Hamline University

DigitalCommons@Hamline

School of Education and Leadership Student Capstone Theses and Dissertations

School of Education and Leadership

Fall 10-3-2016

A Correlation Between English Oral Language Proficiency and the Success of the Reading Recovery Program for Karen Students

Heidi Wheelock
Hamline University, hwheelock01@hamline.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/hse_all

Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Wheelock, Heidi, "A Correlation Between English Oral Language Proficiency and the Success of the Reading Recovery Program for Karen Students" (2016). *School of Education and Leadership Student Capstone Theses and Dissertations*. 4218.
https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/hse_all/4218

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Education and Leadership at DigitalCommons@Hamline. It has been accepted for inclusion in School of Education and Leadership Student Capstone Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Hamline. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@hamline.edu.

A CORRELATION BETWEEN ENGLISH ORAL LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY AND THE SUCCESS OF THE READING RECOVERY PROGRAM FOR KAREN STUDENTS

by

Heidi Wheelock

A capstone submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in English as a Second Language

Hamline University

Saint Paul, Minnesota

September 2016

Ann Mabbott: Primary Advisor
Anne Rogan: Secondary Advisor
Michelle Beck: Peer Reader

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks to the Marie Clay Literacy Trust for giving me permission to reprint their Reading Recovery assessment forms.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: Introduction……7

Reading and Oral Language Proficiency.....……..10

Role and Background of the Researcher……....12

Guiding Questions……14

Summary……15

Chapter Overviews……15

CHAPTER TWO: Literature Review……17

The Karen People……...…18

The Reading Recovery Program……22

Reading Recovery and ELs……27

Oral Language and Reading……...32

Aspects of Reading Recovery that fit Best Practices for ELs……34

The Gap……..35

Research Questions……36

Summary……37

CHAPTER THREE: Methodology……..……..38

Overview of the Chapter……..39

Case Study Research Paradigm…….…40

Data Collection…….….41

Procedure……...43

Data Analysis……47

Reliability and Verification of Data…….….48

Ethics…….…49

Conclusion…….…50

CHAPTER FOUR: Results……..…..51

Participants' EOLP……51

Pretest and Posttest Data……58

Observation Data……...67

Interview Data……70

Conclusion……76

CHAPTER FIVE: Conclusions……78

Major Findings……..78

Limitations……82

Implications……83

Further Research……....86

Dissemination of Results……...88

REFERENCES……..90

APPENDICES……...…94

Appendix A: Reading Recovery Assessments……..…95

Appendix B: Data Collection Sheet……102

Appendix C: Reading Recovery Teacher Interview Questions……..103

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 – Participant Information…….41

Table 2 – Pretest Stanine Scores and Text Level…….61

Table 3 – Posttest Stanine Scores and Text Level…….…..62

Table 4 – Stanine Growth from Pretest to Posttest……..65

Table 5 – Summary of Data…….79

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

I had been teaching English learners (ELs) for about three years in an elementary school when the district announced that we would be adopting a reading intervention designed to move struggling students to grade level performance. The district informed teachers during a meeting that Reading Recovery (RR) is an early intervention program used in first grade with students who score in the bottom 20% on a battery of literacy tests (Clay, 2005b). District staff assured us that Reading Recovery had been studied as being effective and implemented with success with ELs. I wondered which ELs? I was apprehensive because EL populations can be very diverse in their educational backgrounds, linguistic backgrounds, socio-economic status, and level of English proficiency. I was also excited because reading is a key skill needed to access academic curricula, so I really wanted my ELs to benefit from the program.

About three years before the Reading Recovery meeting occurred, my school had an influx of a new EL population, Karen refugees. At first, the school enrolled a handful of Karen students, but by the third year of the influx, the Karen population was the majority of ELs. This altered the demographics of the EL population from mostly Spanish speakers who were born in the United States to mostly Karen refugees as well as doubling the size of our EL population. Between the years 2005 and 2011, almost

seventy thousand refugees from Burma who were living in Thai refugee camps, most of them Karen, were resettled in third countries including America, Canada and Australia (Karen Buddhist Dhamma Dhutta Foundation, 2011). Our school had been turned upside down because none of the teachers or administrators knew anything about our new population before the Karen arrived. To make matters more complex, there were not many resources online and no interpreters in our community. To illustrate the breadth of changes required by this cultural shift, the school had to rethink the way it did everything, even the lunch system.

Our new Karen students came to school from Thai refugee camps. The Karen people entered the camps after years of conflict and persecution by the Burmese government. Some of the students were born in the refugee camps and some remembered fleeing across the border between Myanmar (also called Burma) and Thailand. Post-traumatic stress and depression are common afflictions in these situations. Misinformation about issues related to mental health complicate and often keeps individuals from seeking help. The education system in the refugee camps varied since the education system was set up and staffed by refugees in the camps (Oh, 2010). The Thai officials sanctioned the systems and local and international NGOs and community-based organizations helped support the educational system within the camps. Oh (2010) estimated funding for education to be merely $44 per student as compared to the thousands spent per student in the United States. Even though the Karen community values education highly, as a result of limited resources, schools have been crowded, noisy, hot, and often under-staffed. Therefore, some students and parents came to the

United States with a solid background in Karen literacy and mathematics while many came having very little formal education. In addition to limited access to formal schooling, teaching and learning was viewed differently. Rote memorization was expected. Students who were not able to memorize the content were often held back until they were able to pass the grade level exam which resulted in some students having the equivalent of kindergarten for multiple years. Not only did the teachers at my school think differently in order to meet the needs of our new population, but the Karen students needed to think differently about what teachers expected them to do.

The Karen population is an important element that changed the school into a more responsive and inclusive system with ELs always in mind. So, with those ELs in mind, I wondered whether a reading program chosen by our district would fit our new Karen students. The district population of ELs was more like the population I taught my first two years: U.S. born Spanish and Hmong speakers. I left the meeting wondering if Reading Recovery was designed with ELs such as our Karen students in mind. Would these newcomer ELs be accepted into the RR program? Could this particular group of ELs access the instruction as it was designed? Would the Karen population of ELs be mistakenly identified as having reading disabilities if they did not perform as expected? Most importantly, I wondered whether RR would benefit them and whether it was culturally responsive.

Currently, the RR program has been implemented for several years. The school has had Karen students go through the program, some successful and some not as successful. I was relieved to find out that Reading Recovery was working for some of

our Karen students and that many of them do have access to the program. I still wondered about those who were not as successful, so a Reading Recovery teacher allowed me to observe a few of the Karen students go through some lessons of the Reading Recovery program. I noticed that the Karen students, many with low English oral language proficiency (EOLP), had a difficult time responding to instructional prompts like, "What makes sense?" "Think about what word might come next." I realized that these are prompts that require knowledge of English syntax and semantics. This experience led me to my interest in studying how English oral language proficiency affects the Karen Reading Recovery students. So, this chapter introduces the connection between oral language proficiency and reading.

Reading and Oral Language Proficiency

Oral language proficiency is defined as the control over the complex system of some or all of the language components such as phonology (the ability to recognize and produce sounds of the language), semantics (meaning of a word, phrase, sentence), syntax (set of rules that creates well-formed sentences), lexicon (vocabulary), and pragmatics (understanding of the culturally appropriate use of language within the given context). English oral language is one component of the ACCESS assessment (Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners) of overall language proficiency which also includes comprehension and literacy (WIDA, 2015). Measuring oral language proficiency consists of measuring speaking and listening in terms of linguistic complexity and language control which also includes the above mentioned components.

English oral language proficiency is a critical element for reading success for native English speakers as well as for ELs (August, 2006; Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998). Oral language proficiency contributes to readers' abilities to read individual words. Phonemic awareness and rules of phonics contribute to this skill. Scott and Koonce say the connection between syntax and literacy has been less of a focus in reading recommendations from experts such as those who made up the National Reading Panel in 2000 (as cited in Stone, Silliman, Ehren, & Apel, 2004). They also recommend more research using syntax-specific instruments because syntax is a fundamental component of language and thus should be considered as a factor that could affect a reader's success. Vocabulary development, a lexical and semantic component of language, is critical to a reader's ability to comprehend. A study done by Geva and Massey-Garrison (2013) compared the language skills of ELs and English monolinguals in relation to their reading abilities. Those students deemed as *normal readers* outperformed the students deemed as *poor readers* on all of the oral language measures which included assessing semantic and lexical components of English. The researchers do not specifically say who was included as normal readers and poor readers, but I believe based on the discussion of assessing semantic and lexical components that ELs and English monolinguals were part of both groups although English proficiency levels would have been helpful information. Thus, research connects elements of oral language proficiency in English with reading ability in English.

Role and Background of the Researcher

I conducted my case-study research in the school I had taught in for ten years. My role as researcher was as an outside observer, interviewer and test data analyzer. I observed a small number of Karen first-grade students during four of their Reading Recovery lessons in a suburban district of a Midwestern metropolis in order to determine how English oral language proficiency may affect students' ability to use semantic and syntactic prompts during Reading Recovery. I also interviewed the Reading Recovery teachers in order to gain more perspective on the way students respond to the Reading Recovery program and how successful they are based on Reading Recovery criteria. Lastly, I correlated pre-intervention and post-intervention test data taken from the Reading Recovery teacher with pre-intervention English oral language proficiency data.

I wanted to find out whether English oral language proficiency may correlate to the success of the Reading Recovery program. I wondered whether a student with lower English oral language proficiency might have a difficult time accessing prompts that require syntactic and/or semantic knowledge and whether higher English oral language proficiency might allow a student to benefit more fully from the Reading Recovery program. I wondered whether a student with higher EOLP might be more likely to be a student who constructed a *self-extending system* as defined by Marie Clay, the developer of the Reading Recovery program (2005). A self-extending system refers to a student's ability to take what has been learned and apply it to other situations in order to increase the student's reading ability. In addition, I believe ELs should be able to benefit as fully as possible from school programs like Reading Recovery; thus teachers will need to

consider how English oral language proficiency of their student is affecting responses to their instruction in order to be culturally responsive.

As a teacher, I think this research is important. First, I think it helps address a gap in research on Reading Recovery and ELs by concentrating on a relatively new population of ELs. Second, this research may also allow us to understand a factor of student performance during the Reading Recovery program in order to make appropriate decisions as part of the Response to Intervention (RTI) model of service delivery. RTI is a systematic way of documenting student responses to intervention in order to determine needs for additional supports or special education supports. Students who do not respond well to Tier 3 interventions may be considered for a Special Education evaluation. Reading Recovery is considered to be a Tier 3 intervention in the RTI model, so students who are not successful could be considered for evaluation. Over-representation of ELs in Special Education has been a problem especially when students are tested in English (Sullivan, 2011). To avoid misidentification, it could be particularly important to continue this study on a large scale to develop peer-based norms that could be used by teams working on Special Education referrals. Third, there is a Reading Well by Third Grade initiative for the state that requires districts to report data on reading proficiency of all students in grades K-3 (Minnesota Department of Education, n.d.). The Reading Recovery intervention program was one component of the recommended tiered instruction put into place to help students meet proficiency by the end of third grade. It may be questionable that an EL coming from a refugee background with little to no formal education will be ready to read in English proficiently by third grade. With that in

mind, it is important that teachers understand what can help make this program as successful as possible.

Guiding Questions

Based on research related to reading and oral language development in general, English oral language proficiency may be a factor that affects the success of students in the Reading Recovery program. I want to know how the success of Karen Reading Recovery students correlates to their English oral language proficiency.

1. Will students with higher English oral language proficiency fare better in being deemed a good reader by the tenets of the Reading Recovery program?
2. Is there a correlation between text level achieved and English oral language proficiency?
3. How do students respond to teaching prompts that require syntactic and/or semantic knowledge of English?

I could also have looked at how students responded to prompts that require phonological knowledge, but my focus is on factors beyond the letter-sound system of reading words and more on the skills needed for text level reading. I think the answers to these questions could benefit teachers' instruction. As a result of my study, teachers may better be able to judge whether a student has a reading disability or is responding to the intervention in a manner shown to occur in other Karen ELs with the same English oral language proficiency. Teachers may be able to judge whether development of English oral language proficiency could be a factor that would benefit the students' reading

instruction. Because reading is a critical element of success in school, teachers want to give the best and most effective instruction they can. My hope is that this research will help inform instruction in order to better prepare students for reading instruction in first grade.

Summary

In this study, I focus on how students' English oral language proficiency correlates to the success of the Reading Recovery program, specifically with Karen ELs. This study gathers information on how students are able to respond to and use teacher prompts that require syntactic and/or semantic knowledge of English. It examines pre-intervention and post-intervention assessment data and correlates it to oral language proficiency in English. In addition, the study examines the criteria Reading Recovery students need to meet in order to successfully discontinue the intervention to see how oral language proficiency affects the participants' status at the end of the intervention. This study may be important to teaching and learning because it may shed light on an essential component of reading instruction, English oral language proficiency, especially with ELs. It may help address a gap in Reading Recovery research by concentrating on a population that is, at best, minimally represented in research.

Chapter Overviews

In Chapter One, I have introduced my interest and reasons for pursuing this research. In Chapter Two, I will provide a literature review that details what the Reading Recovery program is, as well as how it defines a good reader and a self-extending system. I will include research on the effectiveness of Reading Recovery as related to

ELs. The literature review will also provide more in depth information about how oral language proficiency in English is connected to literacy, specifically reading and how Reading Recovery relates to oral language. In addition, Chapter Two will provide background on the Karen people. Chapter Three will consist of the research methodology that guides this research and a description of the design of the study. Descriptions of the assessments given for Reading Recovery and the English oral language proficiency measure that I use is included. Chapter Four will consist of the results of the study. Finally, Chapter Five will be the discussion of the results of the study, implications for teachers, further research needed, and the limitations of my study.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study is to discover how oral language proficiency in English correlates to the success of Karen students in the Reading Recovery program. The study focuses on analyzing reading. In addition, the focus of the study includes observing the ways students use and respond to teacher prompts within the Reading Recovery lessons. Lastly, the study addresses whether students are deemed successful in the program and why they have or have not been deemed successful.

