Reading Instructional Models: Review of Reading Recovery and Success for All

Eiko Kato-Otani

リーディング指導モデル：Reading Recovery 及び Success for All 概説

加　藤　映　子

Abstract

Many children who drop out of school come from less privileged families in the US. Compared to middle-class children, they have far fewer stimulating literacy experiences at home and thus find it harder to learn to read at school. Poorer reading ability is a critical factor in their dropping out of school. Many instructional models have been developed to address their low reading achievement in elementary school. In this paper I review two instructional models, Reading Recovery and Success for All, which are used in schools in the US: I then discuss how they help teachers support their at-risk students.

抄　　　録

　米国において学校からドロップアウトしてしまう子どもの多くは、恵まれない家庭環境の出身者である。中流階級の子どもに比べ、家庭で受ける刺激的な literacy の経験は少なく、学校で読み書きを学ぶことが大変難しく感じられる子どもたちである。読む力が乏しいことは学校からドロップアウトしてしまう決定的な要因である。多くのリーディング指導モデルがこの小学校における読みの問題に取り組んできた。本稿ではリーディング指導モデルの中か米国の小学校使用されている Reading Recovery と Success for All の概要を述べ、いかにドロップアウトの危険にある子どもを支援しているかを論じている。

Which US children are considered at risk? Five risk factors are low socio-economic status, poor school attendance, low achievement test scores, retention at the same grade, and behavior problems (Slavin, cited in Slavin & Madden, 1989). These risk factors can be used to predict who will drop out of school by third grade (Howard et al., cited in Slavin & Madden, 1989). In addition, poor reading ability is considered to be a strong predictor of school failure; children at risk who do not acquire adequate basic skills by the end of third grade are unlikely to complete their education (Slavin, Madden, Karwei, Levermon, & Dolan, 1990).

Reading Recovery is an early intervention program that has been widely accepted in New Zealand and Australia as well as in the U.S. and Canada (Clay, 1987). This one-to-one tutorial program has helped children with the lowest reading achievement levels to quickly gain the reading skills they need at their grade level. Success for All, a research-based program, targets children in high-poverty schools and helps them raise their reading ability to their grade level by the end of third grade.

Although both programs have been criticized for their heavy reliance on program evaluation methodologies (Center, Wheldall, Freeman, Outhred, & McNaught, 1995; Center, Wheldall & Freeman, 1992), few doubt that students in these programs have improved their skills. The fact that these instructional models are widely accepted by schools indicates that they are effective and worth consideration. Below, I describe these two models and examine their impact by comparing and contrasting them.

Reading Recovery: General Description

Reading Recovery, a short-term early intervention program for first-grade children at risk, was developed by Marie M. Clay in New Zealand in the late 1970s (Pinnell, Fried, & Estice, 1991). This one-to-one reading instructional model has been successfully implemented in Australia and Canada (Clay, 1987) as well as the U.S., where schools in over 40 states implemented it within eight years (Shanahan & Barr, 1995). Through early intervention the program aims to prevent reading failure among at-risk children and bring them up to the class average as quickly as possible. It also aims at several kinds of changes: changes in children's behavior, through changes in teachers' behaviors and teaching methods, and both organizational and socio-political changes (Center et al., 1992).

Children enrolled in Reading Recovery receive 30-minute one-to-one tutoring instruction in addition to regular classroom reading instruction. The Reading Recovery teacher makes decisions about when and how to help by observing and interacting with her or his student (Clay & Cazden, 1990). Reading Recovery lessons include the following activities in this order: 1) re-reading of two or more familiar books; 2) independent reading

of the previous day's new book from which the teacher makes a running record or miscue analysis; 3) letter identification; 4) writing down a story the child has composed, emphasizing the child listening to the sounds in words (phonemic awareness component); 5) re-assembling a cut-up story; 6) introducing a new book; and 7) reading the new book (Center et al., 1992, p. 264). In these activities, the teacher interacts with the student intensively and expects him or her to become an independent reader. Reading Recovery teachers observe each student's progress carefully, keeping a running record which will be the basis for decisions on when the student can discontinue from the program (Clay, 1991).

