), as well as Sipe's reader response theory (2008) and exhibits the campers' engagement with the text, their partners, and the book club program. While not directly related to the specific research question, campers making a spontaneous comment or asking a question about the text or illustration seemed to indicate the campers' ability to understand the reading. Questions and comments ranged from simple observations, "She's painting a picture," to questions about the actions of the characters, "She asked [the dragon] to do that?" Some campers made connections between the characters and themselves ("I'm afraid of talking back to

my mom”) and made predictions (“She gets brave at the end, right?”). Other indicators of comprehension included the campers’ use of the text or illustration to support their discussion of the questions asked: “I’m gonna read the passage... ‘Grace’s heart sank. Thomas was the school spelling bee champion. His experiments always took a blue ribbon at the science fair. And he was captain of the soccer team.’ So that’s probably why she’s upset, because he’s so good at everything....” Campers also demonstrated their comprehension of the text through the use of intonation and expressive reading.

Finally, the last category of emergent trends was that of camper disinterest in the program, though this category included a small number of incidences. Trends that fit into this category included the big sister allowing one word or “I don’t know” responses to discussion questions, skipped discussion questions, camper arguing, resistance to asking or answering questions and expressions of frustration with the process. Reasons for campers’ disinterest in the program might have included the program detracting from the usual camp schedule, individual camper’s dislike for reading in general or structured reading times, or their dislike of their reading partner.

In considering the discussion questions developed using Sipe’s (2008) “Categories of Response,” most high-quality responses were generated from questions that were geared toward the campers’ personal experiences. These were the responses where both partners were part of the discussion, and the conversations that grew out of these questions were more balanced between partners, rather than simple one-word answers or participation from one partner more than the other. According to Sipe, questions that fall into the category of the “Personal” are those that allow the student to make connections from their lives to the text and from the text to their lives (p. 86). The

second category of response with the highest-quality discussions was the “Analytical,” which according to Sipe “includes all responses that seem to be dealing with the text as an opportunity to construct narrative meaning” (p. 85).

The category with the smallest number of high-quality responses was the “Intertextual” category, which Sipe says “reflects the children’s abilities to relate the text being read to other cultural texts and products.” This finding may have been because the campers were not familiar with children’s books that focus on strong female characters. It was difficult to find books that were appropriate for the ages of the campers and that were centered on the lives of strong girls. It is also possible that there would be more high-quality intertextual responses if the campers had been able to choose the books themselves.

In a read-aloud setting younger children are more likely to call out their thoughts and questions, but as children get older and become more accustomed to what is considered appropriate classroom behavior they are less likely to speak out of turn, and as a result may be more likely to monitor and edit their thoughts and questions before speaking. If a similar study were conducted with younger children, using peers to read aloud and discuss in a less structured setting, it is possible there may be more spontaneous responses in general and that the discussions that grow from the interactions between the campers may be more comprehensive.

Further analysis of the spontaneous comments and questions made by the campers reveals findings more in line with what Sipe experienced in his data. That is, of spontaneous comments or questions asked, 75% fit within the analytical category and 25% fell into the category of the personal. This difference indicates that when

responding to discussion questions the campers were more comfortable with the conversation being of a personal nature, but their spontaneous comments and questions sought to understand and make meaning out of the narrative. The discussion questions were generated to prompt socialization during the book club, which might explain why the “Personal” category of response was prevalent in the responses to those discussion questions.

In sum, the findings suggest that positive interactions can occur using a peer-tutoring/book club intervention even in a short period of time. This reinforces the findings of Raphael and McMahon (1994), Harris et al. (2000), Kourea et al. (2007), and Moore-Hart and Kabarenic (2009). Further, the setting of the present study, a residential summer camp, adds to research that suggests gains can be made in the summer months that may counter the negative effects of the so-called "summer slump" on low-income students (Alexander, Entwisle, & Olsen, 2001; Sinatra, 2004; Schacter & Jo, 2005, White, King, Kingston, & Foster, 2013). The results of the analysis of the qualitative data of this study, especially the examination of the categories of response, indicate that the social aspect of conversation may be stronger when the discussion is guided by some kind of question or prompt.