To aid in understanding the study, this chapter is an overview of some important literature related to Reading Recovery and oral language development as well as the population being studied. First, this chapter gives background on the Karen population. Then, it includes an overview of the Reading Recovery program which describes the components of the lessons as well as the overall goal of the program which in turn addresses the definition of success within the program. After that, research related to the effectiveness of the Reading Recovery program is provided. Next, the link between oral language and reading is addressed and then related to the Reading Recovery program. Finally, this chapter addresses the gap that this study intends to help address.

The Karen People

Because the Karen population is diverse, the information provided in this section is not meant to represent all Karen individuals. Much of the information in this section is from the Karen Buddhist Dhamma Dhutta Foundation (2011), Burma Link (2016), and the Karen Human Rights Group.

The Karen are an ethnic group from South-East Asia. Karen can be found in Myanmar (formerly Burma), Thailand, parts of India, and other South-East Asian countries. The Karen are culturally and linguistically diverse with sub-groups such as the Sgaw Karen, Pwo Karen, or Bwe Karen. The different sub-groups of Karen have their own language and within the languages, there are regional differences. Religion is also diverse. There are Animists, Buddhists, Christians, and a few Muslims. Diversity within religion exists when traditional Animist beliefs are combined with Christian beliefs. A life maintaining fields and animals was common among the Karen people. In addition to rural life, Karen people would fill the role of teacher, community leader, or as a religious leader. Karen villages were often self-sustaining with residents growing their own food, making houses out of bamboo and leaves, and weaving their own clothing. The Karen traditionally live in a collective society and often value immediate and extended family highly.

History

Before Burma was ruled by Britain, ethnic minorities such as the Karen were oppressed by the Burman monarchy. British rule freed ethnic minorities. Thus, the Karen aligned themselves with the British during the Burmese Independence Movement

supported by the Japanese during World War II. During this time, ethnic minorities endured many atrocities such as massacres and rape. After the war, Britain gave independence to Burma.

It is mentioned by the Karen Buddhist Dhamma Dhutta Foundation (2011) that the Burman leaders wanted to be the dominant group and began massacring other minority groups such as the Karen and Mon. This led to the Karen and Mon forming guerilla revolutionary groups. During the 1950s and 1960s, there was a lot of instability with the Burmese military fighting ethnic minority guerilla fighters. Eventually the Karen guerilla fighters gained control of an area and set up their own education and health systems.

To win back control, the Burman army began the Four Cuts program which consisted of targeting civilians rather than the guerilla fighters. Civilians were moved into government controlled areas, anyone out of the government controlled areas were shot. This program successfully drained the Karen guerilla movement of power, except along the Thai border where mountainous terrain kept the Burman military from controlling the area. Human rights abuses by the military regularly affected life for Karen residents.

In 1988, supporters of democracy fled to the Thai border when they were jailed and killed by the military government. This brought fighting to the Thai-Burma border area. People started entering Thailand as refugees. The military government changed the name from Burma to Myanmar in 1989, although it is still referred to as Burma by some nations and Burma's democracy movement (Burma Link, 2016a). In 1991, villagers were reporting abuses by the Burmese military to the Karen Human Rights Group

(1992). By 1994, the Burman army aligned with a group that had broken off of the Karen National Union (KNU) which brought down the last areas controlled by the KNU. During this time, villages were burned, people beaten, women raped, villagers robbed of food and money, villagers jailed and extorted, as well as villagers taken to serve as porters transporting supplies and equipment for the Burman army.

Between 1995 and 2003, the Burman army relocated hundreds of Karen villages. The Karen Human Rights Group (1996; 2000; 2003) reported that villagers living in government controlled areas reported forced labor, arbitrary taxation, restrictions of movement, and punishment for perceived or real connections to the KNU. Those who fled to avoid living in the government controlled areas contended with (a) unmarked landmines placed by the Burman army as well as the armed division of the KNU, (b) Burman soldiers destroying food storage and farms, (c) and a shoot-on-site policy. Many Karen people reported living on the run constantly trying to find a safer place, being malnourished, having few resources, and being afraid for their lives. Thousands of Karen people fled to Thailand to live in overcrowded refugee camps. Many have resettled in the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and some European countries after living in camps for years.

Burma teetered between cease-fires and fighting during the years of 2003 to 2011. In January 2012, the Burmese government signed a cease-fire with the Karen fighters. The Karen Human Rights Group's (2016) reports from 2013 contained information that those living in Burma have poor living conditions where work is restricted, landmines are still causing death and injuries, and abuses by government controlled agencies are

causing death and injuries. There is a system in place for redress, however any compensation awarded is not guaranteed to be paid in full. Burma had a democratic election in 2015 and has a drafted cease-fire agreement with sixteen different rebel groups (BBC News, 2016).

Thai Refugee Camps

Some Karen refugees have lived in the camps for thirty years (Burma Link, 2016b). Many children have known nothing but the refugee camps. There is very little opportunity to support themselves in the camps. Because families live on rations, people break restriction rules in order to have enough to eat. They work outside the camps without permission. Refugees have been detained and sometimes deported for breaking this rule. There have been refugees who have died outside the fences of the camp with no explanation provided.

Education is provided in less remote camps. The education provided in the camps is better than educational opportunities for the Karen in Burma. Some people even fled to the camps just for an opportunity to attend school. There are some opportunities for higher education in the camps although it is limited to very few people. There is also some opportunity for skills training, but little opportunity to use the skills in practice because there are a limited number of jobs available in the camps. Teachers are often foreigners without permission to teach in the camps. If they are caught, the government can deport them. This, as well as Karen teachers leaving the camps to be resettled, can make the educational system unreliable. As mentioned in Chapter One, schools are often underfunded and crowded.

Refugees in the camps are forced to live a life almost completely dependent on others with little hope for change. There is little opportunity for them to prepare themselves for a life outside of a refugee situation. In addition to this, many refugees suffer the consequences of living a traumatic life. Funding cuts have resulted in less health care and malnutrition in camps. Supplies like mosquito netting, thread for weaving, pots for cooking, and sleeping mats have been cut. Thus, mental illness and depression are also a facet of camp life. Abuse of drugs, alcohol, and suicide are not uncommon.

Despite these challenges, the Karen people in the camps have been able to maintain a feeling of community. Religion plays a significant role in the life of a refugee in the camps. People gather for religious ceremonies and rites such as wrist tying. They also gather for camp government, religious and political celebrations, sports, and community groups such as the Karen Youth Organization.

Life in the camps revolves around getting the supplies needed to live within the camp and around resettlement in other countries or the possibility of repatriation. Many Karen people worry that they will go back to a land with little opportunity and continued tumult thus the desire to resettle in countries with educational opportunities. The Karen that have resettled in the Midwest are a resilient population adapting to life in a new culture.

The Reading Recovery Program

This study examines how the Karen population with different English oral language proficiencies perform in the Reading Recovery program. Reading Recovery

(RR) is a reading intervention program that was developed by Marie Clay (Gaffney & Askew, n.d.). It was first developed in New Zealand and is now implemented in several countries including the United States. It is designed for implementation with young children ages six to seven years old who are performing in the lowest twenty percent of peers in their first grade class to prevent a cycle of failure (Clay, 2005b). The program was intended for students who have had one year of formal education that addressed literacy skills, although not all students in first grade have had that experience.

The program is an intensive one-on-one intervention from a trained RR teacher, delivered in addition to regular literacy instruction in the classroom. RR teachers are trained for a year and observed often in order to develop skills for analysis of reading behavior because each lesson is tailored to the needs of the individual. This intervention is meant to be intensive and lasts between twelve to twenty weeks.

Reading Recovery Lessons

The lessons are thirty minutes long and consist of four parts: reading familiar books, one of which was read the prior day for the first time by the student; working with letters or words; writing a story and assembling a cut-up story; and reading a new book (Reading Recovery Fact Sheet, 2000). Each lesson is very focused and each task has a purpose. The familiar texts are for students to practice good reading behaviors and hear what good reading sounds like when they read (Clay, 2005b). Teachers are encouraged to stay out of the familiar text reading as much as possible in order to observe reading behaviors and promote active problem-solving by students. Clay prefers purposeful teacher language that builds on the strengths of the student. Oral language is seen as a

strength for students and also a building block toward good reading, so conversations revolving around the books are valued as part of instruction. A Running Record is taken during the reading of the book from the prior day to further analyze reading behaviors. A Running Record is a system for recording reading behaviors such as self-corrections or the lack thereof, substitutions, and accuracy rate. During word-work, the goal is for the student to develop a way of studying words. Use of prior knowledge to link new words to words the student already knows is used to help foster problem-solving within reading. Writing a story, usually based on a book that was read, is to integrate the knowledge the child has learned about reading and to gain knowledge about reading through writing. The new book portion of the lesson consists of an orientation to the book where the teacher is encouraged to provide the student with scaffolds that will help the student read successfully. The orientation should familiarize the student with the plot, unknown words or sentence structures, and writing style. The student reads the new book with as much independence as possible. The goal is for the student to encounter some unknown words, but not too many to be overwhelming and unsuccessful. The teacher uses teaching prompts such as:

1. What sound would you expect to hear?
2. Do you think this first letter could make that sound?
3. Get your mouth ready for this word.
4. Try that again and think about…
5. Would ____ make sense?
6. Does that sound right?

7. Does it look right?

Follow-up includes any teaching points needed and a brief discussion of the book that requires comprehension. Clay advises that, "It is very important that the child understands what you are saying when you prompt him" (2005, p. 107). As can be seen, oral language proficiency in the language of instruction plays a part in how a student can respond to prompts and understand them.

The Goal of Reading Recovery

The goal of Reading Recovery is to develop an active learner who can use prior knowledge to solve problems and create, what Clay terms, a self-extending system for literacy (2005). With this system, a student would self-monitor. Clay describes a student who self-monitors as one who goes back to one-to-one pointing, directs attention to meaning, and may hesitate at a word when he encounters a problem. Teachers are directed to encourage the student to predict what word might come next based on what he knows about English oral language and check it based on what he knows about letters. Clay terms this reading behavior as cross-checking. Another skill a student with a self-extending system develops is the ability to search for information. Reading Recovery teachers encourage this by prompting for syntax also called structure within the program. For example, a teacher may use a prompt like this: "You said _____. Can we say it that way?" Teachers may also prompt for meaning or semantic knowledge with a prompt similar to this: "You said _____. Does that make sense?" Teachers may also prompt for letter information, visual information, or a general prompt like: "What's wrong with

this?" A student with a self-extending system will begin to use these prompts on his own to self-correct.

At the end of the intervention period, the student is given the Observation Survey which he also took to assess placement into the program. The Observation Survey consists of letter identification, Ohio Word Test (list of twenty words to read), Concepts About Print (assesses knowledge about how spoken language is represented in print), Writing Vocabulary (assesses how many words a student is able to write in ten minutes), Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words (assesses phonemic awareness in connection to writing), and Text Level (determines a student's instructional reading level). A student meets criteria when the teacher believes the student has made a significant gain in acquiring a self-extending system for literacy and can continue to learn given the instruction from the classroom teacher. Discontinuation is the term used when a student is successful and no longer needs the intervention. There is no specific test score or text level criteria for discontinuation required by Clay, although there have been stanines set subsequently with norms for the United States (Clay, 2005a). A stanine score of four through six is considered to show that a student could participate in grade level appropriate instruction with average performing peers.

Reading Recovery is constructive in nature. Clay regards reading as not just word-solving tricks or memorization. She promotes reading as a complex system entrenched with oral language knowledge. A good reader has that self-extending system which leads to searching for relationships and actively problem-solving. She believes a poor reader has not been able to bring order to the reading process which leads to passive

learning (2005b). At the heart of Reading Recovery is the constructivist theory that humans gain knowledge by making meaning of their interactions and use teachers as the scaffold to change passive behaviors into active reading behaviors.

Reading Recovery and ELs

This section focuses on the effectiveness of Reading Recovery with ELs. Can a program that relies heavily on knowledge of oral language be successful with ELs? There is a growing body of research on the effectiveness of RR with English learners.

In 1995, Kelly, Gomez-Valdez, Klein and Neal presented a paper to the American Educational Research Association that summarized three studies on RR that used state-wide data collected from California from 1993 to 1994. They conclude that ELs reach similar reading targets as those met by Native English speakers (NES) in the program and those not identified as needing the program. They reach this conclusion based on figures such as these: 75% of ELs discontinued successfully from the RR program while 74% of NES discontinued successfully; the mean text reading level for NES who discontinued was 14.36 which was very similar to the mean Text Reading level of 14.31 for ELs who discontinued. A Text Reading level of at least sixteen is considered to be on-grade level for the end of first grade. The researchers also find that ELs performed as well or better on end of intervention tasks such as writing vocabulary and hearing sounds in words. Those who did not successfully discontinue also made gains with a mean growth of twenty-eight words for writing vocabulary and a mean growth of twenty-five for hearing sounds in words. This was commensurate with NES who also did not discontinue. Kelly et al. also report that ELs did not need more lessons than NES to

make these gains. Unfortunately, the specific population of ELs is not disclosed, so it is unknown which ELs were studied. It is possible that the majority of the ELs in the study were Spanish-speakers as 84% of the EL population in California schools in 2014 was Spanish-speakers (California Department of Education, 2014). It would be helpful for researchers to describe the EL population studied by including factors such as their English proficiency level, their native language, amount of formal education, and the amount of time they have been in the United States.

Kelly continued her work and did another study with Neal that looked at California data from 1993 to 1996. Neal and Kelly (1999) find consistent results in that ELs show significant progress in their literacy acquisition and reached average levels of performance as NES peers at the end of first grade. These results are again for those students who successfully discontinued the program. A new finding by Neal and Kelly, is that those who do not discontinue were stalled at a text reading level of about 5, and it takes them longer to get to that level. In this situation, Clay (as cited by Neal & Kelly, 1999) would recommend a longer term intervention for those particular students. The kind and length of intervention is not discussed. Again, Neal and Kelly did not break the population of ELs into specific cultural groups, by native language or by English level of oral language proficiency. Participants were only reported as English learners determined by state criteria.

