5-20-2019

Reading Recovery with guided reading supplementation

Katelyn Barok
Rowan University

READING RECOVERY WITH GUIDED READING SUPPLEMENTATION

by

Katelyn Barok

A Thesis

Submitted to the
Department of Interdisciplinary and Inclusive Education
College of Education
In partial fulfillment of the requirement
For the degree of
Master of Arts in Special Education
at
Rowan University
May 6, 2019

Thesis Chair: S. Jay Kuder, Ed.D.

Dedications

This paper is dedicated in honor of Mindy Beth Kaufer, a mentor and Literacy Supervisor that fostered the deepening of reading knowledge and inspired the continuous love of learning. Also Brianne Siderio that instilled in me I was capable of reaching this achievement.

Acknowledgment

I would like to express my appreciation to Professor Jay Kuder for his guidance and help throughout this research.

Abstract

Katelyn Barok
READING RECOVERY WITH GUIDED READING SUPPLEMENTATION
2018-2019
Jay Kuder, Ed.D.
Master of Arts in Special Education

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of Reading Recovery, an intervention program for first graders, and whether the skills were being transferred into their general education classroom. Specifically, the reading abilities of students in the program were analyzed. Three students participated in the study, one female and two male first grade students. All three students were not classified and came from an inclusion classroom co-taught with a general education and special education teacher. The design of this research was pre-post, post-test group design and teacher surveys were individualized for all participants. Twenty weeks of intervention was provided in thirty minute daily increments by a certified Reading Recovery specialist. In addition, students received 3-4 days of guided reading instruction in their classroom either by the general education teacher or special education teacher in a small group setting. Results show that although none of the participants "officially" exited out of the program, all three of the participants made academic growth in each of the subtests. Teacher surveys showed that there was consistency with student performance in both academic settings. Further research is needed to examine the long-term benefits of student's receiving Reading Recovery in subsequent elementary years.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents (Continued)

List of Figures

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

For many students entering into first grade, their hopes and dreams for the school year are to learn to read or to become a better reader. Reading is an essential skill for students to grasp that will carry over into every aspect of their lives. For teachers to achieve this goal and adhere to the New Jersey State Standards, more and more school districts are utilizing a balanced literacy approach, a program that uses whole language and phonics, to teach language arts instead of using a basal reader program. Balanced literacy allows the skills to be integrated into core literature (shared reading), guided reading, reader's workshop, writer's workshop, and word study. It is essential that school districts use the most effective instructional methodologies to support our young readers. However, not all students are able to reach their full capabilities using these types of programs.

While a balanced literacy approach to reading instruction might be beneficial for most students, some may benefit from a more intensive method. The study presented in this paper will focus on a program called Reading Recovery for struggling first grade readers. The study examined whether or not improvements were made by the students and whether they were utilizing those skills being transferred into the classroom. These students were selected from their kindergarten teacher recommendation and from the observations of their first grade teachers. Students were then screened for eligibility. In addition, the students continued to partake in the curriculum for teaching language arts literacy that included core literature/ guided reading, reader's workshop, word study, and writer's workshop. The school district at which this research study was conducted utilizes

guided reading for students in grades first through third on a daily basis regardless of their reading level. This study evaluated whether Reading Recovery improves the reading of students with reading difficulties.

Purpose of the Study

It is the purpose of this study to investigate whether Reading Recovery improves the reading of students with reading difficulties and whether the skills can be transferred into the regular classroom reading program as evidenced by student progress in reading. Students who qualify for the additional instruction completed by a certified reading recovery teacher are not students who have been determined to be eligible for special education. However, this program can be used to identify those students who are not making substantial progress in reading.

Research Questions

In this study, I explored the reading outcomes of those students who received both guided reading and Reading Recovery instruction and how it impacted the reading achievement of struggling readers in first grade. The research questions are:

1. What are the outcomes of struggling readers participating in Reading Recovery?
2. Will students be able to transfer the learned skills into the classroom setting?

It was my hypothesis that the use of Reading Recovery would increase the reading levels of students and their comprehension. I hypothesize the individualized instructional approach of Reading Recovery would provide students with reading strategies that will allow them to comprehend the text and decode words. I hypothesized that students who got a double dose would show more academic growth in reading. I hypothesized that all

students would make reading improvements, but that lower readers would experience more growth compared to higher readers.

Key Terms

Guided Reading- The purpose of Guided Reading is to teach reading strategies. This instructional strategy is taught in small flexible groups of 4-5 students based on students reading level, interests, and their need for similar and particular reading strategy instruction.

Learning Disabilities- A classification including several disorders in which a person has difficulty learning in a typical manner, usually caused by an unknown factor or factors.

Reading Recovery- a school-based, short-term reading intervention designed for children in first grade that receive 1:1 instruction for 8-20 weeks

Balanced Literacy-program uses whole language and phonics and aims to include the strongest elements of each. The components of a '**balanced literacy**' approach are as follows: Core Literature (Shared Reading), Guided Reading, Reader's Workshop, Writer's Workshop, and Word study

Word Study- students are able to gain knowledge about how words work in order to construct meaning in reading and writing

Reader's Workshop- is a block of time during the day at all grade levels when students engage in reading and responding to self-selected texts at their independent reading levels

Writer's Workshop- daily, sustained block of time devoted to student and teacher immersion in a variety of learning experiences for writing

Core Literature- literacy block when students and teachers engage in shared reading experiences

