IMPLEMENTING READING RECOVERY: ENCOURAGING CRITICAL REFLECTION ON EARLY LITERACY INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

BY

ROSANA MONTEBRUNO

A Thesis
Presented to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

Department of Humanities and Social Sciences
Faculty of Education
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

COPYRIGHT PERMISSION

INPLEMENTING READING RECOVERY:

ENCOURAGING CRITICAL REFLECTION ON EARLY LITERACY INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

BY

ROSANA MONTEBRUNO

A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge those people, who in some way, have enabled and empowered me to see this project to completion.

First of all, a thank you to my thesis committee. Thank you Dr. Riva Bartell for serving on the committee and for your valuable input. Your suggestions were greatly appreciated. To Dr. Sheldon Rosenstock, the confidence and encouragement to reflect that you fostered in 1984/85 has lived on. It has been an honor to receive your guidance in this project. To Erika Kreis, your ongoing support, even before this project became a reality, has been invaluable. And, a special thanks to Dr. Bev Zakaluk, my advisor. Your interest, insight, guidance, and encouragement has allowed me to learn more than I thought possible. You have my deepest respect and admiration.

To my first Reading Recovery class, I thank you for your insights, time, patience, and support in this effort. I hope you will recognize yourselves in this work. You have contributed a great deal to my learning.

Finally, to my family and friends, a very special thanks for still being there after four long years.

ABSTRACT

This action research study documented the implementation of Reading Recovery, an early intervention reading program for grade one students. The guiding question for the investigator, a teacher leader, was: What effects does the implementation of a program such as Reading Recovery have on diverse groups of stakeholders, in this case: the Reading Recovery teachers themselves, the respective classroom teachers, school administrators and parents. More specifically, the following questions were posed: (1) What shifts in learning occurred for the stakeholders? (2) What were the general attitudes of the stakeholders towards the Reading Recovery program during the program implementation? (3) What were the primary implementation concerns regarding the Reading Recovery program for each of the stakeholders?

The answers to these questions assisted in the implementation of the Reading Recovery program and provided suggestions for future program implementation. Data for the study consisted of investigator field notes (the investigator assumed the role of participant observer), journals kept by Reading Recovery

teachers and questionnaires completed by the Reading Recovery teachers and the other stakeholders, the school administrators and the parents.

Findings showed that Reading Recovery teachers gained new insights about the implementation of the Reading Recovery program, theoretical understandings of the reading and writing process, the reciprocal nature of reading and writing and the teaching of at-risk literacy learners. Classroom teachers gained insight into new assessment procedures, book levelling, and the Reading Recovery program. Administrators became more aware of literacy programming in their schools. Parents learned how to help their at-risk child with reading. Attitudes towards the program were positive for all stakeholders. The overriding implementation concerns for all dealt with the availability of the Reading Recovery program for all of the students identified as requiring the program, and financial constraints. These issues continue to be a concern.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

H. Reading Recovery Timeline and Divisional Report

Overview of the Study

The first chapter delineates the nature of the problem. A review of the theoretical and research literature is found in Chapter 2, the method and design of the study is outlined in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 reports findings and relevant discussion, conclusions, implications and recommendations.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

> I now recognize that collaboration is at the heart of learning. Learning is social. People don't learn in isolation; we learn as members of learning communities. While we each construct an individual interpretation of a particular event or situation, our understanding is shaped by contact with other people's perceptions of what is taking, or has taken, place. Our particular interpretations stand until a discrepancy of some sort catches our attention and causes us to re-examine and to reinterpret the situation. (Newman, 1991, p. 14)

General Statement of the Problem

The specific purpose of this action research was to document the implementation of Reading Recovery in two school divisions in Manitoba in 1993-94 in order to: (1) facilitate the ongoing implementation; and (2) provide suggestions for the future. The two school divisions involved and Manitoba Education and Training made early literacy learning a priority through the allocation of time, fiscal resources, and the training of two Reading Recovery teacher leaders, one of whom was the investigator in this study. The teacher leaders were trained in 1992-93 at the Canadian Institute of Reading Recovery in Scarborough, Ontario, Canada, for

one year. The Reading Recovery teacher leader training program includes a clinical practicum experience, a theoretical seminar, and a supervised practicum. In addition to the theoretical seminar, teacher leaders in training work with four children daily and apprentice with an experienced teacher leader. Once the year of coursework, apprenticeship, and work with children is completed, teacher leaders return to their districts to implement the Reading Recovery program (DeFord, Lyons, and Pinnell, 1991; Dunkeld, 1991).

Literacy Acquisition

The normal course of literacy acquisition in children may be helpful in providing a better understanding of problems with at-risk children. However, this 'normal course of literacy acquisition' varies greatly. Current views on literacy learning place as much importance on influence as they do on development.

Many frameworks have been developed for categorizing areas of literacy knowledge (Mason & Allen, 1986; Morrow, Connor, & Smith, 1990; Stahl & Miller, 1989; van Kleeck, 1990). Each framework has implications for addressing differences and

matching a child's literacy background with classroom instruction. Perhaps the three most significant frameworks deal with: (1) the role of writing, (2) the role of social context, and (3) the role of storybook reading. Each will be briefly described.

The Role of Writing

The role of early writing is considered important in early literacy acquisition. Writing provides children with a sense of accomplishment (Durkin, 1966) and, through writing experiences at home and school, children refine their knowledge of written language. They become aware of patterns and sequences that go together in writing, which has a reciprocal effect on reading (Clay, 1991). Through reading and writing, and interactions with others who model language, children develop an understanding of the conventions, purpose, and functions of print.

The Role of Social Context

The context in which literacy is experienced is crucial to the full understanding of one's literacy knowledge and development (Mason & Allen, 1986). Literacy practices and achievements are often driven by a culture's purpose for literacy. Purposes vary within and across countries. For example, in Israel, Jewish

children do not speak Hebrew but learn to read it in order to read the Bible. In countries like Japan and India stories are used to emphasize moral development and transmission of cultural values and socialization. In multi-cultural countries such as Canada and the United States, purposes for literacy within the school system and in the culture of the home may conflict. This will pose quite a dilemma for a classroom teacher trying to meet the needs of a variety of cultures that may conflict in their purposes for literacy.

It is often thought that socioeconomic status contributes to reading achievement. This thinking may not always be accurate. Rather, other family characteristics related to attitude toward education, parental aspirations for the child, conversations in the home, reading materials in the home, and cultural activities may contribute to reading success in school (Mason & Allen, 1986; Stahl & Miller, 1989; Copeland & Edwards, 1990).

The Role of Storybook Reading

Storybook reading is one area in which a child's reading development can be documented and is significantly influenced by the child's home environment. The nature of the adult-child interactions surrounding storybook reading affects children's

knowledge about, strategies for, and attitudes towards reading.

Sulzby (1994) traced children's storybook reading development and developed a classification scheme to characterize young children's early reading behaviors. Sulzby suggests that children's first attempts at storybook reading are governed by pictures in the text. That is, children label the pictures and describe the actions represented on each page, but do not tell a story. Eventually, the language they use becomes more like book language and they begin to tell a story across the pages, still using the pictures. Finally, children's storybook reading becomes more print-governed. Children may initially refuse to continue storytelling if they realize what they are saying does not match the print on the page. Gradually, children begin to focus on aspects of the print, such as known words, letters, and letter sounds. Children move from imbalanced reading, where they become fixated on the print and skip unknown words or sound out words excessively, to being able to read independently.

If the current ways of viewing literacy acquisition are accepted, then the problem becomes not "What is the problem?", but

rather, "How can we help the child experiencing literacy learning difficulties in a formal school setting to take him/her on a path to conventional literacy?" Regardless of the reasons for literacy learning difficulties, this is what the Reading Recovery program attempts to do.

The Reading Recovery Program

Reading Recovery is an early, short-term intervention program designed for the lowest-achieving students in grade one, regardless of ethnic, linguistic or socio-economic background, intelligence, language achievement, physical handicaps or learning disabilities. The goal of Reading Recovery is to accelerate the learning of the at-risk child so that after a short-term intervention period, usually between 12-20 weeks of daily, individual 30 minute lessons, the child develops into a competent and independent reader able to function independently at an average or above average level in the classroom (Clay, 1992a, 1993a). Reading Recovery presents literacy instruction in a holistic, supportive and meaningful context.

Reading Recovery is intended for students who, after one year

of regular classroom instruction, do not seem to be developing an effective processing system in reading and writing. Students are not selected according to their potential. No child in a regular classroom is excluded from Reading Recovery for any reason. Exceptions are not made for children of lower intelligence, for second-language children, for children with low language skills, for children with poor motor coordination, for children who seem immature, for children who score poorly on readiness measures, or for children who have already been categorized as learning disabled (Clay, 1991).

Selection of students is generally made as a team, choosing students who seem to be experiencing the most difficulty using classroom observations and An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement (Clay, 1993b). Clay (1993b) describes three factors that influence reading and writing success. First of all, supportive preschool experiences help ensure that all children bring some prior world knowledge and knowledge about literacy to the school environment. The second factor is the curriculum in the early years classroom which needs to be implemented to facilitate literacy learning. In spite of good classroom instruction, some

students still experience difficulty in learning to read and write. For these students, an early intervention program should be available to bring the child's progress within the average range of achievement in his or her classroom. This involves a check at the end of the first year at school, the implementation of an early intervention program for those students who require it and, the third factor, referral to specialists for students who have persistent problems after the intervention.

Program Implementation Effects For Teachers

The implementation of the Reading Recovery program brings early literacy development and instruction to the forefront. The structure of the program provides opportunities for Reading Recovery teachers to explore their literacy instruction and improve their observation skills. The implementation process itself provides an opportune time for Reading Recovery teachers to reflect critically on their practice and support each other in their instructional efforts. Intervention is not a "one shot deal" (Mitchell, 1994), therefore opportunities to collaborate and problem-solve are made available on a regular basis throughout the year. Since Reading Recovery teachers are on the front-line of

program implementation, their input into decisions regarding potential reforms is invaluable. Teachers involved in change require opportunities to express their concerns, interact with one another and reflect on their practice (Mitchell, 1994). Involvement in any of the activities must be voluntary. If not, opportunities for empowering teachers, engaging them in meaningful and lifelong learning, and effecting change are lost.

After my one-year training in Scarborough, as a newly-trained Reading Recovery teacher leader, my task was to implement Reading Recovery into Manitoba's educational system. My concerns were not only with training the Reading Recovery teachers, but within the process, involving early years teachers, more specifically, grade one teachers, administrators and parents. It was my contention that implementing Reading Recovery would serve as a springboard, not only for the investigator and the Reading Recovery teachers themselves, but also for the classroom teachers, administrators, and parents to reflect upon their beliefs regarding early literacy instruction. The implementation of Reading Recovery would:

- Increase the sensitivity of the Reading Recovery teachers

in training to the needs of at-risk beginning readers.

- Provide classroom teachers with opportunities to become more:

  -critically reflective of their early literacy instruction and aware of the current professional literature, philosophies and practices in regard to early literacy instruction.

- Afford administrators with opportunities to think about:

  -the advantage of Reading Recovery as an early intervention program and Reading Recovery implementation as a vehicle for reflection and instructional change in literacy learning.

- Assist parents in helping their at-risk children at home and become partners in their child's literacy acquisition.

The Training Program

The training program for Reading Recovery teachers was established by Marie Clay (1993a). Reading Recovery is a comprehensive design for teacher education. Successful, experienced teachers are selected to train as Reading Recovery teachers during a year long inservice program conducted by the

teacher leader. Teachers meet throughout the school year for study and reflection, generally every two weeks, while teaching four children at any given point in the year. Observation is the key element both in the teacher training and the Reading Recovery intervention for children. Teachers training for Reading Recovery, as well as trained Reading Recovery teachers, observe each other teach at training sessions behind a one-way glass. To facilitate change in teaching, discussion is facilitated by the teacher leader to: (1) incorporate theoretical and practical aspects of the reading and writing process, and (2) encourage reflective thought on teaching decisions in order to make the most productive instructional decision for a particular child at a particular time. These teaching sessions are pivotal in the training of Reading Recovery teachers to ensure program fidelity and continued quality implementation of Reading Recovery.

The Current Program

In this current program implementation, steps were taken to involve the respective classroom teachers in the Reading Recovery program by including them: (1) in the selection process of students, and (2) more specifically, with the discontinuing

assessment of students. My objective was twofold: both to provide Reading Recovery teachers with leadership roles in implementing Reading Recovery and to bring the respective early years teachers together to examine their early literacy instruction.

Administrators were involved in the Reading Recovery program by their agreement to implement the program in their schools. The Reading Recovery teachers in training were encouraged to communicate with their respective school principals regarding the implementation of Reading Recovery. They were also encouraged to become a part of the school team to make decisions about: (1) the selection of students, and (2) issues related to program implementation.

Parental involvement is not mandatory when a child is included in the Reading Recovery program. However, Reading Recovery teachers were encouraged to communicate with parents in any way and as often as deemed necessary and/or appropriate. They were also encouraged to have parents come to the school to observe lessons.

Questions

The guiding question then became: What effects does the

implementation of a new program such as Reading Recovery have on diverse groups of stakeholders within the school system? This question was examined from the points of view of: the Reading Recovery teachers in training; the respective classroom teachers; the administrators; and the parents. Informative data consisted of: investigator field notes, Reading Recovery teachers in training journals and completed questionnaires, and a questionnaire completed by classroom teachers, administrators and parents. The information gathered throughout the first year of implementation, the 1994/95 school year, was used to inform the implementation process. More specifically, the following questions were addressed from the data gathered:

1. Specifically, what shifts in learning occurred for the Reading Recovery teachers in training, and the respective classroom teachers, administrators, and parents?
2. What were the general attitudes of the Reading Recovery teachers, respective classroom teachers, administrators, and parents towards the Reading Recovery program during and as a result of the implementation of the program in their schools?

3. What were the primary implementation concerns for the Reading Recovery teachers, classroom teachers administrators, and parents?

Significance of the Study

With the implementation of an early intervention program, such as Reading Recovery, issues of impact are a concern. Different groups of people view the program in different ways. Their perspectives can be taken into account to facilitate and assist in the implementation process.

This study documented the process in which: (1) teachers developed the theoretical background and practical knowledge needed to implement Reading Recovery in their schools; and (2) examined the feedback provided by those affected - the Reading Recovery teachers, the classroom teachers involved with the program in some way, the administrators, and the parents of children in the program. This documentation provided a rich source of information regarding attitudes, concerns, and significant issues that arose, thereby serving as a possible resource for the administration of future programs.

Approaches to Research

Patterson and Shannon (1993) make a distinction between three types of research: (1) experimental research, (2) naturalistic research, and (3) teacher research.

Experimental researchers tend to measure and describe research in numerical terms (Harris & Hodges, 1995). The goal is to use perceived valid and reliable measures in order to be able to assume generalizability of results. The design is rigorous and very carefully controlled. There is a search for facts.

In contrast, naturalistic research, particularly ethnographic inquiries, uses descriptive data and meet the criterion of ecological validity (Cockrum and Castillo, 1991). A variety of methodological approaches may be used in data collection, including case studies, interviews, and observation. A naturalistic approach to research is valid because, as educators, we never have "the facts". What we have is knowledge upon which to act. We make assumptions and work under those assumptions until experiences cause change.

According to Patterson and Shannon (1993) teacher research, although a type of naturalistic research, is unique. Teacher

researchers attempt to understand the particular individuals, actions, policies, and/or events, in the process of their work, in order to make decisions. Teacher researchers engage in moments of reflection about student learning and their own learning. The research tends to be somewhat unpredictable and is sometimes not accepted within the research community because it is felt that the research lacks rigor. This research is often considered action research.

Action research could be collaborative in nature. Glatthorn (1987) identifies five different ways of conducting collaborative research:

1. Professional dialogue where the focus is on reflection about practice and in which teaching is viewed as thinking.

2. Curriculum development where the emphasis is on the production of materials and there is collaborative curriculum development using naturalistic processes.

3. Peer supervision that involves the observation of

instruction and the analysis of teaching followed by feedback.

4. Peer coaching that includes skill mastery based on models of teaching, supported by staff development.

5. Action research which focuses on solving problems and the development and implementation of feasible solutions to teacher identified problems.

This study was carried out using action research during the initial Manitoba implementation of Reading Recovery, an early intervention reading program. Implementation occurred during the 1994-95 school year.

Limitations of the Study

The following factors may have influenced the findings in this study:

1. Although efforts were made by the Reading Recovery teachers

and the teacher leader to gather all questionnaires, not all questionnaires were returned. There were twelve Reading Recovery teachers in training and twelve school principals involved in the study. The exact number of classroom teachers and parents who were sent out questionnaires by the Reading Recovery teachers is not known. However, there would have been approximately 25 classroom teacher questionnaires given out and 64 parent questionnaires handed out. The data analyzed were based on returned questionnaires: 75 percent of the initial assessment questionnaires were returned by the Reading Recovery teachers, but all final questionnaires and journals were submitted; approximately 68 percent of the classroom teacher questionnaires were returned; all administrator questionnaires were returned; and approximately 25 percent of the parent questionnaires were returned. The participant observer's field notes were also used.

2. The data were collected during the first year of implementation of Reading Recovery at one site by a newly-trained Reading Recovery teacher leader instructing her first class of Reading Recovery teachers. To make generalizations about the

implementation of Reading Recovery, or judgments about the value of the program based on this data would be presumptuous.

3. The research aspect of this implementation was known by all involved in the study. This may have constrained the sharing of responses included in the questionnaires and/or journals. The Hawthorne effect, an increase in effort because of the motivating effect of receiving special attention, may have occurred. Even though participants were insured anonymity, the teacher leader generally knew who the respondents were in the case of the Reading Recovery teachers.

4. As a teacher leader and participant observer, I acknowledge an understanding and belief in the philosophy of the Reading Recovery program. This ownership may have had an influence on responding to data which was more favorable.

Definition of Terms

The following section defines terms used in this study:

Action research. Research designed for direct application to behavior or to a situation. It is designed primarily to produce practical application rather than theoretical knowledge (Harris & Hodges).

Critical reflection. The process or result of serious thinking over valued experiences (Harris & Hodges).

Emergent literacy. The development of the association of print with meaning that begins early in a child's life and continues until the child has reached a stage of conventional literacy (Sulzby & Teal, 1991).

Reading readiness. This term, referring to a child's readiness to profit from reading instruction, became widely accepted between 1925-1935 as an important concept related to basal reading programs. This term has now been

replaced by the concept of emergent literacy (Harris & Hodges, 1995).

Zone of proximal development. The distance between a child's actual developmental level as determined through independent problem solving and the child's potential level when he or she is guided by a more capable other (Vygotsky, 1978; Sumner,1991).

Scaffolded instruction. Instruction supported by an adult through direct instruction, modeling, questioning, and feedback. The support is gradually withdrawn as a student becomes more independent. This concept is based on Vygotsky's (1978) concept of the zone of proximal development (Harris & Hodges, 1995).

Metacognition. One's self-awareness and self-knowledge of one's own cognitive processes such that one can self-mediate to achieve a goal (Harris & Hodges, 1995).

Metalinguistic awareness. The conscious awareness of a language user of language as an object in itself (Harris & Hodges, 1995).

Basic concepts about print. Refers to the understanding of the concepts related to the form and function of print. This includes an understanding of the concepts of letter, word, sound, drawing, writing and reading, hierarchical concepts, and directional concepts (Clay, 1991; Harris & Hodges, 1995).

Phonemic awareness. The awareness of the sounds (phonemes) that make up spoken words important in learning to read and write (Harris & Hodges, 1995).

Miscue analysis. Coding and analysis of the deviations from the original text made during oral reading for the purpose of determining the strengths and weaknesses of the reader (Goodman, 1965).

Running record. A type of miscue analysis that can be taken without preparing text ahead of time (Clay, 1993b).

At-risk. An individual or group whose prospects for success are marginal or worse (Harris & Hodges, 1995).

Pull-out programs. A remedial program in which children are removed from regular classroom instruction (Harris & Hodges, 1995).

What Is Reading Recovery?

Reading Recovery is a program which provides a second chance for children in grade one who have not responded to their first year of literacy instruction in school. It is meant for the 10 -20 percent of the population that needs more intensive instructional intervention in reading. It is not meant as a program for teaching beginning reading to the majority of the grade one population (Clay, 1993a). The goal of Reading Recovery is to help children discover effective reading strategies that will help them develop a self-extending system of reading. These strategies are

developed while the child reads and writes stories. Success is measured in terms of outcomes for the child. These outcomes are specified by the child achieving the same level of reading and writing progress as a child considered to be in the average band in his/her classroom. Reading Recovery provides short term (12-20 weeks) individual and intensive help that results in accelerated progress for at-risk children. In order for this to occur the child must have many opportunities for meaningful practice in reading (decoding) and writing (encoding). A fundamental component of the program is to help students build independent strategies to help solve the reading and writing problems they may encounter. The goal is to move as many children out of the "remedial track" as soon as possible. The program depends on the teacher's ability to observe a child's reading and writing behaviour, to infer the child's intentions and underlying cognitive processes, and to make instructional decisions based on process rather than a set curriculum (Clay, 1993a; Pinnell, 1989a, b).

Background of Reading Recovery

Dr. Marie Clay began the Reading Recovery Research Project in New Zealand "to explore the extent to which it was possible to undercut reading failure in an education system by a programme of early intervention" (Clay, 1993a, p. 60). The problem was defined by New Zealand teachers who were looking for ways to assist children making slow progress in learning to read and write.

The first project in 1976-77, The Development Project (Clay, 1993a), involved detailed observation and keeping records of teachers working one-on-one with children having difficulty in learning to read. Teachers discussed children's difficulties and the most efficient and economical teaching practices.

Field trial research began in 1978 (Clay, 1993a). The purpose of the field trials was to demonstrate that the procedures developed in phase one allowed children to make progress in a variety of settings, with experienced teachers without specialist training. It was during this study that the procedures and guidelines, both for teaching and teacher training, were improved. Three important points are worth noting. As the goal of the field trials program was to return children to average reading groups

within their classrooms, accelerated progress was necessary. To achieve accelerated learning, students required many opportunities to read and write and be involved in meaningful reading and writing tasks while developing a complex, flexible system of strategies to facilitate independent reading.

A second important aspect of the field trials project was teacher training. Teachers were trained throughout the year, initially being encouraged to use their own experience. Reading Recovery procedures were gradually introduced and demonstrated. Teachers met every two weeks, observed their peers teaching a student through a one-way screen and discussed his/her procedures and teaching decisions. Clay noted that teacher discussion shifted from a focus on skill development to a focus on the child's independent use of text-solving strategies.

A third important result was that high numbers of students made progress which enabled them to read at levels equal to their peers. The One Year Follow-up study showed that these children continued to succeed.

Further studies refined the Reading Recovery program until it became the national program it is known as today in New Zealand

(Clay, 1993a). In 1984 a pilot project for Reading Recovery began in Ohio, with the assistance of Dr. Clay and Barbara Watson, National Director of Reading Recovery in New Zealand. Implementation of the Reading Recovery program has since spread throughout the United States. Other implementations have occurred in Australia, Great Britain, and Canada.

Theoretical Assumptions of Reading Recovery

> Whatever their origins, reading and writing difficulties have a large learned component. They limit achievement in school learning. They get worse if left untreated and many pupils get further behind their classmates over time even when they receive available treatments. Surprisingly, although what is difficult about reading differs markedly from child to child the programmes they have been placed in have often been prescriptive and general. (Clay, 1993a, p. 7)

Reading Recovery is based on two crucial assumptions. First, that a program for a child having literacy learning difficulties needs to be based on systematic and detailed observation of the child as a reader and writer, in particular the child's strengths in these areas. The second assumption is that children learn to read and write by reading and writing as opposed to isolated skill instruction.

Clay's theoretical orientation to reading acquisition is outlined in Becoming Literate: The Construction of Inner Control (Clay, 1991). The assumptions within her theory include that reading involves an integrated use of cueing systems (meaning cues, language cues, and visual or grapho-phonemic cues) which develop in an interrelated way enabling the emergent reader to become a fluent reader.

In terms of Reading Recovery, there are several principles which contribute to accelerated progress for children not succeeding. They include:

- one-to-one teaching;
- working from the child's strengths;
- learning to read and write by reading and writing - the focus is on strategies not skill development;
- a balance of two kinds of learning, first on familiar text and second on independent problem-solving using new text;
- teacher decision-making based on the most powerful and productive examples;
- supportive teaching only when necessary;
- daily, 30 minute lessons; and

- aiming for independence.

Selection of Children for the Program

Reading Recovery targets the lowest-achieving six year old children in reading who are in the first grade. Identifying these children involves a team effort of observation by the previous year's kindergarten teachers, the grade one teachers, and the Reading Recovery teachers. These identified students, generally the lowest 20 percent of the first grade class, are assessed using An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement (Clay, 1993b). The Observation Survey consists of six tasks: (1) letter identification, (2) word recognition, (3) concepts about print, (4) writing vocabulary test, (5) hearing and recording sounds in words, and (6) taking a running record, a type of miscue analysis, of text reading. On the basis of the test scores and teacher consultation, the lowest-achieving students are chosen for entry into the program.

The assumptions are that classroom programming will continue, that the Reading Recovery lessons will be individual, and that teachers be trained (or in training) to be Reading Recovery teachers. This implies an understanding of the reading process and

the Reading Recovery program.

Reading Recovery teachers are required to write an Observation Summary for each child before beginning the child's program. The Observation Summary summarizes the assessment results and emphasizes the child's strengths in reading and writing at various levels of text (the text level, the word level, and the letter level). This information is used as a starting point for instruction. The Reading Recovery teachers are also required to write predictions of progress for each student in which they specify goals by determining what the child knows and what the child specifically needs to know in terms of strategies. Predictions of progress help the teacher keep sight of long range goals and help the teacher to check the child's progress in accordance with those goals.

