

The Success of Reading Recovery for English Language Learners and Descubriendo La Lectura for Bilingual Students in California

Judith C. Neal, California State University, Fresno

Patricia R. Kelly, San Diego State University

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine if Reading Recovery and Descubriendo La Lectura interventions resulted in reading and writing success for two groups of bilingual children: (a) English language learners receiving Reading Recovery instruction (first-grade children acquiring English as a second language concomitantly with developing literacy in English through instruction provided in English-speaking classrooms); and (b) Spanish-speaking children receiving the Descubriendo La Lectura intervention who were in first-grade bilingual classrooms that provided primary language instruction.

Pre- and post-test data for the two target populations of first-grade children in California were compared with data for the total English-speaking population of children in Reading Recovery in California for three academic years, 1993-1996, and with end-of-year data from random samples of first-grade children.

Results of this study indicate that statistically significant progress was made by both target populations of children, indicating that the interventions enabled low-performing English language learners and Spanish-speaking children to improve their performance on selected indicators of literacy acquisition. The proportion of these children's success rates compared favorably with that of the total population involved in the interventions, and they achieved scores within the average range of a cohort of their peers drawn from a random sample of first graders.

Early intervention for arresting predicted reading failure of at-risk children is becoming an essential aspect of comprehensive literacy plans for elementary schools (California Department of Education, 1995; Hiebert & Taylor, 1994; Pikulski, 1994). The concept of **early intervention** is unique in American education in that it is neither a remedial program, a special education program, nor a classroom program, a combination of which has characterized the range of educational options for children in our schools over the past several decades. Intervention, unlike remediation, is not a “wait and see” approach that allows children to fail in order to obtain a two-year discrepancy between grade level and reading achievement. Rather, intervention is pro-active; it identifies children early who need supplemental assistance in order to learn to read and write successfully in the primary grades. By providing a “safety net” for fragile learners before years of failure have fossilized unproductive patterns of responding, intervention seeks to correct quickly young children’s misunderstandings of how to operate on print so that future forms of long-term assistance will be greatly reduced or will be unnecessary.

Early intervention is “something more” than classroom instruction alone. Intervention accepts the premise that some children, due to differences in preschool experiences and/or opportunities to learn, require **extra** resources to assure their early success in learning to read and write. Hence, an intervention program is supplemental to classroom instruction but does not replace it. Rather, the success of a plan of intervention as extra help is interdependent with a regular classroom program of literacy instruction that operates alongside it. Children are receiving a “double dose,” as it were, of literacy instruction.

A program of intervening for literacy success is intended to help screen children who, at a young age, appear to be having difficulties learning to read, yet who cannot be identified with certainty as requiring placement in a long-term assistance program such as special education. In this case, early intervention serves as a pre-referral program to special education to differentiate between children experiencing early confusions related to reading and writing acquisition, and children who have processing difficulties requiring long-term special help.

The crucial issue of extra instructional time for children who are behind in reading was addressed by Kameenui (1998): “The pedagogical clock for students who are behind in reading and literacy development continues to tick mercilessly, and the opportunities for these students to advance or catch up diminish over time” (p.12). The longer we wait to help children who are behind, the greater the gap between them and their peers. Stanovich (1986) described the increasing gap as the “Matthew effect;” that is, children who

have difficulties in the beginning stages of learning to read fall further and further behind their classmates. The “rich get richer and the poor get poorer,” so to speak.

In addition to catching children early in their schooling and providing supplemental assistance alongside classroom instruction, intervention programs, to be effective, must focus on powerful instruction that enables slower-performing children to “catch up” with their peers. In traditional thought about children and learning, the idea of taking the lowest-achieving children and moving them more quickly than their peers in order to “recover” the trajectory of progress their classmates have obtained, appears an unlikely, if not impossible, task. However, successful early intervention programs regularly enable children to “accelerate” in their literacy development. The acceleration that children achieve from early identification and intensive supplemental instruction is what makes intervention a short-term program; children “fill in the gaps” of their learning rather quickly and then are released from the supplemental program to continue learning from regular classroom instruction (Allington, 1995; Clay, 1991; DeFord, Lyons, & Pinnell, 1991). In the following section we review the research literature regarding school-based early intervention programs that have been found to be effective.

Although the purpose of this study is to investigate the outcomes of particular early interventions for two specific groups of children (i.e., English language learners and Spanish-speaking students who are participating in Spanish reading instruction), a general review of effective early intervention programs is being provided as background.

Effective Intervention Programs

English Intervention Programs

Several programs have been devised that meet the intervention criteria of providing intensive, individual and/or small group, short-term, supplemental instruction to high-risk children. Among these programs are Success for All (Madden, Slavin, Karweit, Dolan, & Wasik, 1991), the Early Intervention in Reading (ERI) Project (Taylor, Short, Shearer, & Frye, 1995), The Winston-Salem Project (Cunningham, Hall, & Defee, 1991), Small Group Literacy Intervention/Boulder Project (Hiebert, 1994), and Reading Recovery (Clay, 1993b; Lyons & Beaver, 1995; Pinnell, 1989, 1995).

Success for All is a total school program that provides both regular classroom instruction and supplemental instruction. The classroom component

includes a comprehensive reading program in which students are regrouped for instruction, affording them the opportunity to work with materials that are appropriate for them. For students who are falling behind their peers, a supplemental program is provided. It consists of 20-minute daily individual tutoring sessions conducted by certified teachers or well-qualified paraprofessionals. Consistency is achieved between the classroom program and the tutoring through a focus on the same strategies and skills. Results of a large replication study that evaluated Success for All in 23 sites across the United States showed statistically significant positive effects in reading performance in grades 1 through 5 on every measure used, including standardized tests. Additionally, special education students who were participating in Success for All improved their performance and there was a reduction in special education referrals (Slavin, Madden, & Wasik, 1996).

In the Winston-Salem Project, the traditional ability-grouped basal instruction was replaced by multi-method, multi-level instruction. Classroom instruction was reorganized to include a "four-blocks program" involving guided reading, self-selected reading, working with words, and writing. High-risk students received an additional 45 minutes per day of small group instruction. Results of Informal Reading Inventories and observational data indicated that "after two years of multi-method, multi-level instruction, no child remained a non-reader. Most children, including those at high risk for failure, read at or above grade level" (Hall, Prevatte, & Cunningham, 1995, p. 154).

The Early Intervention in Reading (EIR) Program (Taylor et al., 1995) was developed to accelerate the learning of low-achieving first-grade children. It involves 20 minutes of supplemental, small-group reading instruction taught by the classroom teacher as an addition to the regular daily classroom reading program. While the results of EIR were not as dramatic as those reported by other interventions (Reading Recovery and Success for All), the program helped many low-achieving, emergent readers become readers. By the end of the first year of implementation, 67% of the children served were reading at least on a preprimer level, while 40% were reading on grade level or better. These achievements surpassed a comparison group who did not receive the supplemental instruction. In a follow-up study of these children in March of second grade, 72% of the children who had participated in EIR were reading second-grade-level texts while 65% of the children in the comparison group were reading on grade level. This intervention demonstrated that classroom adaptations by teachers can positively affect the reading development of children experiencing difficulty in first grade, even though it does not meet the needs of every child who requires special assistance (Taylor et al., 1995).

Another intervention program that reported promising results modified Title 1 instruction to focus on rereading of predictable books, word identification strategies, word pattern instruction, and writing. The intervention was provided to groups of three children for 30 minutes daily by paraprofessionals and teachers (Hiebert, 1994). According to the author, the majority of children who were initially in the bottom quartile were performing at levels comparable to the average students in their classrooms by the end of the year.