Implications for camp programs aiming to improve the reading motivation of campers, and to stave off the losses in reading achievement that can occur during the summer months might be to implement a similar book club program. Implications for teachers given the expected outcome of this study might be that a school may choose to implement a program where students in the upper grades visit with students in the lower grades two or more times a week in a tutoring capacity, as it may fit with the curriculum

and scheduling needs of the school. It is important to note that this peer tutoring method is inexpensive and would work for a school or out-of-school program that has limited funds.

### **Limitations**

One possible limitation to this study includes camper apathy in the book club program. As many of the campers were returners from previous years they were aware that in some instances the book club was cutting into their free time, which some were not happy about. As previously discussed, results indicated that there were occasions where campers were frustrated with the process, and some campers truly did not get along with their partners, which might have skewed results of both the quantitative and qualitative data, but given the limited amount of time for the study, having a change to partners was not an option. There is also a possibility that the older campers, who were trained in how to interact with their little sisters, were not paying attention during the trainings, did not find their job to be important, or forgot their role.

An additional limitation may have been the camper's individual experience with and understanding of the term *sister*. Those campers who have sisters at home themselves would likely have a different understanding of the term than those who are only children, live separately from their siblings, or don't have what might be considered a good relationship with their sister. This difference in understanding might have shaped what they saw as their role in the camp book club sister relationship, regardless of training before the intervention began.

Possibly the most impactful limitation may have been related to the restrictions in time, as this study was run during a short period of two weeks.

## **Future Research**

Future research may look at a similar program run at a camp or summer program with longer-running sessions, or one where the campers are not assigned to the same partner for the duration of the study but can be moved around to a different partner each time.

Additionally, research might be conducted that mirrors the girls-only atmosphere of the present study by conducting a similar program at a boys-only camp or summer program, or a mixed-gender program.

Finally, a study that compares middle or high SES children and low SES children may shed light on any differences between the two groups in terms of reading attitude and self-perception.

## References

- Alexander, K.L., Entwisle, D.R., & Olson, L.S. (2001). Schools, achievement and inequality: A seasonal perspective. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 23(2), 171-191. Retrieved from [www.jstor.org/stable/3594128](http://www.jstor.org/stable/3594128)
- Alexander, P.A. & Fox, E. (2004). A historical perspective on reading research and practice. In R.B. Ruddell & N.J. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading* (5<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 33-68). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Allington, R. & McGill-Franzen, A. (2003). The impact of summer setback on the reading achievement gap. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 85(1), 68-75. Retrieved from [www.jstor.org/stable/20440508](http://www.jstor.org/stable/20440508)
- Beach, K.D., McIntyre, E., Phillippakos, Z.A., Mraz, M., Pilonieta, P., & Vintinner, J.P. (2018). Effects of a summer reading intervention on reading skills for low-income Black and Hispanic students in elementary school. *Reading and Writing Quarterly* 34(3), 263-280. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2018.1446859>
- Berliner, David C. (2009). Poverty and potential: Out-of-school factors and school success. Boulder and Tempe: Education and the Public Interest Center & Education Policy Research Unit. Retrieved 5/18/11 from <http://epicpolicy.org/publication/poverty-and-potential>
- Campbell, L.O., Sutter, C.C., & Lambie, G.W. (2019) An investigation of the summer learning effect on fourth grade students' reading scores. *Reading Psychology*, 40(5), 465-490, DOI: 10.1080/02702711.2019.1629516
- Chall, J., Jacobs, V. & Baldwin, L. (1990). *The Reading crisis: Why poor children fall behind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.



- Chall, J. & Jacobs, V. (2003). Poor Children's Fourth-Grade Slump. *American Educator*, 27(1), 14-15, 44.
- Eeds, M. & Wells, D. (1989). Grand conversations: An exploration of meaning construction in literature study groups. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 23, 4-29.
- Forman, E.A. & Cazden, C.B. (1986). Exploring Vygotskian perspectives in education: The cognitive value of peer interaction. In R.B. Ruddell & N.J. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading* (5<sup>th</sup> ed., pp.163-186). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Garst, B.A., & Ozier, L.W. (2015). Enhancing youth outcomes and organizational practices through a camp-based reading program. *Journal of Experiential Education* 38(4), 324-338. DOI: 10.1177/1053825915578914
- Gee, J.P. (2004). Discourse and sociocultural studies in reading. In R.B. Ruddell & N.J. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading* (5<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 116-132). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Guthrie, J.T & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In Kamil, M.L, Mosenthal, P.B., Pearson, P.D. & Barr, R. (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research* (Vol. 3, pp. 403-422). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). The place of dialogue in children's construction of meaning. In R.B. Ruddell & N.J. Unrau (Eds.), *Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading* (5<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 133-145). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