Reading Recovery: Theoretical underpinning

The theory behind Reading Recovery is that "people learn to construct meaning through social interventions" (Pinnel, Lyons, DeFord, Bryk, & Seltzer, 1994, p. 11). The teacher interacts with the student by instructing, requesting, and modeling, and the student responds. The teacher scaffolds the learning, modeling how the child can connect what he or she already knows to new information the teacher presents (Hobsbaum, Peters, & Sylva, 1996). Thus, children in Reading Recovery become "able to continue learning to read and write as a 'self-improving system,'" because Reading Recovery is designed to help children to learn "the integration of the semiotic codes of oral language and English orthography, plus world knowledge, into complex operations of reading and writing" (Clay & Cazden, 1990, p. 219). Thus, Reading Recovery is built on Vygotsky's idea that good instruction marches ahead of development and leads it (Pinnel, Fried & Estice, 1991). It is also important to note that Reading Recovery's teachers reveal tacit knowledge about language rather than telling. This approach is important for young learners, because they cannot digest what they are told for later use and they may oversimplify the complex reality of written language if they are merely told (Cazden, 1992).

Success for All: General Description

Success for All is a reading intervention program designed for high-poverty schools (Slavin et al., 1996). It began in one American elementary school in Baltimore, Maryland, in 1987 and by 1996 had expanded to 300 schools in 24 US states (Slavin et al., 1996). This early intervention program aims to bring every student to grade level in reading by the third grade (Ross & Smith, 1994). Its key elements are reading tutors, a reading program, eight-week reading assessments, a preschool and kindergarten program, family support teams, program and facilitators (Madden, Slavin, Wasik, & Dolan, 1997).

The instructional programs in Success for All are based on research and also incorporate cooperative learning (Slavin et al., 1996). In the reading program, a teacher

begins the lesson by reading a piece of children's literature. The children then discuss that story to enhance their listening and speaking vocabulary, and then engage them in writing (Madden et al., 1997). In kindergarten and first grade, children use Story Telling and Retelling (STaR) to develop their basic language skills. After learning letters and sounds, they read those letters in words. The program also uses phonetically regular but stimulating mini books. In the 2nd grade reading level, Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) is used with basal series. CIRC activities teach children to predict, summarize, build their vocabulary, decode words, and engage in story-related writing.

Success for All: Theoretical underpinning

Success for All has an intensive kindergarten and preschool intervention program, because it is based on the idea that prevention must occur as early as possible: once students have fallen behind, they are less likely to catch up because the experience of failure causes other problems (Madden et al., 1993). In addition, the reading program in Success for All is a research-based: "students learn to read in meaningful contexts, and... word-attack skills" are presented systematically (Madden et al., 1997, p. 113). The STaR approach helps develop students' language skills and cooperative learning (CIRC) helps develop their learning skills (Slavin et al., 1996). The tutoring approach used in Reading Recovery is also used in Success for All because one-to-one tutoring has been found to be the most effective instruction (Wasik & Slavin, cited in Slavin et al., 1996).

Comparing Reading Recovery and Success for All

Both programs are considered to succeed with children at risk. Each program, however, has distinctive characteristics. Below, I compare and contrast these models, considering several issues: the economic status of their target group, grouping, assessment, professional development, cost effectiveness, instructional techniques and materials, parental involvement, and coordination with regular classrooms.

Target group

Because Reading Recovery is designed for children who have shown difficulty in their first year of reading instruction, it targets children who have the lowest levels of reading achievement (Pinnell et al., 1991). Clay (cited in Shanahan & Barr, 1995) points out that "Reading Recovery can be used with any kind of children in any kind of classroom programme" (p. 982). In reviewing various research articles about Reading Recovery, I was unable to determine whether it is designed for specific SES groups. However, while assessing the cost of Reading Recovery, Shanahan and Barr (1995) point out that a school in a high-income area might not have the program. This may indicate that schools in such

areas have few children with reading difficulties because most have the advantage of literacy experiences and support at home.