One of the most widely disseminated and researched intervention programs in schools today is Reading Recovery. It is an early literacy, one-to-one intervention designed to help the lowest-achieving first-grade children achieve accelerated progress by developing productive strategies for reading so that they are able to perform at a level commensurate with the average readers in their classrooms and to profit from classroom instruction (Clay, 1993b; Pinnell, 1995; Pinnell, Fried, & Estice, 1990). As an intervention program, it provides daily individual 30-minute lessons for approximately 12-20 weeks. Lessons are taught by specially trained teachers and consist of reading and writing experiences designed to help children develop effective strategies. Attention is paid to phonological awareness and the alphabetic principle in both reading and writing activities. Instruction is provided until the child is reading at or above the average of his or her class **and** has acquired independent reading and writing strategies. The program is then "discontinued," providing the opportunity for another child to begin the Reading Recovery program.

Reading Recovery was developed by Marie M. Clay, a New Zealand educator and psychologist. During the 1960's, Clay conducted longitudinal research documenting change over time at weekly intervals, enabling her to design techniques for detecting reading difficulties of young children. In the mid-1970's, she developed Reading Recovery procedures with teachers and tested the program in New Zealand (Clay, 1979). The success of the pilot program resulted in the nationwide adoption of Reading Recovery in New Zealand in 1983.

Subsequently, the success of Reading Recovery in New Zealand led to program initiatives in Australia, the United States, Canada, England, Ireland, and Scotland. In the United States, Reading Recovery sites have been established in 49 states and the District of Columbia. Additionally, Descubriendo La Lectura, the redevelopment (not translation) of Reading Recovery in Spanish (see Escamilla, 1994), has been implemented in eight states. Descubriendo La Lectura offers in Spanish the same intensive literacy intervention to eligible first-grade children receiving primary language instruction that Reading Recovery offers to English speakers. (Descubriendo La Lectura

will be described in greater detail below.) With all authentic Reading Recovery and Descubriendo La Lectura programs, data are collected daily and national data are analyzed annually for all children served. (See The Ohio State University and Reading Recovery Council of North America, 1998.) In fact, Reading Recovery has gone further in collecting data on every student involved than any other early intervention program (Pinnell, 1995).

The success of Reading Recovery has been well documented in the United States, New Zealand, Australia, and England (Askew, Fountas, Lyons, Pinnell, & Schmitt, 1998; Clay, 1993b; Frater & Staniland, 1994; Hobsbaum, 1995; Pinnell, 1995; Rowe, 1995). In North America alone, nearly three quarters of a million children have been served by Reading Recovery since it was first introduced in 1985; and, since its inception in North America, 83% of children who had full Reading Recovery programs have become independent readers (The Ohio State University and Reading Recovery Council of North America, 1999). Several longitudinal studies have shown that most Reading Recovery children continue to succeed in reading beyond first grade (Askew et al., 1998; Brown, Denton, Kelly, & Neal, 1999; The Ohio State University and RRCNA, 1999).

Contributing to the success of Reading Recovery is the high-level professional development for teachers (Pinnell, Lyons, DeFord, Bryk, & Seltzer, 1993) whereby they are trained in the practice and theory of literacy acquisition through an intense yearlong graduate course of study. Following their training year, Reading Recovery teachers continue to attend sessions about Reading Recovery theory and practice and receive support from their teacher leaders as they work with the hardest-to-teach first-grade children.

Bilingual Intervention Programs

Although interventions for bilingual children have been less widely reported, there have been a few reported for children in bilingual classrooms and for English language learners whose first languages are other than English, but who are receiving literacy instruction in English. Goldenberg (1994), though not dealing specifically with early intervention programs, described classroom programs that supported beginning Spanish readers. He concluded that kindergarten children in Spanish bilingual classrooms “learn more about literacy when they are in classrooms that provide additional and direct opportunities for learning about print. They learn more when directly taught” (p. 184). In this case, a strong emphasis on learning letters, sounds, and how they combine to form syllables and words helped Spanish-speaking children become literate. In first-grade Spanish bilingual classrooms, Goldenberg (1994) found

that a continuous balance between a code emphasis and reading for meaning and communicative purposes was more effective than an emphasis mostly on learning the code and skills. Additionally, increased pacing of instruction and the systematic inclusion of opportunities for taking books home to read and discuss with parents had positive effects on student learning.

Slavin et al. (1996) reported that in Success For All schools where the bilingual version of the program, *Lee Conmigo*, was implemented, Spanish-speaking students outperformed control group bilingual students and the differences were significant. The bilingual students scored at or near grade level and more than six months ahead of children in control groups.

Descubriendo La Lectura (a reconstruction of Reading Recovery in Spanish) is an early intervention program for students whose initial literacy instruction is in Spanish. The aim of Descubriendo La Lectura is to help students having difficulties in bilingual first-grade classrooms to read and write within the average band of their peers. Preliminary investigations of Descubriendo La Lectura have shown it to be a successful intervention for Spanish-speaking children who are being taught to read and write in Spanish (Escamilla, 1994; Escamilla, Loera, Ruiz, & Rodriguez, 1998). In a study that examined the initial impact of Descubriendo La Lectura on 23 students who participated in the program during 1991-92, Escamilla (1994) reported that Descubriendo La Lectura intervention students made significant gains in literacy acquisition and surpassed control group students on six reading measures, including text reading. In another study which examined the sustaining effects of Descubriendo La Lectura programs, Escamilla et al. (1998) found that students who had successfully completed the Descubriendo La Lectura intervention program in first grade and were continuing to read in Spanish in second and third grades, sustained their reading achievement as indicated on both informal and standardized measures of reading (text reading and SABE-2 Spanish Reading Achievement Test). Results indicated that 92% of the second-grade former Descubriendo La Lectura students met or exceeded the average band on Spanish Text Reading and 75% met or exceeded the average band on the SABE-2. For third graders, the percentages were 93% and 79%, respectively. The authors concluded that Descubriendo La Lectura had a positive impact on Spanish-speaking children in much the same way that Reading Recovery had on English-speaking children.

English Language Learner Intervention Programs

The research on the success of early intervention programs for English language learners is limited. Slavin et al. (1996) examined the efficacy of an

adaptation of Success For All for “English as a Second Language” (ESL) students and found it to be effective. Asian students in grades 3-5 performed at or above grade level and far better than control students. Many of them had been in the program since kindergarten. Outcomes for non-Asian ESL students were also very positive with statistically significant differences being documented between experimental and control groups.

Reading Recovery has been found to be successful in helping young English language learners become literate. In New Zealand, Clay’s (1993b) earlier studies and, more recently, Smith’s (1994) research on children for whom English is a second language, confirmed that Reading Recovery was an effective intervention for such learners. In England, Hobsbaum (1995) reported that bilingual children who received Reading Recovery had similar outcomes on *An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement* (Clay, 1993a) tasks as monolingual English-speaking children. Entry scores for the bilingual children were lower on all subtests of the survey, but by the end of the program, bilingual and monolingual children looked very similar.

In a one-year study of the effects of Reading Recovery on English language learners, Spanish-speaking bilingual children, and monolingual English children, Kelly, Gomez-Valdez, Klein, and Neal (1995) reported that English language learners who received Reading Recovery and Spanish-speaking children who received Descubriendo La Lectura benefited from both interventions. Furthermore, their success was similar to monolingual English children who participated in Reading Recovery.

The Purpose of the Current Study

The purpose of this study was to extend the work of Kelly et al. (1995) by examining several years of data collected in California between 1993 and 1996 to document longer-term outcomes. The focus of the investigation was the same; that is, to determine if Reading Recovery and Descubriendo La Lectura interventions resulted in reading and writing success for two groups of bilingual children: (a) English language learners receiving Reading Recovery instruction—first-grade children acquiring English as a second language concomitantly with developing literacy in English through instruction provided in English-speaking classrooms; and (b) Spanish-speaking children receiving the Descubriendo La Lectura intervention who were in first-grade bilingual classrooms that provided primary language instruction.