Summary

In summary, children entering into first grade are reading at a variety of levels and are in need of a program that is targeted at their instructional level. Reading Recovery is a tiered intervention that allows for students to get one-on-one support to address concerns with reading at an early age. The three students chosen for this study were screened and selected as the lowest eight of the first grade class in hopes of improving their reading. In addition, the three students reviewed received instruction from a special education and general education teacher in reading and writing. It is hypothesized that those students who participated in Reading Recovery would improve their reading achievement.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Reading Recovery (RR) is an early reading intervention targeted for students in first grade that have been in the school district for a year and are considered "at risk." School districts rank and test students to determine which ones are qualified to enter the program. Typically, the program will accept children falling into the lowest 10- 20 percent of the grade. This information is determined by the *Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement* (as cited in Clay, 1993a), which is comprised of six testing components: a running record on text reading, letter identification, dictation, concepts about print, sight words, and writing vocabulary. The *Observation Survey* assesses the early literacy behaviors of the students. Based on the test results, the test administrator is able to analyze the stanine for each child, which helps with student selection. Stanines are a type of score based on the mean and standard deviation of scores for each component of the observation (Reading Recovery, 2013). Students who fall within the Stanine of 1, 2, and 3 are considered 33% of the standard deviation or "at risk." Based on the *Observation Survey*, these students are ranked on their stanine results of each test and by their birthdates. Students who are older are prioritized for selection due to the longevity of exposure to literacy and the fact they are not progressing adequately. Upon selection, students meet one-to-one to receive special individualized reading and writing instruction for a minimum of 12 weeks to a maximum of 20 weeks. In addition, teacher selection training occurs for one year and consists of six graduate credits and ongoing professional development that emphasizes Clay's theories (Reynolds & Wheldall, 2007). Lastly,

Reading Recovery collects copious amounts of student data throughout their placement in the program and it is reputable as effective among educators and administrators.

Lewis (2017), reports on her own experiences completing the Reading Recovery program and the lessons she learned afterwards to apply her training into the classroom. Observation is essential for instruction of reading (Lewis, 2017). Observation not only of the student but observation of our own teaching from others or video recordings. The second lesson focuses on what students can do well and not so much on what they can't. This builds the student's self-confidence and ability to want to continue to succeed. Lesson 3 concentrates on the understanding of Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development and the how understanding of the individual capabilities and limitations of our students helps them achieve more. The next lesson highlighted that there is a difference between using scaffolding support to help students versus rescuing a student which would mean the teacher is giving the child something they are not capable of doing. If a student isn't making progress, educators can't just look to the student but needs to determine what they as a teacher may need to do differently. Another important lesson is to remember "who is doing the work?" Limit teacher talk as too much of it can interfere with student learning. The last two lessons remind educators that it takes a village to teach a student. Educators are not alone and not one can possibly know everything.

Reading Recovery in the United States vs. New Zealand

Reading Recovery was developed by Dame Marie Clay in New Zealand in the 1970s and has been implemented as an early reading intervention for over 40 years. The strategies taught are aligned with the literacy curriculum and whole-language approach

used in schools in New Zealand and is a more intensive version of what occurs in the classroom (Tunmer & Chapman, 2003). In New Zealand, students learn to read by reading but little to no attention is paid to the development of word-level skills and strategies. Instead, students are relying on meaning. The whole language approach to reading and the Reading Recovery program barely teach children to use letter-sound cues to confirm language predictions. Research shows that the letter-sound relationship is the basic building blocks of students learning to decode words (Pressley, 1998). Tumer and Chapman (2003) found "using word-based strategies enables beginning readers to identify unfamiliar words which, in turn, results in the formation of sublexical connections between orthographic and phonological representations in lexical memory (p.3)" and allows access to the mental lexicon for text comprehension.

According to 2017 National Data from the Ministry of Education of New Zealand, 77% of students who exited Reading Recovery made adequate progress and were discharged from the program. Furthermore, 15% of students were referred for additional literacy support, 5% left before finishing the program, and 3% were unable to finish their lessons (2018).

The program has been adopted by other school systems across the world, including in the United States (U.S), Canada, Great Britain, and Australia. RR (as cited in Lyons & Beaver, 1995). Reading Recovery was introduced in the United States in Columbus, Ohio and quickly spread to 47 states by 1994.

According to National Data from International Data Evaluation Center for 2017-2018 for the United States, 53% of students who exited Reading Recovery made adequate progress and were discharged from the program. Furthermore, 22% of students were

referred for additional literacy support, 18% did not complete the program, 4% moved, and 3% did not fit under any category (2018). However, if you just look at the intervention status of Reading Recovery students who completed the intervention in the United States, 70% were discontinued and 30% were recommended for additional support.

According to *Reading Recovery in Evesham Township 2017-2018*, 62% of students who participated in Reading Recovery made adequate progress and were discharged from the program. However, 21% of students were referred for additional literacy support, 9% did not complete the program, 2% moved, and 6% did not fit under any category (2018). However, if you just look at the intervention status of Reading Recovery students who completed the intervention in Evesham, 75% were discontinued and 25% were recommended for additional support.

Success of Reading Recovery

More than 50% of students who completed the program are considered successful. A study (Wheldall et. al., 1992) has shown students completing the program in the first half of their first grade year have shown better outcomes compared to those who entered the program in the second half of their first grade year. Reading Recovery has also been known for its successes in early reading instruction such as clear goals, phonemic awareness, letter-sound relationships, purposeful teaching, and professional development targeted on effective instruction (Hiebert, 1994).