Ashdown and Simic (2000) entered the ring with research on RR and ELs. They did so because ELs were lagging behind the NES peers academically. Their view was that without an intensive intervention, the gap would widen, so they began researching

reading interventions. Ashdown and Simic have similar conclusions that RR is effective with ELs, but add to the body of work by noting some irregularities in who was selected to participate in the RR program. These researchers worked with data from New York between 1992-1993 and 1997-1998. A little more than twenty-five thousand first graders were participants in this study. These researchers revealed more specific information about their participants. There were fluent English speakers with their native language other than English (fluent ESL), limited English proficient students (LEP), and native English speakers (NES). The students who were identified as LEP in this study consisted of 54% Spanish-speakers, 26% Chinese-speakers, and 19% listed as other languages. Ashdown and Simic also find that Reading Recovery closes the gap between NES and ELs in first grade. They noticed that the procedures for determining placement into the Reading Recovery program were not followed exactly. The lowest 20% were not always the students taken. There is a caveat in the RR program guidelines that says if students are unable to understand the directions during the assessments they should be allowed to gain more English proficiency before being taken into the program, so they should participate in the next round of RR (Clay, 2005b). Ashdown and Simic contemplated whether pressure of success may be affecting the selection process. Reading Recovery is an expensive program to implement with a per pupil estimate of about $4, 625 (Shanahan & Barr, 1995). There may be pressure to serve those thought to be more likely to be successful. They also noted that much of the research has been done only on participants who have gone through all of the lessons. Their study has a more inclusive sample by not omitting the data from those students who did not complete the program. All-in-all, they

still conclude that RR works for all students and that a factor like language proficiency should not exclude students from the program. The researchers recommend that research be done on specific factors relating to students which may influence their success.

Again, Kelly continued her research with Gomez, Chen, and Schulz (2008), but this time with national data from fifty-two states and federal subdivisions from the years 2002-2003. Spanish-speakers made up the majority of ELs with 74% with 12% of participants labeled as Asian. Kelly et al. researched whether the rate of students who successfully discontinued RR was comparable between ELs and NES. They determine that the difference in rate of success was significant but the effect size was too small to be meaningful. They find that 69% of ELs versus 76.42% of NES achieve grade-level performance. The researchers added a new variable to this study. They looked at oral language proficiency and how it related to spring literacy scores in Reading Recovery. They find that English oral language proficiency is related to the discontinuation rate of ELs. Those with a proficiency level of 3 or 4 are 1.6 times more likely to discontinue successfully from Reading Recovery than students with a proficiency level of 0-2. Interestingly enough, even those with low levels of proficiency discontinued successfully at a rate of 60.6%. Voyles (2011) finds a similar connection to English oral language proficiency (EOLP) and RR. Her research reveals that with every unit increase in EOLP there is a .32 unit increase in Reading Recovery Text Level. In order to increase one entire text level, the EOLP needs an increase of 3.1 units.

Taken together, there is a growing body of research that shows that Reading Recovery works with ELs (Kelly et al., 1995; Neal & Kelly, 1999; Ashdown & Simic,

2000; Kelly et al., 2008; Voyles, 2011). This needs to be looked at critically because at least some of the body of work has been done with researchers connected to the Reading Recovery program or the Ohio State University, which brought RR to the United States. For instance, Patricia Kelly, a researcher who conducted multiple studies, is a Reading Recovery trainer and director of the Reading Recovery program at San Diego State University (Neal & Kelly, 1999). Judith Neal is a Reading Recovery trainer of teacher leaders. Francisco Gômez-Bellengé is the director of the National Data Evaluation Center at the Ohio State University and Melissa Schulz earned her doctorate from Ohio State University (Kelly, Gômez-Bellengé, Chen & Schulz, 2008). Jane Ashdown directs the Reading Recovery Project and Ognjen Simic is a research scientist for the Reading Recovery Project of the University of New York (Ashdown & Simic, 2000). Jayne Voyles was a Reading Recovery teacher leader in Georgia (Voyles, 2011). More independent studies of RR could be warranted.

Even though the above researchers are connected to RR in some way, they still recommend more research be done with Reading Recovery and ELs. Some of the researchers recommend studies that address whether students sustain the gains they make in RR through grades two through five (Neal & Kelly, 1999; Kelly et al., 2008; Ashdown & Simic, 2000). Another recommendation for further research is that researchers address factors that affect student achievement of ELs in Reading Recovery (Simic & Ashdown, 2000; Voyles, 2011; Yerington, 2004). Research on factors such as oral language proficiency, first-language characteristics and background, race, ethnicity, cultural background, socio-economic status, teacher training, as well as others, may shed more

light on specific aspects that play a part in determining the effectiveness of Reading Recovery with ELs.

An Independent Study of Reading Recovery

Shanahan and Barr (1995) did an independent study of the Reading Recovery program which included all types of learners such as ELs. They conclude that Reading Recovery does build reading skills so learners are comparative to the average first grader. Their research finds that students increase their ability to read texts by 8.26 to 9 levels. The text levels used by Reading Recovery go from level 1 to 30 and correspond to the Fountas & Pinnell system of levels A-U (Pearson, 2016). Shanahan and Barr state that this study was more conservative with its claims of success than prior studies that were not independent studies.

Oral Language and Reading

Thinking about factors that may affect the effectiveness of Reading Recovery, it is important to consider the connection between oral language and reading because, as stated in the introduction, oral language proficiency is a critical element for reading success in native English speakers as well as ELs (August, 2006; Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998). Without strong oral language skills, reading and writing is difficult. Espinosa indicates that the development of oral language proficiency is necessary for English literacy (as cited in Garcia & Frede, 2010). She, as well as other researchers, agree that oral language development in second language learners and NES is a “necessary prerequisite” to good literacy development (pp.144). Some of these other researchers such as Custar (2011) and Suarez-Orozco, Suarez-Orozco, and Todorova, (2008) have

done research that shows a statistical link between English oral language proficiency (EOLP) and higher achievement by ELs. They find that this link between EOLP and reading achievement is even stronger in higher grades. With this information and the statistics that Lee, Gregg, and Donahue found, ELs overrepresent low achieving students in the bottom 5% to 25% and underrepresent in the high achieving top 5% to 25% (as cited in Garcia & Frede, 2010), it is not surprising that researchers recommend time be spent on developing English oral language proficiency in ELs.

This low achievement may be compounded by the little amount of time dedicated to oral language development. Arreaga-Mayer and Perdomo-Rivera report that ELs in their study spent as little as 9% of their time practicing English oral language even in classes specifically for English Language Development (1996). That is why Hadaway, Vardell, and Young (as cited in Young & Hadaway, 2006) emphasize that oral language development must be addressed and instruction must include abstract and academic language in order to address literacy needs. Mora (as cited in Young & Hadaway, 2006) recommends developing listening skills by using repetition, regular patterns, attention to new words and structures, that participation be purposeful and authentic, and attention be placed on pace and rhythm. Scarcella and Oxford (as cited in Young & Hadaway, 2006) say collaborative learning through pair and small group work is essential to developing English oral language in ELs. They state that the small group setting allows for authentic speaking and listening tasks that offer role models fluent in English with the added benefit of being able to adjust pace in order to aid in comprehension. Goldenberg (2008) also adds insight to developing oral language for ELs by recommending instructional

supports such as strategic use of the primary language including focusing on similarities and differences of the first language and English, consistent expectations and routines, extended explanations and opportunities for practice.

Thinking about the link between oral language proficiency and reading, it would be beneficial for any reading program to address the above recommendations. Does the Reading Recovery program address the above recommendations?

Aspects of Reading Recovery that Fit Best Practices for ELs

Reading Recovery has been shown to be effective with ELs possibly because some of the core beliefs mesh well with best practices recommended for teaching ELs. As stated earlier, according to Clay, oral language is integral to reading and writing (2005b). To support this, Clay and others developed a tool, called the Record of Oral Language, for measuring needs based on English oral language proficiency within Reading Recovery after years of research on oral language and its connection to reading (Gentile, 1996). The Record of Oral Language shows a student's familiarity with English syntax. That being said, Reading Recovery revolves around language and preparing the student for the language needed to read the text. Reading Recovery uses multiple researchers' suggestions to improve oral language among ELs. The one-on-one tutoring format of RR allows for the pair work with a fluent English-speaker that Scarcella and Oxford recommend (as cited in Young & Hadaway, 2006). Talking about the book during the new book orientation allows for authentic speaking and listening that both Scarcella and Oxford and Mora urge (as cited in Young & Hadaway, 2006). Another purpose of the book orientation is to prepare students for unknown words, phrases and

text structures. The use of repetition and building background knowledge are some of the ways this is accomplished. This procedure follows Mora's (as cited in Garcia & Frede, 2010) recommendations to use repetition and focus attention on new words and structures and Goldenberg's (2008) recommendations to provide extended explanations. The portion of the lesson of Reading Recovery that requires reading familiar books helps to provide opportunities for practice which follows the suggestion by Goldenberg (2008) to provide multiple opportunities for practice. As for allowing students time to develop their oral skills during school, Yerington (2004) observed almost a 50/50 balance of teacher to student turn-taking and up to 33% of talk being done by students during the new book orientation which is an improvement from the reported 9% low by Arreaga-Mayer and Perdomo-Rivera (1996). This alignment with recommended practices for ELs and focus on oral language may be what helps Reading Recovery's success with ELs.

The Gap

The assumption that all ELs are the same is a dangerous assumption. It can lead to uninformed teaching practices. This is one reason I, as well as others, believe more attention should be paid to different populations being served within Reading Recovery (Ashdown & Simic, 2000). As reported, much of the research done on Reading Recovery was done with Spanish-speaking students. To add to the diversity in the research, my study will focus on Karen students and the way English oral language proficiency impacts their progress during their Reading Recovery program. This seems important because Spanish and English are both Indo-European languages whereas Karen is categorized as a Sino-Tibetan language (Lewis, Simmons, & Fenning, 2015). Spanish

is much more widely known than Karen. For instance, Spanish language resources such as lists of cognates are easily found. The Open Language Archives (n.d.) list seven thousand, seven hundred, and twenty-three resources that inform readers about Spanish. In contrast, the Open Language Archives list a total of twenty resources that help inform readers of the Karen language (n.d.). Thus, the ability for teachers to use first language knowledge, which is regarded as very effective, is much more accessible with Spanish than with Karen. The difference between English and Spanish versus English and Karen, may be a factor that affects the success of the RR program.

A gap also exists in addressing different factors that may affect the success of students in Reading Recovery. English oral language proficiency is a factor that should be researched more by independent studies in the context of Reading Recovery.

Research Questions

After review of the research, I am left wondering how the success of Karen Reading Recovery students correlates to English oral language proficiency.

1. Will students with higher English oral language proficiency fare better in being deemed a good reader by the tenets of the Reading Recovery program?
2. Is there a correlation between text level achieved and English oral language proficiency?
3. How do students respond to teaching prompts that require syntactic and/or semantic knowledge of English?

Summary

This chapter gave background on the Karen people and their struggle for opportunity. It also gave an overview of the Reading Recovery program with its basic lesson components and its overall goal. In addition, research on the effectiveness of Reading Recovery was presented generally and in connection with ELs. After that, research connecting the importance of oral language development to reading achievement was given. A connection was made between research recommendations for developing English oral proficiency for reading and connections to the practices of the Reading Recovery program. Finally, it was shown that much of the research has been done on the Spanish-speaking population and that researchers have not given sufficient attention to how specific factors like English oral language proficiency affect the success of Reading Recovery. Chapter Three will consist of the methodology that guides this research and a description of the design of the study. Descriptions of the assessments given for Reading Recovery and the English oral language proficiency measure I used will be included along with a description of the participants.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

This study is designed to investigate how the success of Karen Reading Recovery (RR) students correlates to English oral language proficiency (EOLP). Chapter Two gave an overview of the RR program, reported the research regarding the effectiveness of the program with ELs, gave background on the research on the connection between oral language proficiency and literacy, and connected RR procedures with recommendations for developing English oral language proficiency in order to better reading skills. In this study, I want to know how English oral language proficiency correlates with the success of Karen ELs in the RR program. Answering the following questions will help me gain insights into my broader research question:

- Will Karen students with higher English oral language proficiency (EOLP) fare better in being deemed a good reader by the criteria of the Reading Recovery program?
- Is there a correlation between text level achieved and EOLP?
- How do students respond to teaching prompts that require syntactic and/or semantic knowledge of English?

The methodology I used for the study is a case study which is both qualitative and quantitative in nature. In order to construct a study with validity, multiple sources of evidence are needed (Yin, 2003). I gathered pretest and posttest data on EOLP for first grade Karen students in the second round of Reading Recovery in a suburban elementary school in the Midwest. I also collected pretest and posttest scores on the Reading Recovery Observation Survey (OSS). I compared the pretest and post-test data in order to generate a picture of how each student progressed in the Reading Recovery program based on their EOLP. I observed four reading recovery lessons for each student in order to gather information on students' responses to teacher prompts that require syntactic and semantic knowledge of English. Furthermore, I interviewed the RR teacher in order to gain insights into the status of discontinuation for each student and what led to the teacher's decision. The data gathered attempts to answer the question: How does the success of Karen Reading Recovery students correlate to their English oral language proficiency?

Overview of the Chapter

This chapter presents the research methodology that was used in this study. First the rationale for using a case study is provided along with a description of the case study paradigm. Next, the methods of data collection are explained and described. The procedure that was followed is detailed with a description of the materials that were used and how they were used. After that, there is a discussion of the data analysis methods that were used and reliability and validity are addressed. The chapter concludes with a description of safeguards that were utilized to protect participants' rights.

