Case Study of Reading Interventions on Twin English Language Learners Who Are Struggling Readers

by

Jennifer Carlson

A Research Paper
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the
Master of Science Degree
In

Education

Approved: 2 Semester Credits

_____
Dr. James Lehmann

The Graduate School

University of Wisconsin-Stout

August, 2011

The Graduate School
University of Wisconsin-Stout
Menomonie, WI

Author: **Carlson, Jennifer L.**

Title: ***Case Study of Reading Interventions on Twin English Language Learners Who Are Struggling Readers***

Graduate Degree/ Major: MS Education

Research Adviser: **Dr. James Lehmann**

Month/Year: **August, 2011**

Number of Pages: **45**

Style Manual Used: **American Psychological Association, 6th edition**

Abstract

This research paper is a case study following the reading and language interventions of twin male English language learners. The twins began first grade with similar language and reading scores; however, Twin A was given more language support while Twin B was given one to one Reading Recovery. The researcher collected data from the classroom teachers, language teacher, and reading specialist to determine which interventions produced the greatest reading and language growth for these twin English language learners. From analyzing the data it was clear more interventions did not equal greater academic achievement. Twin A who received more language help, finished the year reading below grade level expectations with lower language skills than his brother. Twin B who received one to one Reading Recovery intervention at the beginning of first grade and less language instruction finished first grade reading above grade level.

The Graduate School
University of Wisconsin Stout
Menomonie, WI

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my husband and two children for the love and patience they have shown me while going through the process of writing this research paper. They have given me unconditional support and encouragement throughout the entire writing process. I could not have finished this process without the extra time they gave me to work. I am looking forward to spending more time with them!

Acknowledgements go out to the staff I work with for providing the data necessary to complete this research project. They willingly gathered their paperwork for me and allowed me to carefully examine their data. I appreciate the time they spent helping to encourage and advise me how to proceed through the research process.

Lastly, I would also like to thank the professors and staff of the online Masters of Science program through the University of Wisconsin-Stout for deepening and broadening my knowledge of current education practices. I would especially like to thank my advisor Dr. Lehmann for his guidance during the research process.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter I: Introduction

There was a growing population of English language learners (ELL) in public schools across the United States. This population created an ongoing debate as to the best methods of reading instruction for English language learners. The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act which became law in 2002 mandated every student third grade and above was required to take a statewide test and to earn a proficient rating in core academic areas. The testing requirement created controversy because all ELL students were required to earn a proficient rating in language arts or their schools were in danger of receiving sanctions. Along with NCLB, there were changes to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) which was no longer based upon the discrepancy model it was previously under. Under the new rules of IDEA, a student who was not responding to academic instruction after one year was to be given additional instruction or intervention to allow them to make gains and catch up to their normal achieving peers. One reading intervention for struggling first grade ELL students was Reading Recovery.

Statement of the Problem

This year in first grade Bridge View Elementary had twin English Language Learner students. These two brothers were struggling readers. Because of the requirements of IDEA and the Response to Intervention (RTI) framework implemented in schools across the United States, they were given the Dynamic Indicator of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) universal screening tool in the fall. The twin boys did not reach Benchmark Standards in some of the areas assessed on the DIBELS which required them to participate in interventions to accelerate their reading progress. When given further assessments from Marie Clay's (2002) *An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement,* it was discovered Twin B scored lower than Twin A and qualified for one to one Reading Recovery services while Twin A received an additional 30 minutes of small group pullout language support from the ELL teacher and 30 minutes of small

group Title 1 services. When working with ELL students it was difficult to know which reading skills they lacked and how to address their specific needs as a reader and also as a learner of the English language. In addition, there was not a lot of research which explored the effects of Reading Recovery on ELL students.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to analyze the literacy interventions for first grade English Language Learners who were struggling readers. This was a case study focused on comparing the literacy progress of twin ELL students who received Reading Recovery, Title 1 services, and 30 minutes of supplemental pull out language support provided by an ELL teacher. This study assessed each twin's progress through the interventions and compared the growth each twin achieved throughout the school year. The data of the twins was compared to determine if the interventions were successful and if the order the interventions were received was a factor in their literacy achievement. The research addressed the following questions:

1. To what extent did the interventions allow Twin A and Twin B to achieve reading growth?
2. To what extent did the order of interventions affect Twin A and Twin B's reading achievement?
3. During which intervention did Twin A and Twin B show the most reading growth?

The data collected was used to inform the stakeholders at Bridge View Elementary on the effects of Reading Recovery, Title 1, and extra pull out language support interventions on ELL students who are struggling readers.

Definition of Terms

Breakthrough to Literacy. Breakthrough to Literacy was the supplemental reading program. Breakthrough to Literacy consisted of 15 minutes of individualized software instruction on the computer, big books for shared reading, and comprehension activities.

Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS). Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills was a universal screener used to assess the literacy skills of kindergarten through sixth grade students. The DIBELS assessment was comprised of one minute fluency assessments designed to measure the development of early reading skills.

English Language Learner (ELL). An English Language Learner referred to a student who spoke a language other than English at home, and/or was not born in the United States and was working to learn the English language.