Gapp, Zalud, and Piertrazak (2009) conducted a study that involved 176 former Reading Recovery students now in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade. The students selected either successfully had completed their Reading Recovery program and were discontinued or

were recommended for additional literacy support. The study was a causal-comparative design that reviewed the student's end result and later compared it to their reading achievement. The students were given the Dakota State Test of Educational Progress (Dakota STEP) to assess reading achievement. The Dakota STEP gathered information on the individual's total reading performance which consisted of word study, reading vocabulary, and reading comprehension. Evidence suggests students who have successfully completed their lessons and graduated from the program have remained within proficient and advanced performance of their peer groups in 3rd, and 4th grade (Gapp et al., 2009). Students who were recommended for additional support in 3rd and 4th grade were found to be considered basic or below in their reading abilities. However, in 5th grade they did not find a significant difference for predicting reading performance.

May and her colleagues (May et al., 2015) conducted a study that evaluated the results of using a multisite randomized controlled trial (RCT) to estimate program outcomes under the $55 million Investing in Innovation (i3) Scale up Project in 2011-2012. The study tracked 13,328 RR students that resulted in 52.4% successfully completing the program, 22.4% were referred to additional services, 4.7% changed schools, and 19.7% received less than 12 weeks of lessons (May et al., 2015). In addition, the study included a randomized control trial comprised of students who received RR and classroom instruction and the control group who received classroom instruction and an optional alternative to RR if available. Both of the treatment group and control group were administered the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) that accessed reading words and comprehension. Students in the Reading Recovery treatment group

were found to outperform those in the control group scores, by over one-half of a standard deviation.

To measure the effectiveness of Reading Recovery, a study was conducted by Schwartz (2005) from 37 teachers who submitted data on 148 first graders that participated in the first and second round of instruction. Students were accessed at the beginning of the year using the six measures from *An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement.* In addition, at the transition period and end of year, students were tested on the Yopp-Singer Phoneme Segmentation Task, a sound deletion task, the Slosson Oral Reading Test-Revised, and the Degrees of Reading Power Test (Schwartz, 2005). Students were grouped compared to their class as a low average or high average performer. The low average student was selected by the RR teacher. However, one high average student was selected from the middle of a classroom teacher's ranking list. Some students were selected and randomly assigned first round or second round and some students were purposely placed in first or second round. The intervention group showed significantly higher performance compared with the random control group. Schwartz found there to be no differences comparing the intervention group with the average group.

Researchers McGee, Kim, Nelson, and Fried (2015) examined errors of first grade readers to determine insights into the strategies and information sources they draw to problem solve in reading and how these strategies change overtime as they develop into stronger readers. Specifically, they examined running records of first graders who entered into RR in the fall who made benchmark and those who did not make benchmark at the end of the school year. The researchers completed an analysis that identified actions that

students took at a point of difficulty and found a large percentage of errors students took multiple attempts rather than single actions to decode the words. This led them to analyze student's errors that included multiple and single attempt errors. From examining the two groups, they found all readers used contextual information and increased their use of graphic information and used a combination of the two. In addition, two new error categories were reported: single action, where a student made a mistake and kept reading, and action chains, where a student attempted three or more strategies to decode the word. Students with increased action chains were to found to be reading at higher levels than those that who were not reading on level.

Weakness of Reading Recovery

Reading Recovery has not been entirely successful. Researchers have found that although it has been proven to be successful for most students, students considered most "at-risk" still need additional support at the end of the 20 weeks. During the ranking of the *Observation Survey*, the most "at risk" students are the ones found to be the least likely to succeed in the program (Reynolds & Wheldall, 2007). Students who are entering into the program with poor phonemic awareness have the least benefits and still have a deficit in phonological processing skills. Reading Recovery relies heavily on theoretical principles which focus on the importance of using information from many sources in identifying unfamiliar words without recognizing that skills and strategies involving phonological information are of significant importance in beginning literacy development (Perfetti, 1985, p. 239). Instead, teaching procedures over graphophonic cues (Tunmer & Chapman, 2003). Reading Recovery has not dramatically reduced literacy failure in education systems since being introduced and has limited or differential long term effects

(Reynolds &Wheldall, 2007). Gapp et al. investigated the relationship between completion of Reading Recovery and later reading achievement on a state test. They found it was predictive in 3rd and 4th grade but not in 5th grade (2009). Lastly, Reading Recovery has been known to be associated with high costs.

Tunmer and Chapman's (2003) research focused on four deficits of the Reading Recovery program that were questionable: the theoretical underpinnings of the program, the specific procedures and instructional strategies used in the program and the one-to one instruction delivery method. The theoretical underpinnings reported that children using word-based strategies as opposed to text-based strategies were performing better in reading achievement (Tunmer & Chapman, 2003). Instructional strategies are based on whole language and Calfe and Drum found struggling beginning readers need a more highly-structured, systematic approach to develop phonologically-based skills and strategies as opposed to the whole language approach (1986). Elbaum et al. (2000) found one to one instruction limited the number of students that could receive Reading Recovery.

Guided Reading

Guided reading occurs with students' reading level texts in small groups. Reading level texts are books organized in levels of difficulty from the easy books that an emergent reader might begin to the longer, complex books that advanced readers will select. During guided reading, readers learn how to take words apart with flexibility and efficiently while attending to the meaning of the text (Fountas & Pinnell, 2012). The structure of a lesson includes a teacher selecting a text at the student's instructional level. Once a text is selected, the teacher decides on what strategy to teach the students. The

teacher will introduce the text and teaching point, students will read the text quietly, discuss the text, and complete word work related to words found in the text (Fountas & Pinnell, 2012). A teacher will need to assess the students' reading abilities frequently in order to ensure the text is meeting the instructional reading level of the group. According to Fountas and Pinnell, the purpose of guided reading is to help students build a network of strategies for processing texts. These strategies fall into three categories: thinking within the text, thinking beyond the text, and thinking about the text. For thinking within the text, readers are solve words, summarize information that they can easily remember, practice fluency, and adjust their thinking based on what type of text they are reading. For thinking beyond the text, readers are constructing unique meanings through the use of background knowledge, emotions, and attitudes (Fountas & Pinnell, 2012). For thinking about the text, readers are analyzing the writer's craft and thinking critically about the text.