Reading Recovery Lessons

Roaming Around the Known

The first ten lessons of Reading Recovery are spent 'roaming around the known'. During this time the Reading Recovery teacher allows the student opportunities to become fluent and flexible

within areas the child knows, some of which may have been identified in the Observation Survey assessment. The child and teacher have opportunities to read, write, and become acquainted. Within this context, the teacher confirms his/her initial observations and obtains further insight into what the child can do.

Following the 'roaming around the known' lessons, the teachers begin intensive instruction building on what they have discovered about the child. A lesson framework is followed to establish a routine which provides opportunities for the child to be engaged in reading and writing for thirty minutes each day. However, it is up to the teacher to work within the time frame and modify lessons to provide the child with the most powerful learning opportunities. Throughout the Reading Recovery program, the focus is on whole text activities. The following framework is used:

Familiar rereading. The lesson starts with the child rereading two or more familiar books. This allows the child to practise fluent, expressive reading and use strategies developed on familiar text.

Running record. The teacher then takes a running record using a book introduced to the child in the previous lesson. The child is expected to read the book as independently as possible. The running record is the most powerful assessment tool in Reading Recovery because it is analyzed carefully and used to make inferences about the child's growth in the use of strategies. This analysis provides the basis for guiding instruction.

Letter identification and/or making and breaking. Two or three minutes of the lesson are used to develop letter identification knowledge and/or learning how words work, similar to word analysis. This is the only part of the lesson which focuses on skill development in isolation, but it is planned with the knowledge of what the child can do and will have to know for reading and writing text.

Composing and writing a message. The child composes and writes a message with support from the teacher as needed. The child is actively constructing print by paying attention to and learning about the details of written language. The student learns

how to hear and record sounds in words in order to write unknown words and through this process, successfully develops a writing vocabulary of high frequency words. To monitor his/her work, the child rereads the message both as and after it is written.

Cut-up sentence. The teacher then writes the sentence on a strip of paper and cuts apart the words or phrases for the child to reassemble. This requires the child to predict letters in words, to search using visual information, and to check by rereading.

Introducing and reading a new book. Each day the teacher selects a new book that will provide the child with new learning challenges, but that can still be read at about 90 percent accuracy. This book is used for the running record the next day. Book choice is crucial. If the book is too hard, the child's reading will break down and strategies will not be used effectively. If this occurs, the teacher takes responsibility and chooses a new book for the child. On the other hand, if a book is too easy, it may not provide the child with enough opportunities to extend learning.

The purpose of these lessons is not to correct all errors to produce perfect reading. What the teacher aims to do, using the child's reading performance, is select the most powerful examples to show the child what reading is all about. These examples are often connected to something the child already knows. The lesson framework is individualized on the basis of a daily analysis of student progress. The intent of the lesson is to help children develop the effective strategies that good readers use. Specifically, the Reading Recovery teacher is encouraging and reinforcing the child's development of a self-extending system:

> The endpoint of such instruction is reached when children have a self-extending system - a set of operations just adequate for reading a slightly more difficult text for the precise words and meanings of the author. When we operate or work on a problem we are engaged in a conscious search for solutions. In reading we sometimes consciously search for a word or a meaning or a correction but most of the time our active search is a fast reaction of the brain that seems to be automatic and not conscious. Perhaps strategies is a better name for these fast reactions used while reading. (Clay, 1993a, p. 39)

An independent student is one who is able to: monitor his or her reading and writing for meaning, reread to confirm meaning, search for cues, self-correct miscues and solve new words using these

reading strategies with increasing speed and fluency on texts with longer stretches of meaning, less familiar language and less predictable text (Clay, 1993a).

Clay devotes 16 sections of her guidebook, Reading Recovery: A Guidebook for Teachers in Training (Clay, 1993a) to teaching procedures in the following areas: learning about direction, locating responses, understanding spatial layout, learning to look at print, writing stories, hearing and recording sounds in words, assembling cut-up stories, reading books, teaching for strategies, linking sound sequence with letter sequence, taking words apart in reading, teaching for phrasing in fluent reading, teaching for a sequencing problem, strong skills which block learning, remembering when it is hard, and accelerating children who are hard to accelerate. It is stressed throughout the guidebook that the teaching focus is on using a child's strengths and that the procedures are only used when necessary for an individual child. All procedures are also interrelated throughout the lesson. A "cook book" description of Reading Recovery cannot be given. Therefore, the extensive and intensive training of Reading Recovery teachers plays an important role in the ultimate success of the program.

Materials

There is no program package, per se, required for Reading Recovery. Reading Recovery teachers require a copy of Clay's books; Becoming Literate (1992), An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement (1993b), and Reading Recovery: A Guidebook for Teachers in Training (1993a). For materials, Reading Recovery teachers choose from among a variety of short literature selections classified into 20 difficulty levels, ranging from the equivalent of pre-emergent to levels considered appropriate for the end of grade one. The Ohio State University has a comprehensive list of levelled books, which is continually updated. However, Reading Recovery teachers are encouraged to use any books they consider suitable for a particular child; Reading Recovery teachers have complete freedom in selecting titles. No publisher has a monopoly in regard to the books used in Reading Recovery.

Peterson (1991) describes Reading Recovery book levelling. The books are generally between 50-400 words with supportive elements which, as reflected below, change in degrees throughout levels. Peterson describes sources of predictability in groups of

levels. This helps in developing guidelines for estimating difficulty, as described in the following summary.

Levels 1-4. Books at these levels are appropriate for emergent readers, that is, children moving out of "pretend" reading who are making genuine efforts to understand the nature and meaning of print (Harris & Hodges, 1995; Depree & Iverson, 1994). Text characteristics are:

- consistent placement of print;
- repetition of 1-2 sentence patterns and/or 1-2 word changes;
- structure that resembles oral language;
- topics that deal with familiar objects and actions; and
- illustrations which provide high support for the text.

Levels 5-8. Books at this plateau are appropriate for children moving out of emergent reading into the early reading stage. At the early reading stage, children are reading at a level at which they can apply their knowledge about language and print, as well as their own experiences to read text (Depree & Iverson,

1994). Text characteristics include:

- repetition of 2-3 sentence patterns, phrases may change;
- either opening and closing sentences that vary from the repetitive pattern or, varied simple sentence patterns;
- structures that represent predominantly oral language;
- topics that focus on familiar objects and actions; and
- illustrations that provide moderate to high support for the storyline.

Levels 9-12. Books at this level are appropriate for readers at the early reading stage, as described above. Characteristics of the text include:

- repetition of 3 or more sentence patterns or the use of varied sentence patterns with repeated phrases or refrains;
- language structures that blend oral and written discourse;
- stories that describe fantastic happenings in a framework of familiar experiences; and
- illustrations which provide moderate textual support.

Levels 13-15. Books at this stage are for readers moving out of the early reading phase and on their way to becoming fluent readers. A fluent reader is one who reads smoothly, fluently, and with comprehension. All cue sources (visual, structural, and meaning-based) which are available to facilitate reading are used. (Harris & Hodges, 1995; Depree & Iverson, 1994). Text characteristics include:

- varied sentence patterns which may have repeated phrases or refrains or repeated patterns in cumulative form;
- language structures which resemble more formal written expression;
- oral structures which appear in the form of dialogue;
- story structures which are organized according to conventional story grammar (setting, problem or goal, actions leading to resolving the problem or attaining the goal) and use of literary language;
- specialized vocabulary relevant to informative topics; and
- illustrations that provide low to moderate support for the text.

Levels 16-20. Books at this uppermost level are suitable for fluent readers. Characteristics include:

- elaborated episodes and events;
- extended descriptions;
- links to familiar stories;
- literary language as opposed to talk written down;
- unusual and challenging vocabulary; and
- illustrations which provide low textual support.

Peterson found that text difficulty increases on a continuum across levels as evidenced by such elements as vocabulary differences and a shift from the use of oral language written down to more literary language.

Recordkeeping

Maintaining records in Reading Recovery includes keeping lesson by lesson records to document: (1) observations regarding the child's strengths, (2) the child's responses, (3) teacher decisions and prompts, (4) performance on the daily running record, (5) progress by book level through the use of a graph, and (6) a record of the child's writing vocabulary. See appendix A for a

sample.

End of the Program

There are two options in ending a Reading Recovery program for a student; s/he may either be discontinued or referred.

A child is considered discontinued when it is felt that s/he can function independently within the average reading group in the classroom. Clay is cautious not to impose strict criteria:

> There can be no hard and fast criteria because the aim will be to replace a child in a class group in which he can continue to make progress, and this will differ from child to child and from school to school... .There is no fixed set of strategies nor any required levels of text nor any test score that must be attained to warrant discontinuing. It is essential that the child has a system of strategies which work in such a way that the child learns from his own attempts to read. (Clay, 1993a, p. 59)

In making the decision to discontinue, Clay suggests consultation with the classroom teacher and readministering the Observation Survey. She also suggests some questions to consider regarding the student's setting, survival in the classroom, Reading Recovery analysis, Observation Survey scores as well as the application of strategies to support a self-extending system. Ongoing support, if required, is also provided for the student and

the respective classroom teacher to ensure success.

Clay suggests monitoring the progress of discontinued students carefully over the next three years and the provision of further individual help if progress slows down:

> Although Reading Recovery children perform well in their classes some of them remain at-risk children, easily thrown by life circumstances or poor learning experiences. A refresher course of individual instruction for quite a short period should be most helpful for a 'recovered' child who has just begun to slip behind his classmates. (Clay, 1993a, p. 59)

If the child is not discontinued and considered not to be making the accelerated progress needed after intensive work and an appropriate length of time in the program, the student may need to be referred for a more specialized assessment and the planning of long term support.

Reading Recovery Staff Development

The design of Reading Recovery in regard to staff development is consistent with Vygotsky's theory of constructing meaning through supportive social interactions at every level of teaching and learning. Learning is supported while the learner

becomes increasingly independent. Vygotsky (1978) proposed that higher mental functions appear first on the social level between people (intercognitive) and later on the individual level (intracognitive). This growth occurs in the zone of proximal development. Within Reading Recovery, the teacher leader and the Reading Recovery teachers collaborate in shared tasks. Based on observing lessons and analyzing children's records, instruction shifts from interindividual to intraindividual functioning (Tharp & Gallimore, 1988). Just as Reading Recovery children engage in social interaction with the teacher to construct new levels of cognitive growth, Reading Recovery teachers engage in social interaction with their colleagues and teacher leaders, to construct a view of learning and instruction that supports literacy learning. Together, by expressing different perspectives, agreeing, disagreeing, and resolving issues, the group elicits thinking that surpasses individual efforts.

Peer Coaching

The strength of the teacher professional development component of Reading Recovery has been a major focus in the literature in recent years (Anderson & Armbruster, 1990; Pinnell,

1987, 1989a, b; Pinnell, DeFord, & Lyons, 1988; Clay & Watson, 1982; Pinnell, Lyons, DeFord, & Seltzer, 1994). Peer coaching is the collaborative model of staff development used in training Reading Recovery teachers. Teachers in training attend sessions where observation is a focal part of the process. They observe each other teaching a Reading Recovery lesson behind a one-way glass. The rest of the class observes the child's behaviours and the teacher's decision-making. The teacher leader, who has undergone similar training, leads the discussion at the teaching session. Ideally, teachers in Reading Recovery are volunteers who have a strong literacy background, although that is not always the case nor is this required.

Assessment

Reading Recovery teachers attend assessment sessions in order to familiarize themselves with the Observation Survey, the student selection process and writing observation summaries and predictions of progress (Clay, 1993b). During the initial training sessions Reading Recovery teachers discuss the results of the Observation Surveys they have administered in order to problem-solve and gain alternative insights.

Teaching Sessions

The in-service sessions, which in the original design occurred fort-nightly throughout the school year with approximately eighteen sessions, involve each teacher intraining teaching two lessons observed behind a one-way glass. Observing these lessons provides opportunities for the Reading Recovery teachers to critique the demonstrating teacher's decisions and at the same time allows all Reading Recovery teachers to evaluate and reflect upon their own work with students. The discussion during and after the lessons focuses on the theory underlying the reading and writing process and make teachers aware of the reasons that lie beneath their instructional decisions and whether their decisions are powerful ones for the child. "Why?" becomes the basis of this reflective process. The focus is on the student's needs and making the most powerful decisions to meet those needs using student's strengths as much as possible. Teaching procedures and concepts are introduced and dealt with as needs arise. Reading Recovery: A Guidebook for Teacher in Training (Clay, 1993a) is a reference and serves as a basis for discussion and clarification of concepts, although articles from relevant

journals may also be reviewed and discussed in relation to the lessons.

Teacher Leader Visits

Reading Recovery teacher leaders coach Reading Recovery teachers in on-site visits, several times per year. These visits may include observations of lessons, discussions and/or demonstrations of techniques, discussion of issues or the teacher's work with a student. The teacher leader is also consulted regarding the decision to discontinue students.

Continuing Contact

After their initial training year, Reading Recovery teachers continue to obtain professional support in what are called continuing contact sessions. Observation of lessons and discussions continue at this level, as do teacher-leader site visits, although they are less frequent. Regular colleague visits are encouraged between Reading Recovery teachers. Results from different sites have shown that this continued support is needed to maintain the quality and the high student discontinuing rate which characterizes the program. The continuing contact sessions: (1) provide a support system for Reading Recovery teachers and (2)

facilitate the process of ongoing learning and critical reflection regarding instructional practices (Lyons, 1991; Pinnell, 1989b, Clay, 1994).

Reading Recovery Systemic Implementation

Reading Recovery was conceived as a school system-wide intervention. Program involvement requires commitment, training, continuing inservice and data collection. Central to the implementation is the teacher leader, who is responsible for facilitating the inservice course to train Reading Recovery teachers, collecting data, monitoring children's progress, establishing administrative procedures to make implementation possible, providing continuing contact for previously trained Reading Recovery teachers, and communicating with parents, administrators, and other district personnel (Pinnell, 1990). The teacher leader's role may also include working with administrators and providing inservice for early years teachers. The teacher leader also continues to work with children on a daily basis (Pinnell, 1988).

Teacher leader training involves a full time, one year

training program conducted by Reading Recovery trainers. In Canada, there are presently two sites to train teacher leaders: The Canadian Institute of Reading Recovery located in Scarborough, Ontario and The Western Canadian Institute of Reading Recovery established in 1996 in Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Clay (1987) believes that an innovation cannot move into an educational system only on the merits of what it can do for children. Implementers must take into consideration the educational system into which the program is being integrated. If this is not done, the implementation is more likely to fail (Sarason, 1990). Pinnell (1990) warns that teacher leaders need "to remind themselves that they are not trying something easy. After all, the program seeks to do what the prevailing belief system views as farfetched: to enable the lowest achievers to make accelerated and continuous progress" (Pinnell, 1990, p. 17-18).

Caveats

Clay (1987) suggests that the Reading Recovery program was planned and managed in a way to facilitate successful implementation in different educational jurisdictions. The four

areas of focus were: (1) change in teachers in terms of teaching conceptions, methods and strategies, (2) change in students as a result of more reflective teaching, (3) change in the school organization requiring the support of both teachers and administrators, and (4) changes in political funding by governing authorities. These organizational changes which are mandatory if the program is to survive, can only take place if the program is: (1) cohesive in terms of theory, training, design and evaluation (2) seen as beneficial to the system, and (3) cost-effective.

Reading Recovery is an intervention that always seeks to solve problems (Pinnell, 1992). While in implementing Reading Recovery, it appears that the primary focus is on training the Reading Recovery teachers, the support of others in the school is needed to fulfill program goals. Pinnell (1989a, b) cautions that implementation should involve classroom teachers and solicit parental input. She suggests long-term, high quality support and inservicing to help classroom teachers become cognizant of the program and more reflective in their teaching practices. Reading Recovery teachers and classroom teachers must also be aware of theories and research regarding literacy acquisition in order to

improve both their teaching and student learning:

> Effective collaborations operate in the world of ideas, examining existing practices critically, seeking better alternatives and working hard together at bringing about improvements and assessing their worth. (Fullan and Hargreaves, 1991, p. 55)

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This review integrates information on literacy acquisition, Vygotsky's theory of cognitive development, instructing at-risk students, and the Reading Recovery early reading intervention program. A review of research on the efficacy of Reading Recovery as an early intervention program is also included.

Early Literacy

Research in the past 20 years (Sulzby & Barnhart, 1992; Clay, 1991; Sulzby & Teale, 1991; Glazer, 1989; Rhodes & Dudley-Marling, 1988; Ehri, 1987,1989; Taylor & Strickland, 1986; Graves, 1985; DeFord, 1984; Gavelek, 1984; Mason, Stewart & Dunning, 1984) has focused on new ways of conceptualizing the reading and writing development of children. In preference to the notion of reading readiness, the term emergent literacy evolved in the early 1980s, derived, in part, from Marie Clay's research (1993a). Emergent literacy encompasses constructs such as metalinguistic awareness, phonemic awareness, early literacy

development and concepts about print. Thus, the use of the term emergent literacy helps to expand upon and unify the research on early literacy.

Emergent literacy may be defined as "the reading and writing behaviours that precede and develop into conventional literacy" (Sulzby & Teal, 1991, p. 728). Emergent literacy is concerned with the process of becoming literate between birth and the time children are able to read and write conventionally. Early reading and writing concepts, behaviours and attitudes are seen as children's constructions that are influenced within a social environment that provides a range of natural literacy learning activities (Sulzby & Teale, 1991; Harste, Woodward & Burke, 1984). Exposure to, and interactions with books within a social context is viewed as essential to literacy development. Repeated exposure to children's books helps develop the concept of what makes a story and how to create one. Metalinguistic awareness, the ability to think about and consciously manipulate language, is also important to beginning literacy, particularly for preventing reading difficulties (Gillett & Temple, 1990). Since children become literate within a social context, the culture of the society

in which the child lives affects literacy development. Children may take different paths in developing conventional literacy (Sulzby & Barnhart, 1992). For example, some children may learn primarily from their experiences with written language, while other children may learn primarily from their exposure to storybook reading. Some children will be motivated to become literate as they see a variety of purposes for literacy. Other children may have a limited view of the purposes of being literate, and may not be as motivated to reach a conventional stage of literacy. Thus, paths may be longer, shorter, easier, or more difficult for each individual. It then becomes the teacher's challenge to help the child reach an accepted level of conventional literacy and extend this learning.

Theoretical constructs in the area of emergent literacy emphasize interpreting data from a child's perspective and revolve around social constructivist theories (McCarthey & Raphael, 1992). Investigators are concerned with issues such as the nature of the child's contributions, the role of the social environment in the process of becoming literate, and the interaction or transaction between the two. Harste, Woodward, and Burke (1984) and Wood

(1988) believe that theory and methodology provide a structure for research and instruction. Therefore, what teachers believe about language and language learning will either impose constraints or broaden teaching and learning parameters. Research into how children develop as readers and writers and effective instructional approaches allow us to reflect upon and make adjustments in the way we interact with children as they become literate.

Vygotsky's Influence

Many of the recent theoretical considerations in emergent literacy have been guided by Vygotsky's sociohistorical theory (1978, 1986). Vygotsky suggested that the child's development proceeds on the basis of experiences in the social world. Since learning goals are developed according to what is important to the culture, an understanding of the natural history of a culture is important to understanding cognitive development. Vygotsky's theoretical perspective places increased importance on the teacher as mediator. Since children learn from activity and from more knowledgeable people, the teacher's role in fostering cognitive development and independence is important. The primary vehicle in

developing these abilities is language. Mastery of reading and writing represents a major turning point in the child's cultural development in that these abilities provide the child with new ways of learning, experiencing, thinking, and communicating.

As described by Sumner (1991), it is useful to think of Vygotsky's concept of the student's zone of proximal development:

> This refers to the zone or distance between what a learner can do in isolation and what he can do in the presence of others. For instruction (or assessment) to be effective, it must be aimed at the student's proximal level. If aimed beneath what a child can do, it is a waste of time. If aimed above the proximal level, it is also inappropriate and can be damaging to the child. Instruction and assessment are best at the level in which a student stretches just beyond his or her current level of competence, into his or her next level of learning (p. 142).

The implication for the early stages of literacy instruction is that teachers must model, scaffold, and verbally direct students to meet the specified goals within their zones of proximal development. Also, students will eventually formulate their own learning goals. To teach within the zone of proximal development also implies that assessment become an integral part of teaching. This assessment provides the observant teacher with insight into

the child's functioning (Gavelek, 1984) and informs subsequent instruction. Current trends towards the use of holistic, collaborative learning, and teaching approaches that emphasize metacognition, which have been influenced by Vygotsky's sociohistorical views on learning, seem to be appropriate both in providing more context to scaffold learning, and in encouraging and allowing for interaction between students and between students and teachers.

At-Risk Students

An issue of concern is how educators can help children considered at-risk. At-risk students are those whose prospects for success are marginal (Harris & Hodges, 1995). The trend toward earlier intervention has become evident (Clay, 1992a) along with an increasing acceptance of the emergent literacy view (Johnston & Allington, 1991). Today, at-risk students are broadly categorized as students experiencing difficulty with literacy learning and those more likely to drop out (Gentile & McMillan, 1990). Rhodes and Dudley-Marling (1988) make an important point regarding the never ending attempts to label children experiencing

difficulties:

> There are children who are failing in school, children in need of our help. Our most important task is to identify effective teaching strategies for these students and not to engage in endless polemics over what to call them (p. 6).

Too often, educators use children's "deprived" social and economic pre-school experiences as excuses for not teaching them how to read and write. Levin (1991) states that one third of American elementary and secondary students are considered at-risk. However, even families that are considered "deprived" participate fully in the language of their culture, although it may be very different from that of children in the mainstream. That is, their purposes for literate behaviours may differ from what the school expectations may be. The value of literacy experiences at home may not be understood and the responsibility of conventional literacy learning may be the school's. Regardless, these children have the right to literacy and we must use what we know about literacy development to accelerate, not only remediate, literacy learning (McGill-Franzen & Allington, 1991). Slavin, Karweit, and Wasik (1993) and Slavin, Madden, Karweit, Dolan, and Wasik (1991) researched intensive early intervention programs, including

Reading Recovery. These investigators concluded that reading failure is preventable for nearly all children, regardless of home background and learning disability classifications. However, the intervention must be systematic and adapted to the child's needs.

Slavin and his colleagues (Slavin, Madden, Dolan, Wasik, Ross, & Smith, 1994) report promising results for Success for All, an intervention program for schools with low achieving students. The guiding principle behind the Success for All program is that no child is permitted to fall behind in basic skills, with an emphasis in the early years to ensure that every child is successful. Some important assumptions that the Success for All program makes are:

- The best place to work on ensuring success for all is within the classroom instructional program.
- The programming focus is not on a single variable, but rather on the implementation of strategies that address all major components of classroom learning successfully.
- The emphasis is on immediate response to students' needs for corrective instruction.
- Flexibility in the use of school resources is key, including

time and personnel.

The Success for All program provides research-based instruction in literacy areas from preschool through to grade six. Classroom programs emphasize cooperative learning strategies. The literacy programs attempt to strike a balance between phonics instruction, use of children's literature, writing, and home reading. In order to support the classroom program, teachers are provided with opportunities for intensive professional development and a full-time building facilitator whose role is to help them continually improve their instructional practices. Curriculum-based assessment allows teachers to monitor student progress and identify individuals who need extra help. A family support team in each school works to get parents involved in their children's learning and teaches parents to help their children at home. The family support team also works to: improve attendance; resolve behavior issues, and; see that the children's basic health and medical needs are met. For struggling grade one readers, a one-to-one tutoring program is provided. The instruction is provided by certified teachers and closely matches the classroom program. Metacognitive skills are emphasized during this tutoring.

Evaluation of the Success for All school implementation program showed that students scored progressively higher than those in matched control groups as they moved through the primary grades. By fifth grade, students were more than a year ahead. Like proponents of the Reading Recovery program, although on a grander scale, Slavin maintains that early intervention is more effective and cheaper than remediation in later years. Both programs also provide a more immediate response to a student's needs for corrective instruction.

Despite such programs as Success for All, the instruction of children experiencing difficulties is likely to be carried out through highly structured, top-down programs that isolate the teaching of skills. "Such instruction contributes to impoverished notions of literacy and exacerbates problems of metacognition" (Palincsar & Klenk, 1992, p. 211). Focusing on isolated skills at the expense of reading and writing will not provide students with the foundations or motivation to become literate (Franklin, 1992). Rhodes and Dudley-Marling (1988) believe that children at-risk have both intrinsic and extrinsic factors affecting their learning. These factors are individual to every student and interact and

change continually. As children become literate within a social context, a more holistic view of literacy learning is important for "at risk" learners. What is also required is early and systematic intervention for these students in an attempt to never having them become remedial readers.

Theoretical Considerations of the Reading and Writing Relationship

There has been an increase in the research examining the reading and writing relationship. One of the first examinations, and most notable, was research conducted by Loban in 1964. Based on the data collected from an extensive longitudinal study of the reading and writing abilities of 220 students as they progressed across 12 grade levels, one of Loban's conclusions was that there was a significant relationship between reading and writing proficiency. Students were assessed using the Stanford Achievement Test and one writing sample which was holistically scored. Every student who scored well on the writing portion of the assessment was also found to be a good reader. However, every student who scored poorly on the writing also scored poorly on the

reading assessment. The large sample size used in this study, along with the use of students across grade levels, early emphasis on the reading and writing relationship, and its effect on thinking in the field has made this study notable.

Shanahan (1984) sought to clarify the nature of the relationship between reading and writing by comparing the performance of beginning and advanced readers at the second and fifth grade levels using 256 second and 251 fifth graders as subjects. Four reading tests were administered, three standardized and one cloze. Writing samples were analyzed according to length, vocabulary diversity, and organizational structure. An exploratory analysis of these variables was made using canonical correlational analysis. Separate analysis were done for each grade level sample and an additional two samples of beginning and proficient readers. These additional samples were derived from the original sample.