Case Study Research Paradigm

A case study paradigm was chosen to elicit answers to my research questions. Because a case study is identified as a bounded system (Merriam, 2009), it fits with my concentration on a certain group of students, Karen, within a certain program, Reading Recovery. In addition, Merriam explains that a case study can use many methods for data collection which would fit my purpose (2009). Yin states that a case study, unlike other research paradigms, can include qualitative and quantitative evidence (2003). Furthermore, Yin also concludes that case studies are particularly suited to "how" and "why" questions. My research question, "How does the success of Karen Reading Recovery students correlate to their English oral language proficiency?" fits Yin's conclusion that case studies are suited to "how" and "why" questions. Yin also advises that case studies need a proposition to help focus the study. I wonder whether lower English oral language proficiency affects Reading Recovery success because students are unable to benefit fully from the teacher prompts that require syntactic and semantic knowledge. Yin states that the unit of analysis is particularly important because it defines the case. My unit of analysis will be Karen students and their English oral language proficiency. My criteria for interpreting the findings will be comparing patterns developed from the existing research predominated by Spanish-speakers.

Even though much of the research on the effectiveness of Reading Recovery is quantitative in nature, I believe a case study paradigm helps give more specific information related to two factors that may affect the success of Reading Recovery, culture and English oral language proficiency.

Data Collection

Participants

Students who participated in my study are first-grade Karen students between ages six and seven with different English oral language proficiencies (see Table 1). There are three participants included. These students are immigrants who range between having been in the U.S. for a year to a little over six years. Participants are a sample of convenience based on their status of being selected to participate in the second round of Reading Recovery and students who turned in their parental consent form.

Table 1

Participant Information

Participant	Number of years in the United States	English oral language proficiency
Participant A	1	2.0
Participant B	1	2.5
Participant C	6	4.0

Location/setting

This study took place in a suburb of a large metropolis in the Midwest. The school has a population between four hundred and six hundred students with an EL population that ranges around forty percent. The majority of ELs are Karen.

Data Collection Technique I

I used pretests and posttests to collect data about how the students progressed during Reading Recovery. It was a simple design in which students were given the usual Observation Survey (see Appendix A) by the Reading Recovery teacher before the intervention as well as after the intervention. The Observation Survey consists of a battery of literacy tests that measure knowledge of how spoken language is represented in print, ability to read a list of words, letter identification, phonemic awareness, ability to write words, and determines an instructional reading level. This is standard protocol in the Reading Recovery program. In addition, I gave students the speaking and listening portion of the Kindergarten Model test developed by WIDA before the intervention to identify the students' English oral language proficiency. Unfortunately, the use of pretest and posttest data does not eliminate the possibility results are from other sources than the RR program. Growth could be a result of maturation, classroom instruction, EL instruction or other factors that the student may have encountered between the pretest and posttest (Bell, n.d.). In order to lend reliability and validity to this data collection method, I have provided a thorough description of the students and the other services that they would have received that may have also aided any progress made in reading. Comparing progress through use of a control group could also help determine whether the results were directly related to Reading Recovery, however, that is beyond the scope of this study.

Data Collection Technique II

In addition to pretest and posttest data, I used observation data. The strengths of observations are that they reflect reality in that they cover events in real time as well as address the context for the event (Yin, 2003). I observed four RR lessons for each student in order to gain data relating to the syntactic and semantic knowledge relied on during the lessons. A drawback to data collection with observations is that it is difficult to eliminate bias because the observations are made through the eyes of the researcher. The use of triangulation of data and disclosure of beliefs and biases are used to help mitigate bias tainting the observations.

Data Collection Technique III

Furthermore, interview data from the RR teacher was collected in order to gain perspective on the discontinuation status of the student by the end of the RR program. Interview data is useful in gaining perspective on attitudes and beliefs that cannot be observed (Merriam, 2009). As recommended by Merriam, the interviews were semi-structured like most interviews in qualitative research (2009). I employed the use of questions that were open-ended in order to get useful data. In addition to that, I piloted some questions with another Reading Recovery teacher to make sure the questions would provide meaningful data.

Procedure

Participants

Participants were selected from the pool of students who were already selected by Reading Recovery teachers to participate in the second round of RR which includes

students who are completely new to the program and may include those who were not discontinued. The Observation Survey had already been given to the students by the Reading Recovery teachers as part of the RR protocol for determining who was in the bottom 20% of the first-grade class. I collected a copy of the pretest data from the Reading Recovery teacher. Once I had parent permission, I introduced myself and established a rapport with the participants. I administered the Kindergarten Model speaking and listening test in order to better understand the English oral language proficiency of the student. The test was administered and scored in accordance with the protocol set by WIDA, the test developer. I could have used the ACCESS results (state language assessment) from the previous school year, but the results would have been about eleven months old. Therefore, administering the Kindergarten Model, gave me a more recent picture of the students' English oral language proficiency. In addition, the Kindergarten Model design is similar to the ACCESS administration and breaks the oral language proficiency in English into a score similar to the ACCESS results which helped me understand the students' oral proficiency since I am familiar with WIDA's leveling system and criteria.

In addition to collecting test data, I observed the students four times in their RR classroom. The lessons observed were two consecutive thirty minute lessons in order to observe the book orientation where a preview of necessary language was done by the RR teacher and the portion of the lesson where familiar texts were read in order to observe how students respond to syntactic and semantic prompts. The observations were recorded with a voice recorder application on my phone which had the ability to record

for over thirty minutes. I recorded while I observed in order to get accurate and current information. During the observation, I used a data collection sheet (see Appendix B) in order to categorize teacher prompts as those needing semantic knowledge, syntactic knowledge, either syntactic or semantic, or other. Then I recorded whether the student was successful or unsuccessful in using the teacher prompt. I used the audio recording to transcribe prompts and responses that I missed during the observation.

At the end of the Reading Recovery program, the Observation Survey was administered by the Reading Recovery teacher. In addition to the posttest data, I interviewed the RR teacher with a semi-structured format and open ended questions. The interview consisted of questions that addressed the teacher's decision to successfully discontinue the observed students from the program or the reasons for not discontinuing.

Materials

Observation Survey. The Observation Survey is used in the Reading Recovery program to collect information regarding the student's knowledge about print, the reading of continuous texts, letter knowledge, the words the student knows when reading, the words the student knows when writing, and finally hearing and recording sounds in words (Clay, 2002). It is given by the Reading Recovery teacher to determine which students are in the bottom 20% of the first grade class and to guide teachers in appropriate instruction. The Observation Survey is given in a one-on-one setting at both the beginning and end of the intervention.

Kindergarten Model. The Kindergarten Model is a standard-referenced assessment developed to measure young learners' academic English proficiency in all

modalities, speaking, reading, writing, and listening. It may be used as a screener to identify learners as ELs, used to identify proficiency levels, or it can be used to measure growth. In this instance, it will be used to measure English oral language proficiency (EOLP) which included the domains of listening and speaking only. The listening and speaking portions of the assessment were given at the beginning of the RR intervention. It is given in a one-on-one setting using books and manipulatives appropriate for the age intended. The tasks are meant to be as authentic as possible by using books and a game board. The speaking and listening tasks get progressively more demanding. Performance on speaking tasks is measured against a speaking rubric developed by WIDA (2007), the creator of the assessment. Listening task performance is based on appropriate responses. Administering the speaking and listening portion only can result in a varying time frame depending on the ability of the student to respond appropriately. The administration took about thirty minutes.

Observations. I observed four lessons for each participant. During the observations, I used an audio recording application on my phone to ensure I was gathering accurate information. In addition, I used a data collection sheet at the time of the observation. A copy of the data collection form can be found by looking at Appendix B. I transcribed the prompts and responses on the data collection sheet using the audio recording for accuracy.

Interviews. I interviewed the Reading Recovery teachers for each student observed. The interviews were audio recorded to ensure accurate reporting of the information gathered. Interview questions such as these were asked:

- What reading strategies has this student developed that work toward the student having a self-extending system?
- What reading strategies do you think the student still needs in order to develop a self-extending system?
- What strengths does the student possess that will help him/her access classroom reading instruction?
- What weaknesses might limit the student's ability to access the classroom reading instruction?
- Have you successfully discontinued the student from the Reading Recovery program? If so, what criteria did the student meet? If not, what criteria was not met by the student?

See Appendix C for a full list of interview questions.

Data Analysis

There are three general strategies to analyzing case study evidence (Yin, 2003). The three strategies are (a) relying on theoretical propositions, (b) thinking about rival explanations, and (c) developing a case description. Yin prefers the first strategy, that of relying on the theoretical proposition that helped shape the data collection phase. Within the three general strategies, lie specific techniques to analyzing data. One of those techniques is pattern matching. Thus, I took the pretest and posttest data and compared it from the beginning to the end point looking for an increase in scores. I made a chart that showed students' scores from the beginning to end with their EOLP noted in order to see any pattern that might match the current research done mostly on a different population

of ELs. In addition, I looked at the text level each student ended at on the Observation Survey and compared that to what my research revealed, which was that students who do not successfully discontinue from RR stalled around text level five. A scatter plot was used to analyze any link between ending text level and English oral language proficiency.

As Yin (2003) suggests a researcher should do, I went back to my question about whether lower English oral language proficiency correlates to Reading Recovery success possibly because students are not able to benefit fully from the teacher prompts that require syntactic and semantic knowledge. I analyzed observation data by quantifying prompts that needed semantic and/or syntactic knowledge and then quantified the number of successful and unsuccessful uses of the prompts by students. Comparing the percentage of successful uses of semantic and syntactic prompts between students of different oral proficiencies helped address my question.

Grounded Theory is used in qualitative research in order to ensure any conclusions made are indeed grounded by data (Merriam, 2009). In accordance with that, I used a constant comparative method of data analysis with my interview data. I compared interview data looking for themes that emerged in relation to the success of the observed Karen students in the Reading Recovery program. I cross-checked these themes from the interview data with my observation and test data collected. I used a color coding system to track the themes within the different sets of data.

Reliability and Verification of Data

Triangulation of data was used to ensure reliability. In the case of qualitative research, reliability cannot be measured by replication of the study because human

behavior and circumstances do not stay the same (Merriam, 2009). Instead, as Merriam states, reliability is addressed in qualitative research by asking "whether the results are consistent with the data collected" (p. 221). Triangulation of the data was employed by use of pretests and posttests, observation data, and interview data. Internal validity is an important component in research. In this study, I relied on providing a rich description in order for the reader to determine whether the conclusions can be transferred to other situations. I provided a detailed account of what led to conclusions in order to leave an audit trail. Furthermore, the use of member checks with my conclusions derived from interview data will be used to provide validity and reduce bias. A member check is when a researcher takes her tentative interpretations back to the source from where they came to see if the interpretations are plausible.

Ethics

To abide by a professional code and federal regulations in order to protect participants' rights, a number of safeguards were employed:

1. Parent permission was obtained with a letter written in Karen and a Karen liaison call.
2. Research objectives were shared with parents and teachers.
3. Human subject approval was obtained.
4. Audio recordings of interviews were used to aid in accurate transcription.
5. Anonymity of participants is protected through use of pseudonyms.
6. All data collected was stored in a locked file cabinet and a password protected computer.

7. Data will be destroyed after one year of completing the study.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I described the methodology I used to conduct the study, described the procedure and materials that were used, and detailed the process of data analysis that took place. In the next chapter, I will provide the findings related to this overarching research question: How does the success of Karen Reading Recovery students correlate to their English oral language proficiency? I will also provide the findings related to these sub-questions:

1. Will students with higher English oral language proficiency fare better in being deemed a good reader by the tenets of the Reading Recovery program?
2. Is there a correlation between text level achieved and English oral language proficiency?
3. How do students respond to teaching prompts that require syntactic and/or semantic knowledge of English?

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

This study took place in an elementary school located in a suburb of a Midwestern metropolis during the second round of the Reading Recovery (RR) program. This chapter presents the results of my research to answer the overarching research question: How does the success of Karen Reading Recovery students correlate to their English oral language proficiency (EOLP)? The broad question is broken into the following sub-questions:

1. Will Karen students with higher EOLP fare better in being deemed a good reader by the criteria of the Reading Recovery program?
2. Is there a correlation between text level achieved and EOLP?
3. How do students respond to teaching prompts that require syntactic and/or semantic knowledge of English?

The results from the data I collected will be presented by collection method.

Participants' EOLP

As stated in Chapter Three, the Kindergarten Model is a standard-referenced assessment developed to measure young learners' academic English proficiency in all modalities, speaking, reading, writing, and listening. I used it to assess speaking and listening proficiency of the three participants in this study in order to measure their

EOLP. The Kindergarten Model gives an EOLP level based on a continuum with six levels. Level 1 is a student who is just entering the process of learning English as an additional language who can be described as starting with language about concrete ideas from familiar situations in an informal register with simple phrases or single words where meaning is often obscured. A level 6 is a student who is reaching English proficiency who can be described as having the ability to discuss and understand language about abstract ideas from unfamiliar situations using technical vocabulary and formal register. Students who are level 6 can use extended discourse that is comparable to English proficient peers. I will include a description of the level for each participant based on the Performance Definitions created by WIDA (2007) and what the participant could and could not do on the assessment.

Participant A

Participant A is a female Karen student who was six at the beginning of this study, but was seven by the end of the study. She attended kindergarten in the same school as first grade, but arrived for kindergarten in January. By the start of her intervention, she had one year of literacy training as recommended by RR. During kindergarten her EOLP was a 1, so she was just entering the realm of learning English. Consequently, it is likely that she was not able to fully access the literacy instruction in kindergarten. At the time of this study, Participant A received classroom reading instruction including whole group and guided reading with her classroom teacher. She also received a reading intervention in phonics. In addition to reading instruction, she received EL services.

I assessed Participant A's EOLP level with the Kindergarten Model in February 2016 in the corner of an unfamiliar room with some chatter from a small group behind a divider. She was able to converse about familiar topics such as family and school using simple sentences with some meaning obscured. She was not shy during our conversation, but seemed less forthcoming once testing started.