Reading Recovery Strategies in the Classroom

Reading Recovery is typically used in a one-on-one setting, but primary teachers can integrate key strategies in their guided reading groups. One of these key strategies is focusing in on fluency. When students are fluent readers, they have the ability to read a text accurately, quickly, and with expression. In order for teachers to include this in their small group guided reading, students can begin with a familiar text to warm up. Reading Recovery teachers began each lesson with a re-read. Teachers can listen in closely and stop non-fluent readers to model and try again making our reading sound like talking. Also it would be beneficial for each student to have an anchor text that the student can read fluently to service as a model and serve as reminder for what it should sound like

(Lipp & Helfrich, 2016). An anchor text can be in the form of a quick poem, passage, or text that can be easily accessible to the student. It is just as important to model fluent reading during the lesson. Another strategy is to encourage students to use flexible finger pointing, so they are only using it when needed. The next thing to incorporate in the lesson is a conversation about the text they are going to read by practicing unknown words and phrases, confirming and rejecting attempts at words, identifying the problem of the story, and leaving the reader in suspense (Lipp & Helfrich, 2016). Another simple but effective strategy is showing excitement for reading the book. Excitement can be contagious for young readers. Once a text is selected at their instructional level, teacher prompting throughout the reading of the text is important. In addition, the student should be doing most of the work so picking effective prompting is critical. Teachers would need to develop a mental tool box of cues to support the learners. The last step is to observe and analyze the reading of students carefully in order to ensure addressing and identifying their needs.

Summary

Reading Recovery is a widely used early intervention system that is being utilized in first grade across the world. Originating in New Zealand by Marie Clay, the results from 2017-2018 from students who received the reading intervention in New Zealand, the United States, and Evesham School District are comparable. In addition, researchers like McGee et al. are investigating the reading outcomes of those with reading difficulties to find children are not using multiple strategies to decode words. Some researchers have questioned the effectiveness of the program but ultimately the benefits have outweighed the negatives. Like any program, there is always room for improvement to

match our ever evolving world of educating students. It is evident not every student can partake in the intervention, but there are methods that can be incorporated into the everyday classroom that every student can benefit from. These methods stem from Fountas and Pinnell's research on using guided reading to individualize the instruction based on the small group of students' needs. Ultimately, classroom teachers need to become efficient at helping students become strategic problem solvers to increase the processing of information of text (Lipp & Helfrich, 2016).

Chapter 3

Methodology

Setting

School. This study took place at Marlton Elementary School in a Southern New Jersey school district of Evesham. The school is one of six elementary schools in the district. It serves students in kindergarten to fifth grade. When students exit fifth grade they attend either of two middle schools in the district. The district is technologically advanced and has implemented a strong paperless initiative. Starting in third grade each student is given their own Chromebook.

According to the New Jersey Performance Report, the school consisted of approximately 414 students in 2016-2017, the most recent year a report was given. In 2016-2017, approximately 22% of the student population had an IEP and received special education services. In 2016, 81.9% of the students were Caucasian, 9.7% were Asian students, 4.3% were Hispanic, 2.9% were African American, and 1.2% were Multi-Racial decent (New Jersey Department of Education, 2016). A significant change in population has not occurred since the time this report was published and the demographics are similar to the population of when the present study was conducted.

Classroom. The classroom where the study was conducted was a reading specialist or early interventionist classroom. The classroom consists of a teacher desk, a kidney table in the middle of the room, lots of book bins, and a variety of other tables around the room. The teacher and student sit a small table for instruction, sitting side by

side. At times, the student gets up to use a magnetic whiteboard to spell words, and a sand tray for writing words.

In the classroom, there is a special education and general education teacher who share the responsibility of instructing twenty-one first graders with and without learning disabilities in reading, writing, and mathematics. Both teachers share responsibility of instructing the students in a small group setting for guided reading for 20 mins on a daily basis. The classroom has five students who have IEPs. Four students who received the Reading Recovery instruction by a trained professional.

Participants

This study included three students, all from the inclusion first grade classroom. Two students are male and one female student. To complete this study sixty-five students entering into first grade were ranked by their teacher using an alternative ranking form based on their kindergarten reading abilities and prior school records. Based on teacher recommendations from last year and the alternative ranking list, the reading specialist and early interventionist screened the students to determine whether or not they could participate in Reading Recovery. Nine students qualified for Reading Recovery for up to 20 weeks. However, only four were studied. The first round of selected students for Reading Recovery ended February 4, 2019. In addition, all students received twenty minutes of shared reading, word study, and reader's workshop every day.

Participant 1. Student B is a six-year-old Caucasian male. This student is eligible for reading recovery services. Student B's stanine was a level 0 using a Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA). His Letter Identification stanine was 1. His Ohio word test stanine was a 2. Stanine level 2 was for Concepts about Print and the Writing Vocabulary

stanine was a 3. The Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words stanine was a 1. Lastly, his Slosson oral reading test score was a 1. Student B is a kind and energetic student who requires a significant amount of teacher redirection to stay on task. He constantly fidgets and will frequently be caught using his hands for imaginative play during lessons.

Participant 2. Student C is a six-year-old Caucasian female. This student is eligible for reading recovery services. Student A's stanine was a level 4 using a Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) level 2. Her Letter Identification stanine was 3. Her *Ohio Word test* stanine was a 4. Stanine level 1 was for Concepts about Print and the Writing Vocabulary stanine was a 2. The Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words stanine was a 4. Lastly, her Slosson oral reading test score was an 8. Student A is a kind and hardworking student. Student A is often quiet.