It was found that the correlation between reading and writing measures accounted for 43 percent of the variance. The word recognition factors taken from the reading measures were most related to the spelling variables of the writing measures at

both grade levels and at the beginning reader level. For proficient readers, their ability to write in a complex way and use a variety of vocabulary in writing was related to a prose comprehension factor.

This study was extended when Shanahan and Lomax (1986) used the data from Shanahan's (1984) initial research to compare and evaluate three alternative theoretical models of the reading -writing relationship. Each model utilized the same components for reading and writing, but differed in the sequential orderings of the reading and writing relationship. The reading components were vocabulary, and sentence and passage comprehension. The writing components were spelling, vocabulary sentence structure, and story organization components. The three models were: (1) the interactive model which allows for the use of reading knowledge in writing and vice-versa, (2) the reading-to-writing model which only allows reading knowledge to assist in writing, and (3) the writing-to-reading model which only allows writing to influence reading. It was found that the interactive model fit the data better than did the reading-to-writing model at the second grade level and the writing-to-reading model at both grade levels. The

interactional model, the model which allows reading and writing to mutually interact with each other, was considered superior. These findings suggest that an interactional approach to instruction to facilitate literacy development is important.

Other research also supports the value of using an interactional approach to reading instruction. Durkin (1966) found that children who learned to read prior to formal schooling began reading through an interest in writing. Along with Loban (1964) and Durkin (1966), Carol Chomsky's interest in the reading-writing relationship contributed further insight:

> Children ought to learn how to read by creating their own spellings for familiar words as a beginning... . Children have enormous phonetic acuity and ability to analyze words into component sounds... .Allowed to trust their own ears and their own judgments, many children show amazing facility as they begin to spell. Of course the adult working with them must pay attention to the way the children pronounce, and expect their spellings to reflect their own pronunciation and linguistic judgments, not the adults. The product will bear little resemblance to conventional speliing, but no matter. Plenty of time for that later... .This composng of words according to their sounds (using letter sets, or writing by hand if the child can form letters) is the first step toward reading. Once the child has composed a word, he looks at it and tries to recognize it. The recognition is slow, for reading the word seems much harder than writing it. Often the child works it out sound by sound, the reverse of the process by which he

> wrote it, and then recognition dawns all at once....This whole approach introduces him to the written word by making him aware that it belongs to him and grows out of his own consciousness. He does not begin by viewing it as something alien imposed from without, something arbitrary out there which the adult world has concocted to make life difficult. (Chomsky, 1971, p. 296)

There has been much debate and research supporting the teaching of both reading and writing, particularly in the early years, because of the assumed similarities between the two processes: the reciprocal relationship between decoding and encoding. Adding a writing component to a beginning reading program provides an opportunity to focus the child's attention to the details of written language. To fully understand and appreciate the reading and writing processes, they need to be viewed, learned and used together (Graves, 1978; Tierney & Shanahan, 1991). This interactional view is becoming increasingly accepted.

The increasing acceptance of the importance the role of writing instruction in learning to read has is reassuring. As a teacher of young children, it is interesting to observe a child learning to read and write, particularly a child experiencing difficulty. Several observations and inferences can be made. Many children, through writing, seem to be more actively involved in the

literacy learning process. There may be a greater sense of accomplishment in creating a product that can be shared by reading or having it read. Experimenting with writing, from what some may consider scribbling to less than conventional spelling, allows children to refine the knowledge about written language that makes them readers. This is because in forming letters, a child is forced to attend to their distinguishing features. These initial experiences help the child build more advanced understandings about print. In combining letters into words, the child becomes increasingly aware of the letter patterns and sequences that go together, both in reading and writing. However, teachers need to use caution when planning instructional programs for children, whether in the classroom setting or on an individual basis. As previously mentioned, children take different paths to conventional literacy. For most children, an interactional approach will be best. For some children, an emphasis on reading, or for others an emphasis on writing, may be necessary to get the individual child moving along their path.

Programming Considerations

Studies by Eckhoff (1983) and DeFord (1984) explored the

possible effects of children's reading on the quality of writing and found that the context in which literacy was presented affected the children as readers and writers. The quality of children's writing was affected by what they were reading. When the materials used for instruction were basal readers, students' writing reflected the stereotyped language found in these programs. When children's reading material consisted of children's literature selections, the quality of their writing was rich and varied, reflecting what they read (DeFord, 1984). Thus a teacher's theoretical orientation regarding the type of text which should be used for reading instruction may have an effect on the quality and nature of children's writing.

Mason, Stewart, and Dunning (1984) examined kindergarten children's ability to read and spell three and four letter words and the strategies students used both for word recognition and comprehension in both traditional and holistic programs. Similar gains were made by average children in both types of programs. However, when the performance of the at-risk subjects was analyzed, greater gains were made by students in the holistic programs. The students in holistic programs were also more

involved in literacy activities during the summer months than were the other students, although it was not indicated whether these activities were self-initiated by the children.

Palincsar and Klenk (1992) reported on two research projects that challenge the typical methods used to remediate at-risk grade one children. They looked at teaching as scaffolding, learning as bootstrapping, and classrooms as communities of inquiry. Social aspects of learning were emphasized. The first program was designed to improve children's listening comprehension. The second program was designed to improve written literacy. Children in both programs were perceived to have difficulty with intentional learning at school. In contrast to incidental learning, where learning occurs naturally while interacting with the environment, intentional learning is described as "an achievement resulting from the learner's purposeful, effortful, self-regulated, and active engagement" (Palincsar & Klenk, 1992, p. 212).

In the first study, six first-grade teachers each worked with an experimental and matched control group, each consisting of six children, five of whom were considered at-risk. The experimental group was involved in reciprocal teaching, an instructional

strategy in which teachers and students work collaboratively in order to teach students how to summarize, generate questions, clarify, and make predictions as they read or are read text. The context in which these strategies are learned is social, interactive, and holistic. The control group listened to the same passages, but only responded to questions about the passage. No further discussion regarding the content was facilitated. Pre and posttest comprehension measures indicated that the experimental group improved significantly in their abilities to comprehend text, identify the gist of a passage, and to recognize and apply analogical information in texts. Both groups averaged 47 percent correct on pretest. After ten days of instruction, the experimental group averaged 49.9 percent and the control group averaged 37.7 percent correct on test items. After an additional ten days of instruction, the experimental group averaged 70.6 percent correct items and the control group 39.5 percent.

The second research program involved primary grade special education classrooms, with children identified as being learning and/or emotionally disabled. The data collected for this research was qualitative: individual interviews, with a focus on learning

more about a student's metalinguistic knowledge, attitudes towards reading and writing and towards themselves as readers and writers, knowledge about reading and writing, and actual reading and writing achievement; videotapes of lessons, and; field notes taken from lesson observations. It was observed that students in these classrooms were involved in activities which were deemed as neither meaningful nor developmentally appropriate for the students. Most of the school day was spent in isolated, skill-oriented activities. Children's views of reading and writing were also impoverished and negative. Thus, the goal for the researchers became to work with teachers to create a classroom environment that would support and sustain meaningful and appropriate experiences with literacy. Only two instructional routines were introduced into the classrooms, within an already existing framework: story time and handwriting. Story time was initially a quiet, non-interactive time where students had a book read to them with little or no discussion. Handwriting consisted of copying tasks and worksheets. Story time was modified to include selection of themes to guide literature choices and provide writing topics. Interactions regarding the stories occurred before,

during, and after readings. Children were exposed to a variety of texts and were encouraged to talk about what they were learning from the books being read to them, and from the emergent texts they were attempting to read. It was observed that the children were receptive to the sharing and reading of text. Also, more attempts were being made to read their own emergent texts. Handwriting time became writing time. Writing and invented spelling was modelled for the students. Children were also encouraged to use the current theme for writing in order to assist with topic selection. As children wrote individually, teachers further scaffolded the learning by assisting individual children with particular needs. Some resistance was initially met from the children in "spelling the way you hear it", but the children eventually became comfortable with the use of invented spelling and teachers noted a better understanding of written language and reading than they had observed in years working with the same children.

Data collection was still in progress, but the following findings were reported: (1) there was a shift from procedural to epistemic questioning (it is not indicated whether it is from

students or teachers, but as the focus of inquiry was the students, I would assume that is who the authors are implying), (2) the children became increasingly willing to take risks, (3) there was an increased interest in learning to read using their own writing, (4) the use of writing for personal expression was occurring without teacher encouragement, and (5) there was an increased interest in sharing and displaying information. More specifically, in terms of writing, there was: (1) an increase in the amount of writing the children produced, (2) a shift from random and patterned letter strings to invented and conventional spellings, (3) increased use of the conventions of writing, such as spacing between words, and (4) the beginnings of writing complete thoughts. Positive results in these study, when compared to more traditional instructional approaches in special education, reinforce the current popular ideology that there is a need to reconceptualize the role of the teacher, the curriculum, and the delivery of special education programs. The emerging evidence suggests that holistic, mediated programming emphasizing the reciprocal gains of reading and writing may be particularly important for at-risk students.

Phonemic Awareness

Understanding how words work, or phonemic awareness, is another important aspect of early reading success. Studies by Juel, Griffith, and Gough (1986), Juel (1988), and Ehri (1989) all suggest that the correlation between reading and the ability to separate words into their component parts is high and that phonemic awareness is crucial to both reading and writing development before children enter grade two. Developing phonemic awareness, an understanding that speech is composed of component sounds (Yopp, 1992) and the ability to manipulate these sounds (Griffith & Olson, 1992) in young at-risk children is crucial (Solity, 1995; Bradley & Bryant, 1983). However, instruction must not take place in an isolated and meaningless manner (Solity, 1995). Writing knowledge serves as a resource for the reader and vice-versa. This reciprocity needs to be emphasized in early literacy learning as children learn a great deal about phonemic awareness through writing (Clay, 1993a).

Summary

Overall, the above-mentioned studies support holistic, meaningful, scaffolded instruction to facilitate the literacy

development of at-risk children. Using the reciprocal gains of reading and writing to enhance literacy acquisition and develop phonemic awareness is fundamental. Reading Recovery is an instructional approach which builds on these understandings.

Reading Recovery

The following section examines the research on implementing Reading Recovery and issues in effecting change.

Research on Implementing Reading Recovery

Although Reading Recovery training is a collaborative effort, Geeke (1992) found that in Australia most of the Reading Recovery teachers felt some degree of isolation from the rest of school staff. At the beginning of the year, very few teachers in the school in which the program was operating knew anything about Reading Recovery and had many questions. However, the Reading Recovery teacher trainees were advised not to respond until they knew more about the program. This brought about an air of secrecy and increased the distance between Reading Recovery teachers and their colleagues. The issue of how the isolation, or feelings of

isolation, affect the systemic intervention of Reading Recovery has not been examined.

Other research outside of Reading Recovery has looked at the issue of teacher isolation and the effects of minimal collegial contact. Isolation may interfere with the learning of both experienced and inexperienced teachers, inhibit change and prevent program success (Flinders, 1988; Rosenholtz, 1989). In the case of Reading Recovery, school staff may not have had opportunities to reflect on their own literacy teaching and might not have supported Reading Recovery because they did not feel a part of the implementation process. Clay (1993a) and Clay and Watson (1982) believe that Reading Recovery teachers cannot work effectively in isolation, but should be part of a school team to improve literacy learning. Johnson and Johnson (1987) found that in initiating new programs, collegial support made learning easier but also notably enhanced the quality of the experience. With collegial support, teachers tended to accept more responsibility and developed more cohesive relationships with colleagues. There was also improvement in leadership, communication, decision-making, trust building and conflict management skills.

Logistic concerns regarding teaching loads and scheduling were significant in one description of a first year Reading Recovery program implementation (Power & Sawkins, 1991). Teachers also expressed frustration with the high expectations regarding assuming responsibility for their own learning. However, after one year, they were very positive about the amount of learning that occurred and the results achieved with their students.

Geeke (1988) qualitatively evaluated the Field Trial of Reading Recovery in central Victoria, Australia. The data collected were obtained from informal observations of Reading Recovery lessons and in-service sessions, and semi-structured interviews with administrators, the Reading Recovery teacher leaders, the Reading Recovery teachers, parents, and non-Reading Recovery teachers. In all, 162 participants were interviewed. The findings regarding the effect of the Reading Recovery program were:

1. All groups reported a significant growth in the reading performance of the children.

2. All groups reported a positive development in the children's self-esteem and confidence, not only in Reading Recovery lessons, but in

the classroom, and at home.

3. Teachers identified the following beliefs that they had developed from Reading Recovery - that effective learning:

- depends on the child becoming responsible for his/her own learning;
- builds on student strengths and the understanding of expectations;
- leads to awareness of problem solving strategies and the development of a self-extending system; and
- effective instruction depends on: (1) accurate observations and sensitive responses, (2) the quality of interaction between teacher and child, and (3) the teacher's understanding of the learning process, and competence in observing, identifying, and understanding the child's learning.

Teachers also identified causes of pressure and anxiety they felt in their role as Reading Recovery teachers. They included: teaching for their peers and other visitors; having their existing knowledge and beliefs continually challenged at the in-service sessions; the intense demands of teaching at-risk children for two

hours a day, which they found more demanding than classroom teaching; the responsibility they felt for justifying the resources allocated to the program where there was resistance, and; the isolation they felt in schools where there was resistance to the program. It must be considered, however, that many of the teachers selected for training during this Field Trial were not experienced teachers of early literacy, a high priority when selecting teachers to train as Reading Recovery teachers. It is also interesting to note that many teachers felt that many of the discomforts they felt during the training year led to the changes in their teaching and thinking about literacy learning.

Resistance to Reading Recovery was also found to be met for a variety of reasons: the belief that the program was item specific; the pull-out aspect of the program was not seen as favorable; the program was perceived as not being cost-effective, and; teachers were not convinced that anything new was being offered. Resistance diminished in most cases and was replaced by support and a growing level of interest in training teachers in the program. In fact, the impact of Reading Recovery was positive. It was seen as an effective, well structured, and highly organized

program. However, Geeke suggests that:

> Better communication about the objectives, principles and practices of Reading Recovery would have meant that there was less understanding of it, and that other teachers might have been led to understand that it was not the packaging and organization of old 'methods' that characterized Reading Recovery, but a distinctive orientation to teaching. (Geeke, 1988, p. 183).

Some common questions teachers asked about Reading Recovery were explored by Hill and Hale (1991). They found, as with any new implementation, that there was teacher resistance and defensiveness. Most teachers, however, supported Reading Recovery but had concerns regarding the integration of Reading Recovery with their classroom reading programs. These investigators concluded that classroom teachers needed more orientation in order to become familiar with the concept and theory underlying Reading Recovery. Wright (1992) and Robinson (1989) discussed problems of implementation in terms of making more systematic attempts to improve general classroom teaching and to develop a greater liaison between the Reading Recovery teacher and classroom teacher.

During the implementation of Reading Recovery the integrity

of the program must be maintained by monitoring the implementation and by assuring that no shortcuts or substitutes in training are created (Clay, 1987; Dunkeld, 1991, Gaffney & Paynter, 1994). Classroom teachers must become involved because all teachers have a critical role in beginning reading instruction, but this role becomes particularly important when students experience difficulties in learning to read (McGill-Franzen & Allington, 1991; Clay 1993a).

Lyons, Pinnell and DeFord (1993) explored the different phases of learning Reading Recovery teachers experience in their year of professional development by examining teachers' reflections and analysis of their teaching. Six Reading Recovery teachers in training tape-recorded, analyzed, and evaluated their lessons throughout the year. The teachers also came together at Reading Recovery in-service sessions throughout the year to discuss their lessons and decision-making processes. Their study illustrated that Reading Recovery teachers monitor their own teaching behavior and become more responsive and effective. Teachers in their study reported five general principles of learning and teaching to help improve their Reading Recovery instruction:

1. All learners have a zone of proximal development through which they can expand and organize their learning.

2. The language in Reading Recovery mediates performance and assists in creating change.

3. Dialogue plays an important role in learning.

4. It is through collaboration that teachers develop theoretical and practical understandings.

5. The major shifts that occur in Reading Recovery occur through the teaching and in-service courses.

Although exact percentages are not given, a pattern emerged from the analysis of the data. Early in the in-service courses, the teachers were focused on the procedural aspects of Reading Recovery. About midway through the year the focus was on understanding a child's responses during the lessons. Near the end, teachers were focused on understanding the student's perspective.

Reading Recovery and Classroom Practice

The issue of how Reading Recovery affects classroom practice has been widely discussed. Hiebert (1994) criticized Reading Recovery training for not providing teachers with a

mechanism for changing classroom instruction. Clay has attempted to clarify two major misconceptions in updated versions of the guidebook for Reading Recovery teachers (Clay, 1993a). She stressed that Reading Recovery is not for classroom use, but an individual intervention for the hardest-to-teach children. Secondly, she does not expect that Reading Recovery will influence classroom instruction beyond the fact that most students leaving the Reading Recovery program will be working within the average band of that classroom and will require less individual instruction and attention from the classroom teacher.

Shanahan and Barr (1995) identify how teachers in Reading Recovery training become skilled observers of literate behaviour. As Clay (1991) explains:

> Observing reading behavior informs a teacher's intuitive understanding of cognitive processes and her teaching improves...so every teacher builds a kind of 'personal theory' of what the surface behaviours in reading imply about the underlying cognitive processes (p. 232).

If this is the case, then the experience afforded in Reading Recovery training has potential for improving classroom teaching. My personal observation is that this issue is often clouded because

there is a lack of understanding of the distinction between instruction that has potential to affect classroom practice and instruction that is limited to the Reading Recovery program itself. Attempts to clarify this issue for teachers and administrators are often futile. It is difficult to help individuals understand that: (1) Reading Recovery is an individual intervention that is not intended for general classroom use, as most children do not need the type of intense intervention provided by Reading Recovery, (2) if you take a program that is to be individually tailored for an individual child and try to convert it into a classroom program that the effectiveness will be lost, and (3) the intense professional development and colleague support provided for Reading Recovery training is an important aspect of the program. When it has been suggested that schools look at their classroom literacy programs and develop ways to improve classroom instruction, the request is often ignored in favor for a 'quick fix' idea due to a lack of time and financial resources.

Contrary to Clay's view, Lyons, Pinnell, and DeFord (1993) see the potential effects of Reading Recovery for the system as a whole, including classroom practice:

> Those who are considering Reading Recovery can expect that involvement will provoke changes in the system. Every aspect of literacy teaching, commonly accepted practice, evaluation practices and system or political decision making will undergo scrutiny. Teachers will start to look at children and at literacy in new ways; there will be a seemingly insatiable demand for more books for children to read, and not just from Reading Recovery teachers. There may be a feeling of disequilibrium among teachers, a demand for more information and for help in promoting more reading and writing in classrooms. Reading Recovery turns things upside down. (p. 24)

Due to the consistency between Reading Recovery and classroom goals, strategies and materials in New Zealand, it is easy to see how this issue could assume more prominence on this continent. In the United States, and perhaps Canada to a lesser extent, there may be greater differences between classroom programming and Reading Recovery which could lead to implications for professional development, changes in classroom literacy instruction, and curriculum development (Gaffney, 1994; Lyons, Pinnell, & DeFord, 1993). For a number of years, the primary model of reading instruction in the United States has been basal reader series with accompaying guidebooks for teachers. In Canada, since the early eighties, a literature-based approach to

reading instruction has been popular, therefore there may be more consistency between the holistic nature of both the Reading Recovery program and classroom programs than in the United States.

Wong, Groth, and O'Flahavan (1995) analyzed teacher-student interactions in Reading Recovery lessons in order to generalize principles about how to teach within a child's zone of proximal development. The comments of five Reading Recovery teachers were analyzed during 25 lessons. The researchers found that about half the discourse in lessons could be attributed to teachers' scaffolding comments. Scaffolding is referred to as the methods in which the Reading Recovery teacher used to help the child solve a problem, including motivating the child through questioning, selecting appropriate text, and modelling. The nature of the scaffolding changed, depending on the familiarity with text. On familiar texts the teacher intervened less and provided comments on the reading and/or a new perspective on the text, after the child had finished reading. In contrast, when new books were introduced, teachers increased their modeling, prompting, talk, and general interaction with the child. From these findings, the

authors suggested that classroom programming would be more responsive if we: (1) increased our focus on the integration of the three cueing systems (meaning, structure, and visual information); (2) emphasized student self-monitoring and self-correcting; (3) made efforts to ensure students became interdependent before becoming independent; (4) promoted scaffolding through peer tutoring and teacher intervention, and (5) adapted instructional practices in response to students' familiarity with the text. These authors suggested a classroom model of balanced instruction which includes continuous assessment, a variety of groupings, embedded word analysis, and a stronger home/school connection.

This view is similar to that of Depree and Iverson (1994) who described a balanced literacy classroom program which allows for flexible reading groups and an emphasis on the reading and writing relationship. However, I contend that these are not qualities gleaned from Reading Recovery, but rather aspects of good literacy instruction, if not instruction in general. Reading Recovery and Clay's theory of good reading acquisition make use of these established principles. They were not generated by Marie Clay for the exclusive purpose of Reading Recovery.

Differences Between New Zealand and American Programs

With the implementation of Reading Recovery in other countries, there have been changes made to the program. There are three differences between the New Zealand and American model which may have an important or marked effect on the Canadian implementation of Reading Recovery. Following is a brief review of these differences.

1) Reading Recovery was developed for use with students after one year of literacy instruction in New Zealand. Most children in New Zealand are in some type of early childhood program by the age of four, and literacy instruction is a focus in their first year of school, starting on their fifth birthday. Children are assessed around their sixth birthday and may then be considered for Reading Recovery if necessary. In the United States (and Canada) not all schools focus on linking literacy activities within their theme-centered curriculum in nursery and kindergarten. In many cases, in this country, kindergarten is not compulsory. However, Reading Recovery is implemented in grade one in North America for no apparent reason even though the probable effect is enrolling a large number of children who may not require such one-to-one

instruction (Shanahan & Barr, 1995). Shanahan and Barr also noted that average Observation Survey scores are significantly lower in the United States than in New Zealand which may be a result of differences in literacy instruction in nursery and kindergarten. New Zealand schools emphasize direct literacy instruction and focus on providing students with many literacy experiences from their first day at school, generally at the age of five. With kindergarten often being play oriented in North America, and often not being compulsory, children's literacy experiences may not be equal to those in New Zealand. Thus, it is not surprising that there would be a difference in scores.

2) In New Zealand there are two options out of the Reading Recovery program, as already described; being discontinued or referred. If a student has not had the opportunity to finish the program at the end of the school year the child is carried over to the next school year. No child is ever simply dropped from the program. In the United States, students are also discontinued and referred, but many students simply are not afforded the opportunity to complete their programs, a problem Clay feels needs

more attention (Clay, 1990). This issue is being examined in the United States and some jurisdictions there are experimenting with summer instruction after first grade to allow students to complete their programs (Smith-Burke & Jaggar, 1994).

3) In New Zealand, classes for training Reading Recovery teachers are held during school time and on a bi-weekly basis, for a total of 18 sessions. In the United States, and initially in Canada, classes were held weekly. This may be due to the more extensive use of basal teaching and the need for retraining in the United States. In New Zealand, the school system is more centralized. Reading Recovery grew out of that system (Goldenberg, 1991). With the decentralized system in the United States, Reading Recovery may not always be congruent with classroom programs and philosophy (Clay, 1987). Also, Reading Recovery training is used towards university credit in the United States, making more time for academic training mandatory. This is not the case in New Zealand.

Reading Recovery as a Pull-Out Program

Some pull-out programs have been widely criticized. One of the major criticisms has been that children are in some of these programs for the long term with little evidence that there are significant achievement gains (Allington & Broikcou, 1988). Other pull-out program criticisms suggest that segregation from peers: (1) undermines the responsibility of regular classroom teachers to teach all children, (2) has a negative impact on a student's self-concept, and (3) leads to curriculum fragmentation and loss of exposure to classroom curriculum content (Walmsley & Allington, 1995). Much instructional time is also lost as students make transitions between programs. The actual instructional time afforded pull-out student works out to be less than if they had remained in their respective classrooms.

The problems connected with pull-out programs are well documented, but alternatives have not had much more success (Archambault, 1989). In-class models are often instructionally identical in terms of focusing on isolated skills. According to Archambault, few differences have been found between pull-out and in-class remedial models to support the preferred use of

either. Madden and Slavin (1989) disagreed, however. They explored the qualities of effective classroom and pull-out programs, including Reading Recovery. In the most effective programs students' unique needs were met and there was a substantial amount of direct instruction. Still, Walmsley and Allington (1995) suggested that pull-out programs, when the purpose is to accelerate progress in the short-term, can help a student cope better with classroom demands.

Reading Recovery is a short-term program but has been criticized for being a pull-out program even though it does not share the characteristics of many traditional pull-out remedial programs. Most traditional remedial programs succeed in achievement gains, but do not close the achievement gap. Also, average gains are minimal and quickly disappear (Slavin, 1987; Bean, Couleu, Eichelbeger, Lazar, & Zigmond 1991). Spiegel (1995) analyzed observational research that focused on traditional remedial programs and Reading Recovery. She noted several differences that make Reading Recovery more successful:

1. Reading Recovery targets children before the achievement gap

becomes too wide.

2. Instruction in Reading Recovery focuses on the comprehension of whole text as opposed to fragmented skills.

3. Reading Recovery emphasizes learning to read by reading.

4. In Reading Recovery, both the teacher and student are aware of the instructional goals - that the child develops a self-extending system for reading.

5. Reading Recovery provides something extra for the students who need it.

6. Materials read by students are at an instructional level, neither too hard nor too easy.

7. In Reading Recovery, the primary goal is the orchestration of a flexible set of strategies.

8. Writing is an integral part of the program.

9. Phonemic awareness training through meaningful, relevant tasks is a component.

10. Communication with the classroom teacher and congruence with the classroom program is encouraged.

11. Explicit modeling, discussion of strategies and explanations are offered.

12. Instruction is individualized.

Spiegel also noted that other early intervention programs such as Success for All (Madden, Slavin, Karweit, Dolan, & Wasik, 1991; Slavin, 1991; Wasik & Slavin, 1993) and Early Intervention in Reading (Taylor, Short, Frye, & Shearer, 1992; Taylor, Strait, & Medo, 1994) are also showing promising results.

