Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 24: 266–277, 2010

ISSN: 0256-8543 print / 2150-2641 online
DOI: 10.1080/02568543.2010.487412

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Development of the Dialogic Reading Inventory of Parent-Child Book Reading

Lisbeth Dixon-Krauss
University of North Texas, Denton, Texas

Cynthia M. Januszka and Chan-Ho Chae
Florida International University, Miami, Florida

This study reports the construction of the Dialogic Reading Inventory (DRI), a tool for assessing a parent and child's storybook reading behaviors. Twenty-three parent-child dyads participated in the study. The Adult-Child Interactive Reading Inventory (DeBruin-Parecki, 1999) items were grouped into four categories and revised to reflect current reading theory. Parent-child dyads were videotaped reading a storybook together for a total of 23 videotaped sessions. Videotaped sessions ($N = 115$) were scored on the DRI by five graduate student raters; three independent raters were used to conduct interrater reliability. Internal consistency coefficient alpha was .89, and the split-half coefficient corrected for the full length of the test was .97. Interrater reliability was satisfactory, $r = .60, .63, .74$, $p < .01$. Results of the factor analysis revealed the print awareness/phonological awareness factor accounted for 39.34% of the item variance, the comprehension/vocabulary factor accounted for 22.49% of the item variance, and the attention to text factor accounted for 17.40% of the item variance. The researchers maintained the original four DRI categories: (1) print awareness/alphabet knowledge, (2) phonological awareness, (3) comprehension/vocabulary, and (4) attention to text. The four DRI reading behavior item categories were maintained because they correspond to the four common components of most reading models, they correspond to the four basic components of early reading instruction, and they provide for ease of scoring the DRI.

Keywords: adult-child reading, assessment, dialogic reading inventory

The relationships between preschool storybook reading and expressive vocabulary development (Arnold, Lonigan, Whitehurst, & Epstein, 1994), as well as later school reading performance, are well documented (Stevenson & Fredman, 1990; Wells, 1985). The current study reports the construction of the Dialogic Reading Inventory (DRI), a tool for assessing parent-child book reading. The authors constructed the DRI to have a more valid and reliable instrument than what is currently available to measure parent and child storybook interactions. The DRI is a mediated assessment tool because it assesses the literacy performance of young children while they

Submitted November 20, 2009; accepted March 30, 2010.
Address correspondence to Lisbeth Dixon-Krauss, University of North Texas, College of Education, 1155 Union Circle #311337, Denton, TX 76203. E-mail: lisbeth.krauss@unt.edu

are engaged in an adult-supported reading activity (Dixon-Krauss, 1996). Mediated assessments project what children's future performance can be by analyzing what they can presently do with adult support.

The first part of this article summarizes the elements of emergent literacy, the research on dialogic reading, and the Adult/Child Interactive Reading Inventory (ACIRI). A rationale for using mediated assessments is presented along with the report on how the DRI was constructed. Finally, there is a discussion about the credibility of the DRI as a measure of parent-child dialogic reading episodes.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Emergent Literacy

Emergent literacy refers to the child's knowledge about literacy that develops before formal schooling and will later influence his or her conventional forms of reading and writing (Bowman, Donovan, Burns, & Foundation for Child Development, 2001). A key activity for developing emergent literacy is reading books to children (Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998). Most parents value reading to their children, but there are significant differences in the quantity and quality of parent-child storybook reading. Adams (1990) found that, upon entering first grade, low-income students had an average of 25 hours of parent-child picture book reading, whereas middle-income students had between 1,000 to 1,700 hours of reading. When low-income parents read to their children, they sometimes use less dialogue than middle-income families do (Ninio, 1980). Ninio (1980) reported, low-income students have less productive vocabularies than middle-income students.