Two important terms used in the sections below are defined here: *program*

children are students who participated in Reading Recovery/Descubriendo La Lectura who received a full program of instruction determined either by successfully completing the program, or by receiving a minimum of 60 lessons of tutoring. Children who have *discontinued* from the intervention programs have met two criteria: (a) they have developed independent strategies in reading and writing; and (b) they have reached the average reading level of children in their classrooms and, therefore, can benefit from classroom literacy instruction without additional assistance. To reiterate, for the purposes of this study, children were designated as program children if they received a minimum of 60 lessons or successfully discontinued from the program at the average level of other first-grade children. (Please note: In the United States currently, the 60-lesson designation is no longer used to identify “program children;” rather, 20 weeks is the recommendation for classifying children as having received a full program.)

In determining whether the Reading Recovery/Descubriendo La Lectura programs were effective literacy interventions, “effective” was defined in terms of three variables. The first variable involved changes in average score levels on the three measures of *An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement* (Clay, 1993a) or *Instrumento de Observacion* (Escamilla, Andrade, Basurto, Ruiz, & Clay, 1996), which are described below. Another variable involved the proportion of children receiving full programs who successfully discontinued from each program. The third variable involved the end-of-year progress of children in Reading Recovery/Descubriendo La Lectura as they compared to random samples of first-grade children. Therefore, the questions that guided the research were:

1. What changes in average scores exist between pre- and post-tests for English language learners in Reading Recovery and children in Descubriendo La Lectura?
2. Do similar proportions of children in these two groups successfully discontinue from the programs as compared to the total population of children in Reading Recovery?
3. How do successfully discontinued Reading Recovery English language learners and Descubriendo La Lectura children compare to a random sample of their peers on average scores of the three selected measures of *An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement* (Clay, 1993a) and *Instrumento de Observacion* (Escamilla et al., 1996) at the end of first grade?

Method

Participants and Assessment Instruments

Participants in the study included children who had received Reading Recovery or Descubriendo La Lectura instruction from 1993-1996. They included 2,359 Spanish-speaking children who participated in Descubriendo La Lectura, 3,992 English language learners who participated in Reading Recovery, and a comparison group of 18,787 children who received the Reading Recovery intervention in English.

All children in both Reading Recovery and Descubriendo La Lectura were identified by their classroom teachers as having difficulty learning to read and write. They were selected for intervention based on their teacher's recommendations and the results of their performance on either *An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement* (Clay, 1993a) or *Instrumento de Observacion* (Escamilla et al., 1996). Both of these surveys are administered individually to children in order to determine how well they are developing emergent reading and writing behaviors and understandings. Each survey is comprised of six measures that assess behaviors associated with early reading and writing:

1. **Letter Identification.** The child is asked to identify upper and lowercase letters (54 in English including conventional print for "a" and "g" and 61 letters in Spanish).
2. **Word Test.** The child is asked to read a list of 20 words drawn from words most frequently used in beginning reading texts. Three forms are available.
3. **Concepts About Print.** The child is asked to perform a variety of tasks during a book reading. These tasks check on significant concepts about book handling and printed language, such as directionality and the concepts of letter and word. Two forms are available.
4. **Writing Vocabulary.** The child is asked to write as many words as he or she can in a ten-minute period. The score for this measure is the number of words written accurately.
5. **Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words.** The child is asked to record sounds he/she hears in the words of a sentence that is slowly read

aloud. This measure indicates the child's ability both to hear and to record sounds in words. Four forms are available.

6. **Text Reading Level.** Measures of Text Reading Level are obtained by having the child read texts that have been leveled in a gradient of difficulty. The highest level read with an accuracy of 90% or better is considered the child's instructional text level. The leveled texts have been drawn from a series of stories that are not used in Reading Recovery or Descubriendo La Lectura instruction (The Ohio State University and Reading Recovery Council of North America, 1998).

An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement (Clay, 1993a) and *Instrumento de Observacion* (Escamilla et al., 1996) provide a means by which a wide range of literacy behaviors can be observed in a systematic way through a set of standard tasks with standard administration, thereby providing a means for educators to track changes over time. All six measures are used in order to assure that multiple indicators are applied in assessing early reading behaviors. According to Clay, "No one technique is reliable on its own. When important decisions are to be made we should increase the range of observations we make in order to decrease the risk that we will make errors in our interpretations" (1993a, p. 7). The tasks on *An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement* (Clay, 1993a) were all developed in research studies and are authentic in that they reflect early literacy behaviors that children need to acquire early in the process of learning to read and write. "All tasks in my observation survey are like screens on which are projected the immaturity or degree of control demonstrated by the young child's tentative responses to print and to books" (Clay, 1998, p. 63).

The children were selected for tutoring from the lowest 20% of children in first-grade classrooms as assessed with these surveys in schools where Reading Recovery and/or Descubriendo La Lectura was being implemented. The lowest-achieving children were selected first. For English language learners, an additional criterion for eligibility for the program was their English language proficiency; that is, their proficiency was sufficient for them to understand the directions and required tasks of the assessment instrument.

Procedures

Data were collected on every child served in Reading Recovery and Descubriendo La Lectura programs in California for each of the three academic years: 1993-94, 1994-95, and 1995-96. The data analyzed for this study,

therefore, represent the total population of children who received Reading Recovery or Descubriendo La Lectura intervention for each academic year. (The data for 1993-94 were reported earlier; see Kelly, et al, 1995.) Pre-program and post-program scores were obtained annually for Reading Recovery and Descubriendo La Lectura children on the three target measures of **Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words, Writing Vocabulary, and Text Reading Level**, in order to determine changes in mean scores for each measure. Scores were analyzed in terms of two sub-groups of children, Spanish-speaking children in bilingual classrooms (Spanish L1) receiving the Descubriendo La Lectura intervention; and, English language learners (English L2) receiving the Reading Recovery intervention. In addition, data were obtained for the total population of children receiving the Reading Recovery intervention. (This included monolingual English-speaking children and English language learners in English instruction classrooms.) Pre-program scores were obtained by school-based trained and in-training Reading Recovery teachers at the beginning of children's programs; post-program scores were obtained when children concluded the program, either as "discontinued," or, "not discontinued with a full program." Table 1 depicts the number of children in each group who received Reading Recovery or Descubriendo La Lectura instruction in California for each of the target years, the discontinuing rates for each group, and the average number of lessons for discontinuing.

As mentioned earlier, every child selected for Reading Recovery/ Descubriendo La Lectura intervention was administered **An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement** (Clay, 1993a) or **Instrumento de Observacion** (Escamilla et al., 1996) upon entry to the program. However, if they entered within a few weeks of the initial fall testing, the initial test data were used; otherwise, the battery of tasks was re-administered at entry to obtain a current picture of students' strengths. Children received consistent daily tutorial instruction over an average of 17 weeks. Reading Recovery and Descubriendo La Lectura teachers monitored children's progress on the basis of daily observations and successful reading of progressively difficult continuous text.

When the Reading Recovery or Descubriendo La Lectura teachers, in collaboration with the classroom teachers, decided that children's programs could be discontinued, the surveys were re-administered by someone other than the Reading Recovery/Descubriendo La Lectura teacher. When making decisions to discontinue children's programs, teachers considered whether the children had demonstrated accelerated progress, whether their scores on the surveys fell within the average range for first-grade students in their schools, and whether they exhibited observable behaviors indicative of a self-extending system of lit-

eracy learning (Clay, 1979, 1993b). The joint decisions to discontinue children's programs were supervised by a Reading Recovery/Descubriendo La Lectura teacher leader. The assessments were administered again at the end of first grade for children discontinued prior to April 1st.