- Harris S., & Butaud G.L. (2016) Strategies for Supporting Elementary Students of Poverty in Reading. In: Papa R., Eadens D., Eadens D. (eds) *Social Justice Instruction*. Springer, Cham. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-12349-3\\_16](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-12349-3_16)
- Henk, W.A. & Melnick, S.A. (1995). The Reader Self-Perception Scale (RSPS): A new tool for measuring how children feel about themselves as readers. *The Reading Teacher* 48(6). P. 470-482. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.orgtable/pdfplus/20201471.pdf>
- Heyns, B. (1978). *Summer Learning and the Effects of Schooling*. New York: NY: Academic Press.
- Heyns, B. (1987). Schooling and cognitive development: Is there a season for learning? *Child Development*, 58(5), 1151-1160.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1130611>
- Kanikua, T. (2010). Reading achievement, attitude toward reading, and reading self-esteem of historically low achieving students. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 37(2), 184-188. Retrieved from: <http://web.ebscohost.com.jerome.stjohns.edu:81/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=132080ee-ed29-45be-80b7-57fb016264e3%40sessionmgr113&vid=4&hid=108>
- Kourea, L., Cartledge, G., & Musti-Rao, S. (2007). Improving the reading skills of urban elementary students through total class peer tutoring. *Remedial and Special Education* 28(2), 95-107. Retrieved from: <http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com.jerome.stjohns.edu>
- Kozol, J. (2005). *The shame of the nation: The restoration of Apartheid schooling in America*. New York, NY: Three Rivers Press.

- McKenna, M.C., Kear, D.J. (1990). Measuring attitude toward reading: A new tool for teachers. *The Reading Teacher*, 43(9), p 626-639. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/20200500.pdf>
- McKenna, M.C., Kear, D.J., & Ellsworth, R.A. (1995). Children's attitudes toward reading: a national survey. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30(4), p 934-956. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/748205.pdf>
- McKool, S.S. (2007). Factors that influence the decision to read: An investigation of fifth graders' out-of-school reading habits. *Reading Improvement*, 44(3), 111-131.
- Bell, S.M., Park, Y., Martin, M., Smith, J., McCallum, R.S., Smyth, K., & Mingo, M. (2018). Preventing summer reading loss for students in poverty: A comparison of tutoring and access to books. *Journal of Educational Studies* 46(4), 440-457. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2019.1599822>
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Moore-Hart, M., & Karabenick, S.A. (2009). Becoming successful readers: A volunteer tutoring program for culturally diverse students. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 48(2), 149-171. doi: 10.1080/19388070802226329
- Pearson, P.D. (2002). American reading instruction since 1967. In N.B. Smith (Ed.), *American Reading Instruction* (pp. 419–486). Newark, DE: International Reading Association
- Raphael, T., & McMahon, S. (1994). Book club: An alternative framework for reading instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 48(2), 102-116. Retrieved from [www.jstor.org/stable/20201379](http://www.jstor.org/stable/20201379)

- Robinson, J.G. (2007). Presence and persistence: Poverty ideology and inner-city teaching. *The Urban Review* 39(5), 541-565. doi: 10.1007/s11256-007-0072-8
- Schacter, J. & Jo, B. (2005). Learning when school is not in session: A reading summer day-camp intervention to improve the achievement of exiting First-Grade students who are economically disadvantaged. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 28(2), 158-169.
- Sinatra, R. (2004). A summer literacy approach yields success for inner-city children. *The Language and Literacy Spectrum*, 14, 71-83.
- Sipe, L. (2008). *Storytime: Young children's literary understanding in the classroom*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Terzian, M., Moore, K.A., Hamilton, K. (2009). Effective and promising summer learning programs and approaches for economically disadvantaged children and youth: A white paper for the Wallace Foundation. The Wallace Foundation, 45 pages.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: The M.I.T. Press.
- Whittingham, J.L., Huffman, S. (2009). The effects of book clubs on the reading attitudes of middle school students. *Reading Improvement*, 46(3), 130-136.
- Wigfield, A. & Guthrie, J.T. (1995). Dimensions for children's motivations for reading: An initial study. *National Reading Research Center*, 34.

