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Process Differentiation: Key to Student Learning and Engagement
Colleen Swanson and Leah Nillas*
Educational Studies, Illinois Wesleyan University

Research Question
How can I differentiate instruction when teaching sight word literacy and how do students respond to these differentiation approaches?

Literature Review
• The process in which students learn is an essential component of differentiation (Watts-Taffe, Laster, Broach, Marinak & Walker-Dalhouse, 2013).
• According to Sullivan, Konrad, Joseph, and Luu (2015) student engagement plays a vital role in sight word acquisition.
• Jasmine and Schiesl (2009) argue that DI strategies involving movement dramatically aid sight word recognition.

Methodology
• 19 second grade students from a diverse urban school served as participants.
• Students engaged in three DI strategies during sight word practice in small groups.
• Tomlinson’s (2000) conceptualization of DI was used as a theoretical framework for the study.

Results and Data Analysis
• Videos and photographs showed student engagement in the DI strategies through body language (Figure 1 and 2).
• Ninety-five percent of the students read all of their sight words correctly in the post assessment.
• Students identified Name Mix Up and Sight Word Charades as the most beneficial to their learning.
• Analysis of data supports the finding that student engagement plays a major role in sight word learning (Sulliivan, Konrad, Joseph, & Luu, 2015).

Conclusion
• Differentiated instruction involving movement both engages students and aids in their learning.
• Movement provides another avenue for students to learn and acquire sight word fluency.
• Teachers need to adapt these DI strategies to best fit their students and environment. All strategies may not aid all students.
• Future research should study the effects of tactile DI strategies on sight word learning.