

Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

Theses and Dissertations

5-6-1996

An evaluation of the effectiveness of the Reading Recovery program compared to a traditional BSI program

Karen K. Garrison

Rowan College of New Jersey

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>



Part of the [Disability and Equity in Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Garrison, Karen K., "An evaluation of the effectiveness of the Reading Recovery program compared to a traditional BSI program" (1996). *Theses and Dissertations*. 2166.

<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/2166>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact graduateresearch@rowan.edu.

AN EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS
OF THE READING RECOVERY PROGRAM
COMPARED TO A TRADITIONAL
BSI PROGRAM

by
Karen K. Garrison

A Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the Master of Arts Degree in the Graduate
Division of Rowan College.
May 1996

Approved by

Dr. Stanley Urban

Date Approved

May 6, 1996

ABSTRACT

Karen K. Garrison
An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Reading
Recovery Program Compared to a Traditional BSI
Program
1996
Dr. Stanley Urban
Learning Disabilities T/C

Children enter first grade eager to read, but reading is a complex task. Some children require a remedial reading intervention to acquire the reading skills necessary to be successful. This study hypothesized that the direct individualized instruction supplied through the Reading Recovery program would help children attain higher levels of achievement than a traditional small group Basic Skills Program.

Eight children in the bottom 20% of their first grade class were divided into two groups. Four received the strategy-driven Reading Recovery intervention, and four received the skills-oriented BSI intervention. Pre and post intervention data was collected for both groups using the Clay Diagnostic Survey. This data was compared. The results indicate that though reading achievement was increased in both groups, the Reading Recovery

group demonstrated the highest level of achievement especially in the areas of comprehension and vocabulary development. Their reading levels advanced significantly over the BSI students during the four month interval. This suggests that the Reading Recovery program should be implemented for the most at-risk students in first grade.

MINI-ABSTRACT

Karen K. Garrison
An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Reading
Recovery Program Compared to a Traditional BSI
Program
1996
Dr. Stanley Urban
Learning Disabilities T/C

Eight at-risk reading students received reading intervention within two settings: Reading Recovery and Basic Skills Instruction. It was hypothesized that the Reading Recovery program would produce more significant achievement. Comparison of pre and post data indicated that the Reading Recovery participants did increase their reading ability and reading levels significantly more than the BSI students.

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
1. The Problem.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	3
Need for the Study.....	3
Hypotheses.....	4
Subject of the Study.....	4
Procedure.....	5
Limitations of the Study.....	6
Assumptions.....	7
2. Review of the Literature.....	8
Research Review.....	8
Why is Reading Recovery effective?.....	11
On the Negative Side.....	14
Summary of the Research.....	16
3. Design of the Study.....	19
Statement of the Problem.....	19
Hypotheses.....	19
Population and Sample.....	20
Procedures.....	21
Description of the Instruments.....	24
Design and Analysis.....	25
4. Analysis of Data.....	26
Introduction.....	26
Analysis of Group Samples.....	27
Summary.....	28
5. Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations.....	33
Summary and Conclusions.....	33
Implications.....	34
Suggestions for Further Research.....	35
Bibliography.....	36

CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

Children enter first grade eager to read, but reading is a complex task (Pinnell, 1990). One standard reading intervention program utilized is the Basic Skills program in which children receive a half-hour remedial instruction each day in small groups of five to seven pupils. Students who receive these services experience larger increases in their standard achievement test scores than comparable students who do not. Research has found that their gains do not move them substantially toward the achievement levels of more advantaged students; also, these programs tend to be limited skill-and-drill type remedial reading programs (Kennedy, Birman, and Dermaline, 1986). In addition, the current structure of remediation can result in a loss of total reading instructional

time (Allington and McGill Franzen, 1990). As a consequence, the children remain in these programs for an average of five years (Kennedy et al, 1986). Because of the difficulties these children experience learning to read and write, some are classified as "learning disabled" or retained (U.S. Department of Education, 1990).