Participant 3. Student D is a seven-year-old Caucasian male. This student is eligible for reading recovery services. Student B's stanine was a level 3 using a Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) level 1. His Letter Identification stanine was 1. His *Ohio Word test* stanine was a 3. Stanine level 4 was for Concepts about Print and the Writing Vocabulary stanine was a 4. The Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words stanine was a 3. Lastly, his Slosson oral reading test score was a 2. Student D is a kind and quiet student.

Materials

Both the RR specialist and teacher used a variety of leveled readers based on the current reading level of the student. Students were given book pouches by both teachers to re-read and practice already mastered books for building fluency at home. In addition, both teachers used magnetic letters to help build high frequency and known words. The

Reading Recovery teacher used a sand tray and *Etch a Sketch* tool for writing and practicing words students should know how to spell like "my." Also surveys that included characteristics of those readers at the end of their intervention were given to the general education teacher and reading specialists to complete.

Data Analysis

Data from the pre- and post-intervention Reading Recovery Observation Survey was compiled into a table and compared. Moreover, results from each were converted into graphs of visual analysis. These results helped to determine the effectiveness of Reading Recovery in the first grade classroom.

Letter Identification (LI)

Purpose: To find what letters a child knows and the preferred mode of identification.
Task: Identify upper- and lower-case letters and print forms of "a" and "g".
Scoring: Maximum score = 54.

Stanine Groups									
Period	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**
Fall	0-43	44-47	48-49	50-51	52	-	53	-	54
Mid-Year	0-50	51	52	-	53	-	-	-	54
Year-End	0-51	52	-	53	-	-	-	-	54

Figure 1. Letter Identification Stanine

Concepts about Print (CAP)

Purpose: To find what a child has learned about how spoken language is put into print.
Task: Perform a variety of tasks during book reading by the teacher.
Scoring: Maximum score = 24.

Stanine Groups									
Period	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**
Fall	0-7	8-10	11-12	13-14	15	16-17	18	19-20	21-24
Mid-Year	0-12	13-14	15-16	17	18-19	20	21	22	23-24
Year-End	0-15	16-17	18	19-20	21	22	-	23	24

Figure 2. Concepts about Print Stanine

Writing Vocabulary (WV)

Purpose: To find if a child is building a personal resource of words that can be written.

Task: Write all known words in 10 minutes.

Scoring: Count of words in a 10 minute time limit.

Stanine Groups									
Period	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**
Fall	0-3	4-6	7-9	10-14	15-20	21-27	28-34	35-44	45+
Mid-Year	0-16	17-24	25-30	31-37	38-45	46-52	53-61	62-72	73+
Year-End	0-26	27-35	36-43	44-51	52-59	60-68	69-78	79-91	92+

Figure 3. Writing Vocabulary Stanine

Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words (HRSIW)

Purpose: To assess phonemic awareness by determining how well a child represents the sounds of letters and clusters of letters in graphic form.

Task: Write a dictated sentence, with credit for sounds correctly represented.

Scoring: Maximum score = 37.

Stanine Groups									
Period	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**
Fall	0-8	9-15	16-22	23-27	28-31	32-34	35	36	37
Mid-Year	0-26	27-30	31-33	34	35	36	-	-	37
Year-End	0-31	32-33	34	35	36	-	-	-	37

Figure 4. Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words Stanine

Ohio Word Test (OWT)

Purpose: To find if a child is developing a personal resource of reading vocabulary.

Task: Read a list of high-frequency words.

Scoring: Maximum score = 20.

Stanine Groups									
Period	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**
Fall	0	1	2-3	4-5	6-9	10-14	15-18	19	20
Mid-Year	0-6	7-9	10-12	13-15	16-18	19	-	-	20
Year-End	0-14	15-16	17-18	19	-	-	-	-	20

Figure 5. Ohio Word Test Stanine

Text Reading Level (TRL)

Purpose: To determine an appropriate level of text difficulty and to record, using a running record, what a child does when reading continuous text.

Task: Read texts representing a gradient of difficulty until the highest text level with 90% or better accuracy is determined, with teacher recording behaviors during the oral reading.

Scoring: Maximum score = 30.

Stanine Groups									
Period	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**
Fall	0*[1]	0*[2]	1	2	3	4-5	6-12	14-20	22-30
Mid-Year	0-2	3-4	5-6	7-9	10-12	14-16	18-22	24-28	30
Year-End	0-6	7-10	12-14	16	18-22	24	26-28	-	30

*The raw scores in this stanine do not correspond to the mean and standard deviation for this task. They have been adjusted for the purpose of student selection.

[1]A child who does not read the Level 1 text with 90% accuracy *even after it has first been read entirely by the teacher* is assigned a score of zero for data collection. A child who has an opportunity to read his own dictated text as written and reread by the teacher is also assigned a score of zero. Use stanine 1 for student selection in fall.

[2]A child who does read the Level 1 text with 90% *accuracy only after it has first been read entirely by the teacher* is assigned a score of zero for data collection. Use stanine 2 for student selection in the fall.

Figure 6. Text Reading Level Stanine

Chapter 4

Results

Summary

In this single subject design study, the effects of the early reading intervention program, Reading Recovery, were examined with four first grade students from an inclusion setting classroom. It is the purpose of this study to investigate whether Reading Recovery improves the reading of students with reading difficulties and whether the skills can be transferred into the regular classroom reading program as evidenced by student progress in reading. The research questions to be answered were:

1. What are the outcomes of struggling readers participating in Reading Recovery?
2. Will students be able to transfer the learned skills into the classroom setting?