Williams, L. & Hall, K. (2010). Exploring students' reading attitudes. *Journal of Reading Education, 35*(2), 35-41. Retrieved from:

[http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com.jerome.stjohns.edu:81/hww/results/external\\_link\\_maincontentframe.jhtml?\\_DARGS=/hww/results/results\\_common.jhtml.44](http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com.jerome.stjohns.edu:81/hww/results/external_link_maincontentframe.jhtml?_DARGS=/hww/results/results_common.jhtml.44).

Woolley, M.E., Grogan-Kaylor, A., Gilster, M.E., Karb, R.A., Gant, L.M., Reischl, T.M., & Alaimo, K. (2008). Neighborhood social capital, poor physical conditions and school achievement. *Children & Schools, 30*(3), 133-145. Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com.jerome.stjohns.edu>

## APPENDICES

### Appendix A

#### Focus Group Session 1 Questions:

1. How many of you are reading something right now?
2. What are you reading?
3. Do you mostly read for school or work, or for pleasure?
4. When you're looking for something to read what do you look for?
5. Why do you think you like to read certain types of material and not others?
6. Do you find any type of reading to be challenging?
7. Do you like to read? Why/why not?
8. Did you like to read when you were younger? Why/why not?
9. Was there a time when your enjoyment of reading changed?
10. If you are not required to read for work or school how likely are you to read on your own for pleasure?

#### Focus Group Follow-up Questions

1. What were your thoughts on the book club in general?
2. Did the campers like the books?
3. Was there anything that they really did not enjoy from what you could tell?
4. Which book would you say was their favorite?
5. Do you think the big sisters were able to help the little sisters?
6. If you had to predict the results of the study in terms of their improved reading self-perception or reading attitude what might you expect?
7. In terms of the activities, what do you think was the favorite and what was the least favorite?
8. Outside of the book club program did the campers seem to want to read while they were here?
9. Did you notice any changes in behavior from when we started the book club? For instance, did you notice during observing the campers anyone who was more likely to want to read or discuss? Or less likely?
10. Did you see a lot of praise happening?
11. Did you hear any feedback directly from the campers?
12. How did you feel you did as an observer? Was it what you expected it to be?

## Appendix B

### Purplicious by Victoria Kann and Elizabeth Kann

Synopsis: Purplicious tells the story of a girl who loves the color pink. When some girls at school start to make fun of Pinkalicious, she begins to question her love for pink because she wants to fit in with the other girls. In the end Pinkalicious learns to love herself the way she is and even makes a friend who understands her.

### Morning Reading Session-Discussion Questions

---

1. Name something that you love or a favorite thing of yours. Does anyone like the same things you like? (P)
2. Have you ever been made fun of for liking something? How did that make you feel? (P)
3. Use one or two words to describe the girls making fun of Pinkalicious. (A)
4. Do you know any bullies? What makes a person a bully? (P)
5. Does Pinkalicious remind you of any other characters from books you've read before? (I)
6. How is Pinkalicious' Tuesday note different from her Thursday & Friday notes? (A)
7. Why do you think Pinkalicious makes fun of her brother? Do you think that is the right thing to do? Why or why not? (A)
8. How do you think Pinkalicious feels at the end of the story? Why do you think she feels this way? (A)

### Afternoon Session Activity-Acrostic Poems

---

After being shown a model of an acrostic poem and brainstorming some expressive words that the campers could use to describe themselves, they were provided with colorful paper and crayons and markers and asked to create acrostic poems using some of those expressive words.