More recently, researchers have explained the differences in children's emergent literacy skills as a result of the home literacy environment, rather than by the social marker of income level (Burgess, Hecht, & Lonigan, 2002). The home literacy environment includes shared reading, number of books, library visits, literacy modeling, and oral rhyming games. Wells (1985) found that the amount of story reading of 1- to 3-year-olds correlates with teacher ratings of the child's oral language skills at age 5 and reading comprehension skills at 7. The number of books in a preschooler's house and the number of visits to a library correlated positively with phonological awareness (Raz & Bryant, 1990), and phonological awareness is identified as a building block for reading skill (Snow et al., 1998). Other researchers have found that the frequency of preschool book reading correlates to reading, spelling, and IQ scores (Stevenson & Fredman, 1990). Several studies have shown that parent-child reading helps to improve the child's use of expressive vocabulary (Arnold et al., 1994; Hargrave & Senechal, 2000; Whitehurst et al., 1994; Whitehurst et al., 1988).

Neuman, Koh, and Dwyer (2008) acknowledged the importance of the home literacy environment on children's emergent literacy skills and constructed an instrument to measure it in home-based child-care settings. They field-tested the Child and Home Environment Language and Literacy Observation in 128 home-based settings in low-income neighborhoods and found the instrument to be a valid and reliable measure of the language and literacy environment in home-based settings.

Dialogic Reading

The concept of adult-child dialogic reading has emerged within the past two decades (Anderson, Anderson, Lynch, & Shapiro, 2004; Arnold & Whitehurst, 1994; Fielding-Barnsley & Purdie, 2003; Whitehurst et al., 1994; Whitehurst et al., 1988). Dialogic reading takes the traditional parent-child storybook reading to a higher level of interaction. The parent tells the story in traditional storybook reading, but the goal in dialogic reading is to increase the dialogue between the parent and child, enabling the child to eventually tell the story. In traditional storybook reading, parents generally read the entire story, with some parent-child interaction involving labeling or describing items, and with little emphasis put on sound and letter relationships (Hindman, Connor, Jewkes, & Morrison, 2008). For example, a parent is more likely to point to an illustration and ask a child what it shows than to ask the name or sound of a specific letter in a text.

Dialogic reading consists of the following three principles: evocative techniques, parental feedback, and progressive change (Arnold & Whitehurst, 1994). Examples of evocative techniques include asking the child questions or responding to a child's idea about the story. Parental feedback involves expanding, modeling, correcting, or praising what the child says. The idea of progressive change is based upon Vygotsky's (1986) zone of proximal development. Progressive change involves the adult providing support activities that are just slightly more difficult than what the child could accomplish alone. In a dialogic episode, a parent could facilitate progressive change by asking the child an object's function after the child recognizes the object's name. This would require the child to give more information about the object while parental support is given.

Grover Whitehurst was one of the first researchers to apply sociocultural theory to shared reading. Whitehurst et al. (1988) conducted an experiment on traditional storybook reading versus a newly created intervention. In the study, 22 middle-class families received one-hour training sessions on how to read dialogically to their children. In a 4-week time period, the parents audiotaped dialogic reading sessions between themselves and their children. A pretest and posttest were given, as well as a longitudinal test 9 months later. Results showed that children in the dialogic reading group scored significantly higher on tests of expressive language development (i.e., mean length of utterances, frequency of phrases, and frequency of multiple words) when compared to students in the traditional storybook reading group. Whitehurst et al. (1994) further expanded his studies on dialogic reading to include child care teachers and children from low-income families. The child care teachers read dialogically to small groups of five children. The results showed that dialogic reading also can benefit low-income families and that the reading episodes can take place in settings other than the home.

Hargrave and Senechal (2000) tested the worthiness of dialogic reading in a more realistic child care setting, with eight children instead of five. Their premise was that there are usually two adults in a child care class, and therefore one could read dialogically to a small group of eight children while the other teacher occupies the rest of the class. The results on the Expressive One Word Picture Vocabulary Test–Revised (Brownell, 2000) indicated that dialogic reading could work in a child care setting where the teacher reads to larger groups of children.