The students were assessed in the beginning of the year using the *Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System, 2nd Edition* to obtain their reading levels. This assessment measure evaluates accuracy, comprehension, and fluency with leveled texts. The levels obtained were used to create an alternative ranking of three first grade classrooms and the most significantly below grade level students were screened using the *Reading Recovery Observation Survey.* Depending on the results, students who qualified were able to receive twenty weeks of one-to-one intervention with a certified professional. In addition, the students received guided reading instruction in small groups on a daily basis.

Individual Results

Each subject was assessed on his/her text level (TRL), letter identification, *Ohio Word Test (OWT)*, Concepts About Print (CAP) , Writing Vocabulary (WV), Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words (HRSIW) , and the Slosson Oral Reading test prior to and following their participation in the *Reading Recovery* program.

Table 1 illustrates the results for participant 1. Prior to the intervention, participant 1's text level was a 0 and he was unable to read the text using a Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA). Following his participation in the *Reading Recovery* program, the text level was a 3 and the stanine was a 2. Columns 4 and 5 show the results for participant 1 on the Letter Interventions scores for the baseline and post-intervention. During the baseline phase, he was able to identify 21 letters, which gave him a stanine of 1. In the post-intervention-phase, he was able to identify 44 letters, which gave him a stanine of 1. Columns 6 and 7 show the results for participant 1 on the *Ohio Word Test* scores for the baseline and post-intervention phase of the study. During the baseline phase, he was able to get one correct, which gave him a stanine of 2. In the post-intervention-phase, he was get 8 correct, which gave him a stanine of 2. Columns 8 and 9 show the results for participant 1 on the Concepts about Print for the baseline and post-intervention phases of the study. During the baseline phase, he was able to get one correct, which gave him a stanine of 2. In the post-intervention-phase, he was get 18 correct, which gave him a stanine of 5. Columns 10 and 11 show the results for participant 1 on the Writing Vocabulary test for the baseline and post-intervention phases of the study. During the baseline phase, he was able to get seven correct, which gave him a stanine of 3. In the post-intervention-phase, he was get 17 correct, which gave him a

stanine of 2. Columns 14 and 15 show the results for participant 1 on the Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words test for the baseline and post-intervention phases of the study. During the baseline phase, he was able to get three correct, which gave him a stanine of 1. In the post-intervention-phase, he was got 32 correct, which gave him a stanine of 3. Columns 14 and 15 show the results for participant 1 on the *Slosson Oral Reading* test score for the baseline and post-intervention phases of the study. During the baseline phase, he received a 1. In the post-intervention-phase, he received a 10. For teacher completed surveys, there were similar findings. However, the general education teacher reported there to be more of consistency with skills shown by the student compared to the reading specialist's survey. She chose more often "usually" compared to the more frequently used "occasionally" characteristics.

Table 1

Results for Participant 1

	TXT READING														
Exit Test Data	TXT LVL	STANINE	% / SC	LI		OWT		CAP		WRT VOC		HRSW		Slosson	
Pre	0			21	1	1	2	9	2	7	3	3	1	1	
Post	3	2	94/nil	44	1	8	2	18	5	17	2	32	3	10	

Table 2 illustrates the results for participant 2. Prior to the intervention, participant 2's text level was a 2 and her stanine level was a 4 using a Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA). Following her participation in the *Reading Recovery*

program, the text level was a 6 and the stanine was a 3. Columns 4 and 5 show the results for participant 2 on the Letter Interventions scores for the baseline and post-intervention. During the baseline phase, she was able to identify 49 letters, which gave her a stanine of 3. In the post-intervention-phase, she was able to identify 49 letters, which gave her a stanine of 1. Columns 6 and 7 show the results for participant 2 on the *Ohio Word Test* scores for the baseline and post-intervention phase of the study. During the baseline phase, she was able to get five correct, which gave her a stanine of 4. In the post-intervention-phase, she was able to get 14 correct, which gave her a stanine of 4. Columns 8 and 9 show the results for participant 2 on the Concepts about Print for the baseline and post-intervention phases of the study. During the baseline phase, she was able to get twelve correct, which gave her a stanine of 1. In the post-intervention-phase, she was get 15 correct, which gave her a stanine of 3. Columns 10 and 11 show the results for participant 2 on the Writing Vocabulary test for the baseline and post-intervention phases of the study. During the baseline phase, she was able to get five correct, which gave her a stanine of 2. In the post-intervention-phase, she got 32 correct, which gave her a stanine of 4. Columns 14 and 15 show the results for participant 2 on the Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words test for the baseline and post-intervention phases of the study. During the baseline phase, she was able to get 24 correct, which gave her a stanine of 4. In the post-intervention-phase, she was got 33 correct, which gave her a stanine of 3. Columns 14 and 15 show the results for participant 2 on the *Slosson Oral Reading* test score for the baseline and post-intervention phases of the study. During the baseline phase, she received an 8. In the post-intervention-phase, she received a 16. For teacher completed surveys, there were similar findings. However, the general education

teacher reported there to be more of consistency with skills shown by the student compared to the reading specialist's survey. She chose more often "usually" compared to the more frequently used "occasionally" characteristics.