### The Paper Bag Princess by Robert Munsch

Synopsis: This story is about a beautiful princess who is in love with a prince name Ronald, who she wants to marry. When Ronald is carried away by a dragon Elizabeth sets out to rescue him, wearing only a paper bag because her clothes were burnt up in the dragon's fire. When Elizabeth, who is dirty and still wearing a paper bag, outsmarts the dragon and rescues prince Ronald, he tells her to come back when she looks like a real princess. Elizabeth, who is a smart girl, decides he is "a bum" and chooses not to marry him after all.

### Morning Reading Session-Discussion Questions

---

1. What do you think makes a princess beautiful? (A)
2. What makes you beautiful? (P)
3. What would you do if a dragon took your boyfriend away? (P)
4. Do you think Elizabeth is scared of the dragon? Why/why not? (A)
5. How is Princess Elizabeth different from Pinkalicious? (I)
6. What would you do? Would you go back again to save Ronald? (P)
7. What do you think Elizabeth will do to get Ronald back? (A)
8. How is the dragon like the girls who made fun of Pinkalicious? (I)
9. What makes Elizabeth beautiful? (A)
10. Do you think Elizabeth should have married Ronald? (A)

### Afternoon Session Activity-Paper Bag Dresses

---

Campers were given large sheets of butcher paper and were given time and materials to decorate the bags, which were then wrapped around the campers as if they were "dresses," just like the paper bag princess. Campers were encouraged to use words on their dresses that included personality attributes rather than physical ones. Campers participated in a fashion show to display their dresses in front of their cabins.



### Sheila Rae, the Brave by Kevin Henkes

Synopsis: Sheila Rae is a brave little girl who seems to not be afraid of anything, while her sister Louise is a “scaredy-cat”. When Sheila Rae finds herself in a situation where she isn’t very brave at all Louise comes to the rescue and shows that she can be brave too.

#### Morning Reading Session-Discussion Questions

---

1. What are you afraid of? (P)
2. Can you think of a character from another book we’ve read who was very brave? (I)
3. Is there anything you used to be afraid of that you’re not afraid of anymore? (P)
4. Is Sheila Rae brave? Is her little sister Louise brave Why do you think this? (A)
5. Is Sheila Rae making fun of Louise? (A) Does this remind you of what happened to Purplicious? Why? (I)
6. How are Sheila Rae and Louise different now than they were at the beginning of the book? (A)
7. Do you think Louise is brave? (A) What makes her brave? (A)
8. Do you think a person can be afraid of some things but still be brave at the same time? (P)

#### Afternoon Session Activity-Everyday Bravery

---

Campers were asked to brainstorm and draw pictures of times they were brave in every day situations. The pictures were displayed gallery-style in the camp dining hall.

### Grace for President by Kelly DiPucchio

Synopsis: When Grace is learning about the presidents she wonders why none of them are girls and the rest of the class laughs at her. Her teacher creates a class election and Grace decides to run for class president against Thomas, a boy who seems to be good at everything. Grace runs a tight campaign and in the end is elected class president because in the end she is the better person for the job.

#### Morning Reading Session-Discussion Questions

---

1. Why do you think there has not been a woman president yet? (A)
2. Have you ever had an election at your school? (P)
3. Why do you think the students laughed when Grace said she wanted to be president? (A)
4. Does this remind you of anything from *Purpleicious*? (I)
5. Why is Grace so upset about Thomas running for president too? (A)
6. Does Grace seem like she's not sure she can win? (A) Does this remind you of anything from *Sheila Rae The Brave*? (I)
7. Who do you think will win the election? Why? (A)
8. Why do you think the author decided to write this page like this? How does this style make you feel as you are reading it? (A)
9. Do you think Grace believes she could be president of the U.S. someday? Why does she believe this? (A)
10. Do you think you could be president of the U.S.? (P)

#### Afternoon Session Activity-Perfect for the Job Campaign Posters

---

Campers imagined their dream job and created campaign-style posters like the ones in the book to advertise why they'd be perfect to be given that job. High-value words were brainstormed first. Posters were displayed in the campers' cabins.