Guided Reading. Students were taught reading skills through leveled texts students can read with 90-99 percent accuracy. Guided reading groups consisted of two to six children who read at the same level.

Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). This law guaranteed every child with a disability received a free and appropriate education.

Intervention. An intervention was additional instruction given to a student who does not adequately respond to classroom instruction. An intervention may be small-group or individual instruction tailored to the student's specific learning needs.

Language for Learning. Language for learning was a direct instruction language program designed to teach beginning English speakers. Lessons were scripted and fast-paced to encourage quick acquisition of basic English skills.

Leveled Literacy Instruction (LLI). Leveled literacy instruction was a 30 minute, small-group intervention designed to help children struggling in reading and writing. Lessons

included reading a leveled text at the student's instructional level, word work, rereading past books, and writing about their reading.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP). A child's ability to speak and understand English.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB). A 2001 education reform held schools accountable for allowing every student to have an excellent education. No Child Left Behind proposed every student regardless of disability, race, ethnicity, language or socioeconomic status will be proficient in core academic areas by 2014.

Reading First. Under NCLB, Reading First Grants were given to schools which taught low-income students in kindergarten through third grade to improve reading instruction. Schools which received the Reading First Grant were required to provide intensive teacher training using research based reading practices and assessment tools to guarantee all children learn to read proficiently by third grade.

Reading Recovery. Reading Recovery was a short-term, one-to-one reading program for struggling first grade readers. Reading Recovery lessons were administered by a trained teacher and focused on improving reading and writing skills. Reading Recovery lessons were given daily for 15-20 weeks.

Response to Intervention (RTI). Response to Intervention was a multi-tiered framework designed to increase early identification of students who were at risk for learning difficulties. Students who do not meet benchmarks were given interventions designed to accelerate their learning.

Student Achievement Guaranteed in Educations (SAGE). A federal program which gave additional funding to schools located in poverty areas. This money reduced class sizes to a 1:15 teacher/student ratio, improved school and community relationships, implemented scientifically based curriculum, and provided staff development.

Title1. Title 1 was the largest federally funded education program. Title 1 provided funds to high poverty schools to help at-risk students.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study included the small scale of the exploration. This was the literacy journey of two students and did not reflect all ELL students and their path to becoming proficient readers. Therefore, the results of this study cannot be generalized beyond this study.

Assumptions of the Study

This study acknowledged the assumption Reading Recovery is implemented as designed by Marie Clay and showed fidelity to the Reading Recovery framework. This case study operated under the assumption that although Twin A and Twin B had different classroom teachers, both teachers were given the same intensive training regarding the best reading instruction practices from funding through a Reading First grant. The case study assumed that Twin A's and Twin B's classroom instruction used a balanced literacy approach which included guided reading instruction. Twin A and Twin B were also given the same literacy opportunities at home.

Methodology

To discover the impact of reading interventions for struggling ELL students, several steps were taken. First, a review of the available literature was conducted. Because there was limited research regarding ELL students who have been through Reading Recovery, literature was selected regarding best instructional practices for teaching ELL students, other studies have been conducted concerning elementary ELL students, and the effects of Reading Recovery on struggling readers.

Data was collected from Twin A and Twin B's classroom teachers, ELL teacher, and the reading specialist. The data collected from the classroom teachers included running records and

guided reading levels from September through May. Data collected from the ELL teacher included Twin A and Twin B's Language scores on the ACCESS. The data collected from the reading specialist dates they received Reading Recovery and Title 1 services and September, February, and May scores from the Observation Survey. All data was reviewed and compared to discover similarities and differences between each child's reading growth throughout the first grade school year.

Chapter II: Literature Review

English Language Learners

The number of students identified as English language learners was on the rise in American public schools. In 1991, there were approximately two million students who were classified as ELL students, today that number is more than five million (McElroy, 2005). Between 1979 to the year 2004, the ELL population of school age children increased 162% (National Center for Education Statistics, 2006). According to the report *The Condition of Education 2006* the number of children ages five to 17 who spoke a language other than English at home in 2004 was 9.9 million. The number of children who had difficulty speaking English also increased from 1.3 million to 2.8 million. The projections show by 2030, the percentage of ELL students will be close to 40% of the school population (U.S. Department of Education, 2003). English language learners were diverse in the languages they speak, their cultures, and their economic status.

English Language Learners in American Schools

The number of ELL students has created an ongoing debate in American public schools as to how to best educate this new population of students. This debate has continued to intensify as the reports of poor academic achievement of ELL students has continued to increase (Kindler, 2002). National data indicated 76% of third grade ELL students are below grade level in English reading, and 53% of third grade ELL students were below grade level in mathematics (Zehler, et. al, 2003). English language learners usually take three to five years to have adequate language to function successfully in a mainstream classroom (Brown, 2000 as cited in Fishkin, 2010). According to Klinger, Artiles, and Barletta (2006) educators faced "significant challenges in the education of ELL students at a time when their representation in the school-age population is increasing at an accelerated pace" (p. 109).