To determine the effectiveness of Reading Recovery for English language learners and Descubriendo La Lectura for Spanish-speaking children, we made comparisons between pre- and post-assessment results on three of the measures from **An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement** (Clay, 1993a) for children in Reading Recovery, and **Instrumento de Observacion** (Escamilla et al., 1996) for children in Descubriendo La Lectura: **Writing Vocabulary, Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words, and Text Reading Level**. These three measures were selected because they represent authentic reading and writing tasks required for learning to read and are, therefore, valid indicators of children's growth in

Table 1. Reading Recovery/Descubriendo La Lectura Data for Three California Populations: 1993-96

	Year	Served	Program	Discontinued	Success Rate (%)	Average Number of Lessons
DLL	93-94	243	165	129	78%	65.34
	94-95	721	487	386	79%	62.30
	95-96	1395	952	762	80%	65.31
	93-96	2359	1604	1277	79.6%	64.40
RR:ELL (English =L2)	93-94	1409	885	667	75%	66.00
	94-95	1474	912	653	72%	69.12
	95-96	1109	699	476	68%	68.12
	93-96	3992	2496	1796	72%	67.69
RR (English =L1)	93-94	3621	2419	1789	74%	62.67
	94-95	6674	4368	3268	75%	63.53
	95-96	8492	5658	4295	76%	63.33
	93-96	18787	12445	9352	75.2%	63.27
Totals	93-94	5273	3469	2585	74.5%	
	94-95	8869	5767	4307	74.7%	
	95-96	10996	7309	5533	75.7%	
	93-96	25138	16545	12425	75.1%	

Note. DLL=Descubriendo La Lectura; ELL=English language learner; RR=Reading Recovery

reading and writing.

Observing children's writing helps us to learn what they understand about print and the features of print to which they are attending. The **Writing Vocabulary** task, a measure of the number of words a child can write in 10 minutes, illustrates how quickly children are building control over a basic writing vocabulary. According to Clay (1998), "The word lists differ from child to child, and so are open products. For a year or two this is a very discriminating indicator of who is becoming a writer; it is a good way of capturing changes occurring at this stage" (p. 106). The **Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words** task is an indication of the specific sounds children hear in words and of how well they are able to record the sounds with appropriate letters (Clay, 1993a). This measure taps into children's phonemic awareness, which has been found to be an excellent predictor of success in reading acquisition (Adams, 1990; Stanovich, 1993/94). The total possible raw score on the task is 37 for the English version and 39 for the Spanish version.

Text Reading Levels are obtained by taking samples of children's reading of texts via running records. Running records have shown high reliability (accuracy and error reliability of 0.90) and face and content validity; therefore, they provide teachers with a standardized and reliable way to record reading behaviors that can be analyzed for processing and problem-solving strategies, accuracy, and text difficulty (Clay, 1979, 1993a). In Reading Recovery/Descubriendo La Lectura, children's abilities to read continuous text are assessed on materials not previously seen and which are arranged along a gradient of difficulty from pre-primer levels to a sixth-grade (basal) level of reading. Table 2 displays grade-level equivalents assigned to the **Text Reading Levels** of assessment materials used in Reading Recovery and Descubriendo la Lectura.

The other three tasks from the surveys, **Letter Identification**, **Word Test**, and **Concepts About Print**, were not used in our pre- post-test analysis because although they have value in discriminating between children who are and are not developing literacy understandings in early stages of reading acquisition, they may not discriminate as well between the groups in later stages. This is because the fixed numbers of answers on the **Letter Identification** and **Word Test** provide a ceiling of possible scores so that frequently even children who are not putting together a reading processing system on continuous text are able to score as well as those who are developing reading skills on these tasks of item knowledge. The **Concepts About Print** tasks may not discriminate well with regard to advanced print concepts. Some children who read well may still confuse the concepts of letter and word (Clay, 1998). Additionally, good readers may not notice reversals of text, word, or letters when the tester is reading the text.

Results

Reading achievement data for three academic years, 1993-94, 1994-95, and 1995-96, are displayed in Tables 3, 4, and 5 for the three populations of children relevant to this study: (a) children for whom Spanish was their first language who were receiving primary language instruction and were served in Descubriendo La Lectura; (b) children for whom English was their second language who received classroom instruction in English and were served in Reading Recovery; and, (c) the total English-speaking population of children served in Reading Recovery. The latter group included the English language learners and these children for whom English was their primary language. This total Reading Recovery group served to establish a standard for comparison of data from the other two groups. For each population represented in Tables 3-5, scores are reported for both "Discontinued" and "Not Discontinued" children.

In addition, for each academic year, scores are reported for children selected from two random sample populations of two first-grade cohorts. One random sample was from the Spanish-speaking population receiving primary language instruction; this sample served to establish a comparison for scores of Descubriendo La Lectura children. The other random sample was from the English-speaking population consisting of both monolingual children and those children who were learning English-as-a-second language and receiving English literacy instruction. In other words, the sample represents the typical, diverse first-grade population in California. This sample served as a compar-

Table 2. Grade-Level Equivalents for Text Reading Levels of Reading Recovery and Descubriendo La Lectura Assessment Materials

Text Reading Level Score	Equivalent Basal Level
0-2	Pre-primer A
3-4	Pre-primer 1
5-6	Pre-primer 2
7-8	Pre-primer 3
9-12	Primer
14-16	Grade 1
18-20	Grade 2
22-24	Grade 3
26	Grade 4
28	Grade 5
30	Grade 6

son for scores of the English language learners' population as well as the total Reading Recovery population. (Please note: In Tables 3, 4, and 5, "Entry" scores are obtained at the beginning of children's programs; "Spring" scores are obtained at the end of the school year. Totals may differ from table 1 because of missing data from individual substests.)

Table 3 displays data for all three populations over three academic years on the **Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words** measure (total possible raw score = 37 in English and 39 in Spanish). For each group of Discontinued children, end-of-year mean scores were approaching the maximum scores possible and had changed significantly from entry scores. Furthermore, the end-of-year scores exceeded end-of-year scores obtained for the random samples of first-grade children.

For Not Discontinued children, mean entry scores for each academic year

Table 3. Reading Recovery/Descubriendo La Lectura Data for Three California Populations: 1993-96

Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words							
	Year	Test Time	N	Mean	SD	T-test	p
DLL (Spanish=L1) Discontinued	93-94	Entry	129	6.56	8.14		
		Spring	126	36.87	2.51	40.06 < .0001	
	94-95	Entry	383	7.40	9.79		
		Spring	352	37.06	3.05	52.38 < .0001	
	95-96	Entry	754	8.33	10.49		
		Spring	732	37.38	2.63	71.61 < .0001	
DLL (Spanish=L1) Not Discontinued	93-94	Entry	36	1.08	1.63		
		Spring	33	25.88	9.58		
	94-95	Entry	100	2.38	3.15	10.99 < .0001	
		Spring	91	29.23	7.69		
	95-96	Entry	189	2.22	3.66		
		Spring	172	31.24	6.42	58.72 < .0001	
DLL (Spanish=L1) Random Sample	93-94	Entry	--	--	--	--	
		Spring	50	33.22	7.43		
	94-95	Entry	--	--	--		
		Spring	56	31.14	8.81	--	
	95-96	Entry	--	--	--		
		Spring	91	33.29	8.28	--	
RR:ELL (English=L2) Discontinued	93-94	Entry	666	8.62	10.16		
		Spring	647	34.43	2.86	64.35 < .0001	
	94-95	Entry	652	7.21	9.09		
		Spring	630	34.40	2.67	74.30 < .0001	
	95-96	Entry	476	7.97	10.33		
		Spring	458	34.29	3.55	50.98 < .0001	

were lower than entry scores for Discontinued children; end-of-year mean scores were significantly higher than entry scores, though not as high as mean scores for Discontinued children. The end-of-year scores for Not Discontinued children in all populations were slightly lower than end-of-year scores obtained each year from the random samples of California first-grade children. Results on **Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words** for each of the three populations of Discontinued and Not Discontinued children were statistically significant at the $p < .0001$ level.