On the other hand, Success for All is designed for children in high-poverty schools; Slavin et al. (1996) say such schools typically have "fewer resources in the school to provide top-quality instruction to every child, fewer forms of rescue if children run into academic difficulties, and fewer supports for learning at home" (p. 42). By targeting children in such schools, Success for All tries to prevent school failure among students from such backgrounds.

Grouping

A distinctive characteristic of Reading Recovery is its instruction through one-to-one tutoring. After one year of schooling, children who are found to be the lowest reading achievers are placed in Reading Recovery, where each one works with a Reading Recovery teacher 30 minutes a day and also participates in regular reading class instruction (Pinnel, Fried, & Estice, 1991).

In contrast, in Success for All, students spend most of the day in heterogeneous, age-grouped classes. For a daily 90-minute reading program, however, they are regrouped according to their reading level in a class where students from different grades work at the same reading level (Slavin et al., 1990). This regrouping allows a teacher to focus on students who are at the same reading level (Madden et al., 1993). This regrouping was found to be effective in increasing achievement in elementary reading (Slavin, cited in Madden et al., 1993)

Assessment

In Reading Recovery, an intensive one-to-one intervention program, the unit of analysis is the individual. The teacher observes the student carefully and keeps a running record of his or her achievement. When the teacher determines that the student is an independent reader and writer, that student can leave the program (Pinnell, Fried, & Estice, 1991). Students usually move through the program within 12 to 14weeks, although some stay for 20 weeks (Clay, 1991).

In Success for All, students' achievement is assessed every eight weeks (Madden et al., 1997). Written and oral language are assessed in the early grades; in the later grades tests and assessment rely on a basal series. These assessments are linked to the curriculum and are used for several purposes: rearranging reading groups, determining individual students' needs for tutoring, and examining student progress. These assessments are reported to the program facilitator who evaluates the program and makes changes (Madden et al., 1997).

Professional development

In Reading Recovery, professional development is very important because the teachers make decisions when they teach, choose materials, and assess students' achievement (Klein, Kelly, & Pinnel, 1997). Professional development in Reading Recovery includes a one-year educational program (clinical practicum experience, theoretical seminar, supervision practicum, district apprenticeship), enrollment in graduate-level courses, training of a Teacher Leader, and peer critique called "teaching behind the glass" (DeFord, Lyons, & Pinnell, 1991). The goal of this professional development is to have teachers shed the views and assumptions they brought to the program and find new ways to get their at-risk children make progress quickly (DeFord, Lyons, & Pinnell, 1991).

In contrast, Success for All employs skilled teachers, and a much shorter specific training time. The teachers and tutors in Success for All are regular certified teachers who receive three days of training and detailed manuals. The tutors later receive two additional days of training. Preschool and kindergarten teachers and aides receive training in STaR and Peabody programs (Slavin et al., 1996).

Cost effectiveness

Reading Recovery, a tutoring program, is very expensive because of its low teacher student ratio. A Reading Recovery teacher usually works with about 16 students per year (Shanahan & Barr, 1995). A decade ago, an average teacher's salary was estimated at about $43,529 per year (Shanahan & Barr, 1995) and $47,000 per year in a large city (Slavin, Dolan & Madden, cited in Shanahan & Barr, 1995). In addition to the teachers' salary, professional development in Reading Recovery is expensive as teachers must take graduate-level courses in the first year of their training; the cost for 9 credit hours of graduate study is about $650 per teacher (Shanahan & Barr, 1995). Also, Teacher Leaders are needed to train Reading Recovery teachers; they complete a full year of training during which they are paid but do not teach (Shanahan & Barr, 1995). Although the program is expensive, it is important to note that children who receive the training rarely require additional intervention later (Shanahan & Barr, 1995).

Success for All is about as expensive as Reading Recovery, but it works for all children and tries to improve other areas of the curriculum in addition to reading (Shanahan & Barr, 1995). Also, its cost should be evaluated in terms of its effects. Slavin et al. (1990) point out that Success for All reduces the number of students in special education, leading to considerable savings. Although the preschool and kindergarten program is the most expensive part of the program, each district is already paying for similar programs. Expensive approaches implemented in some schools, like halving class size, did not

improve student achievement, compared to Success for All.