Several researchers tested the validity of a home plus school component of dialogic reading (Hargrave & Senechal, 2000; Lonigan & Whitehurst, 1998; Whitehurst et al., 1994). These studies generally had a home-only dialogic reading group, a school-only dialogic reading group, a

home plus school dialogic reading group, and a control group that was read to in the traditional manner. Results of these studies revealed that dialogic reading that takes place in the home and the school is more effective for students' vocabulary development than a school-only version.

Arnold et al. (1994) created a video with two presentations to teach the dialogic reading techniques to parents and teachers. The authors believed that the video would be less costly than having direct training from a teacher, and that the curriculum could be standardized. The first video presentation showed examples of mothers and their children demonstrating the following dialogic reading techniques: asking "what" questions, following answers with questions, repeating what the child says, helping the child as needed, praising and encouraging, shadowing the child's interests, and having fun. The second presentation showed how to ask open-ended questions and how to expand on what the child says. Both presentations asked the viewers how they would correct the mistakes shown in the nonexamples.

Arnold et al. (1994) conducted a study to test the effectiveness of the video presentations. The study was done with 2-year-olds from middle- to upper-class families. Sixty-four children and their parents were assigned to one of three groups: a control group, in which parents read to their children in the traditional manner; an experimental group, in which parents were taught dialogic reading techniques from a video; and an experimental group where parents were taught dialogic reading techniques from a trainer. Children in the video group outperformed the other two groups on vocabulary and expressive language measures. Additionally, the study showed that video training can be a cost-effective way of implementing dialogic reading.

Lonigan, Clancy-Menchetti, Phillips, McDowell, and Farver (2007) created the Literacy Express Curriculum, which specifically addresses dialogic reading. The authors divided the questions asked by adults during dialogic episodes into three ascending levels. Adults begin dialogic reading episodes by asking knowledge level questions (e.g., What is this?). As the reading episodes increase, the adults begin to ask more open-ended questions (e.g., What else do you see going on?). The highest level of questions is used when the adult and child are very familiar with dialogic techniques. These questions revolve around story sequence, personal experience, and prediction. Lonigan et al. (2007) suggested beginning with the lowest level questions and moving on to the next level only when the child is ready, whereas other researchers found it beneficial to ask struggling readers higher level questions, even at the beginning of teaching dialogic reading episodes (Hindman et al., 2008).

Adult and Child Interactive Reading Inventory

DeBruin-Parecki (1999) constructed an instrument, the Adult and Child Interactive Reading Inventory (ACIRI), to measure storybook reading behaviors. The ACIRI monitors parent and child literacy behaviors in three categories: enhancing attention to text, promoting reading and supporting comprehension, and using literacy strategies. There are four literacy behaviors under each category, for a total evaluation of 12 specific literacy behaviors (adult/child, respectively). To use the ACIRI, an observer watches a parent-child storybook-reading episode and then tallies how many times he or she sees a specific literacy behavior. The instrument was field tested within an Even Start home visiting program. Teachers made the observations of the joint reading sessions in September and then again in May. The teachers used the September assessment to guide the instruction of the parents in dialogic reading techniques.

To test the instrument's reliability and validity, DeBruin-Parecki (1999) used correlations and interrater reliability. The results showed that the parent's ACIRI score on an item significantly correlated to the child's ACIRI score on the same item, and there were significant correlations between the parent's and child's scores in the three ACIRI categories. Additionally, as a parent's ACIRI score increased, the child's score also increased. The test of interrater reliability revealed high agreement among the eight raters observing the same six dialogic reading episodes.

The results of the DeBruin-Parecki (1999) study influenced others to use the ACIRI as an instrument to measure dialogic reading episodes (Brickman, 2003; Kelley, 2003). Kelley (2003) used the ACIRI to examine the effectiveness of training parents in dialogic reading techniques. Parents were trained in dialogic reading techniques in group settings and during biweekly home visits for a period of 5 months. The ACIRI was used to assess parent-child storybook-reading behaviors and to guide future training of the parents in dialogic techniques. As a result, parents noted frequent use of dialogic reading in their homes, and a significant increase in children's language scores was reported (Kelley, 2003).