Table 2

Results for Participant 2

Exit Test Data	TXT READING			LI		OWT		CAP		WRT VOC		HRSW		Slosson	
	TXT LVL	STANINE	% / SC												
Pre	2	4	100/nil	49	3	5	4	12	1	5	2	24	4	8	
Post	6	3	91/nil	49	1	14	4	15	3	32	4	33	3	20	

Table 3 illustrates the results for participant 3. Prior to the intervention, participant 3's text level was a 1 and his stanine level was a 3 using a Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA). Following his participation in the *Reading Recovery* program, the text level was a 10 and the stanine was a 5. Columns 4 and 5 show the results for participant 3 on the Letter Interventions scores for the baseline and post-intervention. During the baseline phase, he was able to identify 43 letters, which gave him a stanine of 1. In the post-intervention-phase, he was able to identify 52 letters, which gave him a stanine of 3. Columns 6 and 7 show the results for participant 3 on the *Ohio Word Test* scores for the baseline and post-intervention phase of the study. During the baseline phase, he was able to get two correct, which gave him a stanine of 3. In the post-intervention-phase, he got 13 correct, which gave him a stanine of 4. Columns 8 and 9 show the results for participant 3 on the Concepts about Print for the baseline and post-intervention phases of the study. During the baseline phase, he was able got 14 correct,

which gave him a stanine of 4. In the post-intervention-phase, he got 16 correct, which gave him a stanine of 4. Columns 10 and 11 show the results for participant 3 on the Writing Vocabulary test for the baseline and post-intervention phases of the study. During the baseline phase, he was able to get 10 correct, which gave him a stanine of 4. In the post-intervention-phase, he was get 30 correct, which gave him a stanine of 3. Columns 14 and 15 show the results for participant 3 on the Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words test for the baseline and post-intervention phases of the study. During the baseline phase, he was able to get 16 correct, which gave him a stanine of 3. In the post-intervention-phase, he was got 33 correct, which gave him a stanine of 3. Columns 14 and 15 show the results for participant 1 on the *Slosson Oral Reading* test score for the baseline and post-intervention phases of the study. During the baseline phase, he received a 2. In the post-intervention-phase, he received a 15. For teacher completed surveys, there were similar findings. However, the general education teacher reported there to be more of consistency with skills shown by the student compared to the reading specialist's survey. She chose more often "usually" compared to the more frequently used "occasionally" characteristics. They both agreed that the "always" uses left-to-right directionality and voice-print match are completely automatic.

Table 3

Results for Participant 3

	TXT READING			LI		OWT		CAP		WRT VOC		HRSW		Slosson	
Exit Test Data	TXT LVL	STANINE	% / SC												
Pre	1	3	100%/nil	43	1	2	3	14	4	10	4	16	3	2	
Post	10	5	92%/1:2	52	3	13	4	16	3	30	3	33	3	15	

Chapter 5

Discussion

The purpose of the present study was to investigate whether Reading Recovery improves the reading of students with reading difficulties and whether the skills can be transferred into the regular classroom reading program as evidenced by student progress in reading. The participants were first grade students without identified disabilities in an inclusive classroom setting. I explored the student reading outcomes of those students who received both guided reading and Reading Recovery Instruction and how it impacted the reading achievement of struggling readers in first grade. The research questions were: what are the outcomes of struggling readers participating in Reading Recovery? A second question was: will students be able to transfer the learned skills into the classroom setting?

Findings

All of the students increased in reading abilities using the Reading Recovery intervention. This was observed for each subtest with the exception of letter identification. Participant 3 made a notable gain in his text level from a 1 to 10, nearly exiting out of the program. Both student 1 and student 3 made growth in their letter identification. Student 2 did not make any additional progress in her letter identification. During the *Ohio Word Test*, students showed an increase in vocabulary and identifying of high frequency words. Some growth was made for student's understanding of spoken language, CAP. Writing Vocabulary increased by 10-27 words known by the participants. Overall, students' scores on the *Slosson Reading* test showed noticeable improvements compared to the pre-test.

Teacher survey results on the transfer of skills showed no major differences between the general education teacher and the reading specialist. Each teacher's responses were no more than 1 option away from one another. For participant 1, the general education teacher felt the student showed more characteristics of reading compared to the reading specialist. For participant 2, again the general education teacher felt the student showed more characteristics of reading compared to the reading specialist. For participant 3, the general education teacher felt the student showed slightly more characteristics of reading compared to the early interventionist. However, the results concluded even though the students were reading at varied levels, it was evident they still had room for growth at their instructional level.

Previous Research

The current study was designed to evaluate the effectiveness of Reading Recovery and whether the skills were being transferred into their typical learning environment in this case the general education classroom. Research by May et al. (2015) found that of 13,328 RR students who were tracked and received Reading Recovery Instruction, 52.4% successfully completed the program, 22.4% were referred to additional services, 4.7% changed schools, and 19.7% received less than 12 weeks of lessons (May et al., 2015). May et al.'s research was designed to compare a control group who utilized an alternative program. The results indicate that the Reading Recovery treatment group outperformed those in the control group scores, by over one-half of a standard deviation. However, the participants in this study did not successfully did not exit the program as defined by Reading Recovery. In order for students to discontinue the program, the child has reached grade-level performance and no longer need supplemental support. Each are receiving

literature support group which is additional literacy support with a reading specialist in a small group setting. In addition, participant 1 is being evaluated by the Childhood Study Team for the possibility of having a disability. Participant 2 and 3 were referred to their school's team for I&RS. The I&RS committee is a team of professionals that include a reading specialist, general education teacher, special education teacher, principal, case manager, and guidance counselor. This committee works as a team to offer intervention suggestions to teachers prior to recommending them for evaluation for a disability. Previous research suggests that former students of Reading Recovery have remained within proficient and advanced performance of their peer groups in 3rd, and 4th grade (Gapp, Zalud & Piertrazak, 2009). If this is the case, if tracked for the duration of their elementary schooling, the current participants may appear reading on grade level. Since Reading Recovery puts strong emphasis on focusing on the meaning of words, researchers McGee et al. (2015) examined errors of first grade readers to determine insights into the strategies and information sources they draw to problem solve in reading and how these strategies change overtime as they develop into stronger readers. They found student readers to make multiple attempts at decoding words by using meaning. Students apart of the reading intervention learn multiple strategies to decode words. McGee et al. (2015) found students with increased action chains were to be reading at higher levels than those that who were not reading on level. It appears although the students did not exit the program, there is evidence that they did improve as readers. The results of the current study do not show successful results like that of other research that has been previously reported. For example, May et al. (2015) found that of 13,328 RR

students who were tracked and received Reading Recovery instruction, 52.4% successfully completed the program.