A recent study by Lyons (Pinnell, DeFord, and Lyons, 1988) found many of the children classified as "learning disabled" were really not disabled at all, but were only having initial difficulties learning to read. The study found that when students were placed in the Reading Recovery program, a high proportion of these children (73.3%) developed balanced reading strategies and were reading at the average level of their classmates in less than thirteen weeks of Reading Recovery instruction.

Reading Recovery has a much smaller time commitment and involves only forty hours total (30 minutes per day for 16 weeks). Retention and special education labels have been reduced in the school districts where this program has been

initiated (Zimmaro, 1991). Reading Recovery's effectiveness, as compared to the traditional program of Basic Skill Instruction is the focus of this study.

Purpose of the Study

This study is designed to compare the achievement gains of children who receive supplemental assistance in a traditional BSI program with those who receive assistance using the Reading Recovery program.

Need for the Study

Historically children with initial reading problems begin their school career academically behind their counterparts in all academic areas. These children are frequently retained or labeled and placed in a special education program. If the accurate early intervention program can be initiated to place the child on grade level with his peers as early as possible to alleviate further problems and possible ensuing decline of self-concept, this will help the student, teacher, the

school district, and ultimately, the nation. It will help with academic success and economically, as fewer teachers are required to bring the child on target with his school peers. Choosing the right avenue to advance the child's reading abilities is obviously very important to our society.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were investigated:

1. There will be greater gains in word analysis and word decoding among the Reading Recovery students than a traditional program of reading instruction with a group of underachieving first graders.
2. There will be greater gains in comprehension among the Reading Recovery students than in a traditional program of initial reading instruction with a group of underachieving first graders.

Subjects of the Study

The subjects of the study were eight first grade students divided into two groups of four.

These groups were comparable in initial ability, sex, age, etc. They range in age from 6 years 1 month to 6 years 9 months from the first grade class in the Whitman Elementary School, Washington Township, New Jersey. Both groups consist of children in the bottom 20% of the first grade class.

The experimental group consists of four underachieving students who demonstrate need in supplemental reading instruction based on teacher input and the results of a diagnostic test which was administered in September 1995 and placed in the Reading Recovery program.

The comparison group consisted of four children from first grade utilizing parallel criterion and placed in the BSI program.

Procedure

The students in the experimental group were instructed one-on-one in half hour sessions daily for three months. These sessions are based on the ideas presented by Dr. Marie Clay (Clay, 1990). The lesson commences with writing words on a black-

board, reading a book the child has already read successfully with expression, instruction on letter identification and word analysis, writing a short story and then cutting it apart so the student can place it back in sequential order and read it, introducing the new book by looking at the pictures and asking prediction-type questions, and lastly, attempting to read this new book using higher level thinking strategies. This pattern, which is repeated daily, integrates the reading and writing process.

In the control group, the children will vary their group instruction with some comprehension activities, Directed Reading Activities, and small group games and story writing. The major difference between these two groups will be the individual attention and personalized program the child in the Reading Recovery program receives.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations apply to this study:

1. The size of the sample was small and represents only a special demographic group.

2. The length of the study was limited to six months.

3. The effect of the supplemental program cannot be separated from individual ability and interest levels and reading instruction in the classroom and at home.

Assumption

1. Teacher opinion and the Clay Diagnostic Reading Survey is an adequate measure of initial reading ability.

Definition of Terms

1. Reading Recovery presumes that reading is a strategic process that takes place in the reader's mind, and that reading and writing are interconnected, reciprocal processes. It is a supplemental pull-out program.

2. Basic Skills Instruction is a small group supplemental reading instruction program. Placement is usually determined by a district-mandated minimum score on the district administered standardized test.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Research Review

This chapter contains a selective review of the research on the Reading Recovery program. Presented are data comparing this program to the traditional remedial reading programs currently in place.