Instructional techniques and materials

Reading Recovery teachers make decisions about what to teach and when to help a student. During the first 10 days of the instruction, called "roaming around the known," the teacher observes what the student knows and what skills he or she has, and then chooses materials based on that students' individual needs. Interacting with a student during writing and reading activities allows the teacher to make decisions about how to accelerate that student's learning. This constant decision making, based on the knowledge of what teaching is effective and what each child knows, is the most difficult task for Reading Recovery teachers (Klein, Kelly, & Pinnel, 1997; Clay, 1987).

In turn, by interacting with the teacher in these rich literacy activities, students make sense of written materials. For each student, the teacher selects from many materials, which include "a) hundreds of short books arranged in a gradient of difficulty; b) blank books and writing tools for writing children's own stories; c) a chalkboard to vary writing surfaces; and d) a set of magnetic alphabet letters for word construction" (Klein, Kelly, & Pinnel, 1997, p. 166).

The materials used in Success for All are prepared by the program, and the program facilitator oversees the operation (Slavin et al., 1996). As teachers use these materials, they follow the procedure for each activity using teacher's manuals also prepared by the program. They read children's literature with their students and use the STaR method, which requires students to listen to and retell the story. Phonemic awareness is also emphasized. In the Reading Roots program, introduced in the second semester of kindergarten or in the first grade, teachers utilize phonologically regular but meaningful and interesting mini books; these consist of one part for the teacher, printed in a small font, and one part for students, printed in a larger font. As the book proceeds, less and less of the text is for the teachers and more is for the students, until the students are reading the entire book themselves. When students reach the primer reading level, a program called Reading Wings, an adaptation of Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC), is introduced. In this cooperative learning activity, students engage in partner reading and structured discussion of stories. This helps them to master vocabulary as well as the story content (Slavin et al., 1996).

Parental involvement

Reading Recovery was not originally designed to involve parents, but its developers found that many parents wanted to help and to be involved (Moore & Wade, 1993). Schools also adopted a policy of inviting parents to observe Reading Recovery sessions,

which helped the parents learn the strategies that its teachers use. For example, they learned that they should wait until their children self-correct. They also learned how important praise is to children. Parents now employ these strategies, among others, when they assist their children at home (Moore & Wade, 1993).

On the other hand, Success for All is designed to involve each child's family by developing good relationships with parents and providing workshops and attractive programs that aim at better parenting. Thus one aspect of the program is strategies that parents can use when reading at home. The family support team also addresses issues like poor behavior and absenteeism by contacting parents (Slavin et al., 1996), as a way to prevent further learning problems.

Coordination with classroom curriculum and practice

As it is considered "something extra," Reading Recovery is not coordinated with classroom instruction (Pinnel, Fried, & Estice, 1991) because "the nature and quality of classroom reading instruction is not the central issue in the Reading Recovery program" (Slavin et al., 1996, p. 69). Reading Recovery teachers, however, contact both classroom teacher and program graduates as resource people (Center et al., 1992).

In contrast, Success for All is linked to regular classroom reading (Madden, 1993), as its teachers also teach in the regular classroom. This has caused some problems because the objectives, approaches, activities, and emphasis are different: regular reading classes tend to take more skill-oriented approaches while Success for All uses more whole language and process-oriented approaches (Ross & Smith, 1994). The tutors in Success for All, however, usually use the same book as in the regular reading class and emphasize the same objectives (Slavin et al., 1996).

Discussion

Having reviewed important elements of Reading Recovery and Success for All, I now focus on three elements that most distinguish these programs from one another: instructional approaches, coordination with the regular classroom, and parental involvement.

Instructional approaches

Although researchers have found the one-to-one tutorial approach to be effective, teachers must make their decisions very carefully. They practice doing so during their professional development, but what is to be done when teachers make mistakes in major decisions, especially on students' assessments? Although standardized tests are used to evaluate the program (Shanahan & Barr, 1995), it might be valuable to include objective

assessment materials rather than relying on only teachers' observations.