In 2006 the National Literacy Panel released their report regarding ELL students. This book titled *Developing Literacy in Second Language Learners* was created to analyze current reports and make recommendations regarding this group of learners. However, much of the research focused on what we do not know regarding the literacy development of ELL students (Escamilla, 2009). Schools across the United States searched for appropriate assessments and knowledge of how to teach reading skills to these second language learners. However, less is known regarding the development of reading skills in ELL students as compared to their monolingual English speaking peers (Betts et. al, 2008). "The fact that ELL students must now be assessed in reading means that researchers and educators must find ways to effectively and efficiently teach these students how to read" (McCardle & Chhabra, 2006, p.240).

Developing English Language Proficiency

Title III under No Child Left Behind required school districts to offer English as a second language (ESL) services to minority language children in order to improve their English proficiency (Pu, 2010). Research showed students who are exited out of ESL classes still need to have support continued throughout their academic careers in order to develop their academic English (Pu, 2010). Literacy programs were successful when time and resources were invested into the literacy development of the first language of the student in comparison to English only programs (Escamilla, 2009). In his research, Cummins (1981) created what he titled the interdependence hypothesis. This hypothesis stated instruction in the student's first language promoted proficiency in developing the child's second language. Cummins discovered language one (L1) and language two (L2) were interdependent of each other. When bilingual programs developed L1 before focusing on L2, literacy skills transferred more quickly than when instruction was provided in L1. This was true in older learners as well. Cummins discovered when older learners whose L1 was better developed acquired L2 faster than younger learners.

Cummins stated the idea about the negative effects of using L1 in the home was a misconception. In fact, developing and maintaining L1 has many long term benefits on the student's acquisition of L2 and other academic skills. Unfortunately, most programs in the United States were not based on this type of delivery method of instruction, but rather were set up as ESL instruction (Mohr, 2004).

The typical ESL instruction focused on the goal of improving the ELL students' basic knowledge of the English language. English language learners were typically removed from the classroom for 30 to 60 minutes a day to practice the English language. English as a Second Language sessions were often lecture in format and did not improve the students' English language or incorporate grade level reading and writing into the curriculum. As Mohr (2004) stated the format and structure of the ESL pullout program can be a problem. First, unless the ESL teacher had a strong knowledge base of reading and writing, these skills could be ignored during their language pullout. Secondly, if an ELL student was pulled out of their classroom during literacy instruction, it caused ELL students to receive less reading and writing instruction than the average student. Mohr hypothesized the best teacher for ELL students is the reading teacher. Mohr believed the reading teacher was better equipped to handle the literacy and language needs of the ELL student and provided instruction that was "fast paced, integrated, engaging, and enriching" (p. 19). Classroom teachers did not have high expectations for ELL students and allowed them to be passive observers in the classroom setting. "Inadequate understanding of language minority students' skills and their learning environment contributes to inappropriate expectations" (Pu, 2010, p. 152). Cummins (1989) developed his theoretical framework to address the issue of the difficulties minority students were having in the classroom. He believed that many of the problems minority students had were created from discrimination shown to their ethnic groups. Cummins stated when a bilingual child had academic difficulties;

it was the child that needed remediation, not the educational system. He believed in order to help a bilingual child succeed L1 should be shared and not suppressed in the classroom.

Reading Instruction for English Language Learners

In order for ELL students to make the necessary academic achievements, they needed to be able to read and understand academic language. This means their teachers needed to be aware of academic language their ELL students needed to understand, teach targeted vocabulary words, and teach the language structure of English (McCardle & Chhabra, 2006). The National Reading Panel determined there were five key components a student needed to possess in order to be a good reader: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary (Kamps et. al, 2007). When ELL students were given literacy instruction focused on phonics, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary they made progress similar to native English speakers (McElroy, 2005; McCardle & Chhabra, 2006). There was no reason to delay reading instruction while a student is learning to become proficient in the English language (McCardle & Chhabra, 2006).

Mohr (2004) recommended in order for ELL students to make accelerated progress in the understanding of English, several components needed to be in place in the regular education classroom. First, the classroom teacher needed to have high expectations for ELL students in both achievement and effort. Secondly, the teacher needed to increase the amount of talk time between students in the classroom. Thirdly, books were to be used to support concepts and vocabulary being taught. Fourth, instructional conversations were to be based off of literacy lessons, including the use of explicit English lessons, thematic units which promoted vocabulary and cognitive strategies, and integrated literacy for social and language development.

English Language Learners who Struggle with Learning How to Read

English language learners who struggled to learn how to read often fell into a gray area. They were disadvantaged because many of the assessments given to them and the curriculum taught to them do not allow for their cultural differences (Lenski, Ehlers-Zavala, Daniel, & Sun-Irminger, 2006). Educators struggled to determine their academic needs and tended to focus on the ELL students' deficits instead of their strengths and progress that was shown (Klinger, Artiles, & Barletta, 2006). Instruction of ELL students varied from school to school. Struggling ELL students were often placed in language development programs in which participation and expectations are minimal (Klinger, Artiles, & Barletta, 2006). When bilingual education or ESL programs were not effective, ELL students failed to make the necessary progress. English language learners who were from low socioeconomic backgrounds found it difficult to learn when they were expected to fit into middle class expectations. When instruction was not modified to meet the specific needs of ELL students, learning problems became more serious over time (Wilkinson, Ortiz, Robertson, & Kushner, 2006). English language learners needed to be observed in a variety of settings across different curricular areas to obtain a true picture.