How Effective is Reading Recovery?

Reading Recovery research represents 20 years of research beginning with Clay's field-studies conducted between 1976 and 1981 (Clay, 1993a). Some critics (Shanahan & Barr, 1995; Hiebert, 1994) note that the research in Reading Recovery is limited in number and scope. There are few traditionally designed empirical studies, but there are several unpublished studies. Most studies have been conducted by proponents of the program, therefore the assumption is that the research is biased. However, this could be true of all research. The complexity of intervention research also makes large scale, longitudinal studies difficult, due to time and resources. In the case of Reading Recovery, many studies are

conducted in the first year of intervention, even though it is quite probable that an intervention would need to be in effect over more than one year in order to deliver a quality intervention. Methodological shortcomings of non-random assignment of experimental and control groups, decreasing sample size over time (which can often not be helped due to mobility), inconsistent discontinuing criteria (which is purposefully kept flexible), use of Clay's observation survey (1993b) as a selection and outcome measure, inconsistencies in presentation of statistical data, and lack of reliability have all been noted (Anderson, 1988) as problems with the Ohio studies. Regardless, it seems that Reading Recovery may have more supportive program data than most early intervention programs (Johnston & Allington, 1991).

North American studies began at Ohio State University in 1984 where program evaluation data is analyzed from all Reading Recovery implementation sites in North America. Each site represents a replication of the Reading Recovery process with different teachers, teacher leaders, and children. In 1990-91, of 9,486 students who received at least sixty Reading Recovery lessons, 87 percent were successfully discontinued (Pinnell,

1992).

During the Pilot Year of Reading Recovery implementation in Columbus Ohio, 385 students were drawn from 14 grade one classrooms (Huck & Pinnell, 1985; Pinnell, DeFord & Lyons, 1988). Seven classrooms were considered Reading Recovery classrooms and seven were comparison classrooms. The lowest eight readers in each class were selected using teacher judgment and Observation Survey results to participate in the research (55 children in each group). The remaining children were considered to be within or above the average range of each class. A random sample of grade two students were assessed in order to determine a target reading level and to provide some data for comparison the following year. The following findings were reported: (1) 65 percent of the students were discontinued, meaning they had achieved the average band of the classroom, (2) comparison students scored well below the average band of their classes in most cases, and (3) Reading Recovery children scored higher than comparison children on selected standardized reading and writing subtests and the observation survey. A difficulty with this study is that it is unclear as to what sort of intervention, if any, the

comparison group received. In following the Reading Recovery group's progress through second and third grade, students discontinued from the Reading Recovery program scored higher than non-discontinued students from the Reading Recovery group, many performing at or above average levels on observation survey measures. At the end of both second and third grade, greater proportions of all Reading Recovery students were performing at or above average levels on the used measure.

Research in Canada (Gregory, Earl & O'Donoghue, 1992) evaluated the effectiveness of Reading Recovery using 270 first-grade students at a number of sites implementing Reading Recovery. In each site, students identified as being at-risk for reading difficulties were ranked in order of priority and were alternately assigned to either Reading Recovery or a comparison group which was to receive any assistance that would occur without the Reading Recovery program. Classroom teachers completed student record sheets to provide descriptive data about student background, classroom instruction, additional instruction provided, and student attitude towards literacy. Both groups were compared to a reference group of their average-achieving peers. A

variety of standardized reading and writing subtests were used to assess all students as pre and posttests, and a modified miscue analysis was administered to ten students in each of the three groups (Reading Recovery, comparison, and reference). Reading Recovery students obtained significantly higher scores overall and improved at a faster rate that their at-risk peers in the comparison group. Reading Recovery did not succeed for all students, but greater gains were made over time than reference students. Although this could be attributed to regression to the mean, comparison students made fewer gains over time than the reference group. Similar research conducted in Great Britain (Wright, 1992) and Australia (Wheeler, 1984) have made similar findings.

The most recent research (Pinnell, DeFord, Lyons, Bryk, & Seltzer, 1994) was designed to look at specific questions:

1. Would any one-to-one program work as well?
2. Is the year-long training program for Reading Recovery teachers really necessary?
3. Without the year-long training of instructors, would student results be similar?

This study tested the effectiveness of Reading Recovery techniques by randomly assigning 324 first graders identified as the most needy either to one of four intervention treatment programs or a control group treatment that represented traditional practice. Since all low-achieving students had an equal chance of receiving Reading Recovery instruction or the alternative treatments, students in all treatments would be equally affected by regression to the mean. The four intervention programs were:

1. Traditional Reading Recovery (average instructional time was 33:21 minutes);
2. Reading Success which was Reading Recovery with a shortened training time for teachers, (average instructional time was 27:23 minutes);
3. Direct Instructional Skills Plan where experienced reading teachers worked with students individually, not using Reading Recovery techniques (average instructional time was 26:49 minutes), and
4. A Reading and Writing Group in which trained Reading Recovery teachers led student group sessions instead of providing private tutoring sessions (average instructional

time was 31:43 minutes).

The control groups relied on the skill and drill approach described as typical of federally-funded remedial programs in the United States. The average instructional time for the control group was 26:39 minutes.

The performance of subjects in each of the four interventions was compared with its own control group in one of the project schools. Children were randomly assigned to treatment and instruction which lasted 70 days for the first 4 groups and all year for the control groups. At the end, the students took four tests to gauge their mastery of a wide range of literacy skills. To measure the lasting effects of the different forms of instruction the students repeated some of the tests at the end of grade one and again at the beginning of second grade.

The Reading Recovery program was found to be the most successful approach of those compared, however the statistically transformed data does not allow for ease in determining the amount of actual learning or comparison with other studies. Reading Recovery was also the only treatment indicating lasting effects into the beginning of grade two. At the end of service,

Reading Recovery children were reading 5 levels ahead of the others. They were also the only group for which effects on text reading were still evident at the beginning of grade two.

The results showed that the success of Reading Recovery goes beyond individual instruction:

> ...we have learned that appropriating the materials and lesson formats used by Reading Recovery teachers is insufficient; to be as effective as Reading Recovery, teachers may need an extended professional development program...several different factors may account for the superior effectiveness of Reading Recovery: professional development program for teachers, tutorial format, and perhaps the instructional model.... However, the research also shows that although the instructional model and the tutorial format may be necessary, they are insufficient conditions for effectiveness. (Shanahan & Barr, 1995, p. 976-977)

Rasinski (1995a) cautioned, however, that the Reading Recovery students received more instructional time than the comparison groups. That factor alone may account for greater learning gains. He also criticized the study for the use of substitute teachers in some conditions and differences in levels of teacher training (Rasinski, 1995b). In regard to instructional time, Allington, Stuetzel, Shake, and Lamarche (1986) found that about

one-third of the time allocated for remedial reading classes was taken up by non-reading activities. Pinnell, Lyons, DeFord, Bryk, and Seltzer (1994), on the other hand, found that in Reading Recovery, only six seconds per analyzed lesson were spent in activities apart from reading and writing instruction.

In their critical examination, Shanahan and Barr (1995) evaluated mostly American Reading Recovery programs because of implementation differences and because of existing reviews on New Zealand research. In 1987, Shanahan concluded that the New Zealand research was designed in such a way that it would be impossible to know whether the program worked. Shanahan specifically targeted the complete lack of random, experimental versus control group studies. Clay refutes this claim:

> There is good evidence of various kinds that it works, but I concede that there is not yet strong evidence in terms of typical scientistic criteria of experimental design. In neither New Zealand nor Australia has the randomized experimental/control group study been done, and for good reasons. It would not have produced the evidence required to convince administrators of what the program could achieve... I contend that an effective research evaluation requires, first, an existing valid and effective implementation. (Clay, 1990, p. 1)

Clay has made an insightful observation. It has been my experience that administrators are not terribly concerned with comparing Reading Recovery with other programs. The evidence they are interested in is more practical. That is, they want to talk to other administrators that have implemented Reading Recovery in their schools. They want to know what the discontinuing rates are, the kind of progress that students make, and how children function subsequent years. If this need for practical evidence is universal, then Clay's approach to research was, and is, an appropriate one.

It is interesting to note that one study (Yukish & Fraas, 1988) found that children from highly supportive homes progress through Reading Recovery at a significantly faster rate than other children. This area of research requires further attention.

Hiebert (1994) reviews the available Reading Recovery research to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. She notes that Reading Recovery was a response to a specific set of needs in New Zealand. Most New Zealand children attend small community based schools and teachers have considerable autonomy in curriculum implementation and assessment. New Zealand is also a small country with a centralized educational system and high

literacy rates (Guthrie, 1981). In this context, Reading Recovery seems to be sufficient. However, in the American context, different issues emerge (Hiebert, 1994) such as absenteeism and mobility in inner city schools which are barriers to implementation. As a result, discontinuing rates and text-reading levels tend to be lower (Smith-Burke & Jagger, 1994). Thus, differences between New Zealand and North America have an effect on program evaluation. These differences include: the nature of preschool programs; school entry age; opportunities for program completion; Reading Recovery training, and; teacher autonomy regarding curriculum decision making.

Research on Discontinuing Rates

Shanahan and Barr make some interesting points on the American research. Three groups of children were looked at: (1) children who had less than 60 lessons in the program, (2) children who discontinued from the program, and (3) children who completed 60 or more lessons but were not discontinued.

The percentage of discontinued students reported is based on the last two subgroups only. Therefore the actual percentage of discontinued students is reported as being higher than it actually

was. A significant number of students with less than 60 lessons did not complete their programs because of lack of time in the school year. It would be unfair to count them in the total number. This accounts for about 26 per cent of the students in the group. Shanahan and Barr (1995) suggest that the omission of these groups does not allow for a fair evaluation of the amount of learning generated by Reading Recovery. More systemic evidence is needed on discontinuing and how to take this factor into account when conducting research.

Some research into discontinuing has been completed, however (Reading Recovery Staff, 1991). In Illinois, 22 percent of the students fell into the category of not being discontinued because the school year ended. Nine percent of these students ended the year with fewer than 60 lessons, 7 percent were placed in special education and 6 percent moved. Another school system found that the non-discontinued group constituted 29 percent of their 1991-92 cohort, of which 16 percent had less than 60 lessons, 6 percent had withdrawn to special education, 3 percent transferred from the school, and four percent withdrew for other reasons (Donley, Baeren, & Hundley, 1993). In New Zealand, as

many as 25-30 percent of students may be referred for further assessment and/or intervention outside the realm of Reading Recovery due to poor attendance or lack of accelerated progress (Center, Wheldall, & Freeman, 1992). This research implies that referred students in New Zealand are not dealt with. Personal observation and understanding, particularly of the New Zealand model, indicates otherwise. Students are referred only after they have had adequate amount of time in the program (12-20 weeks) and every step has been taken to break down the barriers that are preventing the student from making accelerative progress:

> The patterns of progress made by children will be very different from child to child. For hundreds of children in the New Zealand Reading Recovery Programme acceleration is the outcome of sound teaching. As the child gains control of the various components of the reading process the teacher, who is observing sensitively begins to realise that a faster pace up through text difficulty levels is possible. However, for some children and some teachers this does not seem to happen. There is only one position to take in this case. The programme is not, or has not been, appropriately adapted to the child's needs. It is time to take a close look at possible reasons for this, and colleague comment is what the teacher should seek. (Clay, 1993a, p. 56)

Given the intense one-to-one instruction provided to the

student, Clay clearly attributes the responsibility for facilitating the child's learning to the Reading Recovery teacher first. The Reading Recovery teachers themselves check on their instruction and consider: (1) incorrect assumptions that may have been made about the child, (2) the operation of the program, (3) whether the child's strengths and weaknesses were addressed, (4) the attention given to writing, and (5) whether they have taught for dependency, rather than independence. If this process is not successful in accelerating progress, the teacher needs to analyze the child's assessment scores and lesson records to determine what has caused the child's difficulties and what the child has done with ease, consider why, and then, with the support of talk and visits from colleagues, try to sort out what needs to be in place in order to help the child become literate.

Reading Recovery teacher leaders are also part of this process. Many Reading Recovery teachers sort out the difficulties in their teaching, however, and succeed in discontinuing their students. Those students, who after extensive input do not make accelerated progress, may be referred for more specialized and/or long term support. At this point, it is realized that the Reading

Recovery program has not been able to meet the child's needs. Given the intense instruction and professional development provided to Reading Recovery teachers, it seems fair to place responsibility first on the teacher, and then on the structure of the program itself when a student has not succeeded in making accelerated progress. It must be remembered that Reading Recovery is a short term intervention and to spend much beyond the maximum time with one student (about 20-22 weeks) would short change other students who would benefit from the intervention.

Wasik and Slavin (1993) claim that students who are not discontinued often achieve below grade level at third grade. This is not surprising. Students not discontinued would be referred and/or have not completed the program for some specific reason. Critics suggest that the Reading Recovery program has not been able to meet the needs of the referred child. There are no claims that students who are referred have developed a self-extending system.

Thus, a confounding factor in evaluating the benefits of Reading Recovery is discontinuing rates. In some cases, up to 22 to 29 percent of those who begin the program do not finish for

reasons of program availability or need of further specialist help. Given the design of the original New Zealand program, the only reason students would not be discontinued would be due to lack of accelerative progress, regardless of other factors, after intensive follow up from the Reading Recovery teacher and Reading Recovery colleagues. These would be students requiring specialist help beyond the scope of Reading Recovery.

Do Reading Recovery Students Maintain Their Gains?

The maintenance of gains is a big issue in Reading Recovery. Clay attempts to clarify this issue in her guidebook:

> Research studies which followed children who had remedial instruction have often reported that progress was not maintained back in the classroom. Research following up Reading Recovery children showed that, in general, progress was sustained for most children. However, some children made slow progress for a year and then accelerated again while other children began to lag in progress after two years. The numbers of such children were small but they led us to recommend that Reading Recovery teachers or some other person given this role should:
>
> - monitor progress sensitively over the next three years
> - consider promotions carefully (and not overpromote)
> - provide further individual help if needed particularly if progress slows. (Clay,

1993a, p. 59)

Clay suggests that some at-risk students are easily thwarted either by poor learning experiences or life circumstances and recommends renewed, short, focused intervention to place the child back on track.

Shanahan and Barr (1995) suggest that studies conducted on the issue of maintaining gains have been limited in both number and duration. The research already reviewed supported the maintenance of gains over a limited time (Pinnell et al., 1995).

One Australian study (Center, Wheldall, Freeman, Outhred, & McNaught, 1995) used random assignment of low-progress grade one students to conditions, control groups, standardized tests, and a longitudinal design to evaluate Reading Recovery effectiveness. Two groups were established across ten schools. Group 1 consisted of 31 students who received the Reading Recovery intervention only. Group 2 consisted of 39 students who were to receive any reading intervention the school typically offered. This resulted in about two hours of intervention per week according to teacher collected data. A third group, the control group, consisted of 39 students from five matched comparison schools where

Reading Recovery was not occurring. Students were to receive any reading intervention normally available in the school. Again, this resulted in approximately two hours of intervention per week. There were no statistically significant initial differences among the treatment groups, but in the end, the Reading Recovery group was superior to the control group on all measures of reading achievement. After twelve months, 65 percent of the Reading Recovery students showed continued achievement, whereas only 31 percent of the control sample showed similar continued achievement.

However, we cannot assume that all subsequent success or failure can be attributed to Reading Recovery alone. As Clay suggests, there are many factors impinging on a child's success. One study (Glynn, Crooks, Bethune, Ballard, & Smith, 1989) suggests that the continued effectiveness of Reading Recovery is affected by subsequent classroom instruction. From this suggestion, another important issue arises. If the instruction that a student is receiving is not responsive to a child's needs, the potential successes of any intervention cannot be explained because the classroom instruction also has an effect on the

student (Shanahan & Barr, 1995; Durkin, 1974; Clay, 1992b). Although some research data provide evidence for extended term effects, although whether these effects persist throughout the child's entire school career is not known. The implication is that while the Reading Recovery program results are promising, as students progress upwards through the grades we need to look at literacy practices within classrooms that support the literacy gains students have made.

Hiebert (1994) suggests that the effectiveness of Reading Recovery with students who are the most needy cannot be determined because available data shows that Reading Recovery students are those in the fourth quintile in a nationally normed standardized reading test. Also, the data has been collected in a way that low-income students cannot be identified.

Is Reading Recovery More Effective Than Other Programs?

Some research shows that Reading Recovery results in reading gains. Are these gains greater than what students achieve in compensatory programs or in the classroom? Shanahan and Barr's (1995) evaluation of the research shows that, generally, Reading Recovery students approximate or exceed the gains made

by average students in both situations. In comparison to other low-achieving students, Reading Recovery's approach of selecting the students with the lowest scores makes these results more likely to move up, while the higher scoring comparison students have scores that are more likely to fluctuate. "This phenomenon represents a knotty analytic problem not just for Reading Recovery, but for any program that emphasizes the selection of students on the basis of relatively high or low scores on tests with less than perfect reliability" (Shanahan & Barr, 1995, p. 971). Regardless, according to Shanahan and Barr, most of the Reading Recovery research indicates gains that were probably inflated to some extent by regression to the mean. They also state that:

> The most basic requirement of any instructional program is that it result in learning; not necessarily more learning than would be accomplished by other approaches, but more than would be expected if the intervention did not take place at all. (Shanahan & Barr, 1995, p. 965)

In light of the research presented on the quality of programs for at-risk students, I feel there is a need to explore interventions which will be the <u>most</u> productive and effective for our students and produce the most learning. We need to find or develop and use

approaches which provide the most learning. If we accept, as Shanahan and Barr (1995) suggest, programs which provide only minimal amounts of learning, then we are compromising the education of at-risk students.

What seems apparent is that Reading Recovery instruction leads to more learning than is currently available in other types of programs (Shanahan & Barr, 1995; Pinnell et al., 1994). Despite shortcomings in the research, Shanahan and Barr also suggest that Reading Recovery compares well to other high quality interventions, particularly due to careful teacher selection, the professional development component, and the tutorial format.

What Makes Reading Recovery Effective?

This question is perhaps the most difficult to answer, especially in light of the lack of empirical evidence in this area. Even critics of Reading Recovery (Shanahan & Barr, 1995; Hiebert, 1994), in the end, admit that it in spite of some research misgivings, Reading Recovery appears to be an effective program. However, what makes it an effective program is rarely defined. A sound theoretical and practical base which is developed through quality and ongoing professional development, in-servicing and

colleague support is often considered to be a reason for the effectiveness of Reading Recovery. Some informal and qualitative observations and hypotheses have supported this view. Opitz (1991) observed the Reading Recovery program in progress and hypothesized nine reasons why the program appeared to be successful:

1. It is based on a theory of reading which emphasizes meaning.
2. Each child's reading and writing behaviors are thoroughly diagnosed.
3. Diagnosis is ongoing and part of the instructional process.
4. More time is provided for children to learn essential reading strategies.
5. The emphasis is on the student reading connected text.
6. All learning modalities are emphasized.
7. Reading and writing are both emphasized.
8. Children are taught to be aware of strategies used in reading.
9. Teachers employ many strategies identified as being characteristic of effective teaching, in particular, modeling and immediate feedback.

Opitz himself sees a need for research to go beyond hypothesizing

from observation in order to determine exactly why Reading Recovery works.

Jones (1991) through his experiences and observations as a teacher leader identifies principles that underlie the professional development in Reading Recovery. He determines that the professional development of adults basically follows the same principles as does teaching children in the program:

> Learning and teaching are strategic; one learns to do something by doing it, accompanied by skilled coaching that is careful to build, not deprive the leaner of independence; close observation informs both practice and concept development; learners should be continually challenged; and reflection and articulation play an important role in learning. (Jones, 1991, p. 436)

Jones also acknowledges that the peer interactions which are inherent in the teacher staff development program for Reading Recovery are also crucial. Observations made my Anderson and Armbruster (1990) also support these principles and hypotheses.

Is Reading Recovery Cost Effective?

In reports on the cost effectiveness of Reading Recovery, savings have been considered significant when compared with other interventions. Reading Recovery was found to be economical,

short term, and effective (Lyons & Beaver, 1995; Dyer, 1992; Dyer & Binkney, 1995). Rasinski (1995a, b) challenges the reported cost effectiveness of Reading Recovery over alternative group approaches. However, grouping is almost always related to cost, as opposed to benefit. Having larger groups of children making gains as opposed to having individual children making sufficient enough gains to make them readers and more likely to maintain the gains is what Rasinski may be suggesting:

> Calculating formulas for cost-effectiveness can lead to dangerous, simplistic, and erroneous conclusions. What does gain really mean? Is that the goal, or do we want children to become readers?... .We need to think about what gain is needed to make a significant difference for each student and what support each student needs to achieve that gain. All must become independent readers early in schooling. The goal of Reading Recovery is not progress; it is enabling a child at a very young age to develop a self-extending system for reading... .Beyond controlled, experimental studies, thousands of replications attest to the effectiveness of Reading Recovery. Small gains, however cost effective they may look on reporting sheets, will, in the long run, not be worth the money. (Pinnell, DeFord, Lyons, & Bryk, 1995, p. 274)

Most cost analysis has been carried out by considering education in the United States. There are so many factors impinging on cost-

effectiveness, including lower retention and special education placement rates, that a full exploration is not provided. Dyer (1992) and Dyer and Binkney's (1995) analysis suggest Reading Recovery is more economical than retention and special education placements in the long term. Hiebert (1994) contends that the figures reported by Dyer (1992) are underinflated, as they do not factor the start up cost of implementing Reading Recovery, such as training of a teacher leader and installing a training facility. Shanahan and Barr (1995) in an analysis of this research suggest that Reading Recovery is not as cost-effective as some research may indicate and that modifications could be made to change this. However, Shanahan and Barr do not address the point that cost saving changes could alter program effectiveness.

Summary of Research

Reading Recovery is a complex program. The research on the program is also complex. However, despite the limited amount of empirical research, and shortcomings in the available research, the research suggests the following:

- Reading Recovery is an effective early intervention program.

- Most students maintain their gains after being discontinued from the Reading Recovery program.

- Reading Recovery is part of a comprehensive literacy plan, not the total literacy plan for a whole school system.

- There are a variety of complex facets to Reading Recovery that make the program effective; no one aspect of the program can be attributed to its success.

- Reading Recovery is a quality model for professional development; it also has the aspects of an effective pull-out program.

- How Reading Recovery affects classroom programs is not clear; it may be different in different systems.

• The cost effectiveness of Reading Recovery is not evident; a perspective on this is probably dependent on student goals.

• Discontinuing rates reported in the United States generally do not include students who were unable to discontinue from Reading Recovery due to lack of time in the school year; discontinuing rates do include students who are considered referred.

• Considering the original New Zealand design of Reading Recovery, students who did not have time to discontinue from the Reading Recovery program during the school year would be carried over to complete the program the following year; these students would be included in the data the following year.

• Students not making accelerative progress are referred for further specialist assessment and intervention only after the Reading Recovery teacher has exhausted all avenues to achieve accelerated progress within the scope of Reading

Recovery.

Implications

Rinehart and Short (1991) believe that certain characteristics of Reading Recovery may relate to a restructuring paradigm and create conditions conducive for change. It is with this in mind that decisions regarding the implementation of Reading Recovery within a school system must be made. Along with the collaborative training of Reading Recovery teachers, early years classroom teachers must be provided with opportunities to learn more about Reading Recovery, to examine and reflect critically on their practices and the professional literature, to problem solve collaboratively, to become more involved as a team, and to make changes in literacy practices where there is a need. This principle was operationalized as I implemented Reading Recovery in two school divisions.

To reiterate, the major questions for this study were:

1. What shifts in learning occurred for the Reading Recovery teachers, classroom teachers, administrators, and parents?

2. What were the general attitudes of the Reading Recovery teachers, classroom teachers, administrators, and parents towards the Reading Recovery program, as a result of the Reading Recovery program being implemented in the school?

3. What were the primary implementation concerns for the Reading Recovery teachers, classroom teachers, administrators, and parents?

These questions guided the implementation of Reading Recovery in Manitoba in 1994-95.

CHAPTER 3: PROCEDURES

Introduction

The general purpose of this study was to document and explore the first implementation of the Reading Recovery program in Manitoba using action research. In implementing the Reading Recovery program, I looked for information from Reading Recovery teachers, and other stakeholders such as classroom teachers, school administrators and the parents of children involved. Given the literature review regarding staff development, my goal was to make the implementation of Reading Recovery a team effort in order to enhance its effectiveness.

Participants

Along with myself, as participant observer and teacher leader, and Reading Recovery teachers in training from two school divisions, eight from the school division with which I am employed and four from another school division, others were involved with the Reading Recovery program: (1) the grade one teachers with students in the program and teachers involved in the discontinuing

assessment of students, (2) the respective school administrators, and (3) respective parents.

Design and Data Collection

Action research in teaching is carried out to inform one's own teaching practices and allows for cyclical critical reflection. The time frame for this research was the 1994-95 school year from August 1994 to June 1995. Data were gathered from several sources as described below.

1. Participant observations: As a participant observer, I had a journal in which I kept field notes which included observations, information and reflections regarding:

- the Reading Recovery training classes,
- general observations,
- the classroom teacher inservice sessions on administering, interpreting, and using the results of the Observation Survey (Clay, 1993b), and
- other activities which developed from the Reading Recovery implementation process.

The journal was also used for future planning and to document changes in the implementation process. The journal served as an audit trail to increase the reliability of the data (Merriam, 1988).

2. Reading Recovery teachers: In June of the implementation year, a day-long meeting was held to which the principals and Reading Recovery teachers, as well as any other interested school personnel were invited to receive an overview of the Reading Recovery program, hear expectations, and provide an opportunity to ask questions. After the overview, the Reading Recovery teachers became acquainted with each other and discussed what they could do over the summer to prepare themselves.