It is apparent that we are not meeting the literacy needs of many children in the U.S. In 1987, one out of nine students in U.S. public schools was served by Chapter 1 (Birman, 1988), even though the results of Chapter 1 efforts are not encouraging (Bean et al, 1991). Studies show that Chapter 1 children make greater achievement gains than comparable children not receiving the services, but they make few strides in closing the achievement gap with their peers (Bean et al, 1991). Overall, Chapter 1 results in small gains for children with moderate difficulties, but the

gains dissipate by eighth grade.

Reading Recovery operates through three key programs:

- 1) intensive daily one-on-one instruction
- 2) an in-service program through which educators receive instruction in proven Reading Recovery techniques
- 3) a research program to continuously monitor program results and provide support for participating teachers

Reading Recovery works with the most at-risk first graders as identified by teacher judgement and the Reading Recovery screening measure, the Observation Survey. These children meet with a trained teacher for thirty minutes daily until they are able to function at the average of their classroom in reading and have developed a "self-improving" system of reading. This means they learn more about reading each time they read, without additional instruction (Clay & Cazden, 1990). At this point a child is "discontinued" from the program.

Reading Recovery results are most impressive. Much of the published research has been sponsored by Ohio State University, the U.S. National Diffusion Network site. In the first six years of

the Ohio State project, successful discontinuation rates were 73%, 82%, 86%, 83%, 87%, and 88% (Ohio Reading Recovery Project, 1991). Over three-fourths of the children identified as being in the lowest 20% of their peer group in reading were then performing within the average range in their first grade classrooms.

These gains are maintained as a longitudinal study conducted in the Columbus Public Schools suggested. A high proportion of children served by Reading Recovery demonstrated sustained progress through third grade without further intervention (Pinnell, DeFord, and Lyons, 1988). In 1989, the MacArthur Foundation awarded the Reading Recovery faculty at Ohio State University a grant to compare Reading Recovery to four other reading interventions, each of which contained some elements similar to those used in Reading Recovery. This study - the Early Literacy Research Project - found that Reading Recovery was significantly more effective than the other four approaches, and that the program's effectiveness required not only the use of one-to-one individualized instruction, but the use of its diagnostic and instructional strate-

gies and in-depth teacher training (Pinnell et al., 1991) as well.

A recent study by Lyons (1989) found that many children classified as "learning disabled" really were not disabled at all, but were only having initial difficulty learning to read. The study found that when placed in the Reading Recovery program a high proportion of these children (73.3%) developed balanced reading strategies and were reading at the average level of their classmates in an average of less than 13 weeks of instruction.

In New Zealand, where Reading Recovery began, the studies suggest that regardless of sex, economic status, or sociolinguistic group, the lowest achieving children make accelerated progress. Clay (1990) cites government figures indicating that fewer than 1% of the total age cohort need further referral.

Why is Reading Recovery effective?

Reading Recovery is an early intervention program. Clay (1985) states: "The difficulties of the young child might be more easily overcome if he had practiced error behavior less often, had less

to unlearn and relearn, and still had reasonable confidence in his own ability." Even Chapter 1 programs show more success in Grade 1-3 than those for older students (Carter, 1984).

Reading instruction should focus on the comprehension of connected text, not isolated skills. Reading Recovery emphasizes "the larger the chunks of printed language children can work with, the richer the network of information they can use and the quicker they learn." (Clay & Cazden, 1990) The daily lessons in Reading Recovery begin and end with reading whole short books that use natural language. With an easy, familiar book, the child has the experience of reading quickly and fluently focusing on comprehension - not decoding. Extended reading helps children consolidate strategies and enlarge their vocabularies (Pinnell, 1989).

Gambrell et al. (1981) suggests that poor readers engage in off-task behavior because they are given tasks at which they can not succeed, which lessens their attention and effort. In Reading Recovery, the tasks have been carefully selected to ensure success, and the one-on-one setting maximizes learning.