In Reading Recovery the impact of tutoring instruction is remarkable and creates a challenge for the teachers who also have to make many decisions as they work with a student. Such work requires long-term and high-cost professional development. Reading Recovery focuses on observing what students already know and what skills they have rather than on teaching materials. This is key to their work: teachers involved in intensive one-to-one sessions must know what each child knows and needs to learn and where they lack ability. This is especially challenging in a classroom that is culturally and racially diverse. The literacy culture children bring from home may be very different from what is expected at school, as Heath (1982) showed. However, Reading Recovery teachers do more than observe children's skill upon entry; they start their lessons with that information. Doing so gives students self-esteem and motivation to learn because their teacher asks them what they can do.

In addition to the tutorial approach used in Reading Recovery, I was impressed by the session called "roaming around the known," which requires the teacher to stop teaching from her preconceived ideas (Klein, Kelly, & Pinnel, 1997). Many teachers apply techniques and approaches they learned in school or in earlier teaching experiences, but Reading Recovery requires them to see teaching differently. This may be quite difficult for teachers who have developed their own teaching styles and views. Reading Recovery may help improve instruction in another way: if its teachers coordinate with regular reading class teachers. Many evaluations have been conducted to assess the effectiveness of Reading Recovery, but do the regular teachers also, and consistently, learn from the program? It would be helpful to hear the experiences and difficulties that Reading Recovery teachers have had because such evaluation could improve the program for both groups of teachers.

In contrast to Reading Recovery, Success for All aims at school-wide reconstruction of instruction (Slavin et al., 1990). The program has both a preschool and a kindergarten program. This approach is effective because, compared to middle-class children, those from low-income families may already have literacy disadvantages because they have had fewer stimulating literacy experiences at home. When provided with excellent early literacy instruction, children will be able to learn early literacy skills, which will help their later school performance.

The STaR activity in Success for All is valuable as it promotes listening and speaking skills as well as vocabulary development. This activity is especially important for children from low-income families who often have fewer book-reading experiences with their parents. Many studies of home book-reading show that children learn early literacy skills from being read to (Goldfield & Snow, 1984); these literacy experiences have been linked

to school success (Teale, 1984). Thus children who might lack literacy-oriented activities at home will benefit from activities in preschool and kindergarten programs in Success for All.

Like the tutoring program in Reading Recovery, Success for All has a reading tutor component which gives children extra help, and the tutors use the same materials as the regular teachers. For the children, this probably reinforces the goals of the materials, but what do teachers do when the students lack specific skills that the materials do not promote? In addition, since the materials and teaching manuals are prepared by the program, I question how much flexibility teachers are given in choosing materials for students who need to develop skills not covered by the program.

Coordination with classroom curriculum and practice

Success for All is linked to regular classroom reading while Reading Recovery is a stand-alone tutorial program (Madden et al., 1993). Reading Recovery, considered "something extra," is not intended to take the place of good classroom instruction (Pinnel, Fried, & Estice, 1991). Although Reading Recovery teachers contact regular classroom teachers and program graduates as resource people, I wonder if there is a need for curriculum coordination between regular reading classes and Reading Recovery. I also wonder how Reading Recovery students deal with tasks beyond their skill level in their regular reading classes. Can Reading Recovery teachers help with such skills within their program?

Parental involvement

Parental involvement is important because it can benefit parents who do not know how to help their children and those whose backgrounds are different from the school culture. Although parental involvement was not originally designed into Reading Recovery, parents are encouraged to observe the program and have learned what they should do when interacting with children at home. Thus, the program has improved parenting among those who have observed it (Moore & Wade, 1993). The idea of encouraging parents to participate as school volunteers works in Success for All, leading them to better understand their children's education and academic progress. However, a question for researchers is how much the program can involve parents of lower SES who must work full time.