Three consecutive full day sessions were set aside in late August for assessment training. The Reading Recovery teachers were sent a mailing in the summer with: a brief description of Reading Recovery; a list of frequently asked questions about Reading Recovery (with answers); information on using Reading Recovery training as an independent study for credit from a local university; the components of an early literacy program (to be

shared with their early years school staff); and a request to read the first part of An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement (Clay, 1993b) and to formulate questions and/or ask for clarifications regarding the program.

During the three day assessment training, the administration, scoring, and interpretation of An Observation Survey of Early literacy Achievement (Clay, 1993) was reviewed as well as how to write an Observation Survey Summary and make Predictions of Progress. In addition, issues regarding the selection of students were examined and "roaming around the known" was introduced. The initial assessment training questionnaire (Appendix B) was administered after the assessment training was complete.

Journal entries were made at the end of each class session, but at times, some teachers took their journals home to complete. By the end of second term, it became evident that the journal writing was becoming a chore. It was decided that the only journal writing required in the last term would be a reflective piece using the end-of-year questionnaire (Appendix D).

3. Classroom teachers: Four half-day sessions were provided for classroom teachers who were interested in developing their literacy observation skills for use in their classrooms and/or to assist Reading Recovery teachers and the teacher leader with discontinuing students. The emphasis was on administering and interpreting Clay's (1993b) Observation Survey.

At the end of May, a questionnaire was given to all grade one teachers and teachers involved in the discontinuing process in the Reading Recovery schools (resource teachers and other early years teachers, for example) to summarize their involvement and participation in the activities associated with the implementation process. This questionnaire also provided insight regarding teacher perceptions about the program (Appendix E).

4. School administrators: Administrators received questionnaires in January and June of 1995 to determine their perceptions of the Reading Recovery program and their concerns about program implementation (Appendix F).

5. Parents: Questionnaires were also sent to parents at the end of their child's program involvement to identify their perceptions regarding the Reading Recovery program, their learning as a result of having a child in the program, and their response to their child's learning (Appendix G).

These questionnaires were developed with the assistance of other teacher leaders during my training year as a teacher leader, using some already established forms (source unknown). The intent was not to generalize findings, but to inform the process of implementation.

Training Sessions

In addition to a June assessment orientation day, a three day workshop regarding the administration of the Observation Survey (Clay, 1993b) took place in August. Once the school year began, weekly training sessions for Reading Recovery teachers were held every Monday evening for three hours.

Workshops for training in the administration of the Observation Survey (Clay, 1993b) for classroom and resource

teachers were held in a series of four half day sessions in October.

Information regarding the Reading Recovery timeline for the 1994/95 training year, as well as a divisional report including information on early literacy professional development can be found in Appendix H.

Data Analysis

Data collection and analysis is a simultaneous process in qualitative research. This distinguishes qualitative from quantitative research (Merriam, 1988). Methodological triangulation to confirm findings and strengthen internal validity and reliability was achieved by matching observations. Long term and repeated observations also increased the validity of findings.

Data analysis of the information gathered from the sessions was ongoing throughout the year, with:

1. Progressive reduction of observations through weekly and monthly summaries of observations.
2. Pattern matching of observations by relating similar and/or contrasting pieces of information from the journals and questionnaires. I was looking for themes and patterns to emerge.

In this process, observational and survey data were also compared.

The analysis of the reflection journals of the Reading Recovery teachers sought to identify emerging patterns along the lines of Lester's (1993) notion of "transformative intellectuals". That is, indications that the teacher self-critiques, strives for self-understanding and is open to change.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The data obtained in this study was summarized in the following sections:

- Reading Recovery teacher feedback
- Classroom teacher feedback
- Administrative feedback
- Parent Feedback

Summaries of the information obtained from field notes, journals and questionnaires were compiled. Through this data, information was obtained to: (1) track the first year of Reading Recovery implementation in the St. James-Assiniboia and Winnipeg School Divisions; and (2) and allow input from groups of individuals within the school systems to assist in guiding implementation.

In organizing this chapter, the three research questions are considered under each respective stakeholder group, beginning with the Reading Recovery teachers themselves. Findings across groups are summarized in Chapter 5.

Reading Recovery Teacher Feedback

Feedback from the Reading Recovery teachers is analyzed in this section.

What Shifts In Learning Occurred?

The responses of the Reading Recovery teachers to the first question are presented in relation to each phase of their training and the patterns that emerged from the data analysis: (1) assessment training; (2) roaming around the known, (3) moving into instruction; (4) theory-driven instruction; (5) theoretical understandings.

Assessment Training

Results showed that, in general, teachers felt the assessment training helped clarify ideas and also added to their prior knowledge of Reading Recovery. One teacher commented on the thoroughness of the assessment process and the in-depth analysis required. All teachers found the Observation Survey Summary sheet the most difficult task to complete, but some teachers acknowledged that compiling the observation summary would become easier with time and practice. Recording running records

and sorting and keeping track of all materials was also identified by some as being difficult.

Five responses identified the need for a better understanding of roaming around the known. The intent of the assessment training sessions, however, was not to discuss program intervention in any depth because the intervention would be dealt with in the regular evening classes.

Roaming Around the Known

Once students had been selected, Reading Recovery teachers began roaming around the known, the initial ten lessons of the child's Reading Recovery program. The emphasis in roaming around the known is on helping the child become fluent with what is known and to help the child derive meaning from text. Text reading and writing are crucial activities at this point without doing any 'teaching':

> Stay with what the child already knows. Do not introduce *any* new items of learning. The Observation Survey will have shown up some of the things that the child can do... the most important reason for roaming around the known is that it requires the teacher to stop teaching from her preconceived ideas. She has to work from the child's responses. This will be her focus

throughout the program. (Clay, 1993a, pp. 12-13)

Teaching based on the child's responses was a difficult concept for teachers. Once roaming around the known began, a range of feelings emerged from experiencing enjoyment during these lessons to feeling frustration. Some teachers felt that their roaming around the known sessions needed more structure, while others felt they needed less structure. What some teachers found exhilarating, others found tiring. The only consensus was that it was difficult not to teach during these sessions. Teachers discussed whether modelling was considered direct teaching. As a group, there was agreement that modelling was inevitable and that we should respond to the child's needs but at the same time, not expect the child to do something he or she could not. One teacher reflected what the challenge of roaming around the known would be:

> The challenge I think will be to make the session unique and tailored to the needs of each student and to experiment with a variety of ways for them to practice the things they know. (Journal Entry)

Moving Into Instruction

As we moved into instruction, the Reading Recovery teachers and the teacher leader looked at the components of a Reading

Recovery lesson and the importance of working within the child's competencies. The emphasis was on familiar rereading, setting a positive tone, using a variety of materials, helping the student learn to look at print, and introducing early strategies. The teaching sessions began in mid-October. The observation of lessons provided teachers with many points of discussion. Procedures were being clarified continually. It seemed that as the Reading Recovery teachers further understood the Reading Recovery procedures they became more aware of their needs. Increasingly, the Reading Recovery teachers noted examples of children's "reading work" (using all cueing systems - meaning, structure, visual cues, self-monitoring and self-correcting, searching for information in the cues, integrating the cues) and the importance of watching the way they responded to students within lessons. One teacher noticed that after praising a child on some reading work, she shifted her attention to an error and used the word 'but'. The child's expression showed that this was a disappointment. It was also a lesson to all of us to watch how we interact with children.

By the end of October, Reading Recovery teachers were beginning to think in terms of accelerating progress, although the

language used indicated they wanted children reading books at higher levels rather than increasing strategy use and developing a self-extending system. The journals increasingly described student behaviours and progress. It was clear that the teachers were becoming more focused regarding: the observation of students' progress, teaching decisions, and teaching for strategies:

> I learned the importance of being a critical observer of what is actually taking place. I think right now I'm becoming very focussed on what I am doing. (Journal entry)

> I'm so excited about the whole process that I am doing these lessons in my sleep (Which is probably helpful. You hear about athletes that do their sport all in their mind ahead of time and it improves their performance). (Journal entry)

As we neared the end of the first term, I felt that there was a further shift in which Reading Recovery teachers began thinking about teaching for strategies. By the end of the first term, Reading Recovery teachers seemed, for the most part, to have made many gains and increased their understanding of the Reading Recovery program and the reading process. A shift towards issues and teaching for strategies began taking place. Student progress, pride and confidence in learning to read were the most rewarding part for

the the Reading Recovery teachers' first term efforts, while issues of recordkeeping and lesson timing were still the most frustrating. The following are representative of some journal entries:

> Most rewarding: watching the children surge forward when it finally clicks. I enjoy their obvious pride and pleasure.
> Most frustrating: just prior the surge - it seems they'll never get it. (Journal entry)

> The most frustrating has to be the recordkeeping. I get so involved with the student that I forget to jot down info as I go along. (Journal entry)

> The hardest for me is the documentation, trying to get all the info on the sheets. Also doing everything in the lesson in 30 minutes. (Journal entry)

> The really rewarding part is the students. Every day they are a delight and it's wonderful to share their joy in their new found enjoyment of books. It's the highlight of the day. (Journal entry)

Also evident was that along with a greater understanding of the Reading Recovery procedures, teaching for strategies, and accelerated progress came ownership regarding assuming responsibility for children not making the expected gains. The following comments were documented in the journals:

> I have learned that...M. Clay's view of the definition of a strategy differs from the

> definition I learned at the University of Manitoba during my Special Education certification. (Journal entry)
>
> I've learned to be more precise and analytical concerning my teaching. I've gained more confidence in my ability to teach. I have a better understanding of the process children go through when they are starting to read...The hardest thing is constantly feeling accountable that if the child isn't progressing I had to own the problem. (Journal entry)
>
> I feel that I am beginning to have a better understanding of self-monitoring, self-correcting and cross checking. (Journal entry)
>
> I've learned a lot. I don't even know where to begin. I think I have learned most about how kids learn to read. (Journal entry)

Throughout the second term, Reading Recovery teachers referred to Becoming Literate: The Construction Of Inner Control (Clay, 1991) and the guidebook more often both in class discussion and through journal entries. They really seemed to be making connections between theory and practice.

The second term began with many Reading Recovery teachers asking, through their journals, for particular suggestions for students with whom they were working. I tried to refer them to the guidebook to search for their answers rather than to rely on me. In general, Reading Recovery teachers seemed, increasingly, to be

reflecting on their instruction. There were still many descriptions of student behaviour and progress but there was deeper thinking and a growing independence in reflecting as a teacher:

1. One teacher reread a needed section of the guidebook and kept her book open there for reference during a lesson to clarify her thinking. (Journal entry)

2. One teacher reflected on the importance of having students learn to look at the print early on and realizing that solid teaching and learning took place when this occurred. She was finding some students had reached a stumbling block because they had not learned to look at print effectively.

3. Teachers were able to describe specific areas in their teaching in which they needed support. These were directly related to supporting their students' efforts to integrate cues and strategy use.

4. One teacher continued to struggle with making the most

effective teaching decision at the best time. I know now that this teacher realizes that this is an ongoing struggle that we can only get better at with experience.

As our focus moved to those hard to accelerate students, it became clear that although these students had a variety of needs, the area of greatest need for most students was letter identification. Many references were made to texts in order to keep teachers focused on strategy use:

> The significant question at any stage of progress is not 'How many items (letters, sounds, words) does the child know?' but rather 'What operations can he initiate and carry out and what kinds of operations has he neglected to use?' Answers to those questions can guide the teacher in her prompting and questioning of the novice reader. (Clay, 1991, p. 328)

Clay suggests that a few items and a powerful strategy make it easier to learn more. However, as one teacher pointed out:

> Only do what is essential. Do not get too focused on letters.' (Clay, 1993a, p. 25). It seems like this may be a bit misleading - they've got to really know their letters. (Journal entry)

As the teacher leader, I was concerned that teachers would focus on the use of visual cues and neglect meaning and language

structure cues and effective strategy use by the child. Despite my concerns of over-emphasis on the use of visual cues, the changes in teaching were much more strategic in nature. In their journals and through class discussions and lesson observations it was evident that all the Reading Recovery teachers were, to varying extents:

- trying to pull back and allow the child to be more independent;
- letting the child take the lead and prompting only when necessary;
- slowing down and trying not to push the child;
- trying to be more focused with teaching after obtaining diagnostic information from the daily running record;
- becoming increasingly aware of strategy use by the child; and
- focusing on reading for meaning and trying to integrate the use of meaning and structure cues rather than emphasizing visual cues alone.

The emphasis in our weekly sessions naturally led to developing student independence. This meant looking at our teaching and thinking about how we could foster independence

rather than dependence. Issues of fluency, flexibility, independence in writing and developing independence through teacher book choices and book introductions facilitated our discussion after teaching observation sessions. Even in my school visits, I observed teachers working very hard to foster independence. Sometimes too much so, but the importance of independence was understood and teachers realized it was not an easy task, but one that takes sensitive observation, appropriate responding, and making the most productive teaching decisions for each child.

As Reading Recovery teachers' understandings grew, they observed positive changes in student:

- self-confidence and willingness to take risks;
- letter identification knowledge and use in reading and writing;
- self-monitoring and self-correction; and
- "in the head" problem-solving ability without the need to verbalize.

One teacher observed:

> I never thought (student name) would ever get his sounds and he is amazing me at how well he has begun to do this. 'Get your mouth ready' really

> works well with him. He is another classic case of never assume anything. (Journal entry)

All these observations indicate that teaching for strategies was taking place and strategic problem-solving was being used by students.

Theory-driven instruction. From a focus on instruction exchanges with teachers became more focused on Vygotsky's concept of the zone of proximal development. Teachers made interesting analogies which indicated understanding of Vygotsky's theory regarding the role of social interaction in moving from interpersonal to intrapersonal learning, a fundamental part of Reading Recovery (Clay & Cazden, 1990). Discussion regarding Vygotsky's theory evolved through discussions at teaching sessions and voluntary readings. No specific readings were assigned. One of the most apt descriptions was written by a Reading Recovery teacher in our program who was also a grade one teacher:

> The zone of proximal development is basically our whole Reading Recovery program. It should be that way in the classroom too - but the 1-1 support isn't always easy to give - but some small flexible groupings and volunteers can help. I think in some ways it's the basis of Grade 1, especially your definition (what the child can do with support today he can do alone tomorrow).

> That's why I've stayed all these years. I like to see the jump from September (today) to June (tomorrow). (Journal entry)

Upon reflection of both their own learning from their peers and what they had learned from observing and teaching their students, Reading Recovery teachers considered what they would do early in the program for students whose scores were particularly low on the observation survey:

- Spend more time laying a strong foundation.
- Observe the student more closely in order to learn his/her strengths and weaknesses.
- Spend less time at book levels 1 and 2.
- Focus more on rereading familiar books.
- Ensure students have learned to "look at print".
- Work harder for parental support.
- Teach in a more supportive way.
- Focus on the early strategies.

Teachers seemed to have a better understanding of the time it takes students to learn to be flexible and fluent with letter identification and word recognition. This is valuable in terms of assisting students who had particularly low scores initially.

Theoretical Understanding

Three main areas of theoretical understandings emerged. The first dealt with the connection between reading and writing. The second dealt with the reading and writing process and the third with the issue of teaching at-risk children to read.

The reading and writing connection. Most teachers felt they had a better understanding of the connection between reading and writing, but didn't realize how strong and important that connection was in emergent reading until Reading Recovery:

> Children in Reading Recovery write stories every day. It is the writing part of the daily lesson that children are required to pay attention to letter detail, letter order, sound sequences, letter sequences, and the links between messages in printed language. It is particularly important that children learn to hear the sounds in words they want to write, and find appropriate ways to write these sounds down. The writing knowledge serves as a resource of information that can help the reader. However, this reciprocity does not occur spontaneously. The teacher must remember to direct the child to use what he knows in reading when he is writing and vice versa....Reading and writing are interwoven throughout the Reading Recovery programme and teaching proceeds on the assumption that both provides cues and responses which facilitate new responding in either area. (Clay, 1993a, p. 11)

The reading and writing process. Teachers also felt they had a greater understanding of the complex nature of the reading and writing process. Within this, teachers expressed the following insights:

- The realization that we can only make assumptions about what the child is doing which underscores the importance of knowing how good readers and writers become good reader and writers.
- The acquisition of more specific information and knowledge in regard to reading and writing and reading strategies.
- The need to emphasize meaning and work on the integration of the three cueing systems.

One teacher wrote:

> My view of reading and writing reflects an interactive approach. Reading is a process of prediction and confirmation to get meaning using the three cue systems. Writing is a synthesis...a construction of the grapho-phonic code (the writer already has meaning and syntax). (Journal entry)

Teaching at-risk students. The third major change in views dealt with the teaching of at-risk children. Earlier in the year teachers had concerns about children particularly hard to

teach. Three significant shifts in learning occurred - realizations regarding:

- the importance of understanding how good readers and writers become good readers and writers in order to help students experiencing difficulties.
- the importance of a program based on detailed observation and the identification of the strengths possessed by students experiencing difficulty.
- the importance of developing independence and what that means to a child as well as the challenge in helping at-risk students develop independence.

A changed view of at-risk readers developed. Often too many assumptions are made about a child's assumed lack of ability. Such children are not taught basic concepts about print, without which further learning does not occur.

Many Reading Recovery teachers did not share how the changes in their instruction affected student learning, but the ones who did indicated that their students learned more quickly and had good retention of what was learned (both in Reading Recovery and in the classroom) because they were reading appropriate level

books.

Changes in perceptions related to how children become literate and a better understanding of why the teachers were doing what they were doing. The majority of the actual changes were manifested outside the confines of the Reading Recovery program itself and realized with other at-risk students not included in the program. For example, Reading Recovery teachers:

- knew the importance of rereading familiar text for practice but did not realize the impact it had; one teacher set up familiar rereading boxes for students with books classified according to reading levels.

- realized the importance of book introductions to activate prior knowledge and to establish story familiarity to foster the construction of meaning and student success. Reading Recovery teachers indicated that they emphasized this more in their other teaching roles.

- gained insight into the value of individual instruction which

led to more small group, guided-reading sessions where previously whole class shared-book experiences (Holdaway, 1979) had been the primary mode of instruction.

• came to understand the value of writing as a component of the reading program. They instituted more classroom or resource room activities which emphasized the reciprocal gains of reading and writing.

• became aware that literacy was seen as more than reading. This concept was expanded in resource programs; programs moved away from a skills-base to placing increased emphasis on reading and writing in relation to meaningful, literature-based, whole text activities.

• realized that a wide variety of approaches are appropriate for beginning readers in which instruction is based on strengths; prior focus had been on deficits.

• gained a better understanding of the purpose of home

reading programs which led to sending books home that were appropriately matched to a student's reading level.

• developed insight into the value of talk since oral language was highlighted in the Reading Recovery program. This resulted in more scaffolding during literacy instruction.

One teacher shared the following:

> Previously, my view was that children who just couldn't remember words in a story needed the added support of phonics to fall back on. I now know that this is erroneous because all readers need a variety of strategies to draw on and the flexibility to use them all equally. I think this change in approach has accounted for the progress that the students have made. (Journal entry)

It was evident that by the end of the March term, Reading Recovery teachers were able to identify changes in their teaching and learning and how it affected student learning. Again, the Reading Recovery teachers felt they had learned a great deal. Very few teachers still noted organizational and procedural concerns. In contrast to the first term focus on recordkeeping and organizational and procedural issues, the emphasis in the second term was on how to teach strategically to enhance student

learning.

Learning Achieved

Question 8 on the final Reading Recovery teacher questionnaire (Appendix D) required participants to estimate how much learning they felt had occurred in their training year on a scale of 1-5, 1 being nothing and 5 being a great deal. All 12 teachers circled 5, which I feel confirmed what was reflected in their teaching, discussions, and journal entries.

What Were the General Attitudes Towards the Reading Recovery Program?

This was the second question guiding the research. Each pattern that emerged from the data review is presented in terms of first, training highlights; second, learning; and third, growth.

Overall, Reading Recovery teachers had a positive attitude towards the Reading Recovery program. They also felt that there was staff support in their schools. One teacher noted more interest in the upper grades because the teachers wanted more students in their classes that could read. As individuals, every teacher noted the impact the program had on student learning,

whether or not the student was discontinued or referred.

Training Highlights

Most of the highlights cited involved student growth, use of strategies and the children's excitement in learning to read so many books. One teacher reported the progress of a student who was referred due to severe learning difficulties. In her view, without Reading Recovery, the child would not have made the gains he did make. Another teacher highlighted the accelerated progress of one student:

> I think the highlight for me was having a student discontinue after only seven weeks. Before I started Reading Recovery, I would never have believed that such accelerated progress was possible. It helped to remind me of how the program is intended to operate. (Journal entry)

Teacher Learning

Another highlight dealt with the teachers' own learning. A greater understanding of the reading process, in particular the cueing systems, teaching for strategies, how to encourage independence in the child sooner and more effectively, and how to make more individualized and effective teaching decisions was indicated. Presenting at a group-initiated conference, our weekly

teaching sessions, discussions, and ongoing interactions with colleagues trying to implement Reading Recovery reportedly contributed to this.

> My attitude is that any new learning can benefit you in one way or another. (Journal entry)

Growth as a Teacher

Almost all responses included those given in the first three questions of the end-of-year survey, with teachers re-emphasizing their changed attitude and new learning. More generally, teachers felt they had grown as professionals and had more confidence in their teaching decisions and theoretical knowledge. The following journal entries encapsulate the contributions made:

> Reading Recovery has strengthened and confirmed my belief that really good teaching can make a real difference in a child's learning. The fact that the child is totally engaged with the reading process for the thirty minutes is a factor which needs to be emulated in other situations. There are many factors involved in learning that teachers cannot control. Time on task is one factor that we can control. Reading Recovery has made me more able to use time wisely. I believe that all children can learn but sometimes my actions don't support my beliefs. Reading Recovery has helped me make a stronger connection between my beliefs and my actions.

(Journal entry)

> It (Reading Recovery) has helped me remember and appreciate how difficult a task learning to read really is. It has given me further insight into the various problems young readers may have and how they can go astray in the early stages of reading. I think it has helped to make me more patient as a teacher. (Journal entry)

> I feel I have really grown a tremendous amount as a reading teacher because of my training in Reading Recovery this year. I realized I really didn't know much about how children learned because until a few years ago I never thought much about it. I just followed the guidebooks and did what they told me. I learned many specific things about kids and their reading and writing and definitely have a clearer understanding of the whole process. I learned particularly about meaning, structure and visual cues and about how important it is that those are all integrated. In general I just feel so much wiser although I know I have lots more to learn and my zone of proximal development will continue to be challenged. (Journal Entry)

What Were the Primary Implementation Concerns?

The focal issues during the first term were mainly organizational and procedural in nature. Teachers were concerned with: administering assessments, selecting students, writing observation summaries, making predictions of progress for each student, recordkeeping, timing, providing instruction in different

parts of the lessons and lesson procedures. September was a time when teachers were feeling frustrated and incompetent in their new roles, even though many had strong teaching and literacy backgrounds. The following pertains to program implementation concerns, especially regarding the following program issues: (1) the observation survey; (2) the kindergarten curriculum; (3) readability level; (4) student selection; (5) relationship with the classroom teacher; (6) discontinuing; (7) evening sessions; (8) program implementation - dual roles; (9) communicating with other stakeholders; (10) goal setting; and (11) continuing contact.

Observation Survey

Teachers were in general agreement that the concept of "readiness testing" using standardized tests needed to be replaced with evaluation through systematic observation. On the other hand, the exclusive use of observation was questioned. A concern was expressed about how to respond to requests from parents and the general public who might want to know where a child might stand in relation to the "norm". Further discussion led to two conclusions. Clay's (1993b) Observation Survey does provide stanines for both a New Zealand and a North American population

which could be useful. Teachers could also look at performance within their own classroom to help compare students' entering behaviour and to rank students.

The Kindergarten Curriculum

There was general agreement that kindergarten classes needed to provide more literacy-based activities than what the Reading Recovery teachers perceived to be the case in their schools. There was agreement that a more literacy-based kindergarten program should entail: more reading to students, including writing as not only a part of the curriculum, but as a part of practice, developing literacy activities associated with all centres, and providing more teacher modeling of reading and writing in conjunction with authentic literacy events - having students sign-in and creating a daily message, for example.

Readability Level

Book levelling was an important issue for teachers. There was discussion about the differences between levelling books for the purposes of Reading Recovery and levelling books for classroom use. It was clear that more discussion about book levelling should have occurred in the orientation session. Further work needed to be

carried out regarding the connection between book levels, book choices, and student need. Shortly after, Barbara Peterson's (1991) article on book levelling was recommended. In the second year of the program more emphasis was placed on Clay's chapter on book choices in Becoming Literate: The Construction of Inner Control (Clay, 1991).

Student Selection

Some questions arose that dealt with the selection of students. What was to be done with: (1) students considered developmentally or speech and language delayed, and/or (2) students repeating grade one? The following clarifications were made. The Reading Recovery guideline is that all students within the mainstream grade one classroom are considered eligible candidates for Reading Recovery, without making too many initial assumptions about their limitations and capabilities. The exception to this guideline would be a student repeating grade one. If a student's literacy performance was severe enough to consider retention s/he should have been a priority for the Reading Recovery program the preceding year.

Related to this issue was a question regarding teachers

making incorrect assumptions about a child that could result in reading failure. I encouraged the Reading Recovery teachers to guard against making too many limiting assumptions about a child. The teacher's objective in Reading Recovery is to try to solve instructional problems as they are encountered. The goal is to develop each student into a reader with a self-extending system. Although the Reading Recovery program will not solve all problems, efforts have to be made to reach the most disadvantaged and difficult to teach students.

In terms of student selection, many grade one teachers were, reportedly, hesitant to rank students in their classes for assessment and possible inclusion in the Reading Recovery program. Classroom teachers felt they had to be accurate, which was not the case, and some felt they were labeling children too early in the year. However, many students had already been identified as being at-risk by their respective kindergarten teachers. Also, one of the intents of Reading Recovery is to keep students from being labeled.