Brickman (2003) conducted her dissertation on dialogic reading with Spanish families enrolled in an Even Start family literacy program. The parents read stories that contained English and Spanish words on each page, using either traditional reading or dialogic reading. The parents in the traditional and dialogic reading groups tended to read the stories in English and ask the children questions or make elaborations in Spanish. The main difference between the two groups was that the parents in the dialogic groups were given 6 hours of training in how to read in a dialogic manner to their children, whereas the control group received no such training. The results from the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test–Revised (Dunn, Dunn, Robertson, & Eisenberg, 1981) and the concepts of print checklist revealed that dialogic reading of the stories was superior to the traditional method.

Mediated Assessment

Mediated assessments provide an indication of a child's future performance. Traditional assessments only yield a single "snapshot" of what a child has already learned in the past and can perform independently in the present; mediated assessments project a child's future performance by analyzing what a child can accomplish with guidance and assistance. Traditional and mediated assessments are needed in education, because they give a picture of the child's past, present, and future performance (Dixon-Krauss, 1996). The dialogic reading inventory is a form of mediated assessment, because the adult asks the child increasingly difficult questions in order to facilitate the child's comprehension of the text. The adult also mediates the child's learning by relinquishing some of the responsibility for reading the text to the child. A parent could do this by stopping while reading and having the child fill in the next word or phrase in the story.

METHOD

Participants

The study was conducted within an Even Start family literacy project in the southeastern region of the United States. Even Start is a federally funded literacy education project geared for families

TABLE 1
The Sample Size of Parents and Children by Ethnicity ($N = 46$)

	Ethnicity				
Participants	*Hispanic*	*White*	*Asian*	*African American*	*Total*
Parents	14	2	2	5	23
Children	11	6	2	4	23

at risk. The program contains both at-home and center-based components targeting parents and their children. Twenty-three parent-child dyads participated in the study. The ages of the children in the study ranged from 3 to 5 years old, with eight 3-year-olds, seven 4-year-olds, and eight 5-year-olds. The participants in the study were 14 Hispanic, 2 White, 2 Asian, and 5 African American parents, and 11 Hispanic, 6 White, 2 Asian, and 4 African American children (see Table 1).

Development of the DRI

Construction of the DRI began with initial item development by three professors and three doctoral students using the ACIRI (DeBruin-Parecki, 1999). First, the ACIRI items for parent reading behaviors were discussed and grouped into four categories. Items were then revised, added, or deleted to reflect current reading content and terminology. Each parent behavior item was matched with a corresponding child reading behavior item (e.g., the parent's literacy behavior of asking the child to recall information from the book/story corresponds to the child's behavior of recalling information from the book/story). The DRI, shown in the appendix, contains 17 items of adult-child literacy behaviors in four categories: print/alphabet awareness, comprehension/vocabulary, phonological awareness, and attention to text.

To administer the DRI, an observer watched a parent-child storybook-reading episode and tallied how many times he or she observed a specific literacy behavior. Once the reading episode was completed, the observer used the tallies to bubble in or record a score for each literacy behavior (1 = *never*, 2 = *occasionally*, or 3 = *often*). A score of 1 was recorded if no tallies were made for an item, a score of 2 was recorded if one or two tallies were made, and a score of 3 was recorded if three or more tallies were made.

Materials and Data Collection

The two picture books read by the parents contained two text patterns: a repetitive language pattern, in *Wheels on the Bus* (Raffi, 1988), and a cumulative sequence pattern, in *Where's Spot?* (Hill, 1980). Each of the parent-child dyads was videotaped reading one of the storybooks. The dyads were randomly assigned to read either book. Table 2 shows the distribution of parent-child readings of the repetitive pattern or cumulative sequence books. Each videotaped session lasted from 5 to 10 minutes. There was a total of 23 videotaped sessions. The parents were not coached on how to read to the children, and all interaction during the reading sessions was spontaneous.