Although there were a few studies available regarding ELL students who had a difficult time learning how to read, Klinger, Artiles, and Barletta (2006) recommended four instructional interventions for struggling ELL students. First, they suggested combining phonological awareness instruction with activities that developed their reading and English skills. Secondly, they found teaching vocabulary explicitly was critical to increase comprehension in the student's first and second language. Thirdly, they stated ELL students needed to be taught in their first language and in English the key components of comprehension strategies. Lastly, they recommended ELL students were encouraged to build a strong foundation in their native language in order to acquire reading and writing skills in English.

No Child Left Behind

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 was an education reform signed into law in 2002. This law has caused controversy throughout public schools across the United States. NCLB proposed all students in public schools across the United States will score proficient in the core content areas by the year 2014 (McCormick & Zutell, 2011). This included all children regardless of disability, race, language or socioeconomic status. School districts who serviced children with low socioeconomic status received funds to implement research based curriculum which allowed students to meet these standards (McCormick & Zutell). The law mandated statewide testing in reading and math every year for students in third through eighth grade and at least once for students in 10^{th} through 12^{th} grade (Caldwell & Leslie, 2009). Scores from these tests determined which schools were making adequate yearly progress (AYP) towards the goal of 100% proficiency by 2013-2014.

When AYP was not met, schools were subjected to sanctions which included giving students' education to commercial companies, changing the status of the school to a charter school, and a variety of other options that did not improve the academic skills of the students who did not pass. This put enormous pressure upon school districts to have students who were effective readers. To help low-income schools improve reading instruction for their kindergarten through third grade students, grants were available. These grants were titled Reading First Grants. Reading First schools were required to adopt research-based instruction which focused on the five reading components of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, comprehension, and fluency (McCormick & Zutell). Classroom teachers and reading specialist received intensive training around these five essential components of reading. The hope was when students were given quality reading instruction early, reading difficulties would be prevented. However, when students struggled or showed a possibility of a reading delay, they were

identified early and received specialized instruction which addressed their specific learning needs.

Response to Intervention

The 2004 improvement to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) emphasized the importance of each student receiving high-quality, scientifically, research-based instruction. There were two models used to identify children with reading disabilities. The previous approach was based on a discrepancy model (McCormick & Zutell). The discrepancy model looked at a student's current reading ability and compared it to their potential reading ability. When a large gap, or discrepancy, occurred between the two levels, the student was determined to need special reading instruction. While this approach was widely accepted, there was literacy experts who believed this wait to fail approach contributed to a higher number of severe academic issues in the upper elementary grades (Dunn, 2007).

Some literacy experts were proponents for a Treatment-Resistance Model. The Treatment-Resistance Model framework used in schools was titled Response to Intervention (RTI). Response to Intervention was the method for measuring how students responded to interventions before being referred for special education. Response to Intervention consisted of a three-tier model of instruction.

The first tier consisted of the primary instruction in the general classroom. The primary classroom instruction used evidence based strategies to teach the majority of students how to read. The first tier included all classroom students. All students were given a universal screener to evaluate their progress in the regular classroom (Dunn, 2007). Those who did not meet the benchmark standards were referred to a second tier of additional instruction (Kamps et. al, 2007).

The second tier of instruction included small groups of students which were conducted by the classroom teacher or a reading specialist. This second tier was designed to accelerate these

students up to the level of their grade level peers. The progress of students in tier two interventions was monitored to ensure the intervention was working and the student was reaching benchmarks. The second tier of instruction provided an ELL student the opportunity to receive additional reading instruction geared to their specific needs as an English language learner and allowed their progress to be closely monitored (Kamps et. al, 2007). Studies conducted by Kamps et. al (2007) showed second tier benchmarks which were successful with monolingual students, also benefitted ELL students. However, these second tier interventions needed to be extended for ELL students throughout first and second grades. Students who failed to reach benchmark standards through second tier interventions were then referred to a third tier of instruction.

The third tier of instruction was long-term and provided on an individual basis by a reading or special education instructor. Students enrolled in a third tier intervention were not likely to meet benchmark standards (Kamps et. al, 2007). The student's progress was continued to be closely monitored and the length of time spent in the intervention increased. English language learners who fit into tier three interventions required specialized instruction because they had disabilities which could not be met in the general education classroom (Wilkinson, Ortiz, Robertson, & Kushner, 2006). Because little research was available to understand the characteristics of ELLs who have a learning disability, it was difficult to know when to place an ELL student in special education. This made it difficult to understand eligibility requirements for ELL students.

Reading Recovery as an Response to Intervention Method

A well known and well researched intervention for working with first grade struggling readers was Reading Recovery. Reading Recovery was a program which placed students in a one to one intervention with a highly trained reading teacher. These lessons were given for 30

minutes on a daily basis. The difference between the Reading Recovery program and other programs was the fact the teaching began at the same level of the child and was not a curriculum the child had to fit into (Clay, 2002). The power of Reading Recovery was in the fast pace of the lessons. The teacher did not waste time on teaching the child something they already had learned, but moved as quickly as possible onto more challenging text as soon as the reader was able (Clay, 2002). Through this one-to-one program a struggling reader learned how to monitor their own reading, problem solve unknown words embedded in text, use multiple cues to support his reading, and work independently.