Concluding Remarks

It will be difficult for many schools to apply these instructional models to their classes because of the basic cost and time needed for professional development, but any teacher can employ some of the approaches and techniques used in both programs. Two examples

come from Reading Recovery. When a student falls behind, the teacher can observe what that student already knows and can do and then, based on those observations, provide appropriate materials or assignments. Also, teachers can involve parents by inviting them to a reading workshop where they can observe ways to help their children. Involvement in school volunteer work in Success for All can be applied easily to many schools. The fact that these programs are widely used in many schools tells us that we can learn and apply techniques used in these instructional models.

References

Cazden, C. (1992). Revealing and telling: The socialisation of attention in learning to read and write. *Educational Psychology, 12*(3, 4), 305−313.

Center, Y., Wheldall, K. & Freeman, L. (1992). Evaluating the effectiveness of Reading Recovery: A critique. *Educational Psychology, 12*(3, 4), 263−274.

Center, Y., Wheldall, K., Freeman, L., Outhred, L., & McNaught, M. (1995). An evaluation of Reading Recovery. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30*(2), 240−263.

Clay M. (1987). Implementing Reading Recovery: Systematic adaptations to an educational innovation. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 22*(1), 35−57.

Clay, M. M. & 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* (pp. 206−222). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Clay, M. (1991). Reading Recovery surprises. In D. E. DeFord, C. A. Lyons, & G. S. Pinnell (Eds.), *Bridges to literacy: Learning from Reading Recovery* (pp. 55−74). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

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

Goldfield, B. S., & Snow, C. E. (1984). Reading books with children: The mechanics of parental influence on children's reading achievement. In J. Flood (Ed.), *Promoting reading comprehension*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Heath, S. B. (1982). What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and school. *Language in Society, 11*, 49−76.

Hobsbaum, A., Peters, S., & Sylva, K. (1996). Scaffolding in Reading Recovery. *Oxford Review of Education, 22*(1), 17−35.

Klein, A. F., Kelly, P. R., & Pinnell, G. S. (1997). Teaching from theory: Decision making in Reading Recovery. In [check this name] D. A. Stahl (Ed.), *Instructional models in reading* (pp. 161−179). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N. L., Dolan, L. J., & Wasik, B. A. (1993). Success for All: Longitudinal effects of a restructuring program for inner-city elementary schools. *American Educational Research Journal, 30*(1), 12−148.

Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., Wasik, B. A., & Dolan, L. J. (1997). Reading, writing, and language arts in Success for All. In D. A. Stahl (Ed.), *Instructional models in reading* (pp. 109−130). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Moore, M. & Wade, B. (1993). Reading Recovery: Parents' views. *English in Education, 27*(2), 11−17.

Pinnel, G. S., Lyons, C. A., DeFord, D. E., Bryk, A. S., & Seltzer, M.. (1994). Comparing instructional models for the literacy education of high-risk first graders. *Reading Research Quarterly* (Jan., Feb., March), 9−39.

Pinnell, G.S., Fried, M.D., & Estice, R.M. (1991). Reading Recovery: Learning how to make a difference. In D.E. DeFord, C.A. Lyons, & G.S. Pinnell (Eds.), *Bridges to literacy: Learning from Reading Recovery* (pp. 11−35). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Ross, S. & Smith., L.J. (1994). Effects of the Success for All model on kindergarten through second-grade reading achievement, teachers' adjustment, and classroom-school climate at an inner-city school. *The Elementary School Journal, 95*(2), 121−138.

Shanahan, T. & 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.

Slavin, R.E. & Madden, N.A. (1989, February). What works for students at risk: A research *synthesis. Educational Leadership*, 4−13.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N.L., Livermon, B.J., & Dolan, L. (1990). Success for All: First-year outcomes of a comprehensive plan for urban education. *American Educational Research Journal, 27*(2), 255−278.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Dolan, L.J. Wasik, B.A., Ross, S., Smith, L., & Dianda, M. (1996). Success for All: A summary of research. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 1*(1), 41−76.

Teale, W.H. (1984). Reading to young children: Its significance for literacy development. In Goelman, H. Oberg, A. and Smith, F. (Ed.), *Awakening to Literacy* (pp. 110−122). Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.