Table 4 displays data for all three populations over three academic years on the **Writing Vocabulary** measure. This task involves asking children to write as many words as possible in a ten-minute time period. As on the preceding task, all three populations of Discontinued children made remarkable gains in mean scores between entry and end-of-year tests. Additionally, end-of-year

Table 3. Continued

Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words							
	Year	Test Time	N	Mean	SD	T-test	p
RR:ELL (English=L2) Not Discontinued	93-94	Entry	218	2.23	3.64	48.18 < .0001	
		Spring	205	27.74	7.19		
	94-95	Entry	259	1.87	3.40	51.32 < .0001	
		Spring	231	26.68	7.23		
	95-96	Entry	223	1.70	3.14	45.30 < .0001	
		Spring	204	27.24	7.41		
RR (English=L1) Discontinued	93-94	Entry	1773	9.99	10.91	92.10 < .0001	
		Spring	1723	34.43	2.63		
	94-95	Entry	3251	9.67	10.78	127.77 < .0001	
		Spring	3138	34.60	2.81		
	95-96	Entry	4273	10.18	11.17	140.52 < .0001	
		Spring	4144	34.82	2.89		
RR (English=L1) Not Discontinued	93-94	Entry	624	2.18	3.13	77.44 < .0001	
		Spring	556	27.24	7.71		
	94-95	Entry	1091	2.48	3.94	98.94 < .0001	
		Spring	970	27.63	7.57		
	95-96	Entry	1357	2.62	4.17	111.67 < .0001	
		Spring	1226	27.66	7.64		
RR (English=L1 or L2) Random Sample	93-94	Entry	--	--	--	--	
		Spring	424	31.72	7.41		
	94-95	Entry	--	--	--	--	
		Spring	111	31.21	7.95		
	95-96	Entry	--	--	--	--	
		Spring	177	31.01	7.57		

Note. DLL=Descubriendo La Lectura; ELL=English language learner; RR=Reading Recovery

mean scores for all Discontinued children were higher than end-of-year scores for the random samples of first-grade English- and Spanish-speaking children.

Mean scores on the **Writing Vocabulary** task for the Not Discontinued children in all three populations also showed considerable gains between entry and end-of-year testing; however, the means at end-of-year testing did not exceed the means for random sample English- and Spanish-speaking children.

Changes in mean scores between entry and end-of-year on **Writing Vocabulary** for each of the three populations of Discontinued and Not Discontinued children were statistically significant at the $p < .001$ or $p < .0001$ levels.

Table 5 displays data for all three populations over three academic years for the **Text Reading Level** measure (see Table 1 for a guide to text levels). Discontinued children in each population entered Reading Recovery with mean text level scores below 1; they finished the year with mean scores

Table 4. Reading Recovery/Descubriendo La Lectura Data for Three California Populations: 1993-96

		Writing Vocabulary					
		Test Time	N	Mean	SD	T-test	p
DLL (Spanish=L1) Discontinued	93-94	Entry	129	3.83	4.43		
		Spring	126	38.20	11.89	31.56	< .001
	94-95	Entry	383	4.63	5.96		
		Spring	352	39.97	13.33	44.79	< .0001
	95-96	Entry	755	5.59	9.05		
		Spring	727	43.13	12.08	71.10	< .0001
DLL (Spanish=L1) Not Discontinued	93-94	Entry	36	1.11	1.14		
		Spring	33	19.55	9.38	10.99	< .0001
	94-95	Entry	99	1.71	1.33		
		Spring	91	26.34	11.44	20.48	< .0001
	95-96	Entry	189	1.90	2.59		
		Spring	172	27.47	11.08	31.35	< .0001
DLL (Spanish=L1) Random Sample	93-94	Entry	--	--	--		
		Spring	50	29.04	12.38	--	
	94-95	Entry	--	--	--		
		Spring	55	25.91	13.32	--	
	95-96	Entry	--	--	--		
		Spring	91	33.02	15.57	--	
RR:ELL (English=L2) Discontinued	93-94	Entry	667	7.21	9.16		
		Spring	647	48.61	13.52	70.66	< .001
	94-95	Entry	653	6.06	8.16		
		Spring	631	48.28	12.89	77.50	< .001
	95-96	Entry	476	6.78	9.81		
		Spring	459	49.76	13.03	61.41	< .0001

between 13.29 and 14.79. All mean scores for Discontinued children at end-of-year testing exceeded mean scores for random samples of English and Spanish-speaking children in California for each of the three years.

The Not Discontinued children in all three populations had lower mean **Text Reading Level** scores upon entry to Reading Recovery than the Discontinued children; at end-of-year testing, they reached text levels between 4.78 and 5.83. These scores were lower than the mean scores for the random samples of English- and Spanish-speaking children. Results for **Text Reading Level** for each of the three populations of Discontinued and Not Discontinued children were statistically significant at the $p < .001$ or $p < .0001$ levels.

In summary, on all three tasks, children who were successfully discontinued in each of the target populations demonstrated gains that indicated they were operating at levels that exceeded the achievement levels of the random

Table 4. Continued

		Writing Vocabulary					
		Test Time	N	Mean	SD	T-test	p
RR:ELL (English=L2) Not Discontinued	93-94	Entry	218	2.17	1.81		
		Spring	205	30.95	12.74	32.84	< .0001
	94-95	Entry	259	2.27	3.38		
		Spring	230	29.71	11.32	37.50	< .0001
	95-96	Entry	223	1.89	2.07		
		Spring	206	31.28	14.58	29.22	< .0001
RR (English=L1) Discontinued	93-94	Entry	1773	8.35	10.29		
		Spring	1724	47.26	12.99	107.10	< .0001
	94-95	Entry	3251	7.91	9.82		
		Spring	3135	47.30	12.36	153.45	< .0001
	95-96	Entry	4274	8.60	10.85		
		Spring	4141	48.98	12.62	170.67	< .0001
RR (English=L1) Not Discontinued	93-94	Entry	624	2.35	2.23		
		Spring	558	29.13	12.11	54.04	< .0001
	94-95	Entry	1092	2.32	2.31		
		Spring	973	29.76	11.82	75.39	< .0001
	95-96	Entry	1357	2.42	2.55		
		Spring	1228	30.18	11.78	85.52	< .0001
RR (English=L1 or L2) Random Sample	93-94	Entry	--	--	--		
		Spring	423	42.02	18.79	--	
	94-95	Entry	--	--	--		
		Spring	111	41.06	18.10	--	
	95-96	Entry	--	--	--		
		Spring	177	37.48	16.58	--	

Note. DLL=Descubriendo La Lectura; ELL=English language learner; RR=Reading Recovery

sample population at the conclusion of each school year.

Discussion

The results of this study serve to address the three research questions posed and will be discussed with reference to each. Our first research question was, "What changes in average scores exist between pre- and post-tests for English language learners in Reading Recovery and children in Descubriendo La Lectura?" For each academic year, 1993-94, 1994-95, 1995-96, the data obtained indicate significant ($p < .001$ or $.0001$) progress for discontinued children in both target populations of children on each of three tasks related to literacy acquisition: **Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words**, **Writing Vocabulary** and **Text Reading Level**. These results demonstrate that the Reading Recovery

Table 5. Reading Recovery/Descubriendo La Lectura Data for Three California Populations: 1993-96

		Text Reading					
	Year	Test Time	N	Mean	SD	T-test	p
DLL (Spanish=L1) Discontinued	93-94	Entry	129	.043	0.73		
		Spring	126	14.55	4.93	31.43	< .001
	94-95	Entry	383	0.62	1.26		
		Spring	352	14.36	5.28	47.51	< .0001
	95-96	Entry	754	0.61	1.06		
		Spring	732	14.79	5.04	73.81	< .0001
DLL (Spanish=L1) Not Discontinued	93-94	Entry	36	0.17	0.45		
		Spring	33	5.03	3.11	9.34	< .0001
	94-95	Entry	100	0.17	0.45		
		Spring	91	4.86	3.18	14.23	< .0001
	95-96	Entry	189	0.20	0.44		
		Spring	172	4.78	2.65	22.32	< .0001
DLL (Spanish=L1) Random Sample	93-94	Entry	--	--	--	--	
		Spring	50	10.32	8.87	--	
	94-95	Entry	--	--	--		
		Spring	56	8.86	7.76	--	
	95-96	Entry	--	--	--		
		Spring	90	10.40	8.96	--	
RR:ELL (English=L2) Discontinued	93-94	Entry	664	0.86	1.46		
		Spring	648	14.31	4.48	73.51	< .001
	94-95	Entry	653	0.54	1.11		
		Spring	631	13.29	4.29	73.27	< .0001
	95-96	Entry	476	0.76	1.6		
		Spring	460	13.90	3.95	63.93	< .0001

intervention for English language learners and the Descubriendo La Lectura intervention for Spanish-speaking children consistently enabled initially low-performing children to improve their performance on selected indicators of literacy acquisition.