Reading Recovery accepted the lowest 20% of first grade students to be remediated, this included ELL students. Reading Recovery only excluded an ELL child from their program if the child was unable to understand the basic directions given during the Observation Survey assessments (Clay, 2005). Reading Recovery believed if they followed the instructions and attempted to complete any of the tasks, a lesson was able to be constructed for the child. Many criticized this element of Reading Recovery and complained ELL students should not participate in Reading Recovery. However, Clay (2005) stated instances where Reading Recovery was set up specifically for immigrant children in order to accelerate their literacy progress to their peers. Reading Recovery trained their specialists to recognize when children had limited storytelling ability and needed an immense amount of support to acquire vocabulary and language skills. Reading Recovery personalized instruction, taught students how to read and write at their individual level and accelerated their literacy learning in order to catch up to their peers.

Although research from the Reading Recovery Council of North America stated Reading Recovery met the criteria for being a scientifically based reading program for teaching struggling readers, there were many who have challenged Reading Recovery's effectiveness for three reasons (Dunn, 2007). First, many believed there were more economical ways to teach

struggling readers. Naysayers believed one teacher per student for 30 minutes a day for 20 or more weeks was not practical. Secondly, there was the belief the gains a child made within the Reading Recovery program did not last in future grades. Thirdly, it was estimated between 10% and 30% of children who received Reading Recovery services did not complete the program.

Dunn (2007) believed Reading Recovery met the criteria for a RTI model due to the pass/fail nature of the program. Students were required to obtain an ending level within a certain amount of weeks to be discontinued from the program. When children did not meet these criteria, it could indicate a future reading disability. While Reading Recovery proved to be successful with monolingual English children, What Works Clearinghouse (2009) reported there were no studies of Reading Recovery with ELL students which met the protocol necessary for them to draw any conclusions regarding the effectiveness of Reading Recovery with ELL students.

English Language Learners and Response to Intervention

There was a critical need for research in the area of literacy development and interventions for ELL students (Escamilla, 2009). Thus far, research has indicated interventions used with struggling ELL students have met with some success. Interventions focused on the skill of phonological awareness along with other reading activities had shown to be the most successful, but further investigation is warranted (Klinger, Artiles, & Barletta, 2006). While it was clear scientifically researched based programs were recommended, none of the literature suggested specific programs but recommended program structures. What was clear from the research was more research is needed. "The success of RTI models for ELL students will be dependent on several factors, such as designing intervention that rely on a view of literacy as sociocultural practice in which reading skills are embedded, creating a supportive learning environment….and making sure that teachers know a variety of research-based instructional

approaches specifically designed for ELL students who show early signs of struggling to learn" (Klinger, Artiles, & Barletta, 2006, p. 124).

Conclusion

In conclusion there were a growing number of ELL students entering public schools across the United States. These individuals had unique learning needs. With the NCLB mandate, it was vital this group of learners were given literacy instruction which met their learning needs. Under the RTI framework, when ELL students failed to reach benchmark standards and were at-risk for learning how to read, Tier Two interventions needed to be administered to allow for accelerated progress. Although the research regarding the effectiveness of Reading Recovery and other interventions for ELL students was minimal, the beginning data indicated programs which were successful for monolingual children were also successful for ELL students. Interventions focused on the acquisition of phonological awareness skills along with other reading activities were proven to be the most successful with accelerating struggling readers.

Chapter III: Methodology

The literature review detailed the growing number of English language learners in public schools across the United States. English language learners have unique learning needs because of their necessity to quickly learn a new language, but also because they needed to acquire the skills to learn how to read in this new language. Because of the learning needs of these individuals, they were often not given adequate instruction to allow them to obtain grade level benchmarks. When ELL students were not meeting grade level requirements, additional instruction or interventions needed to be given to them to accelerate their learning. There was not a lot of research to support the effects interventions had upon ELL students.

Because of the changes to the IDEA Act, Bridge View Elementary was in the process of adopting an RTI framework. When children were identified as having indicators of being at risk for learning how to read, reading instruction additional to the regular classroom reading instruction needed to take place. This was a case study which followed a pair of ELL struggling readers and the interventions they received in first grade.

This was a case study focused on comparing the literacy progress of twin ELL male students who received Reading Recovery, Title 1 services, and 30 minutes of supplemental pull out language support provided by an ELL teacher. This study assessed each twin's progress through the interventions and compared the growth each twin achieved throughout the school year. The data of the twins was compared to determine if the interventions were successful and if the order the interventions were received were a factor in their literacy achievement. The research addressed the following questions:

1. To what extent did the interventions allow Twin B and Twin A to achieve reading growth?

2. To what extent did the order of interventions affect Twin B's and Twin A's reading achievement?

3. During which intervention did Twin B and Twin A show the most reading growth?

Subject Selection and Description

Bridge View Elementary had an ELL population of about 40% of the student population. When placing ELL students into interventions, a debate occurred as to the best placement for their specific needs. Sometimes, it seemed appropriate for the ELL student to receive additional language services first. At other times, an ELL student was placed into reading services first. At Bridge View Elementary this year, we were presented with the unique opportunity to work with twin male English language learners who were also struggling readers. By having twin ELL students with similar beginning scores, it allowed us to watch their reading and language progress as they went through first grade interventions.