A second issue related to student selection was why five year olds in grade one could not be included in the Reading Recovery program at the beginning of the year. The general principle of

"oldest and lowest" is used for student selection in Reading Recovery, in particular, six year olds. Most of the children who were still five-years old in September would be eligible for Reading Recovery once a student given preference was discontinued.

A third issue was why students in grade two could not be included in Reading Recovery. Again, it was emphasized that Reading Recovery was an early intervention program for grade one students, a guideline set in the Reading Recovery program that has to be followed.

Relationship With the Classroom Teacher

The relationship between the Reading Recovery teacher and the grade one teacher was also questioned. The immediate answer was that the relationship would be up to individual Reading Recovery teachers to decide, considering both time factors and workload. Reading Recovery teachers could assist teachers in administering An Observation Survey (Clay, 1993b). Connected to this, the question arose regarding how regular classroom teachers could manage to conduct the individual survey. A brief discussion centred on the need for grade one teachers to provide a balanced literacy environment in which flexible, small group instruction, as

opposed to total whole group instruction, was a major component. This view is similar to that described by Depree and Iverson (1994) who describe balanced literacy programs which allow flexible groupings.

Discontinuing

Another question was in regard to making the evaluation that a student was not benefitting from the program. Teachers were referred to the procedures outlined in Reading Recovery: A Guidebook for Teachers in Training (Clay, 1993a), the guidebook. "Hard to accelerate" procedures outlined should be followed and then decisions made regarding whether the student should be referred for further assessment and/or more intensive special services.

Evening Sessions

A requirement of Reading Recovery training is to observe two teaching sessions in the once-a-week evening sessions. Teachers in the program began to express some concern. In New Zealand, the training is carried out during school time, while in North America sessions have been after school. After a long day it is difficult for both teachers and students to be alert and stay focused. My own

concern as teacher leader was that we did not seem to be using Clay's guidebook enough in our sessions. Although lack of time seemed to be a factor, it was apparent that it was easier to make assumptions about what the guidebook had to say about a certain subject rather than to use it as a point of reference to support the discussion. It was difficult for both myself and teachers to refer to it as needed.

As a group, teachers were focused on organizational and procedural issues during the first term, with a shift towards more strategic issues. The feelings seemed to be in rollercoaster mode. Teachers would begin to feel as if they were gaining control and knowledge and then children would make a shift and there would be new learning required. As we moved into second term I felt I needed to incorporate the use of the guidebook into our discussions more naturally and effectively, as we seemed to make little reference to it during the first term. This would assist us keeping our discussions focused, due to time limitations, and assist in maintaining the quality of the Reading Recovery training.

Program Implementation - Dual Roles

At the end of the first term, teachers expressed concern

about the implementation of Reading Recovery. They felt that due to fiscal restraints and cutbacks at all levels of government, the program would be cut the following year. Although time for Reading Recovery was cut in many schools during the 1995/96 school year, the program was not. As we approach the 1996/97 school year, time is again being increased to better meet the needs of all students who required the program in grade one.

Also of concern was that most Reading Recovery time was directly taken out of resource time, many Reading Recovery teachers being assigned one-half time to Reading Recovery and one-half time to resource. In this change process, some teachers were finding it difficult to separate their roles:

> One difficulty I personally have is to really separate myself and be the Reading Recovery teacher in the morning and Resource in the afternoon. It will take some time to get used to it. (Journal entry)

This problem persisted throughout the first term with some staff members experiencing resentment that they were unable to fulfill their role as resource teacher as well as when resource was a full time responsibility. Unfortunately, the trend of taking time from resource program delivery remains a common practice, a great

concern to me and others.

Communicating With Other Stakeholders

Although many Reading Recovery teachers felt they had not had much time to obtain feedback from teachers, administrators, and parents, they were planning lesson observation visits with parents and were sharing articles and procedures with classroom teachers.

Classroom teachers. In October, many early years classroom teachers attended an inservice on balanced literacy and sessions to learn to administer An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement (Clay, 1993b) for discontinuing purposes in Reading Recovery. Teachers felt these sessions provided a common language for classroom and Reading Recovery teachers. Reading Recovery Teachers enjoyed the opportunity to attend a session together with the classroom teachers and to have someone in the school who had some of the same knowledge. Reading Recovery teachers also found the sessions helpful in consolidating ideas and learning. Reading Recovery and classroom teachers alike began to see positive changes in students quickly both in the Reading Recovery lessons and in the classrooms:

> One of my students (who was two weeks into school at the time) already was saying she didn't like school. My sense is she's struggling in the classroom and that feeling of failure is already seeping in. She does, however, have a big smile when she comes for Reading Recovery, so that's encouraging. (Journal entry)

Three students in one school were particularly worrisome.

> Both the grade one teacher and the resource teacher agreed that Reading Recovery replaced what appeared in September, to be major behaviour problems in 3 boys, with self-confidence, self-esteem, skills, and success. (Journal entry)

All four of these students were successfully discontinued from Reading Recovery.

Parents. Most teachers noted similar ways of engaging with parents so that they could provide more effective support at home. These included contact through letters and notes, telephone calls, sending home daily both books and the cut-up sentence to reconstruct, continuing to send books home after a student was discontinued, informal parental visits at the school and invitations to observe lessons and to discuss them afterwards. Most Reading Recovery teachers found that the amount of home support was reflected in student progress, whether positive or negative. In

their view, the progress of students not receiving home support (in terms of encouragement and reading at home) was not as accelerated as that of students receiving home support. Reading Recovery teachers tried to put supports in place at the schools for students not receiving support at home by enlisting the services of volunteers, teacher assistants and/or older students, but this was not always possible. Where it was possible, there were benefits for the students.

The impact of parental support was described by two teachers:

> I think it gives the parents the feeling that the school really cares about their child and they know they are responsible to help their child with their reading progress. It gives a very positive feeling between home and school and certainly does make a difference to the success of the program. (Journal entry)

> ...some of the parents are being more positive about their child's behaviour by my example. Books and reading were not a daily part of the lives of some of the children and this has definitely changed. I have tried to involve (younger) siblings by sending home level 1-3 books for my student to use in teaching the sibling to read thus promoting family literacy. (Journal entry)

One Reading Recovery teacher noted that parental visits helped

solve behavioral issues with a student. One teacher reflected on a change for next year:

> Next year I will have the parents in more often and I will call them in before I take the child and really emphasize the commitment they must make. (Journal entry)

Only one Reading Recovery teacher indicated that the parents of one student believed teaching reading was only the school's responsibility. However, some parents refused and/or ignored invitations and/or encouragement to support their child's learning at home.

Goal Setting

Many teachers developed goals for the subsequent year of implementation. I feel these reflect concerns and suggest areas that Reading recovery teachers feel need more attention. These goals varied greatly and included student progress, teaching goals, and school-related goals. Although many are interrelated, they have been categorized.

Student progress goals.

- Helping students to make more accelerated progress and to

read at higher levels.

• Monitoring children no longer in the program.

• Developing more independence for students both in Reading Recovery and in the classroom.

• Placing a greater focus on establishing early strategy use.

Teaching goals.

• Making greater use of the guidebook (Clay, 1993a).

• Becoming more proficient at analyzing and keeping records.

• Making more effective use of roaming around the known sessions.

• Emphasizing the making and breaking (word building) part of the lesson.

• Becoming less error-conscious.

School goals.

• Promoting the use of natural language texts and adapting a strategy-based approach to teaching and learning.

• Communicating more with the classroom teachers of students in Reading Recovery.

- Providing literacy support for early years teachers.
- Establishing a school team.
- Putting information on Reading Recovery in the newsletter regularly.
- Involving and supporting parents more.

Continuing Contact

In terms of Continuing Contact sessions for the subsequent year, teachers wanted to continue discussing issues of strategy use, making and breaking, analyzing records, introducing books, accelerating progress, involving parents, making teaching decisions, and other issues brought up through professional reading. More specifically, teachers asked for more discussion regarding children experiencing language difficulties, transferring independence to the classroom, teaching for early gains, and refining procedures. One teacher suggested observing a Roaming Around the Known lesson and visiting each other to gather ideas for room organization.

As indicated, I was also concerned with the impact that the introduction of the Reading Recovery program would have on the

classroom teachers who had students participating in the interventions. Their feedback is considered next.

Classroom Teacher Feedback

The questionnaire (Appendix E) was given to grade one teachers near the end of the school year. Approximately 68 percent responded to the survey, 17 of a possible 25 teachers.

What Shifts In Learning Occurred?

Classroom teachers were involved with the program primarily through the students in their classroom, discussions with the Reading Recovery teacher, participation in inservices, lesson observations, teaching half-time in Reading Recovery and half-time in grade one, using running records, and through involvement in the testing for discontinuing. All but one teacher had attended some inservicing related to Reading Recovery. Value was found in: (1) learning to use the observation survey, specifically in taking running records, (2) being involved in the discontinuing process, (3) sharing instructional techniques for classroom use, (4) assigning book levels, and (5) observing teaching sessions.

Many teachers did not respond to what they found least valuable, but one indicated that she did not like using running records. Others commented that the amount of information at the discontinuing sessions was too much for a short time, that Reading Recovery is not stressed as a classroom program, and that there was repetition in some sessions. However, most teachers indicated that some change had taken place in their teaching through increased focus on strategy use and balanced literacy programming. For follow up, many teachers were planning to: (1) work on developing a literacy lab where books for the early years teachers would be pooled together in text sets for all to use, (2) focus on balanced early literacy instruction in the classroom, and (3) promote literacy across the curriculum and at home. Other comments emphasized the positive aspects of the program and "teacher will" to maintain the program in their schools.

What Were the General Attitudes Towards the Reading Recovery Program?

Classroom teachers noted that there was a significant change in the students participating in the program with transfer to the

classroom. Only one teacher stated that there was not very much classroom transfer. More specifically, teachers noted in their students increased self-confidence, self-esteem, independence and use of cueing systems and strategies in reading.

What Were the Primary Implementation Concerns?

The classroom teachers observed that better progress was made by students who received support at home than those that did not. Parental perception was good for those involved in their child's learning, but not much was said regarding parents who were uninvolved.

All but two teachers wanted more children in the Reading Recovery program because of the positive results and how the program combined with good classroom teaching. The two teachers who did not want more of their students to participate were positive about the program but felt that there were too many children out of the classroom and it was difficult for them to catch up in other subject areas. Two teachers commented on the availability of the program:

> I feel because of maturity and lack of experience

> the program would be more effective with grade two students after they have made social/emotional adjustments to school expectations. (Teacher comment)
>
> The program should be available to more students based on their needs. Unfortunately it is based on how much money is available to run it. (Teacher comment)

Teachers were asked to rate how much the Reading Recovery teacher let them know about the progress of their students in Reading Recovery. A rating scale of 1 (nothing) to 5 (a great deal) was employed. Thirteen responded with a rating of 5, two with a rating of 4, and two with a rating of 3. No classroom teachers responded negatively.

A third group of people involved in the implementation of reading Recovery was school administrators. Their questionnaire data (Appendix F) is examined next.

Administrative Feedback

A questionnaire was sent to twelve administrators in both January and June of the school year. Responses to both surveys were similar, although the June response was somewhat more specific. The responses are dealt with in an integrated way with

significant differences noted.

What Shifts In Learning Occurred?

Overall, administrators had become more focused on literacy, literacy inservicing, and literacy instruction. The Reading Recovery teacher was seen as a resource person, a good teaching model and a motivator for teachers and parents.

What Were the General Attitudes Towards the Reading Recovery Program?

Responses in both terms were positive. Administrators noted the program had made tremendous impact and that children chosen to take part had advanced more quickly than those who had not. Student attitudes, confidence, self-esteem, pride, willingness to learn, improvement in behaviour, motivation, and increased risk-taking were all noted. In January, one administrator questioned whether students should be in the classroom longer before being taken out for Reading Recovery. The positive aspects of training and the commitment undertaken by the Reading Recovery teachers were also noted.

In January the feedback was less specific, but generally, on both surveys, administrators felt that: classroom teachers were positive and seeing results and many found the program effective and were supportive. Although some teachers recognized the intensiveness of the workload for the Reading Recovery teacher, many expressed interest in becoming Reading Recovery teachers themselves. In one school, some teachers believed that the program was too expensive for the results achieved, but others, in the same and different schools, felt it should be given more time.

Principals indicated that the early intervention, and the daily, one-to-one contact by a trained teacher were strengths of the program. Some administrators thought that Reading Recovery would prevent long term behaviour and learning problems. Growth in reading skills, attitudes, confidence, and self-esteem were noted. One administrator noted that the program seemed to work most effectively with strong parental support. An impact on the quality of the literacy instruction in the school was also noted.

Administrators were more aware of what parents were saying about the program in June than in January. In both surveys, principals did not indicate any negative feedback. Parents were

generally perceived as being pleased about having their child in the program and appreciated the help given and results achieved, not only in terms of reading, but in terms of overall motivation and attitudes towards school.

In rating the program there was a slight positive increase from term 1 to term 2. Rating choices ranged from 1 (not a very good program) to 5 (a very good program). Of all the administrators, in January, one administrator rated the program at 3, one at 4, nine at 5, and one at 6+. In June, one administrator rated the program at 4, nine at 5, one at 5+, and one at 10.

What Were the Implementation Concerns?

Overwhelmingly issues of fiscal restraints were noted. The lack of staffing units needed to implement the program was of prime concern. Some thought that not enough students were affected to justify the costs. Also noted was the excessive paperwork and training demands on the teacher.

Some administrators did not like specific requirements being imposed on the school in implementing the program. The guidelines that are indicated to be a Reading Recovery site were felt too

stringent by some. One administrator was concerned that a program developed with public funds in New Zealand was being "franchised", in his view, in North America.

Staffing issues and costs due to budget restraints were of prime concern, especially in small schools. With the prospect of less time being allocated to the program in the second year, some administrators were concerned that they had more at-risk children than Reading Recovery could serve. The result, some administrators feared, would be that if teachers became itinerant, they would have little opportunity to be literacy leaders in their schools. Some administrators felt Reading Recovery should be a priority and on a "protected subjects" list. Some administrators had no concerns about implementing Reading Recovery the following year.

Despite concerns, all administrators indicated ongoing support of the program.

The last group to be surveyed were the parents. Data from the questionnaires (Appendix G) is presented in the following discussion.

Parental Feedback

Approximately 64 questionnaires were to be given to all parents who had a child in Reading Recovery. The response rate at about 25 percent(16/64) was low.

What Shifts In Learning Occurred?

Two of the sixteen parents responded "no" to the question of new learning, with no explanation. One made no response. All others indicated that the Reading Recovery teacher had helped by providing suggestions for working at home. Cited as being of particular value were being shown how to: (1) help while at the same time promoting independence, and (2) exercise patience.

What Were the General Attitudes Towards the Reading Recovery Program?

Parental responses were very positive, with 2 exceptions. One parent indicated that her son did not like school and another that her child did not like being taken out of the classroom, but they were pleased with the gains made. The ways in which Reading Recovery positively affected the child's experience included the

building of greater confidence and improved reading and writing performance. Reading Recovery also enabled children to complete grade one in one year and develop a positive attitude towards learning.

In response to the question of what they would tell other parents about the program, all but one parent had positive things to say. Generally parents felt that any child experiencing difficulty should be in the program as it was helpful, rewarding, and as one parent noted, there was no stigma at the grade one level.

Lessons

All parents were invited to observe their child's Reading Recovery lessons and the majority were able to attend. Parents commented mostly on the amount of work covered and the teacher's effectiveness in helping students. Those unable to attend cited work-related responsibilities, but these parents were able to maintain contact with the teacher in other ways. Reading Recovery teachers, as indicated in their journals, made contact mostly through telephone calls, sending notes and letters home, as well as initiating some type of personal contact, such as school visits to observe Reading Recovery lessons.

Of the number of parents who responded to the rating scale for the Reading Recovery program, no parent circled the two lowest ratings. One parent rated the program as a 3, one parent as a 4, and all others as a 5.

Other comments by parents included:

- Kindness and patience of teacher.
- Gratefulness to the Reading Recovery teacher and program.
- Hopes that the program would be maintained.
- The building of self-confidence through constant praise of accomplishments.

One parent described a child who was frightened and apprehensive about reading who now embraces every opportunity to read. One other parent noted:

> This is a valuable and beneficial tool for our schools, and we were thrilled to be part of it. My only comment is that the title of the program "Reading Recovery" connotes a meaning which is not necessarily applicable to its young participants. Recovery implies a gaining back of something. For most grade 1's there is no gaining back but an acquiring of this skill, thus they cannot "recover" what they never had in the first place. (Parent comment).

Although I agree with this insightful comment, there is a cultural

aspect to the term 'recovery' which perhaps is lost in North America. I heard Marie Clay speak about this term at a conference (exact source unknown). She explained that the term recovery was referred to often in New Zealand as a nautical term, not a medical term. In nautical terms it means putting a sea vessel back on course, if, for some reason it was put off course. If we think of expecting children to take some path to conventional literacy, but for some reason this is not occurring, Reading Recovery attempts to put the child back on that course. However, the term is inappropriate in North America where the connotation of the word 'recovery' is a medical one, and one that assumes something is wrong with the child. The term also does not reflect the interactive nature and philosophy of the program.

What Were the Primary Implementation Concerns?

Several parents sent letters to their respective school boards in support of the program for fear that it might be cut. One parent was concerned about the pull-out aspect of the program, but felt it was a necessary component. As noted above, one parent did not like the connotation of the word 'Recovery'.

Summary

Overall, for all stakeholders the feedback provided implies a positive attitude towards the Reading Recovery program and some implications to consider for further implementation. A summary of findings, synthesizing points of agreement is presented and discussed in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Humans, as social beings, mature intellectually in reciprocal relationships with other people. Vygotsky (1978) points out that the higher cognitive functions actually originate in interactions with others. Cultural development first appears on a social level (between people) and then an individual level (inside individuals). Together, individuals generate and discuss ideas, eliciting thinking that surpasses individual effort. Together and privately, they express different perspectives, agree and disagree, point out and resolve discrepancies, and weigh alternatives. Because people grow by this process, collegiality is a crucial climate factor.

This chapter summarizes and discusses the analyzed data concerning the implementation of Reading Recovery in terms of the guiding questions in regard to learning shifts, attitudes, and implementation concerns.

Learning Shifts

It is apparent that a great deal of learning occurred for all involved in the Reading Recovery program. The learning for each stakeholder was different and specific to the respective situation and role.

Reading Recovery Teachers

Reading Recovery teachers appeared to make the largest shifts in learning of all four groups. This was evident not only from responses to surveys and journals, but also from teacher leader observations and conversations with stakeholders.

Initially, Reading Recovery teachers were concerned with learning procedures, but this quickly shifted to concerns regarding accelerating student progress. This concern, however, was in terms of book reading levels as opposed to student strategy use. By the end of the first term, another shift occurred with Reading Recovery teachers indicating that they were becoming more concerned with teaching for strategies.

By the second term, teachers became concerned with students that were hard to teach and accelerate. Focus on this issue brought

about a deeper understanding of procedures and strategic teaching and learning. Teachers began to think more about students developing independence and becoming proficient at integrating the three cueing systems (meaning, language, and visual or graphophonic) and began to notice how their teaching decisions affected student learning.

As the year progressed, teachers also developed a deeper theoretical understanding of the reading and writing process, the reciprocity of reading and writing, and the teaching of at-risk students. These understandings were developed through student interaction, discussions with other Reading Recovery teachers and the teacher leader, and greater reference to Clay's work (Clay, 1993a, 1993b, 1991).

Outside of their Reading Recovery duties Reading Recovery teachers began to reportedly assume a more reflective stance. Within their other teaching responsibilities, Reading Recovery teachers stated in their journals that they had begun to think about the importance of:

- familiar rereading of books within the program, in the classroom, and at home,

- book introductions to activate meaning,
- including a writing component in learning to read,
- helping students make links between reading and writing,
- developing a meaning-based program and emphasizing the integrated use of cueing systems,
- focusing on strengths for students experiencing difficulties, and
- oral language and scaffolding.

This learning from Reading Recovery was in terms of learning more about the theoretical underpinnings of literacy development, observation and responsive teaching, and most of all, taking a reflective stance towards teaching in all situations.

Overall, as previously documented, learning shifted from basic procedural knowledge, such as lesson format, recordkeeping, and learning Reading Recovery procedures, to increased theoretical understanding of factors that influence reading acquisition:

> I feel I have really grown a tremendous amount as a reading teacher because of my training in Reading Recovery this year. I realized I really didn't know much about how children learned because until a few years ago I never though about it too much. I just followed the guidebooks and did what they told me. I've learned many

> specific things about kids and their reading and writing and definitely have a clearer understanding of the whole process. I learned particularly about the meaning, structure, and the visual cues and about how important it is that those are all integrated. In general I just feel so much wiser, although I know I have lots more to learn and my zone of proximal development will continue to be challenged! (Journal entry)
>
> I feel as if I have a greater understanding of the complex nature of the reading and writing process. I hope that I am better able to try to analyse what is happening when a child makes an error and/or self corrects. At the same time, I realize that in many situations we are only making a good guess at what is going on in the child's head. I have a new appreciation for the close relationship between reading and writing, especially at the early stages. (Journal entry)

The social nature of the training program facilitates these new understandings and thus new learning was, reportedly, transferred to other situations to enhance teaching:

> Meeting the people in the class was also rewarding. These are people I would not normally have had contact with, since they are resource teachers and/or teachers from another division. I learned a lot from sharing our thoughts and ideas. (Journal entry)
>
> Student learning has been affected in the classroom as I have been attempting to use the various literacy strategies throughout the year to support what I already do...I knew, for example, that familiar re-reading was important and necessary, but not the great impact it can have on

> a child's learning and advancement. The book intro idea has been a big change. I never realized the importance of such a thing or how vital a good book intro is to a child's success. (Journal entry)

These findings are similar to the results of a study conducted by Lyons, Pinnel and DeFord (1993). It seems that teachers who participate in Reading Recovery training become more reflective and responsive to student needs. Their decision making seems to be directed by their increased understanding of theories related to the teaching and learning process.

Classroom Teachers

Teachers were involved with Reading Recovery through student participation in the program, assessment training and/or attending other literacy inservicing sessions. Teachers found value in the literacy inservicing they received, but their responses were less specific than those of the Reading Recovery teachers. Reading Recovery was also criticized for not being stressed as a classroom program. These comments indicated that there was a lack of understanding of Reading Recovery's purpose - to focus on the most difficult-to-teach students who might otherwise experience long term literacy learning difficulties. Reading Recovery teachers and

classroom teachers saw great benefit in the assessment sessions involving the classroom teacher as these sessions helped the two groups of teachers speak the same language and stimulated talk about literacy programming and assessment.

Most learning by classroom teachers related to: (1) the administration and use of Clay's survey (Clay, 1993b), specifically the running record component, (2) learning about book levelling, and (3) understanding more about the Reading Recovery program through involvement with discontinuing and observation of Reading Recovery teaching sessions. Also, teachers indicated plans to level books, focus on balanced early literacy instruction, and promote literacy across the curriculum and at home.

Debate over the connection between Reading Recovery and classroom practice (Shanahan & Barr, 1995; Clay, 1991; Lyons, Pinnell & DeFord, 1993) continues. There needs to be a better understanding of the distinction between instruction that has the potential to affect classroom practice and instruction that which is limited to the Reading Recovery program itself. As Lyons, Pinnell, and DeFord (1993) suggest, teachers in their study not involved with the Reading Recovery training itself found

themselves in a state of disequilibrium. These teachers began to demand more information and more help in promoting more reading and writing in their classrooms.

Overall, there seemed to be shifts in the learning of classroom teachers, as reported by them, and especially in regard to: (1) monitoring and responding to student needs by taking running records, (2) matching students with materials appropriate to their reading level, and (3) increased emphasis on writing to focus more on the construction of words (encoding).

Given the method of data collection, however, these findings can only be tenative. For greater credence, further research based on actual classroom observation is required.

Administrators

Administrators were even more vague about their learning. It was difficult to glean their responses to the survey. However, in terms of literacy learning, the administrators felt that the implementation of Reading Recovery increased the focus and interest in literacy instruction and literacy inservicing. The Reading Recovery teacher was viewed as a resource person,

teaching model, and motivator for teachers and parents.

Overall, administrators came to appreciate the value of having the Reading Recovery program in their schools because it renewed interest in literacy learning and instruction.

Parents

Most parents felt they had learned how to help their child read while promoting independence and exercising patience. This occurred, reportedly through lesson observations and dialogue with the Reading Recovery teacher.

Overall, parents viewed their involvement as having positive effects on their children's learning.

Summary

It is evident that Reading Recovery, in this implementation, has had, in my perception, a significant impact on teaching and learning, more specifically in Reading Recovery, but perhaps more generally outside of the Reading Recovery context:

- Reading Recovery teachers appeared to make the greatest

shifts in learning in terms of theoretical understandings and changes in teaching, both in the Reading Recovery and their own teaching situations.

• Classroom teachers began to examine their literacy instruction and wanted more information in regard to early literacy instruction. In particular, balanced literacy instruction and observation survey assessment were topics of interest. Classroom teachers specifically wanted information as to how Reading Recovery could be used in the classroom, indicating a lack of understanding regarding the purpose of the program.

• Administrators appreciated the value of the renewed interest in literacy learning and instruction that the implementation of Reading Recovery brought to their schools.

• Parental involvement had a positive effect on children's learning. Parent observation of lessons also provided parents with ways to assist children at home.

These shifts, however, are probably not a direct result of Reading Recovery for those not involved in the Reading Recovery training, although they may be for Reading Recovery teachers who also had other teaching assignments. Reading Recovery does not provide a mechanism for changing classroom instruction. However, the investment in the program highlighted literacy instruction. Reading Recovery teachers who were also classroom teachers and resource teachers probably gained from the focus on building a theory of reading acquisition instruction, close observation of student behaviour, and reflecting on teaching decisions.