TABLE 2
Parent-Child Dyad by Age and Book ($N = 23$)

	Age			
Book Pattern	*Three*	*Four*	*Five*	*Total*
Repetitive	5	2	2	9
Cumulative	3	5	6	14
Total	8	7	8	23

RESULTS

The reliability and validity of the DRI was determined by analyzing the data from the videos. All tapes were analyzed to determine the number of parent-child dialogic interactions that occurred beyond the reading of the printed story text. The 23 videotaped sessions of parent-child dyads were scored on the DRI by five graduate student raters for a total of 115 scorers ($5 \times 23 = 115$). Three independent raters were used to check interrater reliability. Descriptive statistics were calculated to find the amounts of parent-child dialogic interactions during the story reading.

Reliability and Validity

An internal consistency reliability test was used to find the homogeneity of the test items used in the measurement of the DRI data gathered. To assess the internal consistency of the DRI test items, Cronbach's coefficient alpha and the split-half coefficient were computed. Cronbach's coefficient alpha for all items was .89, adult reading behavior was .85, and child reading behavior was .87. The split-half coefficient corrected for the full length of the test was .97.

Interrater reliability also was examined to assess whether the different raters gave consistent estimates in their ratings of responses. The scores of three graduate students who were familiar with the dependent measures were used to determine the reliability of the experimenters' evaluation of the DRI. They independently watched and scored the videos. A Pearson correlation coefficient was used to determine the inter-rater reliability on these data. The correlation coefficients among three raters for dialogic reading were satisfactory, $r = .60, .63, .74$, $p < .01$. Consideration of the reliability evidence suggests that the DRI provides a consistent measure that is relatively free of error.

Two types of validity are presented in this article. First, content validity was used to examine whether there was adequate representation of the adult and child reading behaviors for which the test was designed. Second, construct validity was used to examine how well the DRI measured these traits. Content validity was addressed by having experts in reading, early childhood education, and child development review and develop each item and examine the entire instrument, as explained above in development of DRI.

For the construct validity, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to discover the basic structure of dialogic reading behavior. The authors decided to use confirmatory factory analysis,

TABLE 3
Correlations Between the Dialogic Reading Items and the Dialogic Reading Factors

	Factors		
Items	*Print/Alphabetic and Phonological*	*Comprehension*	*Attention*
Print awareness/Alphabet knowledge items			
Book parts	.76[a]	−.03	.19
Where the story begins	.88[a]	.16	.01
A letter or a word	.75[a]	.05	.16
Phonological awareness items			
Rhyming words in the story	.89[a]	.21	−.03
Syllables in words	.94[a]	.17	.04
Initial or ending sounds in words	.90[a]	.26	.03
Repeated words or phrases	.02	.80[a]	−.07
Comprehension/Vocabulary items			
Open-ended questions or predictions	.19	.32	.77
Points to pictures and words	.08	.52[a]	.38
Recall information from the story	.43	.73[a]	.07
Question	.38	.80[a]	.26
Elaborates on or rephrases ideas	.09	.89[a]	.13
Relates the story to real life	−.01	.71	.45
Attention to text items			
Sitting near together	.07	.09	.77
Storytelling voice/animation	.16	.07	.82[a]
Redirects attention to the book	.28	.36	.59[a]
Hold book, touch book, or turn pages	.11	−.30	.81[a]

Note. a. Loadings above .5. It accounts for 25% or more of the item variance.

because they wanted to see if their 17 preset measures of dialogic reading behaviors would hold up. Table 3 illustrates the outcome of rotation with a factor analysis of the 17 measures of dialogic reading behavior.

Three factors were rotated using a varimax rotation procedure. The rotated solution yielded three interpretable factors: Print Awareness/Phonological Awareness, Comprehension/Vocabulary, and Attention to Text. The Print Awareness/Phonological Awareness factor accounted for 39.34% of the item variance, the Comprehension/Vocabulary factor accounted for 22.49% of the item variance, and the Attention to Text factor accounted for 17.40% of the item variance. The repeated words or phrases item loaded highly on the Comprehension factor, rather than the Phonological Awareness factor, and the open-ended questions or predictions item loaded on the Comprehension and the Attention factors.