Limitations

This study was limited to three first grade students from the school year school year 2018-2019. A bigger sample size may lead to a stronger conclusion about the effectiveness of Reading Recovery and the transference of skills. Classroom instruction was shared between a general education teacher and special education teacher. The special education teacher changed placements mid-year and was replaced by a less experienced teacher in regards to teaching reading. A special education teacher present for the remainder of the year and experience level might impact the results. In addition, students in Reading Recovery did not receive instruction from the same teacher. Although they might have been trained by the same instructor, they could be teaching slightly differently. Some students received additional reading support from a Reading Specialist and some an early interventionist. The teachers administering the test had varied experience. Although the students did not successfully exit out of the program, a longitudinal study could be done to track the end of year reading level for the remaining years of elementary school. Reading Recovery in the current district is used as a preventative to a student being classified and all three students are in the process of being evaluated or have been referred to the CST.

Conclusions

The present study supports the use of Reading Recovery for the improvement of the reading abilities of students with reading difficulties. After completing the intervention, students were able to make advancements in their reading abilities. Students

were able to transfer the skills in the regular classroom as the teacher surveys revealed. Reading Recovery had inconsistent results with this particular student population as opposed to recent studies and the success the program has gained.

References

Calfee, R. C., & Drum, P. A. (1986). Research on teaching reading. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching (pp. 804-849). New York: Macmillan.

Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S., Hughes, M., & Moody, S. (2000). *How effective are one-to-one tutoring programs in reading for elementary students at risk for reading failure? meta-analysis of the intervention research*. Journal of Educational Psychology, 92, 605-619.

Fountas, I. C., & Pinnell, G. S. (2012). Guided Reading: The Romance and the Reality. The Reading Teacher, 66(4), 268-284. Retrieved October 10, 2018.

Fountas, I. C., & Pinnell, G. S. (2011). *Fountas & Pinnell Guided Reading Text Level Descriptions. (PDF file)*.Retrieved from http://schools.cms.k12.nc.us/corneliusES/Documents/FountasPinnell Guided Reading Text Level Descriptions.pdf

Hiebert, E.H. (1994). Reading Recovery in the United States: What difference does it make to an age cohort? *Educational Researcher,* 2.?(9). 15-25.

Lewis, K. (2017). Lessons Learned: Applying Principles of Reading Recovery in the Classroom. The Reading Teacher, 71(6), 727-734. Retrieved October 1, 2018.

Lipp, J. R., & Helfrich, S. R. (2016). Key Reading Recovery Strategies to Support Classroom Guided Reading Instruction. The Reading Teacher, 69(6), 639-646. Retrieved September 21, 2018.

May, H., Gray, A., Sirinides, P., Goldsworthy, H., Armijo, M., Sam, C., . . . Tognatta, N. (2015). Year One Results From the Multisite Randomized Evaluation of the i3 Scale-Up of Reading Recovery. American Educational Research Journal, 52(3), 547-581. Retrieved September 24, 2018.

McGee, L. M., Kim, H., Nelson, K. S., & Fried, M. D. (2015). Change Over Time in First Graders' Strategic Use of Information at Point of Difficulty in Reading. Reading Research Quarterly, 50(3), 263-291. Retrieved October 29, 2018.

Ministry of Education (2018). *Annual monitoring of Reading Recovery: The data for 2017.* Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education

New Jersey Department of Education (2016). New Jersey Performance Report. Retrieved Fromhttps://rc.doe.state.nj.us/report.aspx?County=07&District=4790&School=020&SchoolYear=2015-2016&SY=1516.

Perfetti, C. A. (1985). Reading ability. New York: Oxford University Press.

Pressley, M. (1998). Reading instruction that works: The case for balanced teaching. New York: Guilford Press.

Reading Recovery. (2013) *Procedures for Administering Leveled Text Reading Passages and Stanines for the Observation Survey.* Ohio State University

Reading Recovery (2018). *2017-2018 Reading Recovery National Summary Report for the United States.* Columbus, Ohio: International Data Evaluation Center

Reading Recovery. (2018). *Reading Recovery in Evesham Township 2017-2018 Executive Summary.* Columbus, Ohio: International Data Evaluation Center

Schwartz, R. M. (2005). Literacy Learning of At-Risk First-Grade Students in the Reading Recovery Early Intervention. Journal of Educational Psychology, 97(2), 257-267. Retrieved October 10, 2018.

Fountas & Pinnell Guided Reading Text Level Descriptions. (PDF file) (2011). Retrieved from http://schools.cms.k12.nc.us/corneliusES/Documents/Fountas-Pinnell%20Guided%20Reading%20Text%20Level%20Descriptions.pdf

Tunmer, W. E., & Chapman, J. W. (2003). The Reading Recovery Approach To Preventive Early Intervention: As Good As It Gets? Reading Psychology, 24(3-4), 337-360. Retrieved September 29, 2018.

Wheldall, K., Center, Y., & Freeman, L. (1992). *Reading Recovery one year on: A follow up evaluation in NSW schools.* Unpublished paper, Macquarie University Special Education Centre, Sydney, Australia.