Research has substantiated that students reading with a greater than 5% error rate are more off-task than readers with a smaller error rate (Gambrell et al., 1981). Since the books are selected from the child's instructional level in Reading Recovery, the teacher has opportunities for coaching and feedback.

Orchestrating a flexible set of strategies is a primary goal of Reading Recovery instruction (Wasik & Slavin, 1993). Children are taught strategies such as: reading ahead, looking at pictures, examining the letters, and to cross check a "guess".

As Chall has stated (1989), "all effective reading programs expose children to a variety of activities that include a wide array of reading and writing." Every Reading Recovery lesson has a writing component in which the learner composes and transcribes a message. The teacher utilizes sound boxes as necessary to enhance phonemic awareness and spelling.

In Reading Recovery teachers are constructing and reconstructing their own theory of how children learn. They work from observation and learn how to

make decisions. The teacher makes a "running record" of the child's reading, and seizes the "teachable moment." Accelerated progress is possible, as Clay suggests (1985), because "the teacher never wastes valuable learning time on teaching something the child doesn't need to learn." Over two-thirds of the children who participate in this program make accelerated progress (Pinnell, 1989).

On the Negative Side

Although most of the research is strongly positive on its own merit and when compared with other interventions, some possible problems were alluded to in the research. Reading Recovery is not a quick fix or easy answer. The program requires hard work, a long-term commitment, and a willingness to solve problems. It may challenge existing programs and therefore generate resistance among those who feel more comfortable with the "old" ways.

There is no one answer to problems in education. Many Reading Recovery students remain "at risk" due to economic circumstances. Although

these children may adopt a more positive attitude about school and learn to read, they do not become different children. Some problems still remain, such as: poverty, mobility, family problems, poor work habits, and discipline problems (Pinnell, 1990). Also, these children need personal attention, a rich school curriculum - continuous classroom literacy experiences and knowledgeable, observant teachers - also, challenging, interesting reading material at school and at home.

Implementing this program is difficult, takes time, and is relatively costly. It places heavy demands on the teacher. Besides having successfully completed at least three years of teaching and taken language development and reading courses on a primary level, the teacher must attend three hour clinical classes weekly and be monitored by a teacher trainer, who visits to observe and provide assistance. To train one teacher - including the course and materials - costs approximately sixteen thousand dollars. By far the largest ongoing cost of the program is the one-on-one instruction for one-half hour daily. This teacher can only work with four children during a 12-16 week session

(Dyer, 1992). However, to place that child in a Chapter 1 program for the average of five years, teacher salaries would double per student, and in special education, the cost would quadruple over the average six year elementary school placement. Also, retentions and referrals usually decline substantially (Dyer, 1992).

Not all children are helped by Reading Recovery. Those who do not meet the goals of the program (those not discontinued - about 27% or less), often achieve below grade level at third grade (Wasik & Slavin, 1993). The students being served are, however, the most in need, so succeeding with these students is noteworthy. Some possible future interventions that may help some of those previously discontinued to succeed are: preschool contact with home, "little books," kindergarten staff development to outline early strategies, good first grade literacy programs, and helpful diagnostic monitoring (Pinnell & McCarrier, 1989).

Summary of the Research

Early intervention is the key to success in

learning to read successfully for a lifetime. Although Chapter 1-type programs procure moderate success, many children remain enrolled for up to five years, thereby increasing the costs and class time lost, as well as escalating the losses of: productive classroom work, actual reading, focused attention, and personal self-worth. One of the main reasons for the disparity of the results in these programs when compared to Reading Recovery is the goal. The goal of the latter is not to remediate deficits, but to help children be able to read at average classroom levels. This is a subtle, but important difference. Because of this difference, the research suggests that Reading Recovery helps more children to attain successful reading strategies and independence in less time (13 weeks) with this accelerated program, and ultimately, less cost than other programs. It aligns closely with the prevailing assumptions of good teaching and reading techniques for promoting success. Also, this level of reading competency is maintained throughout future years of schooling. Reading Recovery appears to be the "right" way to move into the twenty-first century, thereby

eliminating retentions, referrals, classifications, and long-term Chapter 1 placements. The studies support the notion that all three components are necessary to yield these success rates. This effective reading program provides a wide array of activities that interrelate reading and writing. Ken Goodman states that this whole language approach helps children develop into better readers and writers. The level of success attained by these students ignites the "fire" in the teacher who gives his/her all.