Dialogic Interactions

Two graduate students reviewed the 23 videotaped sessions and tallied all interactions that took place beyond the reading of the story text (e.g., parent requests that child focuses on the story,

TABLE 4
Dialogic Reading Responses by Book (Number in Parentheses Is Initiated Responses)

	Book		
Initiated by	*Where's Spot?*	*Wheels on the Bus*	*Total*
Child	18.4% (39)	31.0% (62)	100% (101)
Parent	81.6% (173)	69.0% (138)	100% (311)
Total	100% (212)	100% (200)	100% (412)

or the child asks parent what animal is in a picture). All dialogic interactions were tallied as parent-initiated, child-initiated, and total by book. The tallies recording the dialogic interactions are shown in Table 4.

The total number of parent-initiated responses was 311 and the number of child-initiated responses was 101, regardless of the book used. As expected, the dialogic interactions were considerably higher for parents than for children. Examination of between-books interactions showed that parents initiated more responses with *Where's Spot?* (173) than they initiated with *Wheels on the Bus* (138). In contrast, the children initiated more responses during the reading of *Wheels on the Bus* (62) than they did on *Where's Spot?* (39).

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The DRI was adapted from the ACIRI (DeBruin-Parecki, 1999) and tested for a high standard of reliability and validity. The DRI showed reliability across components with the use of the split-half coefficient, Cronbach's alpha, and interrater reliability, whereas the ACIRI only tested reliability across components through the use of interrater reliability. In addition, the DRI tested for convergent and discriminant validity by using factor analysis and content validity. The ACIRI only tested for convergent validity. Results from the reliability calculations, content validity process, and factor analysis indicate that the DRI is a viable tool for assessing adult and child reading behaviors during dialogic reading episodes.

The DRI contained four categories of adult and child reading behaviors: Print Awareness, Phonological Awareness, Comprehension/Vocabulary, and Attention to Text. It is important to note that the factor analysis procedure yielded a total of three factors, as the Print Awareness and Phonological Awareness items were actually combined into one factor. This seems justified, because the underlying reading behavior measured by these items is performance in matching the spoken word to the printed word, an emergent literacy skill (Clay, 1967). The three factors obtained in the statistical analysis would reflect the three levels of reading processing: word level processing, text level processing, and metacognitive processing. However, to increase scoring ease and remain consistent with the current areas of emphasis for early reading instruction, we elected to keep the Print Awareness and Phonological Awareness items separated in order to maintain the four DRI behavior categories (see the appendix).

The four categories of the DRI also correspond to the four basic components of most reading models, as follows:

1. Print Awareness/Alphabet Knowledge—visual competence
2. Phonological Awareness—auditory competence
3. Comprehension/Vocabulary—text information competence
4. Attention to Text—self-monitoring competence.

In the factor analysis, the repeated words or phrases item loaded highly on the Comprehension factor, rather than on the Phonological Awareness factor. This result could be explained by the fact that repeating words or phrases would aid the reader's memory, thus resulting in increased comprehension. We left this item in the Phonological Awareness category, because repeated words and phrases in young children's books usually highlight a phonemic or sound pattern within the words (rhymes, alliteration, etc.). The open-ended questions or predictions item loaded on the Comprehension/Vocabulary and the Attention factors. Because these techniques have a history of being associated with comprehension development in early reading instruction (Stauffer, 1975), the item remained in the Comprehension/Vocabulary category.

Previous research indicates that parents generally initiate more responses than children initiate during their first shared reading of a book (Arnold & Whitehurst, 1994). In the dialogic reading episodes reported in this study, parents initiated three times as many responses (311) as the children did (101). Also, parents initiated more responses with *Where's Spot?*, the book with a cumulative plot text pattern, than with *Wheels on the Bus*, which had a repetitive text pattern. The focus on comprehension in *Where's Spot?* makes the book more difficult to read, and this text difficulty could have influenced the parents to initiate more interaction to guide their children in understanding the story. More research is needed to clarify this interaction of parent assistance with text difficulty and with various text patterns as it relates to children's comprehension of story books.