During testing, she was able to locate and name everyday vocabulary such as bird, flower, boots, fruit, sun, money, hat and balloon. She was also able to locate items described with adjectives or prepositional phrases such as purple star, bugs on the ground, and books in a box. She used single words and some simple phrases to tell about items in the picture. She was able to point to items from pictures provided after listening to statements and questions such as

- Mousie wants to play. What can she wear on her feet?
- It's a cold and windy day. What can Mousie wear to keep her arms warm?
- Sara buys a piece of cheese with holes in it. Point to it.

In order complete this task successfully, she had to discriminate between items that were similar such as cheese without holes in it or other items of clothing that would not keep your arms warm.

Participant A was not as successful at locating items after listening to longer sentences with more academic or specific vocabulary. For instance, she was unable to point to the drum after hearing this sentence: Rabbit wants to play with a musical instrument with a round top. There were other musical instruments without round tops to choose from, as well as round items that were not musical instruments. This required her

to put a larger chunk of language together with academic vocabulary to gain meaning. It was difficult for her; she was not able to comprehend that larger chunk of language and vocabulary. Once she encountered tasks where she had to put simple sentences together to compare items, she no longer met expectations to go on with the testing. She was able to communicate that items did or did not belong together, but was not able to explain her ideas using sentences with some details. Participant A ended the testing with an EOLP of level 2. A level 2 is described by WIDA's Performance Definitions (2007) as using or understanding

- general language related to the content areas;
- phrases or short sentences;
- oral or written language with phonological, syntactic, or semantic errors that often impede the meaning of the communication when presented with one- to multiple-step commands, directions, questions, or a series of statements with sensory, graphic or interactive support.

Participant B

Participant B is a seven year old Karen male. He also attended kindergarten and first grade at the same school. Therefore, it is known that he also had one year of literacy training before entering the RR program. His EOLP was identified as 1.5 in kindergarten, so he may not have been able to fully access that instruction. He, too, received first grade classroom reading instruction as a whole group and a small guided reading group with his teacher. He also received a reading intervention in phonics. In addition, he received EL services during this study.

I tested Participant B in late January 2016. He smiled a lot as I asked him questions about his family and school. He answered, but did not offer superfluous information. He did not ask questions of me, so I would not describe him as talkative. His answers were easy to understand, but mostly because they were one word answers or simple phrases. Once testing began in a small quiet room, he interrupted me a few times to ask about the story or to give information about his experiences. This shows that he connected with the material used during testing.

During testing, Participant B was able to perform the same tasks as Participant A. He was able to locate and name everyday vocabulary. He was also able to locate items described with adjectives or prepositional phrases such as purple star, tall hat, bugs on the ground, and books in a box. He was able to describe items in a picture using simple phrases and some adjectives. He could also point to items from pictures provided after listening to the same statements and questions as listed above with Participant A.

Similar to Participant A, Participant B was also unable to put simple sentences together to compare items using some details. When comparing pencils and crayons, he said “not the same.” When I asked how they were different, he responded, “The pencil is black. The color.” He did not elaborate when I asked him to tell me more. He could, however, locate items after listening to longer sentences with more academic or specific vocabulary. Participant B ended the testing with an EOLP of level 2.5. He fell between the level 2 as described above and a level 3. A level 3 is described by WIDA’s Performance Definitions (2007) as using or understanding

- general and some specific language of the content areas;

- expanded sentences in oral interaction or written paragraphs; and
- oral or written language with phonological, syntactic or semantic errors that may impede the communication, but retain much of its meaning, when presented with oral or written, narrative or expository descriptions with sensory, graphic or interactive support.

Participant B was stronger in his listening skills than Participant A, as he was able to understand more specific vocabulary. This is why he has a slightly higher EOLP of 2.5

Participant C

Participant C is a seven year old Karen female. She also attended the same school for kindergarten as first grade. Of the participants, she has been in the United States the longest and she went to kindergarten with the highest EOLP which was 3.2. She was in the developing stage of English described above where she could access general and some specific vocabulary, she could understand and speak in expanded sentences such as: I see a big bird. I think it might fly to the nest. With support, it is possible that she was able to access much of the literacy instruction she received in kindergarten. I was her EL teacher for the last half of kindergarten and observed that she displayed literacy skills when she would read words around the room and used visual information to help her decipher an unknown word. During RR, she also received classroom instruction in whole group and a small guided reading group. She received a fluency intervention during this study. She did not receive EL services during RR. Because Participant C knew me, she was happy and talkative as we walked to a familiar classroom containing another small group working quietly. I tested her at the end of February 2016.

Participant C was able to do all of the tasks that Participant B was able to do:

- Name and locate everyday items with and without adjectives and prepositional phrases describing them.
- Point to items from pictures provided after listening to expanded statements and questions using general vocabulary.
- Point to items from pictures provided after listening to expanded statement using specific content area vocabulary.

In addition, she was able to compare items using short sentences with details and some specific vocabulary. Lastly, she was able to retell a story using four or more comprehensible sentences that contained some details. Her listening and speaking scores were equally strong. She ended testing at an EOLP level of 4. A level 4 is described by WIDA's Performance Definitions (2007) as using or understanding

- specific and some technical language of the content areas;
- a variety of sentence lengths of varying linguistic complexity in oral discourse or multiple, related sentences or paragraphs; and
- oral or written language with minimal phonological, syntactic or semantic errors that do not impede the overall meaning of the communication when presented with oral or written connected discourse with sensory, graphic or interactive support.

In summary, Participant A ended testing with an EOLP of 2, Participant B had an EOLP of 2.5, and Participant C had the highest EOLP which was 4.

Pretest and Posttest Data

Pretest and Posttest data were used to address how EOLP correlates to the success of Karen Reading Recovery students. Students in the RR program were given a battery of assessments as part of the Observation Survey Summary (OSS) in the winter of 2016 which included the Concepts About Print (CAP) assessment, Letter Identification (LI), Hearing & Recording Sounds in Words (HSIW), Writing Vocabulary (WV), Ohio Word Test (WT) and identified their instructional Text Level (TL) using a Running Record. These assessments determined eligibility for the program and established a baseline of reading skills.

Observation Survey Summary Assessments

The CAP assessment (see Appendix A) requires a student to follow teacher directions in order to determine their level of understanding around print. Some concepts the CAP measures are

- that books have parts such as the front and back covers;
- that print has meaning;
- that text is read from left to right and top to bottom;
- that there is a difference between letters and words as well as words and sentences; and
- punctuation has meaning.

The Letter Identification assessment (see Appendix A) determines whether the student knows either the name or sound of both upper and lower case letters. The student is shown a letter in either upper or lower case and is asked to identify it by name or

sound. The student receives a point for each upper case letter she identifies by name or sound and a point for each lower case letter that is identified by either name or sound.

The HSIW assessment (see Appendix A) is used to determine whether the student has a sound-to-letter link that is consistent and rapid. The teacher tells a story to the student which contains a maximum of two sentences. The sentences are predetermined from a list of five. The teacher repeats the story word by word for the student to write. When the student encounters a problem writing a word, the student is encouraged to say the word slowly. The teacher can prompt the student by asking questions such as

- How would you start to write that word?
- What can you hear?
- What else can you hear?

The teacher can also prompt the student to leave the word and go on to the next one if the student is unable to write the problem word. The teacher follows the scoring criteria as outlined by the RR program. Basically, the student will earn a point for each phoneme that is represented correctly. The student does not have to use the correct spelling of a word. The student can use phonetic spelling. For example, a student would receive the same number of points for writing *school* as the student would receive for writing *skool*.

The Writing Vocabulary (see Appendix A) assessment is given to determine whether the student has a bank of known words that can be written fluently. The student is instructed to write as many words as possible in ten minutes. The teacher can prompt the student with specific words from a list or give a prompt for the student to write color

words, names of family members, or animal names. The student receives a point for each word written correctly, reversed letters are accepted other than *b* and *d*.

The Ohio Word Test (see Appendix A) is used to determine whether the student has a bank of known words that can be read. There are three lists of twenty words each. The list is predetermined based on the time of year. The student reads the list of words while the teacher records the number of words read correctly out of twenty.

A Running Record (see Appendix A) is used to determine the student's Text Level. The student is given a text to read with a one-sentence introduction to the book. The teacher keeps track of errors and self-corrections while the student reads the text independently. The teacher calculates the percentage of words read correctly and the self-correction rate. A student must have at least a ninety percent accuracy rate on the text. If not, the teacher selects a lower text level. If the accuracy rate is higher, the teacher selects a higher text until the level is determined. The text levels range from one to thirty and correspond to the Fountas & Pinnell leveling system of A to U (Pearson, 2016).

All of the raw scores, besides the Text Level, can be matched to stanine scores determined by the Reading Recovery Council. Stanine scores are used to compare scores relative to other students' scores in order to determine whether the student is performing at a high level or a low level. The stanines range from one to nine. In order to successfully discontinue from the RR program, the district where this study took place recommends that students reach a stanine of five or higher on each assessment with a text level for the second round of intervention at eighteen or higher. In addition, the RR

teacher has to determine that the student has developed a self-extending system in order to access grade level reading instruction.

Results

The pretest stanine scores for the participants in this study are in Table 2.

Table 2

Pretest Stanine Scores and Text Level

	Participants		
	A	B	C
Test	EOLP 2	EOLP 2.5	EOLP 4
CAP	2	1	2
LI	1	1	3
HSIW	1	1	4
WV	1	1	3
WT	1	1	4
TL	1	0	5

Note. EOLP = English oral language proficiency level; CAP = Concepts About Print; LI = Letter Identification; HSIW =Hearing & Recording Sounds in Words; WV = Writing Vocabulary; WT = Ohio Word Test; TL = Text Level

With the exception of the CAP assessment, Table 2 shows that participant C with a higher EOLP started the RR program at a higher stanine for the assessments than the other two participants with lower EOLP. It also shows that the CAP assessment was as difficult for participant C as it was for the other two participants.

The same battery of tests from the OSS were given at the end of RR in 2016. For most students the end of RR was the beginning of June, for a few students the end of RR

was in July, 2016. Participant A is a student who continued to get RR during the five weeks of summer school to allow the student to receive nineteen weeks of RR. There were a few differences in the way the posttests were administered. Students were tested by a teacher who was not their RR instructor. Students were also given a different list of words for the Ohio Word Test and a different set of sentences for the HSIW assessment. One other difference, not from the pretest but rather from RR instruction, students were not given a full introduction to the new book for the Running Record that determines their text level. Students are allowed a brief one sentence introduction during testing, but allowed a much more detailed introduction during instruction to familiarize students with the new text. Table 3 shows the results for the posttests.

Table 3

Posttest Stanine Scores and Text Level

	Participants		
	A	B	C
Test	EOLP 2	EOLP 2.5	EOLP 4
CAP	4	3	4
LI	9	4	9
HSIW	9	2	9
WV	3	5	6
WT	4	4	6
TL	18	8	20

Note. EOLP = English oral language proficiency level; CAP = Concepts About Print; LI = Letter Identification; HSIW = Hearing & Recording Sounds in Words; WV = Writing Vocabulary; WT = Ohio Word Test; TL = Text Level

Table 3 shows that participant A with an EOLP of 2 met some of the recommended stanine scores to successfully discontinue the RR program. She met in the areas of Letter Identification, Hearing & Recording Sounds in Words, and text level. She did not meet recommended stanine levels for the Concepts About Print assessment which was the case across all three participants. She also did not meet recommendations in Writing Vocabulary or the Ohio Word Test. However, Participant A was recommended for successful discontinuation by her summer RR teacher, but at this time, has not yet been approved by the Lead RR teacher for the district.

In addition, Table 3 shows that participant B with an EOLP of 2.5 met one recommendation to successfully discontinue the RR program. He met the recommended stanine level for the Writing Vocabulary assessment. Again, the district has recommended that a student who successfully discontinues has a stanine of five or above, a text level of eighteen or higher, and that the RR teacher has determined that the student has a self-extending system which would allow the student to keep progressing on grade level in reading instruction. This participant was given a status of *recommended action* which means the student should be taken to the group of teachers who determine whether a student should move along to the next tier of interventions within the Response to Intervention (RTI) model. There are three tiers of interventions, with the third tier being the most intense. RR is considered a third tier intervention, so one of the possible outcomes for this student would be a recommendation to the special education team. The special education team would determine whether the student should be evaluated to determine a need for special education services.

Table 3 also shows that participant C with an EOLP of 4 has met most of the recommendations for successful discontinuation of the RR program. Participant C ended at a stanine of four for the Concepts About Print assessment. A stanine of four is below the recommended score of five or higher. Although, this was the same assessment in which all participants scored at the bottom two stanines at the beginning of RR. Participant C was successfully discontinued by her RR teacher.

Table 4 shows the growth between the pretest and posttest scores for each participant. It shows that participants at all proficiency levels made growth during the RR program which is consistent with the research done by Kelly et al. (1995) that states that gains are made by even those who do not successfully discontinue. The amount of stanine growth is comparable for all assessments among the participants, except for Letter Identification and Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words. Participants A and C made significant growth jumping six to eight stanine levels in Letter Identification while also growing five to eight stanine levels in Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words. Participant B's highest growth area was Writing Vocabulary increasing from a stanine of one to five. Participant B's growth in Writing Vocabulary was more than the other two participants as illustrated by the raw scores. Participant B wrote fifty-one more words from pretesting to posttesting, with Participant C writing thirty-eight more words, and Participant A writing twenty-four more words in the ten minutes provided. Participant B's growth on the Writing Vocabulary task was higher than the twenty-eight to thirty word mean for students who were not discontinued shown by the study done by Neal and Kelly (1999). Participant A's growth on the Writing Vocabulary task was below Neal

and Kelly's (1999) approximate forty word gain for those who were successfully discontinued while Participant C's growth was consistent with their study. On one assessment, Concepts About Print, all participants made the same amount of growth.