Our second research question was, "Do similar proportions of children in these two groups successfully discontinue from the programs as compared to the total population of children in Reading Recovery?" The data displayed in Table 1 indicate that 72% of English language learner program children in Reading Recovery discontinued from the program; the mean number of lessons delivered for discontinuing the program was 67.69. This compares favorably with the proportion of total Reading Recovery children discontinued (75.2%) and the average number of lessons (63.27). For Descubriendo La Lectura, 79.6% of program children successfully discontinued; the average number of

Table 5. Continued

		Text Reading					
	Year	Test Time	N	Mean	SD	T-test	p
RR:ELL (English=L2) Not Discontinued	93-94	Entry	218	0.23	0.59		
		Spring	205	5.43	2.52	29.47	< .0001
	94-95	Entry	259	0.23	0.60		
		Spring	228	5.52	2.66	29.30	< .0001
	95-96	Entry	223	0.13	0.50		
		Spring	204	5.34	2.96	25.25	< .0001
RR (English=L1) Discontinued	93-94	Entry	1772	1.19	1.64		
		Spring	1726	14.36	4.16	123.63	< .0001
	94-95	Entry	3249	1.17	1.72		
		Spring	3144	14.27	4.35	158.35	< .0001
	95-96	Entry	4275	1.22	1.82		
		Spring	4145	14.48	4.14	193.04	< .0001
RR (English=L1) Not Discontinued	93-94	Entry	624	0.42	0.72		
		Spring	558	5.63	2.66	46.00	< .0001
	94-95	Entry	1092	0.34	0.71		
		Spring	973	5.83	3.93	42.99	< .0001
	95-96	Entry	1357	0.40	0.76		
		Spring	1228	5.79	2.78	67.80	< .0001
RR (English=L1 or L2) Random Sample	93-94	Entry	--	--	--		
		Spring	423	13.79	9.12	--	
	94-95	Entry	--	--	--		
		Spring	111	12.74	8.49	--	
	95-96	Entry	--	--	--		
		Spring	177	11.54	8.72	--	

Note. DLL=Descubriendo La Lectura; ELL=English language learner; RR=Reading Recovery

lessons delivered was 64.4. This proportion was higher than for the English language learner group (72%) and for the total Reading Recovery group (75.2%).

Our third research question was, “How do successfully discontinued Reading Recovery English language learners and Descubriendo La Lectura children compare to a random sample of their peers on average scores of the three selected measures of *An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement* (Clay, 1993a) and *Instrumento de Observacion* (Escamilla et al., 1996) at the end of first grade?” Scores on the three literacy tasks described above for each population for each academic year were compared to scores obtained from annually drawn random samples of the first grade cohort. Results indicate that, for all three years, children in both target populations who received a complete program and achieved end-of-program criteria for discontinuation attained end-of-year mean scores that exceeded mean scores for the random samples of children. This demonstrates that initially low-performing English language learners receiving Reading Recovery intervention and Spanish-speaking children receiving Descubriendo La Lectura were enabled to reach the average level of their peers in approximately 63 to 68 lessons, or 31.5 to 34 hours of instruction.

In addition to results that address the three research questions, we make the following observations from the data presented here. First, the common assumptions that children who are learning English will take much longer to acquire literacy than children whose first language is the language of instruction is not borne out by these data. Over the three years of data collection reported here, the mean number of lessons delivered to discontinue from Reading Recovery for English language learners was 67.69 as compared to 63.27 for the total Reading Recovery population. For Descubriendo La Lectura, the mean number of lessons delivered for discontinuation was 64.40.

We believe the remarkable similarity of total time required for successful acceleration of progress for L1 and L2 students does not eclipse the most desirable practice of providing primary language instruction in both the classroom and intervention programs, as other research has demonstrated (Krashen & Biber, 1988; Ramirez, Yuen, & Ramey, 1991; Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998). Rather, the results of this study appear to speak to the power of individual tutoring by specially trained teachers who teach from a theory of teaching and learning that builds on each child’s unique strengths. Moreover, the context of one-to-one tutoring is characterized by constant, language-rich interactions between a language learner and an expert user of that language. That children are enabled to accelerate their literacy learning in a daily regimen of authentic

reading and writing activities whether they are proficient in the language of instruction or still acquiring academic-level competency in their second language should not be a surprising finding.

Second, the data for three years appear to confirm the validity of the discontinuing assessment that was carried out in regard to determining end-of-program status of children. Since a combination of quantitative and qualitative factors are considered on a case-by-case basis for discontinuing individual children from Reading Recovery and Descubriendo La Lectura, one measure of the quality of the decision process is to observe if there are differential outcomes between Discontinued and Not Discontinued children. Although for all three years, differences between entry and end-of-year scores for these two groups of children in both target populations were statistically significant, differences in means do not reveal if the discontinuing decision-making process was “working” in terms of predicting which children had achieved a measure of independence for no longer requiring individual tuition.

One indicator that confirms discontinuing decisions is the discrepancy in end-of-year scores on **Text Reading Level**. Consistently for each of three academic years for both target populations, the Not Discontinued group scored 8 to 10 levels below the Discontinued group, revealing that Not Discontinued children did not exhibit requisite behaviors that would indicate they had acquired a system for literacy learning on continuous text at an acceptable level for first-grade expectations (see Table 1). Furthermore, the Not Discontinued groups in both populations scored below the mean of the random samples taken for the general first-grade population for each of the tasks. These data indicate that Not Discontinued children did not achieve scores commensurate to their age-mates and, therefore, while the data appear to confirm the discontinuing decision-making process and its veracity in discriminating between children who have and have not developed a system of literacy learning, the larger issue remains of how to better serve the children who do not discontinue from Reading Recovery and Descubriendo La Lectura. A consistent finding of the data is that Not Discontinued children appear to stall in their progress somewhere around level 5 in text reading; also, they take a longer time in the program to achieve this limited record of acceleration. (See Table 1.) Clay, the founder of Reading Recovery, maintains that there are two positive outcomes for children participating in Reading Recovery: (a) successfully discontinuing (having accelerated to the average of their cohort), or (b) referral to longer-term intervention. Therefore, for the small number of children who require longer-term intervention, Reading Recovery or Descubriendo La Lectura has not failed; rather it has served successfully to “recover” those children who are

experiencing early confusions about print, while serving as a “screen” for those children whose processing difficulties indicate referral to alternate programs as the appropriate next step. A full examination of this issue is beyond the scope of reporting the results of the present study; however, Reading Recovery and Descubriendo La Lectura personnel are continuing to study the possible obstacles to learning in a short-term intervention that some children experience as we seek to “recover” an ever-greater proportion of children served.

Conclusions

Early interventions such as Reading Recovery are intended to prevent failure for children who can be identified early as being at high risk for not learning how to read. Metaphors such as “a safety net,” “a gift of time,” and “an insurance policy against academic failure” describe the various ways in which powerful interventions function in schools to support the most fragile learners in their quest to become literate. The data reported here demonstrate that Reading Recovery is an effective intervention for initially low-scoring children who are acquiring English concomitant with learning how to read and write in English-speaking classrooms, and that Descubriendo La Lectura is an effective intervention for initially low-performing Spanish-speaking children who receive literacy instruction in Spanish.

Sufficient research has been amassed (Askew et al., 1988; The Ohio State University and Reading Recovery Council of North America, 1999; Brown et al., 1999) to conclude that early intervention as a system innovation can work considerably to reduce early reading failure. Reading Recovery/Descubriendo La Lectura, as a specific model of early intervention, achieves its stated goal to enable the lowest-performing children to accelerate their progress in a relatively short period of time, thereby making it possible for them to “catch up” to their peers. This study has served to confirm the effectiveness of Reading Recovery for children acquiring English and for whom literacy instruction in their primary language is not available. It also serves to replicate the success of the Descubriendo La Lectura program, which has been reported elsewhere (Escamilla, 1994; Escamilla et al., 1998).