The six year old twins were the youngest of five children. They had one older sister and two older brothers. Both of their older brothers were high achieving students. They were from a two parent, low income household. The twins began first grade with approximately the same level of reading and language skills. Even though they had similar abilities, they had different interventions at different times throughout the year. The subjects were chosen because there were a lot of unknowns when working with struggling readers who were also language learners. Because they had similar scores at the beginning of the year, but received different interventions, it allowed us to see the progress made in the individual interventions and what interventions were the most successful for each twin.

Instrumentation

Several assessments were utilized for this case study. At the beginning of the school year, each twin was given the Dynamic Indicator of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS)

universal screener. On this assessment, both boys scored in the some risk category with Nonsense Word Fluency. Six assessments from the Marie Clay Observation Survey were administered to Twin A and Twin B by the reading specialist: Letter Identification, Concepts about Print, Word Test, Writing Vocabulary, Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words, and Reading Text Level. By analyzing the six tasks from the Observation Survey and comparing their scores to the other 20% of lowest achieving first grade students, the twin's reading interventions were decided. Informal assessments used from the classroom teachers included running records. Scores from the twins' kindergarten and first grade ACCESS for ELLs English Language Proficiency Test were obtained from the language teacher.

Data Collection Procedures

Data was collected from the twin's classroom teachers, ELL teacher, and Reading Recovery/Title 1 teacher at the end of the school year after all of the assessments had been completed. The classroom teachers provided scores from running records taken throughout the school year. Running records were taken a minimum of two times per month for struggling readers such as Twin A and Twin B. The running records were conducted using texts which had not been previously read by Twin A or Twin B. During a running record, the student read while the teacher recorded checkmarks and annotations regarding the child's reading. The running record was then analyzed to determine if the reader is using meaning cues, structure cues, or visual cues on their errors and self-corrections. An accuracy percentage was used to determine if the text was at the students independent, instructional, or frustration reading level.

The ELL teacher provided scores the twins had received on the ACCESS for ELLs English Language Proficiency Test. The ACCESS Test was given to Twin A and Twin B in kindergarten and in first grade during the month of January. The ACCESS Test was administered in a small group setting with the exception of the speaking portion. The speaking

test was given individually. The speaking portion is recorded by the test administrator and scored later by the language teacher.

The Reading Recovery/Title 1 teacher provided scores from the six Observation Survey assessments and weekly records of their progress when they received Reading Recovery and Title I interventions. The Observation Survey assessments were administered three times throughout the school year in September, February, and May. The Observation Survey assessments were given in a one to one setting. The reading specialist administered all of the assessments over a two day period for each child. Each assessment was scored according to the guidelines set forth by Marie Clay (2002) in her book *An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement*.

Data Analysis. Fours assessments were used to analyze the twins reading and language achievement through first grade: An Observation Survey, DIBELS, running records from the classroom teacher, and ACCESS for ELLs English Language Proficiency Test. The data was analyzed by comparing the twins' scores at different months of the school year throughout first grade. Each assessment analyzed was taken within a week of each other to ensure they were comparable. The growth of Twin A and Twin B were also compared to the type of intervention they were receiving at the time of assessment and the amount of time they were receiving the intervention.

Limitations

The limitations of this study included the twins' different classroom teachers. Both classrooms teachers have taught first grade for eleven years and have their ELL teaching certification. Both of the first grade teachers operated under the balanced literacy framework with guided reading as the core instruction. Both classroom teachers received intensive training regarding the best practices of reading instruction through a variety of workshops sponsored

through the Reading First Grant. Another limitation is that Twin A received 14 weeks of Reading Recovery in comparison to his brother who received 20 weeks of Reading Recovery instruction. This was due to Twin B receiving Reading Recovery at the beginning of the year and Twin A not starting until mid February. The later start meant that a full 20 weeks could not be completed before the end of the school year.

Chapter IV: Results

The purpose of this study was to analyze the literacy interventions for first grade English Language Learners who were struggling readers. The assessment scores of twin ELL first grade students were analyzed to determine if the interventions allowed them to have accelerated progress in order to meet grade level reading standards. Through Reading Recovery, Title 1, Language for Learning, and ELL supplemental pullout, Twin A and Twin B were given reading and language interventions designed to increase their English language skills and reading abilities. The goal of this case study was to analyze the interventions to determine if the interventions allowed them to achieve reading growth, to determine if the order of the interventions affect reading achievement, and to determine which intervention allowed Twin A and Twin B to make the most growth. In order to answer these questions, the growth Twin A and Twin B made on assessments given throughout the year in first grade needed to be analyzed.

Intervention Analysis

The interventions available to the twins in first grade were Reading Recovery, Title 1, Language for Learning, and ELL pullout which focused on developing language through a whole language approach. Reading Recovery was one to one reading instruction for 30 minutes every day. Title 1 was small-group reading instruction with two to three students for 40 minutes every day. Language for Learning was small-group language instruction with four to five students for 30 minutes every day. Lastly, ELL pullout was small-group language instruction with two to three students for 30 minutes three times a week.