In light of this review, the researcher will use a control group composed of four Chapter 1/BSI students - and compare their progress with the experimental group of four Reading Recovery students. Due to the current research findings, the researcher expects to discover that the Reading Recovery group will attain greater success rates when the two groups are retested at the culmination of this research project.

Most studies are conducted using the Ohio University research findings. This will be an independent study conducted at a new Reading Recovery site.

CHAPTER 3

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to determine the effectiveness of Reading Recovery when compared to a traditional program of initial reading instruction with a group of underachieving first graders.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were investigated:

- 1) There will be significantly better reading analysis among first grade children who receive Reading Recovery lessons when compared to a similar group of children who receive traditional reading instructional lessons as measured by the Clay Diagnostic Reading Survey.
- 2) There will be significantly greater gains in reading comprehension among a group of first graders who receive Reading Recovery lessons than among those who receive traditional reading instruction lessons as measured by the Clay

Diagnostic Reading Survey.

Population and Sample

In order to evaluate the hypotheses stated above, a study was designed involving two groups of first grade students from two homerooms of the Whitman Elementary School in Washington Township, New Jersey. There were four students in the experimental group and four students in the control group. The subjects were selected according to multiple criteria including: participants must be in the bottom 20% of first graders in heterogeneous classes, this must be their second year in school, their scores and performance on the Clay Diagnostic Survey, and classroom teacher's ranking of children. They were divided into groups based on their level of need. The "neediest" four children were placed in the Reading Recovery program, and the next four "neediest" children were placed in the traditional reading instruction program. Both groups received instruction from the same reading teacher who is presently being trained in Reading Recovery techniques. The experimental group con-

sisted of three boys and one girl ranging in age from six years one month to six years nine months. The control group was composed of two girls and two boys ranging in age from six years two months to six years eight months.

The students involved in this study reside in a primarily suburban community. There is a high concentration of middle to high income families in the community. Many of the families are engaged in white collar employment. In general, the families consider education important, intend for their children to attend college, and support the school system.

Procedures

This study began in the first week of October, 1995. The students who participated in the experimental and control groups were selected partially on the basis of the Clay Diagnostic Survey which was administered on September 22, 1995. Only the four lowest achievers in this group were chosen as initial participants in the Reading Recovery program. The next four - this thesis control group - will be placed in the Reading

Recovery program as the initial four - this thesis experimental group - are "discontinued" from the program.

Both the experimental and control groups received regular reading instruction in their homerooms and one-half hour daily of supplemental instruction from the same specially trained reading teacher. The duration of the Reading Recovery lessons can vary from 12 to 20 weeks depending on the level of success attained by each student. The goal is for the student to develop effective reading strategies and read at an average level for their schools. The goal for the traditional program is to perform satisfactorily within the reading curriculum as evidenced by classroom testing and primarily, the annual district-wide testing instrument. These satisfactory scores are determined by the state's criteria and individual district's standards.

The Reading Recovery lesson is structured in that each day follows the same format, yet flexible in following the student's specific needs. The six areas covered daily are:

- 1) Reading a familiar book.
- 2) Doing a running record on a new book (looking for strategies).

- 3) Teaching letter identification using an ABC book.
- 4) Writing a short story.
- 5) Cutting up the story (to use for sequence and sentence word order).
- 6) Introducing and reading a new story.