General Attitudes Towards Reading Recovery

All stakeholders had a positve attitude towards the Reading Recovery program.

Reading Recovery Teachers

It was obvious the Reading Recovery teachers were committed to the Reading Recovery program. Reading Recovery teachers' attitudes towards the program were in terms of their own growth as a teacher and positive student gains. However, it

was noted that this process was not an easy one. Teachers were often frustrated because their shifts in learning created disequilibrium and called for deeper reflection, and change in instructional practices.

Classroom Teachers

Classroom teacher attitudes were generally positive. This was due mostly to the positive learning that took place when their students participated in the program and these effects transferred to increased classroom performance. Some classroom teachers remarked on the enhanced integrated use of the cueing systems and the reading and writing strategies employed by their students. New learning and teacher growth also seemed to contribute to this positive attitude.

Administrators

Administrators were very positive about the program and rated it highly. They felt the program had a great impact on the students involved in terms of accelerated progress, attitude, confidence, self-esteem, pride, willingness to learn, improvement

in behaviour, motivation, and risk-taking. In terms of literacy learning for their school as a whole, the administrators felt that the implementation of Reading Recovery increased the focus and interest in literacy instruction and literacy inservicing.

Administrators felt that most teachers were positive about the program and were seeing positive results, although some thought it was too expensive for the results achieved and others felt the program should be given more time. This is very important as many seemed to keep losing sight of the fact that this was the first year of implementation and teacher-training. The teacher leader was also newly trained. The perception was that Reading Recovery was a very intense program in terms of training demands and recordkeeping. Some administrators felt that the guidelines for implementing Reading Recovery were too stringent.

Parents

All parents rated the Reading Recovery program highly, but one parent commented negatively on the pull-out aspect of the program, although s/he could see that this was necessary. Another parent indicated her/his son did not like school, but did not specify

that Reading Recovery was the reason.

Primary Implementation Concerns

Each group of stakeholders had their own implementation concerns but, as noted, all had one common wish: that the Reading Recovery program be continued. The results of the data analysis in regard to each issue are summarized below.

Reading Recovery teacher concerns were very broad in nature. One major area of concern dealt with the teaching procedures and issues directly related to teaching within the Reading Recovery program. For many of these issues teachers were directed to Clay's guidebook (1993a) for discussion and clarification. This is an ongoing process in the program.

Other areas of concern which arose from the implementation, but could not be directly answered by the Reading Recovery program were noted. These were areas teachers were encouraged to discuss and problem-solve within their individual schools and with each other. In some cases, classroom teachers. administrators and parents identified similar concerns. These concerns were:

The Lack of Literacy-Based Activities in Kindergarten

Along with initiatives within individual schools to develop more literacy-based kindergarten programs, during the second year of implementation the school division took initiative. All kindergarten teachers were provided with extensive inservicing on the use of Clay's Observation Survey in kindergarten (Clay, 1993b), book levelling, how to incorporate literacy into centres, and the importance of writing in kindergarten. It is very apparent now that kindergarten programs are changing and that literacy is becoming a more specific focus.

Matching Reading Recovery Book Levels With Classroom Book Levels

All schools have had many opportunities to attend sessions on book levelling and some schools have begun the process of developing a literacy lab of levelled books for their early years classrooms.

Dual Roles Within a School

By the second year of implementation teachers had sorted out most of these problems. A better understanding of the program in the schools and the clarification of roles seemed to assist with

this process.

Communicating With Other Stakeholders

Many schools began developing school teams to deal with implementation of the program. This allowed for regular meetings and communication about the Reading Recovery program and any issues revolving around the implementation of the program.

Teacher Training

Teachers and administrators were concerned with the weekly evening sessions and the time and stress entailed. Reading Recovery teachers also preferred to observe one lesson during the teaching session, as opposed to two. In the subsequent year, a change was made that followed the original New Zealand design of Reading Recovery more closely: assessment sessions were held the first two weeks of school during school time and Reading Recovery teachers in-training met every second week, for a total of approximately eighteen sessions throughout the year. The two teaching sessions in which every Reading Recovery teacher in training participates in twice throughout the year were maintained, as the program requires.

Lack of Parental Support

There was some concern that students not receiving home support in reading were not making the same gains as other students in the program. Although a concern, no child could be released from the program because of the lack of parental support. Teachers were encouraged, and many did so in the following year, to communicate with parents as much as possible and in the most effective way possible, but if they did not succeed in soliciting parent support they were encouraged to establish extra supports within the school. Even if this was not possible, the child had to be allowed the same opportunities as all other students in the Reading Recovery program.

Fiscal Restraints

All stakeholders expressed some concern that due to government cutbacks, Reading Recovery would not survive or would be cut back drastically. In the second year, most schools allowed only one hour of Reading Recovery daily. The reduced impact and effectiveness of the program was noted and in the third year of implementation at least one school division mandated that each school provide enough Reading Recovery time to meet the needs of

approximately 15-20 percent of the grade one population by the end of the year.

Classroom Need

Many classroom teachers felt that more Reading Recovery time was needed to meet the needs of all children who needed extra support. While Reading Recovery time was actually reduced in the second year of implementation, when this paper was compiled, indications were that time will be increased again in the third year.

Student Selection

In terms of student selection, many grade one teachers were hesitant to rank students in their classes for assessment and possible inclusion in the Reading Recovery program. They felt they had to be accurate with the ranking. Some believed they were labeling the children too early in the year. Teachers were also concerned that five year olds were not included. However, many students had already been identified as being at-risk by their respective kindergarten teachers. Also, one of the intents of Reading Recovery is to prevent a child from being labeled and being involved in long-term interventions. At the same time, teachers

felt Reading Recovery should also be offered in grade two.

Pull-Out Program

Two teachers were concerned with the pull-out aspect of the program because of missed classwork. This is a difficult issue to resolve if the student requires individual support. Classroom teachers and Reading Recovery teachers were asked to decide on timetabling together, if it were possible, so that children would only miss a minimal amount of classroom work. Teachers were also asked to be cognizant of the fact that this was a short term intervention and to make allowances for it. One parent also identified this as a concern.

Implications for Implementation

Given the amount of learning that occurred by all stakeholders, the positive attitudes towards the program, and concern for the survival of Reading Recovery, the goal was, and still is, to continue towards quality implementation.

Although not successful in increasing implementation time for Reading Recovery in the second year, the stakeholders quickly noticed the difference in the effectiveness of the program when

time was compromised. From personal observation, this has caused many difficulties. One of the difficulties is that of maintaining the skills and strategies that Reading Recovery teachers developed in training. As teachers teach more children they refine their observational skills and learn to become more sensitive and responsive to student needs. Working with only two students per day makes developing this skill very difficult.

Also, teachers are still working with the lowest readers in the grade one class. Not in all cases, but often, it seems that these children are the ones who are in the program the longest and there are not many opportunities for other children who need the program to be involved in it. This cutback did not allow for many of the children who may have been carried over in grade two to finish their program. This problem was identified in the American Reading Recovery program and leaves students with the status of being referred to the resource program or other special services when, perhaps, this could have been avoided. Not providing carry over for students unable to complete their program because of the end of the year also affects the research into program benefits.

As we move into the third year of implementation, schools

are being asked to allow for enough time so that at least 20 percent of the grade one students are afforded the opportunity to be in the program if the need exists. This increase in time will allow all children that need more time in the program to be carried over and complete their programs. Unfortunately, most of this time will need to come from school staff as opposed to extra time being given by the school board. This is mainly due to the fact that the provincial government has continued to make cutbacks in education grants. Since schools need to find Reading Recovery time within their allotted staffing, there is a risk that time will be taken from areas which may support students who might be referred for more specialized help.

In response to teacher concerns that a weekly session, with two teaching sessions was exhausting, a change was made emulating the New Zealand model of teacher training which suggests teachers meet on a bi-weekly basis, for approximately eighteen sessions throughout the year. Two teaching sessions still occur at each meeting, as this is required by the training model and allows teachers to observe and discuss the progress of two students as opposed to focusing on only one. In New Zealand

classes are held during the school day and ours are still held in the evening. However, from personal observation it is evident that bi-weekly meetings provide both the Reading Recovery teachers and teacher leader with more time to reflect on new learning. It has also helped me, as a teacher leader, to focus on the most effective and important points to bring up in class. "Less is more" is a motto I have needed to keep in mind in order not to overwhelm myself and the Reading Recovery teachers in training.

Assessment practices were also changed. The Observation Survey (Clay, 1993b) continued to be used, however for compiling running records, teachers use their choice of levelled Reading Recovery books and/or classroom material as opposed to the standardized book sets traditionally used in North America. Teachers were concerned that they would have difficulty choosing books for testing so a variety of books from different levels were identified as books that might be suitable. However, the final decision of which books to use remains with the Reading Recovery teacher.

Also related to the assessment training sessions, they are now held every other half day, during school time, the first two

weeks of school. This has provided Reading Recovery teachers in training with the time to use the test and return to the training sessions with concrete data for ongoing interpretive feedback.

The Canadian Institute of Reading Recovery has started to collect data from Reading Recovery schools across Canada in order to develop some national statistics. This has alleviated much of the paperwork that was previously done for the North American collection of data done at Ohio State University.

Implications For Further Research

It would be interesting to follow-up the Reading Recovery teachers after their initial training year and compare the success rates of those working with four or more students and those working with only two students. As I have already noted, the time for Reading Recovery will be increased in schools, but financial support is not available. This implies that other services, already suffering from financial constraints, will be further cut. This research could be extended to look at what happens to referred children from the Reading Recovery program and other referred students in the school who are not involved in Reading Recovery.

It would be interesting to examine the relationship, if any, of the Reading Recovery teacher's literacy instruction experience and academic background and their success as Reading Recovery teachers. Although it is strongly suggested that Reading Recovery teachers have a strong early literacy background, in particular teaching grade one, this is not always the case. From my personal observation, my hypothesis would be that rather than direct experience with early literacy teaching and being academically aware of the literature on literacy acquisition, the success of a Reading Recovery teacher has more to do with an individual's ability and willingness to reflect critically, learn, change and share. For example, school staff may not have had opportunities to reflect on their own literacy teaching and might not have supported Reading Recovery because they felt excluded from the implementation process. This is an issue that has not received much attention, but one that may warrant further investigation.

Actual classroom instructional observation of Reading Recovery teachers to determine to what extent transfer of learning takes place would be interesting to follow-up on, as would long term follow up of students formerly in the Reading Recovery

program.

A closer examination of stakeholders, other than the Reading Recovery teachers, would also be an interesting extension, of this research to gain more insight into growth, learning and change of the stakeholders. In particular, it might be interesting to examine how parents can be encouraged to become more involved and interested in their children's literacy learning. As a staff begins to implement Reading Recovery, schoolwide possibilities to enhance literacy learning exist. Questions to explore include: (1) How can the staff implement a schoolwide plan to improve the literacy achievement of students? (2) Does the implementation of the Reading Recovery program have schoolwide implications? (3) What elements are applicable? And (4) What has to happen in classrooms, with parents, and with assessment and practice to reach desired levels of literacy achievement with students?

Epilogue

I have, to date, been involved in the Reading Recovery program for three years. My interest and studies in early literacy learning, at-risk students, and the reading-writing relationship led to my involvement in the program. My graduate coursework, along with my Reading Recovery training has allowed me to grow as a teacher beyond my expectations. However, the experience has also been humbling. I increasingly realize how much more I need to know each passing day as I work with the six year-olds. They do not allow me to become too comfortable with my assumptions or beliefs. For me, the greatest self-perceived shift in learning, since my involvement in Reading Recovery, was that my actions and beliefs did not always match. My attempts to meet the needs of at-risk learners were still driven by some preconceived, reductionistic notions I still had about how children learn. I now feel I truly try to find a child's strengths and help that child grow through using those strengths. Now, when my preconceived notions sneak in, I can recognize them, acknowledge them, and then decide whether to use them or discard them.

At a broader level, I have had opportunity to work with people

at all levels of the education system in my role as a teacher leader. In many cases I encountered resistance very similar to the resistance described in the research. Also congruent with the research, the resistance diminished over the course of the year. I attribute this mostly to the success teachers had with students and the support of parents. I must note, however, that to me, resistance implies that someone is doing something they do not believe in or want to be involved in. In the majority of the cases, at all levels, people involved in the Reading Recovery program were involved because they wanted to be. So perhaps the resistance was really more of a challenge and/or part of the process of learning about something new as opposed to opposition to the intervention.

My attitude towards Reading Recovery continues to be supportive, although I realize that implementing Reading Recovery is part of an answer to a problem, not the whole answer. Implementing a high quality program is difficult and requires commitment. I believe we need to support a comprehensive approach to program implementation that includes: (1) programs for the parents of preschoolers, (2) intensive staff development of all early years teachers, including kindergarten teachers, so that

they incorporate early literacy activities into their current programs and choose appropriately levelled books for their students, and (3) holistic instructional approaches in reading and writing that include intensive teaching and systematic assessment. Reading Recovery is for those remaining students who still require intervention in spite of both good early literacy experiences and school instruction. The purpose of Reading Recovery is not to replace or provide for classroom programming. However, in my experience, the implementation of the program does bring literacy instruction to center stage and becomes a springboard to encourage reflection and change in all literacy practices.

A school seeking productive ways of meeting the schooling needs of all students must conclude that there is no easy answer. Interventions, however, like Reading Recovery, provide an important component of school services to a school. Long term development of literacy, language, and communication processes occurs through a strong core curriculum and classroom literacy emphasis and experiences. Building this strong literacy foundation for every child requires diverse strategies and a variety of literacy services, each contributing to the clear focus of building

independence within each student.

As a teacher leader my greatest concern was the reduced time allowed for Reading Recovery in the schools. The majority of teachers only worked with two students per day. Not only did this not provide the program for every child in grade one who needed it, but I feared that the training and expertise gained by teachers would be threatened and compromised. My hope of an increased implementation rate is being realized in the 1996-97 school year, as schools in one school division attempt to achieve full implementation of Reading Recovery. This should allow every child who requires support in reading during grade one to be involved in the intervention. It will be only after a few consecutive years of full implementation that we can truly assess the success potential of Reading Recovery.

In closing, I now look forward to a new challenge. As I embark on a new teaching position as a reading clinician, I am eager to explore how the learning which I attribute to my Reading Recovery training will apply within a broader spectrum.

REFERENCES

Allington, R., and Broikou, R., (1988). Development of shared knowledge: A new role for classroom and specialist teachers. The Reading Teacher, 41, 806-821.

Allington, R., Stuetzel, H., Shake, M., and Lamarche, S. (1986). What is remedial reading? A descriptive study. Reading Research and Instruction, 26, 15-30.

Anderson, R.C. (1988). The Ohio Reading Recovery project: Comprehensive report of program evaluation, 1984-1987. Unpublished manuscript.

Anderson, R.C. and Armbruster, B.B. (1990). Some maxims for learning and instruction. Teachers College Record, 91, 396-408.

Archambault, F. (1989). Instructional setting and other design features of compensatory education programs. In R.E. Slavin, N.L. Karweit, and N.A. Madden (Eds.), Effective programs for students at risk (220-263). Toronto: Allyn and Bacon.

Bean, R.M., Cooleu, W.W., Eichelberger, R.T., Lazar, M.K., and Zigmond, N. (1991). Inclass or pullout: Effects of setting on the remedial reading program. Journal of Reading Behavior, 23, 445-468.

Bradley, L. and Bryant, P. (1983). Categorising sounds and learning to read: A casual connection. Nature, 310, 419-421.

Center, Y., Wheldall, K., Freeman, L., Outhred, L., and McNaught, M. (1995). An experimental evaluation of Reading Recovery. Reading Research Quarterly, 30, 240-263.

Center, Y., Wheldall, K., and Freeman, L. (1992). Evaluating the effectiveness of Reading Recovery: A critique. Educational Psychology, 12, 263-273.

Chomsky, C. (1971). Write first, read later. Childhood Education, 296-299.

Clay, M.M. (1994). Reading Recovery: The wider implications of an educational innovation. Literacy, Teaching and Learning, 1 (1), 121-141.

Clay, M.M. (1993a). Reading Recovery: A guidebook for teachers in training. Portsmouth NH: Heinemann.

Clay, M.M. (1993b). An observation survey of early literacy achievement. Portsmouth NH: Heinemann.

Clay, M.M. (1992a). A second chance to learn literacy by different routes to common outcomes (The Reading Recovey Programme). In T. Cline (Ed.), The assessment of special educational needs: International perspectives. Routledge: London.

Clay, M.M. (1992b). Why is an inservice program for Reading Recovery teachers necessary? Arizona Reading Journal, 20 (2), 55-60.

Clay, M.M. (1991). Becoming Literate: The Construction of Inner Control. Portsmouth NH: Heinemann.

Clay, M.M. (1990). Invited Address to AERA Annual Meeting. Boston.

Clay, M.M. (1987). Implementing Reading Recovery: Systemic adaptations to an educational innovation. New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 22 (1), 35 - 58.

Clay, M.M. and Cazden, C.B. (1990). A Vygotskian interpretation of Reading Recovery. In L.C. Moll (Ed.), Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology (202-222). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Clay, M.M. and Watson, B. (1982). An inservice program for Reading Recovery teachers. In M.Clay (Ed.), Observing young

readers: Selected papers by Marie M. Clay. Auckland: Heinemann.

Cockrum, W.A., and Castillo, M. (1991). Whole language assessment and evaluation strategies. In B. Harp (Ed.), Assessment and evaluation in whole language programs (73-86). Norwood: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Copeland, K.A., and Edwards, P.A. (1990). Towards understanding the roles parents play in supporting young children's development in writing. Early Child Development and Care, 56, 11-17.

DeFord, D.E. (1984). Classroom contexts for literacy learning. In T. E. Raphael (Ed.), The contexts of school-based literacy (163-180). Toronto: Random House.

DeFord, D.E., Lyons, C.A., and Pinnell, G.S. (1991). Introduction. In D.E. DeFord, C.A. Lyons, and G.S. Pinnell (Eds). Bridges to literacy: Learning from Reading Recovery (1-8). Portsmouth NH: Heinemann.

Depree, H. and Iverson, S. (1994). Early literacy in the classroom: A new standard for junior classes. Richmond Hill: Scholastic.

Donley, J., Baenan, N., and Hundley, S. (1993). A study of the long-term effectiveness of the Reading Recovery program. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Asociation, Atlanta Georgia.

Dunkeld, C. (1991). Maintaining the integrity of a promising program: The case of Reading Recovery. In D.E. DeFord, C.A. Lyons, and G.S. Pinnell (Eds). Bridges to literacy: Learning from Reading Recovery. (37-53). Portsmouth NH: Heinemann.

Durkin, D. (1974/75). A six year study of children who learned to read in school at age four. Reading Research Quarterly, 10, 9-61.

Durkin, D. (1966). Children who read early. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dyer, P.C. (1992). Reading Recovery: A cost-effectiveness and educational outcomes analysis. Spectrum, 10, 10-19.

Dyer, P.C., and Binkney, R., (1995). Estimating cost-effectiveness and educational retention, remediation, special education, and early intervention. In R.L. Allington and S.A. Walmsley (Eds.) No quick fix: Rethinking literacy programs in America's elementary schools (61-37). Teacher's College Press: New York.

Eckhoff, B. (1983). How reading affects children's writing. Language Arts, 60, 607-615.

Ehri, L. C. (1989). The development of spelling knowledge and its role in reading acquisition and reading disability. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 22, 356-365.

Ehri, L.C. (1987). Learning to read and spell words. Journal of Reading Behaviour, 19, 5-31.

Flinders, D.J. (1988). Teacher isolation and the new reform. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 4 (1), 17-29.

Fullan, M., and Hargreaves, A. (1991). What's worth fighting for? Toronto: Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation.

Franklin, E.A. (1992). Learning to read and write the natural way. Teaching Exceptional Children, 24, 45-48.

Gaffney, J. (1994). Reading Recovery: Widening the scope of prevention for children at risk of reading failure. In K. Wood and B. Algozzine (Eds.), Teaching reading to students with special needs: An integrated approach (231-246). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Gaffney, J.S. and Paynter, S.Y. (1994). The role of early literacy intervention in the transformations of educational systems.

Literacy, Teaching and Learning, 1 (1), 29-42.

Gavelek, J. (1984). The social contexts of literacy and schooling: A developmental perspective. In T. E. Raphael (Ed.), The contexts of school-based literacy (3-26). Toronto: Random House.

Geeke, P. (1992). Reading Recovery: It's not what you do, it's the way you do it. In N. and E.B. Jones (Eds.), Management approaches To discipline (170-188). London: Kogan Press.

Geeke, P. (1988). Evaluation report on the Reading Recovery field trials in Central Victoria, 1984. Australia: Centre For Studies in Literacy, University of Wollongong.

Gentile, L.M. and McMillan, M. M. (1990). Literacy through literature: Motivating at-risk students to read and write. Reading, Writing, and Learning Disabilities Research, 6, 383-393.

Gillet, J.W. and Temple, C. (1990). Understanding reading problems: Assessment and instruction. Glenview: Scott-Foresman.

Glatthorn, A. A. (1987). Co-operative professional development: Peer-centered options for teacher growth. Educational Leadership, 45 (3), 31-35.

Glazer, S.M. (1989). Oral language and literacy development. In D. Strickland and L.M. Morrow (Eds.). Emergent literacy: Young children learn to read and write (89-93). Newark: International Reading Association.

Glynn, T., Crooks, T., Bethune, N. Ballard, K., and Smith, J. (1989). Reading Recovery in context. Wellington: New Zealand Department of Education.

Goldenberg, C. (1991). Learning to read in New Zealand: The balance of skills and meaning. Language Arts, 68, 555-562.

Goodman, K.S. (1965). A linguistic study of cues and miscues in reading. Elementary English, 42, 639-742.

Graves, D. (1985). They can all write! Learning Disabilities Focus, 1, 36-43.

Graves, D. (1978). Balance the basics: Let them write. New York: Ford Foundation.

Gregory, D., Earl, L., and O'Donoghue, B. (1992). A study of Reading Recovery in Scarbourough: Executive summary. Scarborough: Scarborough Board of Education.

Griffith, P.L. and Olson, M.W. (1992). Phonemic awareness helps beginning readers break the code. The Reading Teacher, 45 (7), 516-523.

Guthrie, J. (1981). Reading in New Zealand: Achievement and volume. Reading Research Quarterly, 17, 6-27.

Harris, T.L. and Hodges, R.E. (1995). The literacy dictionary: The vocabulary of reading and writing. Newark: International Reading Association.

Harste, J.C., Woodward, V.A., and Burke, C.L. (1984). Examining our assumptions: A transactional view of literacy and learning. Research in the Teaching of English, 18, 84-109.

Hiebert, E.H. (1994). Reading Recovery in the United States. Educational Researcher, 23 (9), 15-25.

Hill, L.B. and Hale, M.G. (1991). Reading Recovery: Questions classroom teachers ask. The Reading Teacher, 44 (7), 480-483.

Holdaway, D. (1979). The foundations of literacy. Toronto: Scholastic.

Huck, C.S. and Pinnell, G.S. (1985). The Reading Recovery project in Columbus Ohio: Pilot year, 1984/1985. Technical Report. Columbus: Ohio State University.

Johnson, D.W. and Johnson, R.T. (1987). Research shows the

benefits of adult co-operation. Educational Leaders, 45 (3), 27-30.

Johnston, P. and Allington, R. (1991). Remediation. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, and P.D. Pearson (Eds.), Handbook of reading research: Volume 2 (984-1012). White Plains, NY: Longman Publishing Group.

Jones, N.K., (1991). Helping to learn: Components and principles of Reading Recovery training. Reading Horizons, 31 (5), 421-438.

Juel, C. (1988). Learning to read and write: A longitudinal study of 54 children from first through fourth grades. Journal of Educational Psychology, 80, 437-447.

Juel, C., Griffith, P.L., and Gough, P.B. (1986). Acquisition of literacy: A longitudinal study of children in first and second grade. Journal of Educational Psychology, 78, 243-255.

Lester, N. (1993). Teachers becoming transformative intellectuals. English Education. 231-250.

Levin, H.M. (1991). Financing the education of at-risk students. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 11 (1), 47-60.

Loban, W. (1964). Language ability: Grades seven, eight, and nine. Berkeley: University of California. ERIC Ed 001275.

Lyons, C.A. (1991). A comparative study of the teaching effectiveness of teachers participating in a year-long or two-week inservice program. Fortieth yearbook of the National Reading Council.

Lyons, C.A., Pinnell, G.S., and DeFord, D.E. (1993). Partners in learning: Teachers and children in Reading Recovery. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lyons, C. and Beaver, J. (1995). Reducing retention and learning

disability placement through Reading Recovery: An educationally sound, cost-effective choice. In R.L. Allington and S.A. Walmsley (Eds.) No quick fix: Rethinking literacy programs in America's elementary schools (116-136). Teacher's College Press: New York.

Madden, N.A. and Slavin, R.E. (1989). Effective pullout programs for students at risk. In R.E. Slavin, N.L. Karweit, and N.A. Madden (Eds.), Effective programs for students at risk (52-75). Toronto: Allyn and Bacon.

Madden, N.A., Slavin, R.A., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L. and Wasik, B.A. (1991). Success for all. Phi Delta Kappan, 69 (71), 472-477.

Mason, J., and Allen, J.B. (1986). A review of emergent literacy with implications for research and practice in reading. Review of Research in Education, 13, 3-47.

Mason, J., Stewart, J., and Dunning, D. (1984). What kindergarten children know about reading. In T. E. Raphael (Ed.), The contexts of school-based literacy (97-114). Toronto: Random House.

McCarthey, S.J. and Raphael, T.E. (1992). Alternative research perspectives. In J.W. Irwin and M.A. Doyle (Eds.), Reading writing connections: Learning from research (2-30). Newark: IRA.