Table 4

Stanine Growth from Pretest to Posttest

Test	Participant A EOLP 2	Participant B EOLP 2.5	Participant C EOLP 4
CAP	2	2	2
LI	8	3	6
HSIW	8	1	5
WV	2	4	3
WT	3	3	2

Note. EOLP = English oral language proficiency level; CAP = Concepts About Print; LI = Letter Identification; HSIW = Hearing & Recording Sounds in Words; WV = Writing Vocabulary; WT = Ohio Word Test.

A look at text level growth will give a clearer picture of the participants' ability to take all of the individually assessed skills and integrate them into reading. Participant A began the RR program at a text level one which may include repetitive simple sentences with one word that changes from page to page. She ended the program with nineteen weeks of instruction at a level eighteen. She increased her instructional text level by seventeen levels. She surpassed the more conservative findings of Shanahan and Barr (1995) that students increase their ability to read text by eight or nine levels. Participant B began the RR program at a text level zero meaning he was not reading at a sentence level and ended at a text level eight which is an increase of eight text levels over the twenty week program. He went from not reading at a sentence level to reading sentences with over ten words and some multisyllabic words. Neal and Kelly (1999) found that

those who did not discontinue from RR often stall at text level five and it takes the student longer to get to that level. Participant B's end of intervention text level is commensurate with Neal and Kelly's findings. His results are also commensurate with the findings of Shanahan and Barr (1995) that students increase their ability to read text by eight or nine levels. Participant C began the RR program at a text level five. She ended the RR program after twelve weeks with a text level of twenty. She had a text level growth of fifteen levels over a shorter amount of time than the other participants. Participant C's text level growth is higher than Shanahan and Barr's (1995) results.

In sum, Participant B did not meet recommendations to successfully discontinue after a full twenty week intervention. He only met the stanine recommendation of five or higher in the area of Writing Vocabulary. Participant B did, however, make a lot of growth from the start of the RR program to the end. He increased his stanines on all assessments, plus increased his text level by eight. Participant C did meet recommendations to successfully discontinue from RR after only twelve weeks. She also increased stanines on all assessments. She met stanine recommendations of five or higher on all but one assessment, the CAP. She ended at a text level twenty which was an increase of fifteen levels. These results seem consistent with Kelly et al.'s (2008) finding that those with EOLP of level 3 or 4 were 1.6 times more likely to discontinue successfully from RR than students with a proficiency level of 0-2. Even though Participant A's successful discontinuation status is not yet official, her ability to discontinue successfully at a low EOLP is reflected in other RR research (Kelly et al., 2008; Ashdown & Simic, 2000). She met recommendations in three areas: LI, HSIW,

and text level. However, she was below the recommendations in WV, WT, and the CAP. Similar to Participant B, she made a significant amount of growth in most areas. She surpassed the growth of the other two participants in text level, Letter Identification and Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words. She received nineteen weeks of RR instruction, some of which was during summer school.

Observation Data

Observation data about participants' ability to use syntactic and semantic prompts were collected twice in April 2016 and twice in May 2016. I used an audio recording application on my phone to record the lessons while I collected data in a spreadsheet (see Appendix B). After the observations, I transcribed the prompts and responses. I categorized the prompts as requiring syntactic knowledge, requiring semantic knowledge, either requiring semantic or syntactic knowledge, and other.

One example of a syntactic prompt is when the teacher asked the student if what she said sounded right. This required the student to understand the structure of the English language including concepts such as word order, infinitives, definite articles, and subject-verb agreement. For example, a student said, "A boy ran and that the ball." A student with syntactic knowledge would recognize that one cannot say that.

An example of a semantic prompt is when the teacher would point to the item in the illustration depicting the word the student was stuck on and would ask the student to use the picture. For example, the student is stuck on the word *slide*, so the teacher points to the picture of the slide and prompts the student to "use the picture." The student must have the semantic knowledge of playground vocabulary to use that prompt to figure out

the unknown word. Another example of a semantic prompt is when the teacher would ask, “What would the chick say?” This required the student to understand that the fox in the story was dangerous by comprehending what had already happened and then use her semantic knowledge as well as her lexicon of dangerous situations to determine that the chick would say, “Help!”

Sometimes the teacher would combine syntactic and semantic prompts by saying, “Does that sound right? Does that look right?” resulting in one prompt which the student could use either prompt to help figure out the unknown word. I categorized these situations as either semantic or syntactic.

There were many prompts that asked the student to rely on her phonemic and phonological knowledge such as “get your mouth ready for this word” or “does that letter make that sound” which were categorized as other prompts. Prompts such as “try that again” and prompts that required morphological knowledge or phonological knowledge to make plurals were also categorized as other.

Once the prompts were categorized, I looked at only syntactic, semantic, or prompts that required either syntactic or semantic knowledge. I recorded whether the student’s response was correct or incorrect based on the prompt. I did this for the portions of the lesson where the student reads familiar texts and a new text.

I noticed from the observation data that approximately sixty-five percent of the prompts used were categorized as other. Semantic prompts made up approximately twenty-eight percent of the prompts used. Teachers combined syntactic and semantic prompts approximately five percent of the time. Finally, the use of only syntactic

prompts was very low at .6%. It is possible that teachers avoid using syntactic prompts with ELs.

Semantic Prompts

When comparing whether students of different EOLP were able to use the prompts, I calculated the percent correct for semantic prompts only. Participant A with an EOLP of 2 was able to use semantic prompts to produce a correct response twenty-eight percent of the time. Participant B with an EOLP of 2.5 was able to correctly respond to semantic prompts sixty-five percent of the time. Participant C, the student with the highest EOLP of 4, was able to respond to semantic prompts correctly seventy-one percent of the time.

Syntactic Prompts

The low use by teachers of the other two prompts would have shown skewed data if I reported results as a percentage, so instead, I have included the raw numbers. Two participants, A and C, were given one syntactic prompt while Participant B was given three during his observations. Participants A and C were unable to use their syntactic prompt, while Participant B was able to use his three syntactic prompts.

Either Syntactic or Semantic

Participant A was given two prompts for which syntactic or semantic knowledge could have been used, but answered those prompts incorrectly. Participant B was given eleven prompts for which syntactic or semantic knowledge could have been used. He answered correctly six times. Participant C was given one prompt where syntactic or semantic knowledge could have been used and was able to use it to answer correctly.

Semantic, Syntactic, and Either

To sum up the observation data, teachers relied on other prompts more heavily than syntactic or semantic prompts. Of the thirty-two semantic or syntactic related prompts Participant A (with the lowest EOLP) was given, she was able to use eight for correct responses. Participant B with a slightly higher EOLP was given fifty-one syntactic or semantic prompts and was able to use thirty-three to give correct responses. Finally, the participant with the highest EOLP, Participant C, was given nineteen prompts which required syntactic or semantic knowledge and answered correctly thirteen times.

Interview Data

I collected exit data by interviewing the two RR teachers at the end of the program. Participants A and C had Teacher 1. Participant B had Teacher 2. I recorded the interviews with a voice recording application on my phone. I transcribed the interviews and used constant-comparative method to find themes within the interview data. Once themes were identified, I looked to see if those themes might have occurred in the other data collected.

Themes

As stated in Chapter Two, the goal of RR is to develop an active learner, one that has a self-extending system that allows the student to continue developing literacy skills. In Reading Recovery, a student with a self-extending system is a problem-solver that is able to use meaning, structure, and visual information to solve unknown words while reading. Students who develop a self-extending system discontinue the program successfully. Those who have not developed the self-extending system after the full

program are recommended for action. Participant A did not finished the full program as of June 2016, so has a recommended status of successful discontinuation. Participant B was recommended for action. Participant C was successfully discontinued. Through the interviews, here are some themes that emerged while discussing each participant's exit status. See appendix C for interview questions.

The use of self-corrections. Teachers 1 and 2 both discussed participants' ability or inability to self-correct and what information the participant did or did not use to self-correct. When Teacher 1 talked about Participant C, the teacher reported that the student was able to "…push herself through a text." It was reported that she was able to use meaning, structure and visual information to monitor her reading and self-correct when she sees or hears anything that does not fit. When looking at the observation data, I noticed that Participant C was given fewer prompts by the teacher than the other participants at a lower English oral language proficiency. The Running Records taken by Teacher 1 showed that she was reading familiar books during observations with the ability to read at a 99.5 accuracy rate. When she made errors, she had a self-correction rate of 1:2 or 1:3 resulting in the teacher having few uncorrected errors to prompt which seems to illustrate the student's ability to push herself through a text.

Teachers 1 and 2 also reported that Participants A and B with lower EOLP levels self-corrected, but without the ability to use all three forms of information: meaning, structure, and visual. When talking about Participant A, her teacher commented that she "…uses meaning and she uses visual information, structure to a degree that she understands it." Teacher 1 also reported that she "relies mostly on meaning and visual."

But Teacher 1 also said that she "mostly uses visuals to self-correct." When looking at the observation data, I noticed that she was prompted with many visual prompts that either required her to look at a picture and use semantic knowledge or look at a word and match the sounds to the letters shown. She was also prompted with semantic prompts that required her to understand what was happening in the story to figure out unknown words which would be a case of using meaning; but as reported earlier, her success with semantic prompts were only twenty-eight percent during her observations.

Teacher 2 reported that Participant B had been working on using multiple strategies to solve an unknown word in hopes of making his reading more fluent. Participant B worked with Teacher 2 for twenty weeks, the full RR program, but he had not solidified the use of self-correction. The teacher reported that the student does use meaning to self-correct, but that he does not use it consistently, especially in the end of program testing done by a different teacher. Teacher 2 stated that during testing "…he was not making multiple attempts" to figure out a word. For instance, Participant B's Running Record showed that he read the word *goat* as *swim* in a text with both concepts included. The Running Record did not reflect that he attempted to use the picture, say the first sound, use meaning, or the structure to figure out the word. The testing teacher had to give him the word *goat*. It was the second time he was given the word while reading the first few lines of the text. That lack of self-correction resulted in his testing at a lower text level than what he was reading during RR instruction. He was reading levels twelve and thirteen during instruction, but ended at a level eight after testing. In sum,

participants who were able to self-correct using structure, meaning, and visual information were more successful reading higher level texts with more accuracy.

English proficiency. Both teachers mentioned experience with the English language as a strength or weakness. While Teacher 2 was explaining that Participant B of EOLP 2.5 needed to gain confidence with his phonics skills, the teacher transitioned into explaining how the student "needs more experiences with the language." The teacher talked about his difficulty with reading all the way across a word and using present tense for irregular past tense verbs during his reading. It was reported that when he knew vocabulary such as "helicopter and rescue," he would read those words right every time. In contrast, it was stated that he read "come" for the word came most of the time. Teacher 2 also reported that the student's classroom teacher mentioned that "there is just so much language missing." As an example of missing language in English, Participant B's oral language assessment showed that he was unable to compare both items of food and musical instruments using simple or expanded phrases. His strength was receptive English. In other words, he was able to perform at a higher level on listening tasks than speaking tasks. The teachers' perceptions that he was missing language in English were accurate according to his language testing.

Teacher 1 reported that Participant A at EOLP of 2 had difficulty using the structure of English to help her in her reading. When I asked what she still needs in order to develop a self-extending system, Teacher 1 thought that she needed "…more practice and immersion in English structure to know what sounds right." In addition, the teacher said she has some vocabulary gaps which were also evident in her oral language

assessment and her ability to use semantic prompts during observations. During her oral language assessment, she was unable to point to pictures of words such as bench, tall hat, or square cake. Even though she has some gaps in English vocabulary, an asset for her as reported by her teacher, is that she has an understanding of the way sounds are represented by letters in the English language, which may explain why she was given more visual prompts during my observations.

When Teacher 1 described Participant C, it was reported that she has "a much stronger foundation in English" than Participant A. Teacher 1 mentioned that Participant C is able to use the structure of English in her reading and that she has "a lot of vocabulary." As mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, her oral language assessment showed that she is a level 4. During her testing, she was able to generate sentences that used general and specific vocabulary to compare musical instruments while the other participants were not. This illustrates that what the teacher noticed during reading instruction, was also present in her language assessment. In addition to her bank of vocabulary, Participant C was described as having the ability to use the structure of English. However, use of structure or syntax was not highly evident in her observation data. Granted, it may be difficult to observe the use of structure since the student may not make a structural error to be observed due to the student's knowledge.

To summarize, the teachers discussed English proficiency or limited English proficiency as a factor that affected students' abilities to use all three sources of information, structure, meaning, and visual during reading which in turn affects their ability to self-correct.

Retention and working memory. Participants A and C were both described as having the ability to "take on" new information quickly. Teacher 1 said that Participant A was particularly good at learning how sounds were represented in print and remembering how to write words based on that knowledge, while it was mentioned that Participant C was skilled at learning new vocabulary.

In contrast, Participant B was described as having a difficult time reading fluently, remembering sound-spelling patterns, reading across the entire word, and using the reading strategies consistently on his own. During observations, I noticed that Participant B had to be prompted several times on the same issue. For instance, his RR teacher prompted him to say the first sound in the unknown words he encountered four times in the first 10 minutes of the familiar-read portion of the lesson. Another example is when the student was prompted four times while reading the word *met*. At one point, the teacher showed the student how to read all the way across the word to blend *met*, he then repeated the word. When the student encountered the word again after being told to reread the sentence, he read *meet* instead. I noticed in other observations that irregular verb forms were a consistent source of difficultly for this student possibly owing to his EOLP of 2.5. I wonder whether his struggle with the word *met* was an example of only poor working memory or a case of second language learning making it more difficult to remember the word in the context of reading since reading involves multiple processes simultaneously. Also, it is common for ELs to lack experience with past tense, especially irregular past tense. In addition to lack of experience with past tense, phonological awareness of the different vowel sounds and pronunciation may be contributing factors

which are also common for ELs. In contrast to the examples of poor working memory, Teacher 2 was impressed that he was able to write fifty words in ten minutes on his Writing Vocabulary assessment. It may be that this student can retain information, but possibly the challenge of a multi-process task such as reading affects his retrieval. Teacher 2 thought that Participant B had a lot of skills that did not show up in his post RR testing, which the teacher was surprised by because they were skills he had used during the RR lessons over and over again. At the end of the interview, Teacher 2 wondered if retention was an issue in addition to learning English, but acknowledged that it may just be "…more language."