The four-item categories of DRI correspond to the common four components of most reading models, as well as to the four components of basic early reading instruction. This makes it a comprehensive instrument to use as a pretest, posttest, or monitoring tool for parent-child story book reading. Similar to the ACIRI (DeBruin-Parecki, 1991), the DRI could be useful as a pretest to inform family literacy instructors on the specific reading behaviors that parents need to develop to help support their children's reading. It also could be used for instruction when parents view and critique their progress with the literacy instructor. Further research is needed to verify the use of the DRI with young children of various ages and with books of various text patterns. Additionally, research needs to be done to compare possible differences between DRI scores obtained in a live situation vs. videotaped session. The DRI also needs to be adapted for classroom use with teachers and groups of students during dialogic reading episodes.

REFERENCES

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

Anderson, J., Anderson, A., Lynch, J., & Shapiro, J. (2004). Examining the effects of gender and genre on interactions in shared book reading. *Reading Research & Instruction*, *43*(4), 1–20.

Arnold, D. H., Lonigan, C. J., Whitehurst, G. J., & Epstein, J. N. (1994). Accelerating language development through picture book reading: Replication and extension to a videotape training format. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *86*, 235–243.

Arnold, D. H., & Whitehurst, G. J. (1994). Accelerating language development through picture book reading: A summary of dialogic reading and its effect. In D. K. Dickinson (Ed.), *Bridges to literacy: Children, families, and schools* (pp. 103–128). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Bowman, B. T., Donovan, M. S., & Burns, M. S., & Foundation for Child Development. (Eds.). (2001). *Eager to learn: Educating our preschoolers [Full Report and Executive Summary]*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Brickman, S. O. (2003). Effects of a joint reading strategy on Even Start. *Dissertation Abstracts International, A: The Humanities and Social Sciences*, *63*(12), 4261–A.

Brownell, R. (2000). *Expressive one word picture vocabulary test–revised*. Los Angeles, CA: Western Psychological Services.

Burgess, S. R., Hecht, S. A., & Lonigan, C. J. (2002). Relations of the home literacy environment (HLE) to the development of reading-related abilities: A one-year longitudinal study. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *37*, 408–426.

Clay, M. M. (1967). The reading behavior of five-year-old children: A research report. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, *2*, 11–31.

DeBruin-Parecki, A. (1999). *Assessing adult/child storybook reading practices* (Center for Improvement of Early Reading Achievement Report R-2004). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Center for Improvement of Early Reading Achievement.

Dixon-Krauss, L. (1996). *Vygotsky in the classroom: Mediated literacy instruction and assessment*. New York: Longman.

Dunn, L. M., Dunn, L. M., Robertson, G. J., & Eisenberg, J. L. (1981). *Peabody picture vocabulary test – revised*. Circle Pine, MN: American Guidance Service.

Fielding-Barnsley, R., & Purdie, N. (2003). Early intervention in the home for children at risk of reading failure. *Support for Learning*, *18*(2), 77–82.

Hargrave, A. C., & Senechal, M. (2000). A book reading intervention with preschool children who have limited vocabularies: The benefits of regular reading and dialogic reading. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *15*, 75–90.

Hill, E. (1980). *Where's Spot?* London: Penguin Group.

Hindman, A. H., Connor, C. M., Jewkes, A. M., & Morrison, F. J. (2008). Untangling the effects of shared book reading: Multiple factors and their associations with preschool literacy outcomes. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *23*, 330–350.

Kelley, C. P. (2003). *Dialogic reading: When a picture is worth a thousand words*. New York: Bank Street College.