This is a strategy-oriented, whole language approach. Through the running record, the child is tested daily, providing continual assessment. Also, this program is "inner-directed" as demonstrated when the teacher states: You said, " ". Is that correct? Can you find other mistakes you made. This helps the child develop an inner checking system or the strategies that "good readers" naturally use.

In contrast, the traditional program is more teacher-directed and follows the reading curriculum rather than the child's curriculum. The books provided daily in the Reading Recovery program are on the student's instructional level; whereas, in the traditional program, books are provided only once per week for listening purposes, and they are not aligned to the student's instructional level. There is also no organized format provided, and little, if any, written stories are done, eliminating the advantage of the whole language approach to reading achievement. In this program

phonics and comprehension are taught in a small group setting. The teacher reinforces the curriculum skills through teacher-directed activities and computer programs. The student reads with the teacher only once each week providing only a weekly testing situation.

In conclusion, Reading Recovery is a child-centered program and strategy-oriented, whereas the traditional program is group-centered and skill-oriented. Also, written language experiences are provided for in the Reading Recovery program.

Description of the Instruments

The Clay Diagnostic Survey was used to measure reading ability. This observational survey consists of six parts. The six parts are:

- 1) Letter Identification
- 2) Concepts About Print
- 3) Writing Vocabulary
- 4) Hearing and Recording Sounds
- 5) Word Test (Oral)
- 6) Running Record (to determine reading level).

Norms for this test were established in New Zealand. Consistent assessment of these norms is compiled through ongoing studies by Ohio State University of each Reading Recovery site in the United States in order to choose those best served

by this program. This survey works as an adequate measure for diagnostic purposes as demonstrated by the high success rating the research substantiates.

Design and Analysis

Three tables are used to illustrate the pretest and posttest scores of the groups. The pretest scores will be presented in Table 1 to illustrate the similarity of the two groups in the initial phase. Tables 11 and 111 will depict the significant difference in the two groups in the final stage after four months of instruction has been completed, especially in the areas of word analysis and reading/comprehension level.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to determine if a significant relationship could be demonstrated between the initial and final scores of students in the Reading Recovery program and students enrolled in a Basic Skills Reading program so it can be determined which program provided the greatest growth in achievement within a four month period.

The subjects of this study were eight first grade students ranging in age from six years, one month to six years, eleven months. Originally each child scored in the bottom 20% of their respective classes as determined by a random sample taken of the first grade class. In this study the children in both the experimental group and the control group were rated on the Reading Recovery Observational Survey at the beginning of the study and at the end, four months later. In the interim between the pretest and the posttest, the children in the experimental group participated in intensive daily instruction using running records of their

reading performance to determine their individual needs which were immediately addressed. They utilized self-questioning techniques and "good reader" strategies. The control group was involved in a daily instructional program to reinforce and extend the concepts covered within the regular classroom basal program. These concepts were covered within a small group and the pacing was set by the group's mastery of concepts.

Analysis of Group Samples

The researcher examined pretest data and posttest data for each group. Table 1 indicates the results of the pretesting data.

The pretesting data indicates that in the initial testing phase the students scored within the first and fifth stanine with the majority of the scores falling within the first and second stanines.

Table 11 indicates the results of the posttesting phase of the experimental (Reading Recovery group). They demonstrated scores between the sixth and ninth stanines with the majority scoring in the eighth and ninth stanine range.

Table 111 indicates the results of the control group for the same period. It can be seen that the children participating in the Basic Skills program for four months tested within the second and eighth stanine with the majority falling within the fourth and sixth stanines in most tested areas.

Examination of the stanines reveals that while the children all began these two programs within the same range of achievement as evidenced by the pretesting scores, there was a significant difference in the final achievement of these two groups. This significance is particularly noticeable in the areas of word analysis (Word Test) and reading/comprehension (Reading/Level Test).

Summary

The results of this study indicate that the effects of the intensive one-on-one program of Reading Recovery did affect a significant change in progress from the group-centered Basic Skills program. However, both the experimental and control groups did increase their scores in reading through the reading instruction they received both

within and beyond the classroom setting.