## Appendix C

## Categories of Interactions

Qualitative Trend	Number of Incidences
1. Spontaneous question related to text/illustration	46
2. C2 corrects C1's attention	16
3. Incidence of C2 correction of miscue	44
4. Incidence of non-correction of miscue	91
5. Incidence of inclusion of illustration as part of reading (Grace for President especially)	26
6. Incidence of discussion of illustration as part of reading (Grace for President especially)	13
7. Incidence of self-correction	38
8. Hesitancy to read aloud	4
9. C2 pushing C1 for more complete answers to discussion questions	130
10. C2 allowing 1 word or "I don't know" responses to discussion questions	40
11. Skipped discussion questions	21
12. C2 significant contribution to discussion questions	41
13. Camper 2 unsolicited input/interruption/correction	344
14. Camper asks counselor for help	4
15. Camper confusion over text/illustration	2
16. Spontaneous comment about text/illustration	53
17. C2 explanation of the reading/question plan	68
18. C2 gives praise	142
19. Campers fail to make a connection to another text	2
20. Camper uses evidence from the book to support their response to discussion questions	19
21. Camper identifies with character spontaneously or makes a connection to their own life spontaneously	2
22. Reader emphasizes text for effect through expressive reading	67
23. C2 restates/explains discussion question	60
24. Campers express frustration with process	22

25. Resistance to asking/answering discussion questions	7
26. Camper arguing	18
27. C1 asks for help explicitly	16
28. C2 resistance to help C1	2

Table 1

*Indicators of Camper 2's (Big Sister) Engagement in Book Club Project*

	Number of occurrences
Camper 2 corrects Camper 1's attention	16
Incidence of Camper 2 correction of miscue	44
Incidence of Camper 2 pushing Camper 1 for more complete answers to discussion questions/Camper 2 considerable contribution to discussion question	212
Camper 2 gives praise	142
Camper 2 restates or explains the discussion question	60

Table 2

*Sample Interaction: Reading Sessions Offering Praise*

---

Book: The Paper Bag Princess	
Discussion question read by Camper 2: Do you think Princess Elizabeth's scared of the dragon?	Camper 1: Um, I don't think she's scared because...I think she's scared but she's being brave.
Camper 2: She's scared but she's being brave?	Camper 1: Mhm.
Camper 2: Good answer! You're doing a good job reading.	

---

Table 3

*Sample Interaction: Reading Sessions Offering Direction*

---

Book: The Paper Bag Princess	
Discussion Question read by Camper 2: Do you think Elizabeth should have married Ronald?	Camper 1: No
Camper 2: Why not?	Camper 1: 'Cause he's a bum?
Camper 2: Why is he a bum?	Camper 1: 'Cause he called her... he said her hair is a mess.
Camper 2: He was mean right? He didn't accept her for who she was.	Camper 1: He could have asked her nicely.
Camper 2: Yeah. He could have asked her what she was wearing or what happened or why did she look like that right?	Camper 1: Mhm.
Camper 2: Ok. We're all done. Good job. This is the writer and that's the illustrator.	

---

Table 4

*Indicators of Camper 1's (Little Sister) Engagement in Book Club Project*

	Number of occurrences:
Spontaneous question or comment related to text or illustration	99
Incidence of self-correction	38
Camper uses evidence from the book to support their response to discussion questions	19
Camper 1 directly asks Camper 2 for help	16



Table 5

*Indicators of Disinterest in the Project by Either Partner*

	Number of occurrences:
Camper 2 allowing one word or “I don’t know” responses to discussion questions	40
Skipped discussion questions	21
Campers express frustration with process	22
Resistance to asking/answering questions	7
Camper arguing	18

Table 6

*High-Quality vs. Low-Quality Responses to Discussion Questions*

Question	High Quality Response	Low Quality Response
<p>Grace for President                      Question: Does Grace seem like she's not sure she can win? Does this remind you of anything from Sheila Rae the Brave?</p>	<p>C1: Yeah. Yes because she was in the forest...No, first she was confident, then she, when she was actually doing it she wasn't and that is the same with Sheila Rae.                      C2: Yeah, 'cause Grace was all confident she could win, and then what's his name, whatever Cobb, Thomas Cobb joined, and now she isn't so confident, like Sheila Rae.                      C1: She thinks he's better                      C2: Yeah</p>	<p>Response to part one of question:                      C1: Yeah                       Response to part two of question:                      C1: Yeah.                      Sheila Rae the Brave? She didn't give up.</p>