When considering the resources necessary to mount an intensive intervention like Reading Recovery, school personnel rightfully question the long-term benefits of the intervention: the results of Reading Recovery are impressive, but how do children fare in subsequent years (see Brown et al., 1999)? With regard to long-term sustained effects of an intervention, larger and more complex factors must be considered in an overall implementation effort. Chief

among these is the level of commitment by the educational enterprise to place a priority on the prevention of academic failure. The effects of powerful results for intensive interventions such as Reading Recovery are not possible without a determination to invest resources to assure that every child learns how to read, for when access remains unavailable to the full contingent of eligible children, the program cannot be evaluated for its full effectiveness for a school or school system.

Furthermore, gains of children who are recovered in an intervention may remain tenuous as may be appropriately expected when children have just been put on a path of success and continue to have much additional learning to accomplish. Total conditions for success reside within schools and the culture for successful learning that schools foster. As failure in the early grades is almost always related to the failure in learning how to read, responsibility for the eventual success of children served in any literacy intervention must be borne by the total school community. Slavin, Karweit, and Wasik (1992/1993) maintain, “Success in the early grades does not guarantee success throughout the school years and beyond, but failure in the early grades does virtually guarantee failure in later schooling” (p.11). This quote implies that multiple variables are involved for eventual academic success. Early, intensive interventions such as Reading Recovery and Descubriendo La Lectura provide the best entrée to the world of literacy for the most fragile learners and provide the foundation on which other aspects of schooling can continue to build to assure success for every student.

References

- Adams, M. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
- Allington, R. L. (1995). Literacy lessons in the elementary schools: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. In R. Allington & S. Walmsley (Eds.), *No quick fix: Rethinking literacy programs in America's elementary schools* (pp. 1-15). New York: Teachers College Press and International Reading Association.
- Askew, B., Fountas, I., Lyons, C., Pinnell, G. S., & Schmitt, M. (1998). *Reading Recovery review: Understandings, outcomes, and implications*. Columbus, OH: Reading Recovery Council of North America.
- Brown, W., Denton, E., Kelly, P. R., & Neal, J. (1999). Reading Recovery effectiveness: A success story in San Luis Coastal Unified School District. *ERS Spectrum*, 17, 3-12.
- California Department of Education. (1995). *Every child a reader/The report of the California reading task force*. Sacramento: California Department of Education.

- Clay, M. M. (1998). *By different paths to common outcomes*. York, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.
- Clay, M. M. (1993a). *An observation survey of early literacy achievement*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Clay, M. M. (1993b). *Reading Recovery: A guidebook for teachers in training*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Clay, M. M. (1991). Reading Recovery surprises. In D. E. DeFord, C. A. Lyons, & G. S. Pinnell (Eds.), *Bridges to literacy: Learning from Reading Recovery* (pp. 55-74). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Clay, M. M. (1979). *The early detection of reading difficulties* (3rd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Cunningham, P. M., Hall, D. P., & Defee, M. (1991). Non-ability grouped, multi-level instruction: A year in a first grade classroom. *The Reading Teacher*, *44*, 566-571.
- DeFord, D., Lyons, C., & Pinnell, G. S. (1991). *Bridges to literacy: Learning from Reading Recovery*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Escamilla K. (1994). Descubriendo la Lectura: An early intervention literacy program in Spanish. *Literacy Teaching and Learning: An International Journal of Early Reading and Writing* *1* (1), 57-71.
- Escamilla, K., Andrade, A. M., Basurto, A., Ruiz, O., & Clay, M. M. (1996). *Instrumento de observacion: De los logros de la lecto—escritura inicial*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Escamilla, K., Loera, M., Ruiz, O., & Rodriquez, Y. (1998). An examination of sustaining effects in Descubriendo La Lectura programs. *Literacy Teaching and Learning: An International Journal of Early Reading and Writing*, *3* (2), 59-81.
- Frater, G., & Staniland, B. (1994). Reading Recovery in New Zealand: A report from the office of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Schools. *Literacy Teaching and Learning: An International Journal of Early Reading and Writing*, *1* (1), 143-62.
- Goldenberg, C. (1994). Promoting early literacy development among Spanish speaking children: Lessons from two studies. In E. H. Hiebert & B. M. Taylor (Eds.), *Getting reading right from the start* (pp. 171-197). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hall, D. P., Prevatte, C., & Cunningham, P. M. (1995). Eliminating ability grouping and reducing failure in the primary grades. In R. L. Allington & S. A. Walmsley (Eds.), *No quick fix: Rethinking literacy programs in America's elementary schools* (pp. 137-158). New York: Teachers College Press and International Reading Association.
- Hiebert, E. H. (1994). A small-group literacy intervention with Chapter 1 students. In E. H. Hiebert & B. M. Taylor (Eds.), *Getting reading right from the start* (pp. 85-106). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hiebert, E. H., & Taylor, B. M. (Eds.). (1994). *Getting reading right from the start*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hobsbaum, A. (1995). Reading Recovery in England. *Literacy Teaching and Learning: An International Journal of Early Reading and Writing*, *2* (1), 21-40.
- Kameenui, E. J. (1998). Diverse learners and the tyranny of time: Don't fix blame; fix the leaky roof. In R. Allington (Ed.), *Teaching struggling readers/Articles from The*

- Reading Teacher*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Kelly, P. R., Gomez-Valdez, C., Klein, A., & Neal, J. C. (1995, April). *Progress of first and second language learners in an early intervention program*. Paper presented to the American Education Research Association, San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 394 296)
- Krashen, S., & Biber, D. (1988). *On course: Bilingual education's success in California*. Sacramento, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Lyons, C. A., & Beaver, J. (1995). Reducing retention and learning disability placement through Reading Recovery: An educationally sound, cost-effective choice. In R. L. Allington & S. Walmsley (Eds.), *No quick fix: Rethinking literacy programs in America's elementary schools* (pp. 116-136). New York: Teachers College Press and International Reading Association.
- Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N. L., Dolan, L. J., & Wasik, B. A. (1991). Success for All: Ending reading failure from the beginning. *Language Arts*, *68*, 47-52.
- The Ohio State University and Reading Recovery Council of North America. (1998). *Reading Recovery executive summary 1984-1997*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University and the Reading Recovery Council of North America.
- The Ohio State University and Reading Recovery Council of North America. (1999). *Reading Recovery executive summary 1984-1998*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University and the Reading Recovery Council of North America.
- Pikulski, J. J. (1994). Preventing reading failure: A review of five effective programs. *The Reading Teacher*, *48* (1), 30-39.
- Pinnell, G. S. (1995). *Reading Recovery: A review of research*. (Educational Report #23). Martha L. King Language and Literacy Center: The Ohio State University.
- Pinnell, G. S. (1989). Reading Recovery: Helping at-risk children learn to read. *The Elementary School Journal*, *90*, 161-183.
- Pinnell, G. S., Fried, M. D., & Estice, R. M. (1990). Reading Recovery: Learning how to make a difference. *The Reading Teacher*, *43*, 282-95.
- Pinnell, G. S., Lyons, C. A., DeFord, D. E., Bryk, A. S., & Seltzer, M. (1993). Comparing instructional models for the literacy education of high-risk first graders. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *29* (1), 9-38.
- Ramirez, J., Yuen, S., & Ramey, D. (1991). Executive summary, final report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual programs for language minority children. San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.
- Rowe, K. (1995). Factors affecting students' progress in reading: Key findings from a longitudinal study. *Literacy Teaching and Learning: An International Journal of Early Reading and Writing*, *1* (2), 57-110.
- Slavin, R., Karweit, N., L., & Wasik, B. A. (1992/1993, December/January) Preventing early school failure: What works? *Educational Leadership*, *50*, 10-19.
- Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., & Wasik, B. A. (1996). *Success for All/Roots and Wings: Summary of research on achievement outcomes*. Center for Research on the

Education of Students Placed at Risk: Johns Hopkins University.
Smith, P. E. (1994). Reading Recovery and children with English as a second language. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 29, 141-155.
Snow, C. E., Burns, M. S., & Griffin, P. (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, D. C.: National Academy Press.
Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 21, 360-407.
Stanovich, K. E. (1993/94). Romance and reality. *The Reading Teacher*, 47, (4), 280-90.
Taylor, B., Short, R., Shearer, B., & Frye, B. (1995). First grade teachers provide early reading intervention in the classroom. In R. L. Allington & S. A. Walmsley (Eds.), *No quick fix: Rethinking literacy programs in America's elementary schools* (pp. 159-176). New York: Teachers College Press and International Reading Association.