These results verify the concept that some form of intervention at the earliest point will help students progress. However, they also suggest that the Reading Recovery program will probably provide the greatest achievement growth within the shortest period of time. Coupled with this progress is less frustration with reading and greater confidence in all areas as reading plays such a prominent role in school success.

TABLE 1

PRETEST SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS
ON THE CLAY OBSERVATIONAL SURVEY

SUBJECT	LI RS/ST	CAP RS/ST	WORD TEST RS/ST	READING RS/ST	WRITING RS/ST	HEARING SOUNDS RS/ST
A	31/1	12/2	0/1	LEV 1/1	5/1	4/1
B	50/3	8/1	1/1	LEV B/1	9/2	13/1
C	38/1	14/4	0/1	LEV B/1	5/1	1/1
D	49/2	13/3	2/1	LEV 1/1	8/2	22/3
E	46/1	11/2	0/1	LEV 1/1	5/1	10/1
F	27/1	8/1	0/1	LEV 1/1	2/1	4/1
G	52/5	15/4	3/1	LEV 1/1	5/1	10/1
H	49/2	12/2	2/1	LEV 1/1	5/1	12/1

*Stanines are used to determine the level of students within the Reading Recovery program and are therefore being used by this researcher as the determining factor to be considered for entry and exit levels, as well as achievement attained. Also included are the raw scores.

TABLE 11

POSTTEST SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP ON THE
OBSERVATIONAL SURVEY

SUBJECT	LI	CAP.	WORD	READING	WRITING	HEARING
	RS/ST	RS/ST	TEST RS/ST	LEV/ST	RS/ST	SOUNDS RS/ST
A	53/6	20/8	18/8	LEV 16/8	51/9	36/9
B	53/6	22/9	18/8	LEV 15/8	40/8	35/8
C	54/9	21/9	20/9	LEV 15/8	48/9	37/9
D	54/9	20/8	17/8	LEV 18/9	43/8	36/9

*Advancement in all areas is important; however, special note is taken of the increase in the Reading Level subtest by the Reading Recovery specialist.

TABLE III

POSTTEST SCORES FOR THE CONTROL GROUP ON THE
OBSERVATIONAL SURVEY

SUBJECT	LI RS/ST	CAP RS/ST	WORD TEST RS/ST	READING LEV/ST	WRITING RS/ST	HEARING SOUNDS RS/ST
E	47/2	17/6	6/3	LEV 4/2	19/4	29/5
F	51/4	16/5	14/7	LEV 5/3	30/6	33/7
G	53/6	17/6	11/5	LEV 4/2	36/7	31/6
H	53/6	17/6	12/6	LEV 4/2	28/5	31/5

*Special note should be taken of the Reading Level scores when considering progress.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in reading achievement scores between students who receive an intensive reading program and those who receive a group setting remedial reading program.

After a four month period the researcher compared pretest and posttest data scores for four students in the experimental group and four students in the control group using the Observational Survey of the Reading Recovery program. All students participated in their regular reading programs within their homerooms. An analysis of the results indicated that while students who received the Reading Recovery program increased their reading scores and abilities, the control group made increases, also.

Conclusions

Analysis of data in pretest and posttest scores on the Clay Observational Survey indicate gains occurred in reading in both the experimental and control groups. However, the increases in the control group remained within the low average to average range, whereas the increases in the experimental group were in the above average range. This suggests that the experimental group should be able to blend into the classroom setting with ease and continue their edge in reading skills within the daily reading program without further assistance.

Implications

It appears that beginning supplemental reading instruction as early as possible is imperative to obtaining and maintaining reading success. Supplemental reading programs will help children improve their reading skills; however, the Reading Recovery program's intensive, comprehensive format appears to foster greater results in less time, thus allowing the child to spend less time out of class, and more time on task within the regular

classroom setting. This helps the child to enjoy reading right from the beginning phases and helps to increase the child's confidence in all areas.