It has been noted that the ability to retain information and use working memory were listed as assets to working through a new text, while the inability to retain new information in the long and/or short term were mentioned as hindering the ability to work through a text.

Conclusion

The pretest data showed that participant C with a higher EOLP began RR with higher assessment scores than Participants A and B with lower EOLP. The posttest data revealed that Participant A with an EOLP of 2 was recommended for successful discontinuation having met some recommendations, but has not been approved by the Lead RR teacher. It also showed that participant B with an EOLP of 2.5 did not meet recommendations to successfully discontinue the RR program. Participant C with an EOLP of 4 met all but one of the recommendations for successful discontinuation of the RR program. The comparison data between the pretest and posttests showed that growth

was made by all students of all proficiency levels and that each participant had their own area of strength on the Observation Survey Summary. Text level growth data showed that Participant B with an EOLP of 2.5 grew eight text levels, but did not meet the recommended text level of eighteen. Participant A with an EOLP of 2 grew seventeen text levels. Participant C with an EOLP of 4 grew fifteen text levels in a shorter amount of time than the other two participants. Participant C ended the RR program two levels higher than the recommended eighteen.

Observation data showed that teachers were more likely to use prompts other than semantic or syntactic prompts. Syntactic prompts were used the least. When teachers gave semantic prompts, participants with lower EOLP were less successful than participants with higher EOLP.

Interview data along with a comparison of other data presented three themes in relation to exit status from the RR program. The first theme presented was the ability to use self-correction independently with a more successful outcome if the student was able to use structure, meaning, and visual information. Another theme that emerged was that students with lower English proficiency had more difficultly using structure to aid their reading. Lastly, the theme about retention of learned skills and ability to use working memory were discussed as factors in successful performance in Reading Recovery.

In this chapter I presented the results of my data collection. In Chapter Five I will discuss my major findings, their implications, and suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS

In this study I attempted to answer the broad question: How does English oral language proficiency (EOLP) correlate to the success of Karen students in the Reading Recovery (RR) program? I broke the broad question into the following sub-questions:

1. Will Karen students with higher EOLP fare better in being deemed a good reader by the criteria of the Reading Recovery program?
2. Is there a correlation between text level achieved and EOLP?
3. How do students respond to teaching prompts that require syntactic and/or semantic knowledge of English?

I collected data in multiple ways using pretests and posttests, observations, and interviews. The previous chapter reported results from the data collection. This chapter will address the major findings related to the research questions, the limitations of this study, implications, and recommendations for further research.

Major Findings

Will Karen students with higher EOLP fare better in being deemed a good reader by the criteria of the Reading Recovery program? The data from all three sources of collection and the student's exit status indicate that Participant C with an EOLP of 4 was deemed a good reader as she was successfully discontinued from the Reading Recovery

(RR) program having exceeded the text level recommendation in a shorter amount of time than the usual twenty weeks. Participant A with an EOLP of 2 was also deemed a good reader as she was also recommended to successfully discontinue from Reading Recovery having met the recommended end-of-year text level; however, her test scores did not consistently meet recommendations. Participant B with an EOLP of 2.5 was not deemed a good reader. His status at the end of the RR program was recommended action. The data from this study also indicates that he is lacking some essential skills to being deemed a good reader: the ability to self-correct independently in order to problem-solve and the ability to monitor his reading for things that do not sound right or look right. Table 5 summarizes the data collected.

Table 5

Summary of Data

	English Oral Language Proficiency Level		
Data Collection	Participant A 2	Participant B 2.5	Participant C 4
Stanine Growth	Grew 2 or more stanines on all assessments	Grew 2 or more stanines on all but one assessment	Grew 2 or more stanines on all assessments
Text Level Growth	17	8	15
Ending Text Level	18	8	20
Correct use of Semantic Prompts	28%	65%	71%

Interview Data	Uses meaning and visual	Uses meaning and visual	Uses meaning, visual, and structure
Exit Status	Recommended for successful discontinuation	Recommended action	Successfully discontinued

All students made growth during the RR program in strengthening their reading skills no matter their EOLP which is supported in other RR research (Shanahan & Barr, 1995; Kelly et al., 1995; Neal & Kelly, 1999; Ashdown & Simic, 2000; Kelly et al., 2008). The results also show that it is possible to have a low EOLP like Participant A, but also be deemed a good reader by the RR program. Both Participants A and C were successful in the program, the difference being the degree of success. The results from this study showed that Participant C with the highest EOLP fared better in being deemed a good reader by the criteria of the RR program. Her posttest data was more consistently within the recommended stanines. The observation data showed that she was able to use semantic prompts most of the time, that her teacher believed she was able to use meaning, structure, and visual information to self-correct and that she has the ability to monitor her own reading. In addition, she was able to achieve this level of success in less time than the other two participants.

Is there a correlation between text level achieved and EOLP? Since Participant A with the lowest level of EOLP read at a level closer to Participant C with the highest level of EOLP, the data doesn't seem to show a parallel correlation, although there were not enough participants to see any trends that may or may not exist. It did seem from the data that the ability to determine what sounded and looked right may have been hampered

by a lower EOLP, which in turn may have affected the participant's ability to monitor reading and self-correct. Both monitoring reading and self-correction were cited by RR teachers as ways to push through to the next text level. In addition, it seemed from the experience of Participant B, that the book introduction could be a factor that affects success in reading for a student of lower EOLP. He went from reading texts at levels twelve and thirteen with thorough book introductions that may have mitigated some factors such as missing vocabulary to reading a level eight in his end of RR testing. But because two elements changed during testing, abbreviated book introduction and testing teacher, it is not possible to isolate the book introduction as the only factor in the difference in his performance. Participant B's experience does seem to be similar to the findings of Neal and Kelly (1999) that students who do not successfully discontinue end with a text level around five. This may be due in part to his status as an EL with lower EOLP or due to another factor such as working memory or motivation since another participant with low EOLP did not have the same result.

How do students respond to teaching prompts that require syntactic and/or semantic knowledge of English? The data I collected seemed to show that the lower the EOLP was, the less successful the student was with using semantic prompts (see Table 5). I found during this study that teachers relied less on semantic prompts and rarely used syntactic prompts, so there was not enough data on syntactic prompts to make any conclusion. This lack of data led me to wonder whether teachers avoid those prompts because students have not been or think they will not be successful using them to figure out unknown words. For example, I noticed that teachers would use a prompt requiring

phonological knowledge when students made syntactic errors. Instances like those led me to realize that success at using the prompts may be affected by the teacher limiting semantic or syntactic prompts to times when they think the student is going to be able to answer correctly. Why would teachers use a prompt they do not think would lead the student to a solution? In addition, it was difficult to determine what knowledge students were drawing from to respond to the prompt. Students may have answered correctly using another source of knowledge like letter-sound relationship or even a 50/50 guess for prompts requiring a yes or no response.

Limitations

This study had its limitations. For one, there were not enough participants to see trends in EOLP and exit status or text level achievement because the pool of possible participants for the study was small during the second round of Reading Recovery. If I had been able to get permission to use human subjects in this study earlier, I may have had more possible participants from the first round of Reading Recovery. Another benefit to using students from the first round of RR would have been that the use of the Kindergarten Model would have fit the recommended time frame of beginning of kindergarten through the first half of first grade. Because I was not able to collect data from the first round of RR, the identification of EOLP may have been less accurate because I assessed participant proficiency in January and February, which is no longer the first half of first grade. Another limitation is that one participant's posttest data came later than the other participants' data which adds an additional variable that could affect results. Also, the scope and time-restraints of the study limited the amount of data I

could collect and analyze. For these reasons, I would recommend replicating the study in the fall.

Qualitative research is also subject to interpretation with many possible variables. I discussed some variables in pretesting and posttesting in Chapter Four when explaining the process that is followed by the RR teachers and that other instruction may have led to the progress made by RR students. If this study were to be replicated, as mentioned in Chapter Three, I would use a control group to help mitigate these variables. In addition, there were variables in my observation data as mentioned in Chapter Three. The data could have been different depending on the background knowledge and experience with the text the student read that day. The way I interpreted the prompts and responses may have been different from another observer. If I were to replicate this study, I would have to consider inter-rater reliability.

Implications

What insights have I gained from this study? What practices would I implement or change? First, in Chapter One, I explained my apprehension about Reading Recovery and whether it would benefit the Karen English learner (EL) population. After completing this study, I agree with the research that children enrolled in Reading Recovery benefit from the program, including Karen ELs. Not every student will be able to access RR in the same way or to the same degree, but growth of eight text levels or more, which was the case in this study, is a step in the right direction to developing life-long literacy skills.

Because of the literature review I did for this study, my experience teaching for over ten years, and the results of this study, I would recommend that all teachers spend more time developing students' oral language. Teachers can provide more opportunities for students to communicate with meaningful interactions in a supportive environment. Young learners would benefit from opportunities to retell stories and to create stories which would allow many EL students to draw upon cultural strengths of oral tradition making the instruction they experience more culturally responsive.

I think this study could be useful when budgets get cut and buildings are deciding how to stretch minimal services across an entire building. Cutting EL services to kindergarteners is often considered an option, but should be reconsidered. Using the EL time in kindergarten to increase the EOLP of students, would be an investment in increasing success the next year in Reading Recovery. The data from this study could serve administrators in making a choice that will aid in the success of the Reading Recovery program with ELs rather than hindering the success.

An implication for EL teachers of young learners is that oral language development is a good investment in teaching time because it could benefit students' literacy. More specifically, investing more time teaching the structure of English could be helpful to students' literacy. I wonder if activities that require students to determine which kind of word could come next in a sentence would help develop their syntactic knowledge which in turn may help them access meaning, structure, and visual information during RR lessons. See an example below.

The rabbit likes to _____.		
Verbs	Nouns	Adjectives
hop eat chase	carrots flowers garden	crunchy soft healthy

Not only are there implications for classroom teachers, EL teachers, and administrators, but also for those implementing the RR program. I think RR could be adapted for ELs with low EOLP in order for it to be more culturally responsive. I think this study reminds teachers of the importance of the new book orientation as a way to prepare ELs for unfamiliar grammatical forms, new vocabulary, and new cultural experiences. When planning for ELs, there should be extra consideration taken to plan the introduction. For ELs with lower EOLP, RR teachers could collaborate with EL teachers to identify and plan for structures and vocabulary in the new books. If collaboration is not possible, RR implementers could consider extending the new book orientation by five or ten minutes in order to provide multiple opportunities for practice as recommended by Goldenberg (2008) and Mora (as cited in Garcia & Frede, 2010). In addition to collaborating with an EL teacher on the book introduction, I would recommend collaboration in order to teach and reinforce unfamiliar English syntax found in the texts since structure seemed to be a lacking resource for ELs with lower EOLP. I would also adapt RR by making comprehension an even higher priority for those with low EOLP in order to increase the student's ability to use meaning or semantic prompts.

This could also be an area for collaboration with an EL teacher. Furthermore, I would adapt RR by adding an oral component to the student's homework. Adding an oral component may draw on a cultural strength shown in cultures with oral traditions. I would recommend that the student retell the story from the text to an adult at school in English. I would also add telling a guardian at home the story in the student's home language. This added component could increase the student's awareness of comprehension and lead to a more substantive discussion of the text.

Lastly, I think this study could serve as a building block to understanding what typical performance of a Karen student with a certain EOLP is for reference when a student's exit status is recommended action. In order for it to be a building block, I would recommend further research.

Further Research

The practice of comparing ELs to peer groups of the same language background with the same amount of time in the U.S and/or school to identify students with special education needs leads me to think further large scale research gathering performance data for Karen students and other populations in the Reading Recovery program would be beneficial to identifying typical performance. This study as well as others (Kelly et al., 2008; Voyles, 2011) has shown that EOLP is a factor in performance within the RR program, so it seems important to include that factor in further research to understanding typical performance. As illustrated in the literature review, past research has not provided very specific descriptions of the EL participants, so I recommend that further research provides a more thorough description of the ELs which includes their EOLP,

their native languages, amount of formal education, and the amount of time they have been in the United States. Disaggregating data by these factors could provide helpful information to serving ELs well. In addition, I would recommend that further research on EOLP and RR be done using an English oral language measurement that is designed, implemented, and scored by ESL professionals. In addition, I agree with Simic and Ashdown (2000), Voyles (2011) and Yerington (2004) that more research on other factors is important to the field of education. I would suggest studying parent educational background, refugee status, and whether families are from a literacy-based society. Furthermore, I recommend research in the area of working memory in a second language because Teacher 1 reported that both Participant A and Participant C had a good working memory which was an aspect shared by both students recommended for successful discontinuation. In addition, my study included a population that is currently underrepresented in research which leads me to think more research on whether RR is successful for this population in comparison to other populations may be useful data for measuring cultural responsiveness.

Furthermore, it would be interesting to implement some action research within Reading Recovery or in tandem with Reading Recovery if the case is that RR teachers need to implement the program with fidelity which may not allow for change. I would particularly be interested in practices that might positively affect success of low EOLP students in RR. There could be research on increasing time of the new book orientation for more practice with unknown concepts or structures, collaborating with an EL teacher

in planning or with instruction, or implementing activities meant to increase syntactical awareness.

Lastly, in the past few years, I have had inquiries asking me why some ELs have not sustained the gains they have made while in RR in subsequent grades. I would recommend research, as also suggested by others, that identifies whether this is true and, if so, what factors might be common among those students (Neal & Kelly, 1999; Kelly et al., 2008; Ashdown & Simic, 2000). It might be the case that their academic English has not increased sufficiently to allow the students to use all three forms of information, structure, meaning, and visual. I believe the desire to prepare students the best that we can will drive more research in this area.