Table 1 depicts the interventions Twin A and Twin B received throughout the school year. Twin A received more language instruction than Twin B; however, Twin B received more one on one reading instruction than Twin A.

Table 1

Interventions Received

Student	Month								
	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	April	May
Twin A	Title 1 L4L ELL	Title 1 L4L ELL 1	Title 1 L4L ELL	Title 1 L4L ELL	Title 1 L4L ELL	RR L4L ELL	RR L4L ELL	RR L4L ELL	RR L4L ELL
Twin B	RR L4L	RR L4L	RR L4L	RR L4L	RR L4L	Title 1 L4L ELL	Title 1 L4L ELL	Title 1 ELL	Title 1 ELL

Note. L4L=Language for Learning, ELL = 30 minutes of additional language work three times a week

Twin A received two to three interventions per day: one or two small group language interventions and one daily reading intervention. Twin A was pulled from his classroom two to three times per day. For his reading intervention, Twin A was pull during his classrooms literacy block. For his 30 minutes of supplemental ELL instruction, Twin A was pulled three times a week during the computer lab where he missed 15 minutes of Breakthrough to Literacy Individualized Software Instruction, the supplemental reading program. For his Language for Learning intervention, Twin A was pulled three times a week during social studies and two times a week during math. All of the intervention times equated to Twin A being pulled out of the classroom between 75-90 minutes per day.

With the exception of February and March, Twin B received one or two interventions per day: one reading and one language. Twin B was pulled from his classroom daily during the literacy block for his reading instruction, two times a week during his writing instruction for the supplemental ELL, and daily during math for his Language for Learning intervention. At the end of March, the decision was made by his classroom teacher to take Twin B out of the Language for Learning intervention to allow him to receive more math instruction. Because of

the time Language for Learning took place, Twin B missed 30 minutes of math instruction per day and his math skills suffered. All of the intervention times equated to Twin B being pull out of the classroom between 30-60 minutes per day.

An Observation Survey Analysis

The Observation Survey included six assessments used to analyze different aspects of Twin A and Twin B's literacy knowledge. Letter Identification assessed ability to name uppercase and lowercase letters, Concepts about Print assessed knowledge regarding how print works, Word Reading assessed ability to read sight words, Writing Vocabulary assessed ability to write words, Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words assessed knowledge of letter sound relationships, and Reading Text Level assessed ability to read text.

While all of the assessments gave insight into the literacy knowledge of Twin A and Twin B, the Text Reading Level was scrutinized because it showed the child's ability to make meaning from print. The goal for the end of the year first grade Reading Recovery student was to be able to read a text at a level 18. At the initial testing done in September; Twin A and Twin B's scores were within two points of each other with the exception of Concepts About Print in which Twin B scored higher. Based on the Observation Survey scores, Twin B was chosen to receive Reading Recovery the first round instead of Twin A was because of his poor Text Reading Level on the Observation Survey assessments in September. Twin A was able to read a level two text, whereas Twin B was not able to read any. The fact Twin B was not able to read a level one text put him significantly lower than Twin A. Although Twin B had many of the prerequisite skills needed to becoming a reader, he was not able to piece it all together to read a text. Twin A was able to use the skills he had acquired to read beginning texts. Based on the Observation Survey scores, it was determined Twin A would benefit from reading instruction,

but it could take place in a small group setting. Table 2 depicts the results of Twin A and Twin B's Observation Survey assessments throughout the year.

Table 2

Results from the Observation Survey

	Observation Survey Assessments					
Student	Letter Identification	Concepts About Print	Word Reading	Writing Vocabulary	Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words	Reading Text Level
September						
Twin A	48	10	1	11	21	2
Twin B	48	15	1	9	23	0
February						
Twin A	50	16	15	35	36	8
Twin B	52	19	14	49	37	14
May						
Twin A	53	23	18	49	37	18
Twin B	53	22	18	45	37	22

The February scores were taken at the end of the first round of Reading Recovery. At this point in time Twin A had been receiving daily small group Title 1 instruction, small group supplemental ELL instruction three times a week, and daily small group Language for Learning intervention. Twin B had discontinued from the daily one to one Reading Recovery program and was receiving daily small group Language for Learning intervention. Twin B's scores were higher as he had just finished Reading Recovery, working one on one with an instructor while Twin A had been instructed with two other children. However, Twin A was receiving additional language support during this time Twin B was not getting. This language support did not seem

to help Twin A with his Writing Vocabulary or his Reading Text Level where he scored significantly lower than Twin B.

The May scores were taken at the end of the year. At this point in time, Twin A had received one to one Reading Recovery instruction daily for 14 weeks, small-group Language for Learning intervention daily, and small group ELL pullout support three times a week. Twin B received small group Title 1 instruction and ELL pullout support two times a week. During this time Twin A made gains on Twin B in his Writing Vocabulary, but he did not make the same gains in his Reading Text Level. Although Twin A did narrow the gap found in February, he did not finish the year reading as high as Twin B.