Based on the results of this study we may assume that the classroom teacher plays an important role in the development of reading skills. Also, that all interventions help to some extent. There was a correlation between the concepts being covered within the classroom and those explored in the remedial programs.

Suggestions for Further Research

In view of the results of this study the researcher suggests the following areas be considered for further research:

- 1) A larger experimental and control group should be conducted.
- 2) A study comparing a Reading Recovery group to a regular group that remains in the classroom.
- 3) A study comparing the Reading Recovery program to a different remedial instruction program.
- 4) Studies ongoing at different locations.
- 5) Use Reading Recovery techniques in a large group classroom setting to discover if significant increases in reading scores can be attained.

WORKS CITED

- Allington, R., & McGill-Franzen, A. (1990).
Comprehension and coherence: Neglected
elements of literacy instruction in
remedial and resource rooms. Journal of
Reading, Writing, and Learning Disabilities
International, 6, 149-181.
- Bean, R.M., Cooley, W.W., Eichelberger, R.T.,
Lazar, M.K., & Zigmond, N. (1991). In-
class or pullout: Effects of setting on the
remedial reading program. Journal of Reading
Behavior, 23, 445-464.
- Birman, B.F. (1988). How to improve a successful
program: Pointers from the national assess-
ment of Chapter 1. American Educator, 12,
22-29.
- Carter, L.F. (1984). The sustaining effects study
of compensatory and elementary education.
Educational Researcher, 12, 4-13.
- Chall, J.S. (1989). Learning to read: The great
debate 20 years later - a response to
"debunking the great phonics myth." Phi Delta
Kappan, 70, 521-538.

- Clay, M.M. (1985). The early detection of reading difficulties. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Publishers.
- Clay, M.M. (1990). Reading recovery in the U.S.: Its successes and challenges. Address to the American Educational Research Association. Boston, Massachusetts.
- Clay, M.M., & Cazden, C.B. (1990). An interpretation of reading recovery. Vygotsky and Education, New York: Cambridge University Press, 206-222.
- Dyer, P.C. (1992). Reading Recovery: A cost effectiveness and educational-outcomes analysis. ERS Spectrum, 10, 10-19.
- Gambrell, L.B., Wilson, R.M., & Gantt, W.N. (1981). Classroom observations of task-attending behaviors of good and poor readers. Journal of Educational Research, 74, 400-404.
- Kennedy, M.M., Birman, B.F., & Demaline, R.E. (1986). The effectiveness of Chapter 1 services. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Lyons, C.A. (1989). Reading recovery: A viable prevention to learning disability. Reading Horizons, 31, 284-296.

Martha L. King Language and Literacy Center.

(1990). Learning through literature: The apprenticeship of young readers and writers, Vol.II, No.1. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Columbus.

Lyons, C.A., Pinnell, G.S., DeFord, D.E., Place, A. W., & White, N. (1990). The reading recovery program. Technical Report, Vol.XIII. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.

Pinnell, G.S., DeFord, D., & Lyons, C.A. (1988). Reading recovery: Early intervention for at-risk first graders. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Pinnell, G.S. (1989). Reading recovery: Helping at-risk children learn to read. Elementary School Journal, 90, 159-181.

Pinnell, G.S. (1990). Success for low achievers through reading recovery. Educational Leadership, 48 (1), 17-21.

- Pinnell, G.S., Fried, M.D., & Estice, R.M. (1990).
Reading recovery: Learning how to make a
difference. The Reading Teacher, 43(4),
295.
- Wasik, B.S., & Slavin, R.E. (1993). Preventing
early reading failure with one-to-one
tutoring: A review of five programs.
Reading Research Quarterly, 28, 178-200.
- Zimmaro, L. (1991). Reading Recovery. Massa-
chusetts Chapter 1 Program Interventions
Conference (address), Hyannis, MA.