Lonigan, C. J., Clancy-Menchetti, J., Phillips, B. M., McDowell, K., & Farver, J. (2007). *The literacy express comprehensive preschool curriculum*. Tallahassee, FL: Literacy Express, LLC.

Lonigan, C. J., & Whitehurst, G. J. (1998). Relative efficacy of parent and teacher involvement in a shared-reading intervention for preschool children from low-income backgrounds. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *13*, 263–290.

Neuman, S. B., Koh, S., & Dwyer, J. (2008). CHELLO: The Child/Home Environmental Language and Literacy Observation. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *23*, 159–172.

Ninio, A. (1980). Picture book reading in mother-infant dyads belonging to two subgroups in Israel. *Child Development*, *51*, 587–590.

Raffi. (1988). *Wheels on the bus* (Illus. by S. Wickstrom). New York: Crown Publishers.

Raz, I. S., & Bryant, P. (1990). Social background, phonological awareness, and children's reading. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *8*, 209–225.

Snow, C. E., Burns, M. S., & Griffin, P. (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Stauffer, R. (1975). *Directing the reading-thinking process*. New York: Harper & Row.

Stevenson, J., & Fredman, G. (1990). The social environmental correlates of reading ability. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *31*, 681–698.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language* (A. Kosulin, Ed. & Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wells, G. (1985). Preschool literacy-related activities and success in school. In D. R. Olson, N. Torrance, & A. Hilyard (Eds.), *Literacy, language, and learning* (pp. 229–255). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Whitehurst, G. J., Arnold, D. S., Epstein, J. N., Angell, A. L., Smith, M., & Fischel, J. E. (1994). A picture book reading intervention in day care and home for children from low-income families. *Developmental Psychology*, *30*, 679–689.

Whitehurst, G. J., Falco, F. L., Lonigan, C. G., Fischel, J. E., DeBaryshe, B. D., Valdez-Menchaca, M. C., et al. (1988). Accelerating language development through picture book reading. *Developmental Psychology*, *24*, 552–559.

APPENDIX

Dialogic Reading Inventory-PC

Adult Behavior	*Tally*	*Score*	*Child Behavior*	*Tally*	*Score*
Print Awareness/Alphabet Knowledge					
1. Asks child to locate book parts (front, back, bottom, or top).			1. Identifies book parts (front, back, bottom, or top).		
2. Asks child where you begin to read the story.			2. Identifies where the story begins.		
3. Asks child to identify a letter or a word.			3. Identifies a letter or word.		
Support Comprehension/Vocabulary					
1. Asks open-ended questions or requests predictions about the story.			1. Responds to questions or makes predictions about the story.		
2. Points to pictures and words to help the child understand the story.			2. Responds to parent's picture or word cues or identifies cues on his or her own.		
3. Asks child to recall information from the book/story.			3. Recalls information from the book/story.		
4. Pauses to answer child's question.			4. Asks questions.		
5. Elaborates on or rephrases child's ideas.			5. Spontaneously offers ideas about the story.		
6. Relates the story to real life.			6. Relates story to real life.		
Phonological Awareness					
1. Calls child's attention to rhyming words in the story.			1. Identifies rhyming words in the story.		
2. Directs child's attention to syllables in words.			2. Recognizes that words are made up of syllables.		
3. Directs child's attention to initial or ending sounds in words (onset or rime).			3. Identifies initial or ending sounds in words.		
4. Directs child's attention to repeated words or phrases.			4. Tries to repeat the common words or phrases.		
Attention to Text					
1. Has child sitting near or on parent's lap.			1. Sits near or on parent's lap.		
2. Uses storytelling voice/animation.			2. Responds to parent's voice tone by smiling, copying, gesturing, or paying close attention.		
3. Redirects child's attention to the book or keeps child engaged in the story.			3. Redirects or maintains his or her attention to the text.		
4. Gives child opportunity to hold book, touch book, or turn pages.			4. Holds book or turns pages on his or her own or when directed.		
Score			Score		

Scoring: No tallies: 0 point; 1–2 tallies: 1 point; 3 or more tallies: 2 points.