McGill-Franzen, A., and Allington, R.L. (1991). Every child's right: Literacy. The Reading Teacher, 45 (2), 86-90.

Merriam, S. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco: Journey-Bass.

Mitchell, C. (1994). Organizational learning and educational reform: Learning to do things differently. The Canadian Administrator, 33 (5), 1-7.

Morrow, L.M., O'Connor, E.M., and Smith, J.K. (1990). Effects of a

story reading program on the literacy development of at-risk kidergarten children. Journal of Reading Behavior, 22 (3), 255-275.

Newman, J. M. (1991). Interwoven conversations: Learning and teaching through critical reflection. Toronto: OISE Press.

Opitz, M.F. (1991). Hypothesizing about Reading Recovery. Reading Horizons, 31 (5), 409-420.

Palincsar, A.S., and Klenk, L. (1992). Fostering literacy learning in supportive contexts. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 25, 211-225.

Patterson, L. and Shannon, P. (1993). Reflection, inquiry, action. In L. Patterson, C. Minnick Santa, K.G. Short and K. Smith (Eds.), Teachers are researchers: Reflection and action (7-11). Newark: IRA.

Peterson, B. (1991). Selecting books for beginning readers: Children's literature suitable for young readers: A bibliography. In D.E. Deford, C.A. Lyons, G.S. Pinnell (Eds.) Bridges to literacy: Learning from Reading Recovery (119-148). Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Pinnell, G.S., DeFord, D., Lyons, C., Bryk. A., (1995). Response to Rasinski. Reading Research Quarterly, 30 (2), 272-275.

Pinnell, G.S. (1992). What is Reading Recovery? Arizona Reading Journal, 20 (2), 61-67.

Pinnell, G.S. (1990). Success for low achievers through Reading Recovery. Educational Research. (September), 17-21.

Pinnell, G.S. (1989a). Success of at-risk children in a program that combines writing and reading. In J. Mason (Ed.), Reading and writing connections (237-259). Toronto: Allyn and Bacon.

Pinnell, G.S. (1989b). A systemic approach to reducing the risk of reading failure. In J.B. Allen and J.M. Mason (Eds). Risk

makers, risk takers, risk breakers: Reducing the risks for young literacy learners (295-313). Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Pinnell, G.S. (1988). Sustained effects of a strategy-centered early intervention program in reading. A paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Columbus, OH.

Pinnell, G.S. (1987). Helping teachers see how readers read: Staff development through observation. Theory into Practice, 26, 51-58.

Pinnell, G.S., DeFord, D.E. and Lyons, C.A. (1988). Reading Recovery: Early intervention for at risk first grade readers. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Pinnell, G.S., Lyons, C.A., DeFord, D.E., Bryk, A.S., and Seltzer, M. (1994). Studying the effectiveness of early intervention approaches for first grade children having difficulty in reading. Reading Research Quarterly, 29 (1), 9-39.

Power, J., and Sawkins, S. (1991). Changing lives: Report of the implementation of the Reading Recovery Program on the North Coast, NSW. Northern Rivers: University of New England.

Rasinski, T. (1995a). On the effects of Reading Recovery. Reading Research Quarterly, 30, 264-270.

Rasinski, T. (1995b). Reply to Pinnell, DeFord, Lyons and Bryk. Reading Research Quarterly, 30, 276-277.

Reading Recovery Staff. (1991). Reading Recovery in Illinois: A report of the first three years. Urbana-Champaign, Illinois: Centre for the study of Reading.

Rhodes, L.K. and Dudley-Marling, C. (1988). Readers and writers with a difference: A holistic approach to teaching learning disabled and remedial students. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Rinehart, J.S. and Short, P.M. (1991). Viewing Reading Recovery as a restructuring phenomenon. Journal of School Leadership, 1, 379-399.

Robinson, V. (1989). Some limitations of systemic adaptation: The implementation of Reading Recovery. New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 24 (1), 35-40.

Rosenholtz, S.J. (1989). Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools. New York: Longman.

Sarason, S.B. (1990). The predictable failure of educational reform: Can we change course before it's too late? San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shanahan, T. (1987). Review of the early detection of reading difficulties, 3rd ed. Journal of Reading behaviour, 19, 117-119.

Shananhan, T., and Barr, R. (1995). Reading Recovery: An independent evaluation of the effects of an early instructional intervention for at-risk learners. Reading Research Quarterly, 30 (4) 958-996.

Shanahan, T. (1984). Nature of the reading-writing relationship: An exploratory mutivariate analysis. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 466-477.

Shanahan, T. and Lomax, R.G. (1986). An analysis and comparison of theoretical models of the reading-writing relationship. Journal of Educational Psychology, 78, 116-123.

Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N.L., and Wasik, B.A.(1993). Preventing early school failure: What works. Educational Leadership, 50 (1), 10-18.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Dolan, L.J., Wasik, B., Ross, S., and Smith, L. (1994). Success for All: Longitudinal effects of systemic school-by-school reform in seven districts. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association

Annual Meeting, New Orleans.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L.J. and Wasik, B.A. (1991). Success for all: Ending reading failure from the beginning. Language Arts, 68, 404-409.

Slavin, R.E. (1991). Chapter 1: A vision for the next quarter century. Phi Delta Kappan, 72, 586-592.

Slavin, R.E. (1987). Making Chapter 1 make a difference. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 110-119.

Smith-Burke, M.T., and Jaggar, A.M. (1994). Implementing Reading Recovery in New York. In E.H. Hiebert and B.M. Taylor (Eds.), Getting reading right from the start (63-84). New York: Teachers College Press.

Solity, J. (1995). Teaching phonological skills to reception age children. In B. Raban-Bisby, G. Brooks, and S. Wolfendale (Eds.), Developing language and literacy in the national english curriculum (81-97). England: Trentham Books/UKRA.

Spiegel, D.L. (1995). A comparison of traditional remedial programs and Reading Recovery: Guidelines for success for all programs. The Reading Teacher, 86-96.

Stahl, S.A. and Miller, P.D. (1989). Whole language and experience approaches for beginning reading: A quantitative research synthesis. Review of Educational Research, 59 (1), 87-116.

Sulzby, E. (1994). Children's emergent reading of favorite storybooks: A developmental study. In R.B. Ruddell, M.R. Ruddel and H. Singer (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading, fourth edition (244-280). Newark: IRA.

Sulzby, E. and Barnhart, J. (1992). The development of academic competence: All our children emerge as writers and readers. In J.W. Irwin and M.A. Doyle (Eds.), Reading writing

connections: Learning from research (120-145). Newark: IRA.

Sulzby, E. and Teale, W. (1991). Emergent literacy. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, and P.D. Pearson (Eds.), Handbook of reading research: Volume 2 (727-757). White Plains, NY: Longman Publishing Group.

Sumner, H.M. (1991). Whole language assessment and evaluation: A special education perspective. In B. Harp (Ed.), Assessment and evaluation in whole language programs (137-157). Norwood: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Taylor, B.M., Strait, J., and Medo, M.A. (1994). Early intervention in reading: Supplemental instruction for groups of low-achieving students provided by first grade teachers. In E.H. Hiebert and B.M. Taylor (Eds.), Getting reading right from the start: Effective early literacy intervention (107-121). Needham, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Taylor, B.M., Short, R.A., Frye, B.J., and Shearer, B.A. (1992). Classroom teachers prevent reading failure among low-achieving first grade students. The Reading Teacher, 45, 592-597.

Taylor, D. and Strickland, D.S. (1986). Family storybook reading. Richmond Hill: Scholastic.

Tharp, R.G., and Gallimore, R. (1988). Rousing minds to life: Teaching and schooling in social context. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tierney, R.J. and Shanahan, T. (1991). Research on the reading-writing relationship: Interactions, transactions, and outcomes. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, and P.D. Pearson (Eds.), Handbook of reading research: Volume II (246-286). New York: Longman Publishing Group.

van Kleek, A. (1990). Emergent literacy: Learning about print before learning to read. Topics in Language Disorders,10

(2), 25-45.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1986), Thought and language. Cambridge, MA.: The MIT Press.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.

Walmsley, S.A. and Anderson, R.L. (1995). Redefining and reforming instructional support programs for at-risk students. In R.L. Allington and S.A. Walmsley (Eds.), No quick fix: Rethinking literacy programs in America's elementary schools (19-44). New York: Teacher's College Press.

Wasik, B.A., and Slavin, R.E. (1993). Preventing early reading failure with one-to-one tutoring: A review of five programs. Reading Research Quarterly, 28, 178-200.

Wheeler, H.G. (1984). Reading Recovery: Central Victorian field trials. Victoria, Australia: Bendigo College of Advanced Education.

Wong, S., Groth, L., and O'Flahavan, J. (1995). Classroom implications of Reading Recovery. Reading Today, 13 (3), 12.

Wood, D. (1988). How children think and learn: The social contexts of cognitive development. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Wright, A. (1992). Evaluation of the first British Reading Recovery programme. British Educational Research Journal, 18, (4), 351-368.

Yopp, H.K. (1992). Developing phonemic awareness in young children. The Reading Teacher, 45 (9), 696-703.

Yukish, J.F., and Fraas, J.W. (1988). Success of old order Amish children in a strategy-oriented program for children at risk of failure in reading. Paper presented at the Annual meeting

of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

APPENDICES

QUESTIONNAIRES AND REFLECTION GUIDELINES

APPENDIX A

Daily Lesson Record (Clay, 1993a)

Daily Running Record Sheet (Clay, 1993b)

Weekly Record of Book Level (Clay, 1993b)

Weekly Record of Writing Vocabulary (Clay, 1993b)

READING

NEW TEXT	RE-READING	STRATEGIES 1 USED 2 PROMPTED	TAKING WORDS APART IN READING	1 LETTER IDENTIFICATION 2 MAKING AND BREAKING

	WRITING		CUT UP STORY	
TASK	CONSTRUCTING WORDS AND FLUENCY PRACTICE	SPATIAL CONCEPTS	SEQUENCING	COMMENT

RUNNING RECORD SHEET

Name: _____ Date: _____ D. of B.: _____ Age: ____ yrs ____ mths

School: _____ Recorder: _____

Text Titles	Running words / Error	Error rate	Accuracy	Self-correction rate
1. Easy _____	_____	1: _____	_____ %	1: _____
2. Instructional _____	_____	1: _____	_____ %	1: _____
3. Hard _____	_____	1: _____	_____ %	1: _____

Directional movement _____

Analysis of Errors and Self-corrections
Information used or neglected [Meaning (M) Structure or Syntax (S) Visual (V)]

Easy _____

Instructional _____

_____

Hard _____

_____

Cross-checking on information (Note that this behaviour changes over time)

_____

_____

Analysis of Errors and Self-corrections
(see *Observation Survey* pages 30–32)

Page		E	SC	Information used	
				E MSV	SC MSV

Analysis of Errors and Self-corrections
(see *Observation Survey* pages 30–32)

Page		E	SC	Information used	
				E MSV	SC MSV

Name: _____

RECORD OF BOOK LEVEL

Date of Birth: _____

Book Level	Enter examples of titles here
...	
...	
24	
23	
22	
21	
20	
19	
18	
17	
16	
15	
14	
13	
12	
11	
10	
9	
8	
7	
6	
5	
4	
3	
2	
1	
0	

o—o—o—o 90% accuracy or above

•—•—•—• below 90% accuracy

Gradient of Text Difficulty (Teacher Devised)

Date

Weekly Observations

Initial Testing Date:	Week: Date:	Week: Date:	Week: Date:	Week: Date:	Week: Date:	Week: Date:
Week: Date:	Week: Date:	Week: Date:	Week: Date:	Week: Date:	Week: Date:	Week: Date:

APPENDIX B

Reading Recovery Teachers Initial Assessment Questionnaire

1. How did the assessment training help your understanding of Reading Recovery?

2. What was the easiest for you?

3. What did you find most difficult?

4. How do you feel the assessment training could be changed?

5. What do you feel you need a better understanding of?

APPENDIX C

Reflection Journal Guidelines

Teachers were not required to follow these guidelines. They were suggestions only in order to structure responses for those who found it helpful. Many chose not to.

•Describe any new learning that was significant to you.

•Describe involvement of classroom teachers, parents, administrators, etc.

•What are you finding valuable/not valuable?

•What do you feel you need more help with? Be specific.

APPENDIX D

Reading Recovery Teacher End of Year Questionnaire

PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS IN YOUR JOURNALS.

1. How has your view of the reading and writing process changed this year?

2. How have your views on literacy teaching changed? How has this affected student learning?

3. In your work with Reading Recovery, what have been the highlights of your teaching experiences this year? Why?

4. In your work with Reading Recovery what have been the least valuable experiences you have had this year? Why?

5. In what ways have you worked to involve parents in their children's Reading Recovery program? How has this made an impact?

6. In what ways has the Reading Recovery training contributed to your growth as a teacher?

7. As you think about your role and responsibilities in Reading Recovery for next year, what are some goals you have set for yourself? What would you like to see dealt with in Continuing Contact sessions?

8. Circle the number below which best describes your answer. As a Reading Recovery teacher, how much have you learned this year?

1	2	3	4	5
Nothing				A great deal

9. Please comment on some of the changes as Canadian guidelines are set up. Please be specific.

APPENDIX E

Classroom Teacher Questionnaire (JUNE)

1. Have any children from your classroom been involved in the Reading Recovery program this year? If so, how much has the Reading Recovery teacher let you know about the progress of you students?

1	2	3	4	5
Nothing				a great deal

2. What changes have you observed in children participating in the Reading Recovery program as they work in the classroom?

3. What do parents of Reading Recovery children say about the program?

4. Are you interested in having more children from your classroom involved in Reading Recovery? Why/why not?

5. Circle the number below which best describes you view of Reading Recovery?

1	2	3	4	5
Not a very good program				A very good program

6. Describe your involvement with Reading Recovery?

7. Have you been involved in any of the inservice sessions related to Reading Recovery? If so, which ones.

8. What was the most valuable learning for you in each of the sessions?

9. What was the least valuable learning for you in each session?

10. Has any of your teaching changed? If it has, describe how it has changed and how it has affected student learning.

11. What things have remained the same in your teaching. Why?

12. What types of literacy learning and teaching activities would you be interested in being involved in next year?

13. Other comments.

PLEASE INDICATE GRADE LEVEL(S):_____

APPENDIX F

Administrator Questionnaire (JANUARY AND JUNE)

1. In your view, what impact has Reading Recovery had on the children in the program?

2. In your view, what impact has the implementation of Reading Recovery had on literacy teaching in your school?

3. What do teachers in your school say about Reading Recovery?

4. What do parents say about Reading Recovery?

5. What do you see as the strengths of the program?

6. What do you see as the weaknesses of the program?

7. What are your concerns about implementing Reading Recovery next year?

8. Circle the number below which best describes your view of Reading Recovery?

1	2	3	4	5
Not a very good program				A very good program

9. Other comments.

APPENDIX G

Parent Questionnaire

1. How has Reading Recovery affected your child's experience in school?

2. Did you learn anything new that helped you help your child? If so, who helped you with your new learning?

3. If you were telling another parent about Reading Recovery, what would you say?

4. Did the Reading Recovery teacher let you know about your child's progress? If so, how were you contacted?

5. Did you get the opportunity to observe a lesson with your child. If so, how many and describe what you thought. If not, please explain why (working, not invited, etc.).

6. Circle the number below which best describes you view of Reading Recovery?

1	2	3	4	5
Not a very good program				A very good program

7. Other comments

APPENDIX H

Reading Recovery Timeline

Divisional Report

READING RECOVERY TIMELINE: 1994/95

JUNE

- Initial Assessment Training Day (June 23, 1994)

AUGUST

- 3 day assessment workshop (August 22, 23, 24)
- River Elm Reading Recovery Overview (August 29, 1:00-2:00)

SEPTEMBER

- Weekly Reading Recovery sessions begin
- Screening and assessment of students
- Linwood Reading Recovery Overview (September 23, P.M.)

OCTOBER

- Weekly Reading Recovery Sessions
- Data sheets for O.S.U.
- Observation Survey Assessment Workshops (Early Years Grant)
- Inservice for Manitoba Association of School Psychologist

NOVEMBER

- Weekly Reading Recovery Sessions
- Conference plans for New Year
- Jameswood workshop on Developing a Balanced Reading Program, November 10th, P.M.

DECEMBER

- Weekly Reading Recovery Sessions
- Plan for January awareness sessions for interested schools

JANUARY

- Weekly Reading Recovery Sessions
- Awareness sessions presented

FEBRUARY

- Weekly Reading Recovery Sessions
- Ohio Conference February 12-14
- Visits for teachers interested in training

MARCH

- Weekly Reading Recovery sessions
- Applications due for next year's training class
- Inservice Crestview School (March 3, 1994)
- Support Grant Report to Erika Kreis
- Report to trustees

APRIL

- Weekly Reading Recovery sessions
- Scarborough Conference April 27-29
- Selection process for training class for 1995/96 finalized

MAY

- Weekly Reading Recovery sessions
- Books ordered for 1995/96
- Assessment dates set for June (1 day) and August (3 days) and information sent out to schools

JUNE

- Weekly Reading Recovery Sessions
- Spring testing and data collection
- Information session on continuing contact
- Plans for 1995/96

P.D. PLANS FOR 1994/95:

- Assessment training of teacher via early years grant for assistance in discontinuing children from the Reading Recovery program

- Inservice sessions for schools as requested

- Ongoing after-school sessions in areas of interest for teachers

St. James-Assiniboia Reading Recovery Five Year Plan

Reading Recovery is an early, short term intervention program for grade one students experiencing the most difficulties in early literacy learning, specifically reading and writing, regardless of their ethnic, linguistic, socio-economic or academic background. The goal is to enable and empower these students to make accelerated progress and to become competent independent readers and writers in approximately 12-20 weeks of daily 30 minute lessons from a trained Reading Recovery teacher. Reading Recovery is based on extensive research done by Dr. Marie Clay and has been implemented in New Zealand, The United States, Britain and Canada.

During the 1993/94 school year I trained at the Canadian Institute of Reading Recovery in Scarborough as a Reading Recovery teacher and teacher leader. My goal in the implementation of Reading Recovery is to maintain the integrity and quality of Reading Recovery. It should be kept in mind that Reading Recovery is only a part of a complete approach to early literacy.

Teachers interested in training as Reading Recovery teachers must volunteer to be a part of the program as the demands of training, accountability and responsibility are great and a significant amount of time is spent outside of the regular school day.

YEAR ONE: 1994/95

The 1994/95 School year will involve the following:

•Training of 12 teachers in Reading Recovery via summer assessment workshops (June 23, August 22, 23, 24) and year long weekly training sessions (August- June, Mondays 4:00-7:00). Each teacher will bring one child, once each term, to teach "behind the glass" and the teacher leader will visit each teacher approximately six times through the year, as well as additional visits upon request.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS

•Familiarize and train key staff in using the Observation Survey in order to assist the Reading Recovery teacher with discontinuing students after the training year.

The St. James-Assiniboia Reading Recovery Staff Development Centre could also be used as a training site for the training of teacher leaders if a site is established in Manitoba.

The following are some expectations of the Reading Recovery teachers <u>after</u> their training year:

<u>YEAR ONE TEACHERS:</u>

•Continue with the quality implementation of Reading Recovery within their schools

•Work collaboratively with classroom teachers, particularly grade one teachers, in order to support Reading Recovery students in the classroom

•Familiarize early years staff with the Observation Survey

•Familiarize staff with running records

<u>YEAR TWO PLUS TEACHERS:</u>

•Continue to work collaboratively with teachers in order to support Reading Recovery students

•Monitor progress of students discontinued from Reading Recovery

•In-service staff in the use of Running Records

•Assist in the selection and organization of reading and writing materials from kindergarten through to grade two

•Assist in implementing Family Literacy session

•Assist in training of parent volunteers in the area of literacy support

READING RECOVERY

Reading Recovery, a short term early intervention program, is in its first year of implementation within the St. James-Assiniboia School Division. Intensive daily one-to-one instruction is provided for first grade children who are identified at risk in the area of reading. Currently eight teachers from the St. James-Assiniboia School Division and four teachers from Winnipeg School Division are being trained by Rosana Montebruno who,in the 1993-94 school year, trained as a teacher leader at the Canadian Institute of Reading Recovery in Scarborough, Ontario.

The staff development component in Reading Recovery is intensive and requires each teacher to provide instruction to four students on a daily basis and to attend three hour inservice sessions on a weekly basis. These inservice sessions, held at the training site established at Educational Support Services, allow teachers the opportunity to work "behind the glass" with students and to receive feedback and coaching from their training peers and the teacher leader. Regular visitations to all school sites are conducted throughout the year by the teacher leader as well.

Reading Recovery students are being discontinued as expected in the first year of implementation and training. Teachers who attended the Observation Survey workshops in order to discontinue students have been involved in the discontinuing process. Involvement by these teachers has provided them with a better understanding of the program and an opportunity to practice more unfamiliar assessment techniques. Reading Recovery teachers also will be given the opportunity to discontinue students before the end of the year.

Feedback from principals surveyed in January regarding the program was very positive with regards to teacher perceptions, parental views and effects on the children. The only concerns with the program that were provided on the survey dealt with staffing and time issues.

Parents have provided positive feedback through school visits, letters to the Board of Trustees and for those whose children have discontinued, parent surveys. Parents will be invited to an evening feedback session in May. The purpose of this meeting not only is to obtain information from the parents but also to provide them with further strategies to facilitate literacy within the home.

All grade one teachers involved with Reading Recovery will be surveyed in May, as will parents and principals.

EARLY LITERACY WORKSHOPS

A series of workshops has been held throughout the year at the Professional Staff Development Centre to provide information on a number of strategies used within the reading recovery program. The response to these workshops has been positive and it is apparent from discussion that teachers are beginning to make positive changes in their classrooms in order to better meet the needs of their students. Many teachers have started using running records as a diagnostic teaching and/or assessment technique, which also can be a useful part of a portfolio assessment. Teachers particularly were interested in the session on levelling books. One teacher shared information on how a literacy lab was being developed in her school, as well as how she organized her time in order to provide her students with many literacy experiences in groups and on an individual basis as needed.

EARLY LITERACY WORKSHOP

Educational Support Services assisted in the organization of an early literacy workshop held at Sturgeon Creek School on Nov. 16/94 and featuring Helen Depree. Approximately two hundred participants attended from school divisions throughout Manitoba.

READING RECOVERY CONFERENCE

The Reading Recovery teachers have planned a conference to be held on Thursday, April 20 and Friday, April 21. The focus will be early literacy in the classroom and making connections between Reading Recovery and the classroom. The response to the conference has far exceeded expectations. Approximately 300 particiants will be attending the conference each day-many from rural Manitoba. Teachers have chosen areas of interest and have worked individually or in pairs to plan their sessions. This is proving to be a very positive learning experience for all involved.

TOTAL QUALITY PROJECT TEAM

A Total Quality Project Team was established this year to enhance the Reading Recovery Initiative in the Division. Specifically the Team has focused on issues related to program implementation and improvement.
Action Plan:
1. Formulate a Total Quality Project Team
2. Assess where we are and where we are going
3. Assess the need for student data collection and design a process to deal with the assessed need
4. Analyze the patterns in the process and inputs necessary
5. Assess the teacher needs
6. Consider the staff professional development needs
7.Design a flowchart for the process and determine responsibilities and a timeline
8. Implement the plan

Committee members :
Candace Borger, Administrator, E.S.S.
Darryl Johnson, Assistant Superintendent, Student Services
Rosana Montebruno, Reading Recovery Teacher Leader
Lorraine Prokopchuk, Coordinator Language Arts
Sharon Smith, Assistant Superintendent, Elementary Schools
Irene Thiry, Vice-Principal, Lakewood School

It is anticipated that the Project Team will continue in the 1995-96 school year.

ADDITIONAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES PROVIDED BY THE TEACHER LEADER

SEPT./94
- Reading Recovery overview-River Elm School
- Reading Recovery and Running Records-Strathmillan and Linwood
- Reading Recovery overview-Phoenix
- Poster Session-Manitoba Association of School Psychologists (SAG)

OCT./94
- Reading Recovery overview-Lakewood

NOV./94

- 4 Day Assessment workshop for teachers not involved in Reading Recovery (for discontinuing)
- Running Records-Jameswood

JAN./95
- Reading Recovery and Early Literacy (with Lorraine Prokopchuk)-Principal's meeting

FEB./95
- Reading Recovery Overview and Running Records-Reading Classes(2)-University of Manitoba
- Reading Recovery Overview-University of Manitoba Access Program

MAR./95
- Running Records-Crestview
- Education Manitoba Support grant Poster Session
- Orientation Session for 1995-96 school year

APR./95
- Reading Recovery Conference: Connections with Classrooms (2 days)
- MTS Curriculum and Instructional Team Meeting-Reading Recovery Overview

MAY, JUNE/95
- Brandon Early Literacy Conference-Early Literacy Workshop
- Kindergarten Assessment Training-Observation Survey
- Parent Feedback Session
- Library Technician Sessions-selection and levelling

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR 1995-96

1. Training will be continued to ensure the full implementation of Reading Recovery in the early years schools within the St. James-Assiniboia School Division. Four schools from the Winnipeg School Division, as well as Fort Garry School Division, St. Boniface School Division and possibly River East School Division also will be involved in the training.

2. Continuing contact sessions will be provided for trained Reading Recovery teachers.

3. Non-Reading Recovery Teachers will continue to receive training to enable them to assist with the discontinuing of students from Reading Recovery.

4. Early literacy workshops will continue to be provided for classroom teachers to encourage strategic and responsive early literacy teaching.

5. A systematic plan for the collection of Divisional longitudinal data will be developed to monitor program and student success.

6. The Total Quality Project Team will continue to meet to address program implementation issues in 1995-96.

7. Divisional staff will continue to serve on the Provincial Management team to help with provincial implementation and to assist with the development of a Western Canadian Training Site for teacher leaders through the University of Winnipeg