Biography

Judith C. Neal is a professor of Literacy and Early Education at California State University, Fresno, where she teaches graduate coursework and serves as a Reading Recovery trainer of teacher leaders. Dr. Neal has published articles in the *Journal of Reading* (now *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*), *The California Reader*, *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, and *The Running Record: A Review of Theory and Practice for Reading Recovery Teachers*. In addition to directing and supporting twenty Reading Recovery training sites, she is currently active in applying principles of early literacy intervention to students in the upper grades as formal programs of late intervention.

Patricia R. Kelly is a professor in the College of Education at San Diego State University. Dr. Kelly teaches graduate courses in reading and clinical and theoretical courses in Reading Recovery. She is the director of the Reading Recovery Program at San Diego State University. Dr. Kelly has conducted research in the areas of early intervention, reader response, and effective literacy instruction. Her articles have been published in *The Reading Teacher*, *The Journal of Reading*, *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, *The New Advocate*, *Reading Horizons*, and the *Journal of Reading Behavior*.

Reading Recovery Council of North America



VISION

The vision of RRCNA is that children will be proficient readers and writers by the end of first grade.

MISSION

The mission of RRCNA is to ensure access to Reading Recovery for every child who needs its support.

PURPOSE

The purpose of RRCNA is to sustain the integrity of Reading Recovery and expand its implementation by increasing the number of individuals who understand, support, and collaborate to achieve the mission of the Council.

Rights and Permissions

Permission to Quote or Reprint: Quotations of 500 words or more or reproductions of any portion of a table, figure, etc. require written permission from the Reading Recovery Council of North America. Proper credit to the organization should be included. A fee may be charged for use of the materials and permission of the first author will be secured.

Photocopies: Individuals may photocopy single journal articles without permission for the nonprofit, one-time classroom or library reserve use in educational institutions. Consent to photocopy does not extend to items identified as reprinted by permission of other publishers, nor to copying for general distribution, for advertising or promotion, or for resale, unless written permission is obtained from the Reading Recovery Council of North America.

Address inquiries to:
The Reading Recovery Council of North America
1929 Kenny Road
Columbus, OH 43210.



**Literacy Teaching and Learning:
An International Journal of
Early Reading and Writing™**

Editorial Offices
School of Education
Purdue University



Editorial Policy

Literacy Teaching and Learning: An International Journal of Early Reading and Writing is a scholarly journal established to provide an interdisciplinary forum on issues related to the acquisition of language, literacy development, and instructional theory and practice. The journal publishes original contributions that inform the construction of knowledge in children and teachers, teaching methodology, and public policy to offer a variety of viewpoints, allowing practitioners, policymakers, and researchers to enter into a reflective dialogue on such issues.

Encouraged are submissions that include multiple perspectives from disciplines such as child development, linguistics, literacy education, psychology, public policy, sociology, special education, and teacher education. Contributions may include: (a) reports of empirical research; (b) theoretical interpretations of research; (c) reports of program evaluation and effective practice; and (d) critical reviews, responses, and analyses of key conceptual, historical, and research perspectives. Manuscripts representing diverse methodologies including ethnographic, empirical, and case study research are encouraged.

Literacy Teaching and Learning: An International Journal of Early Reading and Writing is an official publication of the Reading Recovery Council of North America (RRCNA), developed to provide a forum among professionals from a wide variety of disciplines. The journal has an international focus that encourages contributions from individuals with similar interests and research agendas working throughout the world. It is believed that this multidisciplinary and global perspective can make a positive contribution to the literature on early literacy learning.

RRCNA is an organization whose vision is that all children will be proficient readers and writers by the end of first grade. The organization serves to provide a network for colleagues, Reading Recovery (RR) professionals and interested partners, to interact throughout the continent. The network of RR professionals involves more than 15,000 educators in over 10,000 schools in the U.S.

Instructions for contributors

To have a manuscript considered for publication, submit four print copies to the editor with two self-addressed, stamped envelopes. Manuscripts should follow the style outlined in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychology Association* (4th edition), including a one hundred word abstract. Each copy must have the complete title on the first page of the text but no identification of the author(s) or affiliation should appear in the article. Include a cover letter giving the title, author's professional affiliation, complete address, and telephone number. Contributions will be refereed (i.e., blind review process), but may also include invited and themed submissions, as well as editorials. Upon acceptance, contributors will be required to submit manuscripts on a 3.5 inch diskette. Graphic material must be submitted camera ready. Correspondence may be directed to:

Maribeth Schmitt, Editor
1442 Liberal Arts and Education
Purdue University
West Lafayette, Indiana 47907-1442
765-494-9750 or mschmitt@purdue.edu

**Reading Recovery Council of North America
Membership Application**

Benefits of membership in RRCNA include:

- ✦ A one-year subscription to RRCNA newsletters
Council Connections (3 issues)
Running Record or *Network News* (2 issues each)
- ✦ A one-year subscription to *Literacy Teaching and Learning* research journal (2 issues)
- ✦ Special member rates on other RRCNA publications
- ✦ Voted representation on the RRCNA Board of Directors
- ✦ A lapel pin and membership certificate for new members
- ✦ A network of colleagues throughout the Continent



Renewal New

Name _____

Employer _____

Work Street Address _____

City _____ State/Province _____ Zip Code _____

Phone (____) _____ FAX (____) _____

E-Mail _____

Home Street Address _____

City _____ State/Province _____ Zip Code _____

Phone (____) _____ FAX (____) _____

Preferred Mailing Address: Home Work

Check the appropriate items below that apply to you.

RR Teacher RR Site Coordinator

RR Teacher Leader RR Leader Trainer

Partner: Specify Classroom Teacher Title 1 Teacher Principal
 Administrator Parent Volunteer

I am associated with Descubriendo La Lectura.

I am associated with Canadian/Western Institutes of Reading Recovery.

— continued on next page —

Membership Application page 2

Please help the Council maintain an accurate Reading Recovery database by providing the following information:

If a Teacher Leader, list your affiliated university regional training center:

If a Reading Recovery Teacher, list name of Teacher Leader:

If a Reading Recovery Site Coordinator or Teacher Leader, list name of your site(s):

I was referred for membership by: _____

I would like to:

pay annual membership dues of \$40.00 per year. \$ _____

pay annual membership dues of \$30.00 per year, I am in training. \$ _____

pay supporting membership dues of \$100.00 per year. \$ _____

to make an additional tax deductible charitable contribution to help support the Council's work. \$ _____

Total Amount of Membership and Contribution: \$ _____

Visa or MasterCard

----- - ----- - ----- - -----

Expiration Date: _ | _ mo. _ | _ yr.

Signature: _____

Office Use Only
Remittance Advice: RRCNA

Name _____

Check # _____

Invoice # _____

Date _____

Amount _____

Please send completed form with your check, credit card information, or purchase order made out to RRCNA to the following address:

Reading Recovery Council of North America
1929 Kenny Rd., Suite 100
Columbus OH 43210-1069
(614)292-7111 FAX (614)292-4404



Reading Recovery Council of North America
The Ohio State University
1929 Kenny Rd., Suite 100
Columbus, OH 43210



Non Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Columbus, Ohio
Permit No. 711