Dissemination of Results

Fortunately, I work in a district that values collaboration in order to learn from others. Professional learning communities, co-planning, and department meetings are supported. This will allow me to share findings and implications with classroom teachers, Reading Recovery teachers, EL teachers, building administrators, and the district EL coordinator. In order to encourage further research and stress the importance of developing English oral language skills, I may also submit a proposal to present at the state EL conference.

This study has allowed me to practice thoughtful inquiry which is one component of Hamline University's conceptual framework for the School of Education. Inquiry and reflection are important components of effective teaching. Thus, I value the experience

and hope that further research will increase culturally responsive teaching practices which in turn may increase reading achievement for ELs.

REFERENCES

Arreaga-Mayer, C., & Perdomo-Rivera, C. (1996). Ecobehavioral analysis of instruction for at-risk language-minority students. *Elementary School Journal, 96*(3), 245-258. doi:10.1086/461826

Ashdown, J., & Simic, O. (2000). Is early literacy intervention effective for English language learners? Evidence from Reading Recovery. *Literacy Teaching and Learning, 5*, 27-42. Retrieved from https://readingrecovery.org/reading-recovery/research/effectiveness/english-language-learners

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2006). Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth [Executive summary]. Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/content/download/ 2243/29073/version/3/file/developing-literacy-in-second-language-learners-executive-summary.pdf

BBC News. (2016, March 30) *Myanmar profile-Timeline.* Retrieved from http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-pacific-12992883

Bell, B.A. (n.d.). Pretest-posttest design. In N. J. Salkind (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of research design* (2010). Retrieved from http://srmo.sagepub.com/view/encyc-of-research-design/n331.xml

Burma Link. (2016a). *History since colonisation*. Retrieved from http://www.burmalink.org/background/burma/history-since-colonisation/

Burma Link. (2016b). *Refugee camps*. Retrieved from http://www.burmalink.org/background/thailand-burma-border/displaced-in-thailand/refugee-camps/

California Department of Education. (2014). *Facts about English learners in California - CalEdFacts.* Retrieved from http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/cefelfacts.asp

Clay, M. (2002). *An observation survey of early literacy achievement*. Auckland, NZ: Heinemann.

Clay, M. (2005a). *An observation survey of early literacy achievement*. Auckland, N.Z: Heinemann.

Clay, M. (2005b). *Literacy lessons designed for individuals*. Auckland, NZ: Heinemann.

Custar, R. (2011). *The relationship between oral language proficiency and academic achievement of high school English language learners* (Doctoral dissertation).

Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global database. (UMI No. 851308789)

Gaffney, J.S., & Askew, B. (n.d.). *Marie Clay: Teacher, researcher, author, and champion of young readers*. Retrieved from http://readingrecovery.org/reading-recovery/teaching-children/marie-clay

García, E. E., & Frede, E. C. (2010). *Young English language learners: Current research and emerging directions for practice and policy*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Gentile, L. M. (1996). Oral language: Assessment and development in Reading Recovery in the United States. *Literacy Teaching and Learning: An International Journal of Early Literacy, 2*, 3-14. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED436725.pdf

Geva, E., & Massey-Garrison, A. (2013). A comparison of the language skills of ELLs and monolinguals who are poor decoders, poor comprehenders, or normal readers. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 46*(5), 387-401. doi:10.1177/0022219412466651

Goldenberg, C. (2008). Teaching English language learners: What the research does-and-does not say. *American Educator,* 8-23, 42-44.

Karen Buddhist Dhamma Dhutta Foundation. (2011). *The Karen people: Culture, faith, and history*. Retrieved from http://www.karen.org.au/docs/Karen_people_booklet.pdf

Karen Human Rights Group. (1992). *Incident reports.* Retrieved from http://khrg.org/

Karen Human Rights Group. (1996). *Human rights in Karen areas of Burma.* Retrieved from http://khrg.org/

Karen Human Rights Group. (2000). *Interview annex to: Starving them out: Forced relocations, killings and the systematic starvation of villagers in Dooplaya District.* Retrieved from http://khrg.org/

Karen Human Rights Group. (2003). *Expansion of the guerrilla retaliation units and food shortages in Toungoo District of Northern Karen State.* Retrieved from http://khrg.org/

Karen Human Rights Group. (2016). *Hpapun field report: January to December 2013*. Retrieved from http://khrg.org/

Kelly, P. R., Gomez-Bellenge, F., Chen, J., & Schulz, M. M. (2008). Learner outcomes for English language learner low readers in an early intervention. *TESOL Quarterly*, *42*(2), 235-260. doi:10.2307/40264449

Kelly, P. R., Gomez-Valdez, C, Klein, A. F., 8c Neal, J. C. (1995). *Progress of first and second language learners in an early intervention program*. Paper presented at the Annual American Education Research Association, San Francisco, CA, United States. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED394296.pdf

Lewis, M. P., Simons, G. F., & Fennig C. D. (Eds.). (2015). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world* [Online version]. (18th ed.). Retrieved from http://www.ethnologue.com

Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Minnesota Department of Education. (n.d.). *Read well by 3rd grade.* Retrieved from http://education.state.mn.us/MDE/EdExc/ReadWell/

Neal, J. C., & Kelly, P. R. (1999). The success of Reading Recovery for English language learners and Descubriendo La Lectura for bilingual students in California. *Literacy Teaching and Learning: An International Journal of Early Reading and Writing*, *4*(2), 81-108. Retrieved from https://readingrecovery.org /images/pdfs/Reading_Recovery/Research_and_Evaluation/LTL.4.2_English_DLL_Language-NealKelly.pdf

Oh, S. (2010). *Education in refugee camps in Thailand: policy, practice and paucity.* (Paper commissioned for the EFA Global Monitoring Report 2011, The hidden crisis: Armed conflict and education). Retrieved from http://unesdoc.unesco.org /images/0019/001907/190709e.pdf

Open Language Archives Community. (n.d.). *OLAC resources in and about the S'gaw Karen language.* Retrieved from http://www.language-archives.org/language/ksw

Open Language Archives Community. (n.d.). *OLAC resources in and about the Spanish language.* Retrieved from http://www.language-archives.org/language/spa

Pearson. (2016). *Reading level comparison chart*. Retrieved from http://www.pearson.com.au/educator/primary/browse-resources-online/english/literacy-levelling-guide/

Reading Recovery Council of North America. (2000). *Reading Recovery* [Fact sheet]. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/contentdelivery/servlet /ERICServlet?accno=ED440366

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. doi:10.2307/748206

Snow, C. E., Burns, S. M., & Griffin, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Stone, C.A., Silliman, E.R., Ehren, B.J., & Apel, K. (Eds.). (2004). *Handbook of language and literacy: Development and disorders.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Suarez-Orozco, C, Suarez-Orozco, M. M., & Todorova, I. (2008). *Learning in a new land* [ProQuest ebrary]. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.hamline.edu:2278/lib/hamline/reader.action?docID=10312780

Sullivan, A. L. (2011). Disproportionality in special education identification and placement of English language learners. *Exceptional Children*, *77*(3), 317-334. doi:10.1177/001440291107700304

Voyles, J. (2011). *The relationship between oral language proficiency and the success of English language learners in Reading Recovery* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global database. (UMI No. 3434054)

WIDA. (2015). *ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 summative assessment*. Retrieved from https://www.wida.us/assessment/ACCESS20.aspx#about

Yerington, L. (2004). *Language interactions between reading recovery teachers and their English-language learners* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global database. (UMI No. 305040195)

Yin, R. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed., Vol. 5). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Young, T. A., & Hadaway, N. L. (Eds.). (2006). *Supporting the literacy development of English learners: Increasing success in all classrooms.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Appendix A

Reading Recovery Assessments

Appendix A

OBSERVATION SURVEY SUMMARY SHEET

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

School: _____ Recorder: _____

Text Titles		Errors / Running Words	Error Ratio	Accuracy Rate	Self-correction Ratio
Easy	_____	_____	1: _____	_____ %	1: _____
Instructional	_____	_____	1: _____	_____ %	1: _____
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)

_____

How the reading sounds	**Easy** **Instructional** **Hard**	
Letter Identi-fication		Raw Score
Concepts About Print	* **Sand** **Stones** **Shoes** **Moon**	
Word Reading	* **List A** **List B** **List C** **Other** _____ (Enter test name)	
Writing Vocabulary		
Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words	* **A** **B** **C** **D** **E**	
Other tasks	**Writing sample** **Story**	

* Circle whatever was used

An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement by Marie Clay © 2013 The Marie Clay Literacy Trust; reprinted with permission.

RUNNING RECORD SHEET

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

School: _____ Recorder: _____

Text Titles		Errors / Running Words	Error Ratio	Accuracy Rate	Self-correction Ratio
Easy	_____	_____	1: _____	_____ %	1: _____
Instructional	_____	_____	1: _____	_____ %	1: _____
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)

Page	Title	Count E	Count SC	Analysis of Errors and Self-corrections: Information used E MSV	SC MSV

An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement by Marie Clay © 2013 The Marie Clay Literacy Trust; reprinted with permission.

☐ *Sand*
☐ *Stones*
☐ *Moon*
☐ *Shoes*

CONCEPTS ABOUT PRINT SCORE SHEET

Date: _____

Name: _____ Age: _____ TEST SCORE: /24

Recorder: _____ Date of Birth: _____ STANINE GROUP: _____

PAGE	SCORE	ITEM	COMMENT
Cover		1. Front of book	
2/3		2. Print contains message	
4/5 4/5 4/5 4/5		3. Where to start 4. Which way to go 5. Return sweep to left 6. Word-by-word matching	
6		7. First and last concept	
7		8. Bottom of picture	
8/9		9. Begins 'The' (*Sand*) Begins 'I' (*Stones*) Begins 'I' (*Moon*) Begins 'Leaves' (*Shoes*) bottom line, then top, OR turns book	
10/11		10. Line order altered	
12/13 12/13 12/13		11. Left page before right 12. One change in word order 13. One change in letter order	
14/15 14/15		14. One change in letter order 15. Meaning of a question mark	
16/17 16/17 16/17 16/17		16. Meaning of full stop (period) 17. Meaning of comma 18. Meaning of quotation marks 19. Locate: m h (*Sand*); t b (*Stones*); m i (*Moon*); m i (*Shoes*)	
18/19		20. Reversible words 'was', 'no'	
20 20 20 20		21. One letter: two letters 22. One word: two words 23. First and last letter of word 24. Capital letter	

An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement by Marie Clay © 2013 The Marie Clay Literacy Trust; reprinted with permission.

LETTER IDENTIFICATION SCORE SHEET (ENGLISH)

Date: _____

Name: _____ Age: _____ TEST SCORE: /54

Recorder: _____ Date of Birth: _____ STANINE GROUP:

	A	S	Word	I.R.	A	S	Word	I.R.
A				a				
F				f				
K				k				
P				p				
W				w				
Z				z				
B				b				
H				h				
O				o				
J				j				
U				u				
				a				
C				c				
Y				y				
L				l				
Q				q				
M				m				
D				d				
N				n				
S				s				
X				x				
I				i				
E				e				
G				g				
R				r				
V				v				
T				t				
				g				
				TOTALS				

Confusions:

Letters Unknown:

Comment:

Recording:

A Alphabet response: tick (check)

S Letter-sound response: tick (check)

Word Record the word the child gives

I.R. Incorrect response: Record what the child says

TOTAL SCORE

An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement by Marie Clay © 2013 The Marie Clay Literacy Trust; reprinted with permission.

HEARING AND RECORDING SOUNDS IN WORDS
OBSERVATION SHEET

Date: _____

Name: _____ Age: _____

Recorder: _____ Date of Birth: _____

TEST SCORE: ____

STANINE GROUP: ____

(Fold heading under before child uses sheet)

COMMENTS

An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement by Marie Clay © 2013 The Marie Clay Literacy Trust; reprinted with permission.

WRITING VOCABULARY OBSERVATION SHEET

Date: _____

Name: _____ Age: _____ TEST SCORE: ☐

Recorder: _____ Date of Birth: _____ STANINE GROUP: ☐

(Fold heading under before child uses sheet)

COMMENTS

An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement by Marie Clay © 2013 The Marie Clay Literacy Trust; reprinted with permission.

OHIO WORD TEST SCORE SHEET

TEST SCORE: /20

STANINE GROUP:

Date: _____

Name: _____ School: _____

Recorder: _____ Classroom Teacher: _____

Record incorrect reponses.
Choose appropriate list of words. ✔ (Check mark) Correct Response • (Dot) No Response

LIST **A**	LIST **B**	LIST **C**
and	ran	big
the	it	to
pretty	said	ride
has	her	him
down	find	for
where	we	you
after	they	this
let	live	may
here	away	in
am	are	at
there	no	with
over	put	some
little	look	make
did	do	eat
what	who	an
them	then	walk
one	play	red
like	again	now
could	give	from
yes	saw	have

An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement by Marie Clay © 2013 The Marie Clay Literacy Trust; reprinted with permission.

Appendix B

Data Collection Sheet

Date

Teacher Pseudonym

Student Pseudonym

Title of Book:

Portion of lesson:

Student error:

Teacher Prompt:

circle
Syntactic knowledge needed Semantic knowledge needed Both Other

Student Response

circle
Correct Incorrect

Student error:

circle
Syntactic knowledge needed Semantic knowledge needed Both Other

Teacher Prompt:

circle
Correct Incorrect

Student Response:

Appendix C

Reading Recovery Teacher Interview Questions

What reading strategies has this student developed that work toward the student having a self-extending system?

What reading strategies do you think the student still needs in order to develop a self-extending system?

What strengths does the student possess that will help him/her access classroom reading instruction?

What weaknesses might limit the student's ability to access the classroom reading instruction?

Have you successfully discontinued the student from the Reading Recovery program? If so, what criteria did the student meet? If not, what criteria was not met by the student?

Is there anything you would like to add about this student?