DIBELS Analysis

Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) was the universal screener for students at Bridge View Elementary. The DIBELS assessment was administered three times throughout the school year to determine the progress of students. It was based on four assessments: Letter Naming Fluency (LNF), Phonemic Segmentation Fluency (PSF), Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF), and Oral Reading Fluency (ORF). Each assessment is a one minute timed test. Letter Naming Fluency assessed letter identification, Phonemic Segmentation Fluency assessed ability to break apart sounds in words, Nonsense Word Fluency assessed ability to read short vowel nonsense words, and Oral Reading Fluency assessed ability to read text. The score a student received placed them into one of three categories: Low Risk/Benchmark, Some Risk/Strategic, or At Risk/Intensive. Students who scored in the Low Risk/Benchmark category were considered to be achieving at grade level standards. Students who scored in the Some Risk/Strategic or At Risk/Intensive categories were considered to be achieving below grade level standards. Table 3 depicts Twin A and Twin B's scores on the DIBELS assessment.

Table 3

DIBELS Scores

	September			November			April		
Student	LNF	PSF	NWF	PSF	NWF	ORF	PSF	NWF	ORF
Twin A	26	46	21*	60	36*	10*	44	41*	17**
Twin B	26	51	19*	44	46*	17*	64	43*	45

Note: LNF=Letter Naming Fluency, PSF=Phoneme Segmentation Fluency, NWF=Nonsense Word Fluency, & ORF=Oral Reading Fluency
*=Scored in the Some Risk/Strategic Category
**=Scored in the At Risk/Intensive Category

Although the scores were similar in September, Twin B made greater gains in Phonemic Segmentation Fluency and Oral Reading Fluency than Twin A. The testers were the same for September, but they were different for the testing completed in November and April. In each testing period, Twin A and Twin B scored in the Some Risk/Strategic category for their Nonsense Word Fluency. In November, Twin A and Twin B struggled with achieving Benchmark scores in Oral Reading Fluency. However, by the end of the year Twin B had caught up to his peers and reached Benchmark status. Twin A had not, and fell lower into the At-Risk/Intensive Category.

Classroom Guided Reading Levels Analysis

The guided reading levels of Twin A and Twin B were determined by running records administered by their classroom teachers using texts they had not previously read. Classroom guided reading levels were based upon the Fountas and Pinnell book leveling system. In the school district where Twin A and Twin B attended first grade, the expectation was for a beginning first grader to read at a level C or higher. The expectation for an end of the year first

grader was to read at a level I or higher. Table 4 depicts Twin A and Twin B's guided reading levels throughout the year.

Table 4

Classroom Guided Reading Levels

	Month								
Student	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May
Twin A	A	B	C	C	D	E	F	G	H
Twin B	Pre-A	B	D	E	F	G	H	I	J

Note: Guided reading levels are based upon Fountas & Pinnell's leveling system

Neither Twin A nor Twin B met the beginning of the year grade level expectation of reading at a C. Twin B began first grade reading lower than Twin A, but he made fast gains in September through December while he received Reading Recovery instruction. During those four months, Twin B moved five levels. During that same period of time, Twin A moved two levels. Twin A had difficulties at the beginning of the year improving his reading skills to move on to higher levels. Twin A did not change guided reading levels during the months of November and December. Beginning with the month of January, Twin A moved one level consistently the rest of the year.

The end of first grade expectation is for the student to read at a level I. Twin B met and exceeded this expectation by finishing the year reading at a level J. Although Twin B exited from Reading Recovery in February, he continued to make the gains necessary to achieve grade level benchmarks. Twin A did not meet the end of first grade reading expectations. Twin A was close, but he finished the year reading at a level H. Twin A made progress throughout first grade, but he could not overcome the difficulties he had at the beginning of the school year.

Language Analysis

The test given to assess a student's English language proficiency at Bridge View Elementary is the ACCESS for ELLs English Language Proficiency Test. ACCESS for ELLs is a standards based criterion referenced test which measures an ELL student's language proficiency in the areas of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The ACCESS for ELLs scored ELL students on a scale of one to six: Level 1 entering, Level 2 Beginning, Level 3 Developing, Level 4 Expanding, Level 5 Bridging, and Level 6 Reaching. The ACCESS for ELLs test scored ELLs English proficiency into seven categories: listening, speaking, reading, writing, oral language, literacy comprehension, and overall score. The oral language scores were derived from taking 50% of their listening and 50% of their speaking scores. The literacy scores were derived from taking 50% of their reading and 50% of their writing scores. The comprehension scores were derived from taking 70% of their reading scores and 30% of their listening scores. The overall score was derived from taking 35% of their reading score, 35% of their writing score, 15% of their listening score and 15% of their speaking score.

When Twin A and Twin B were given the ACCESS test in kindergarten their scores were similar. Twin A had an overall score of 205 with a proficiency level of 1.8. Twin B had an overall score of 203 with a proficiency level of 1.7. Items of significance are the similarity of the scores. Although Twin A received an average of 30 to 60 minutes more of language instruction per day, he did not show any significant gains over his brother Twin B. Twin A began the year with a .1 higher score than Twin B, but he ended the year -.1 from his brother. Table 5 depicts the ACCESS scores earned in kindergarten and Table 6 depicts the ACCESS scores earned in first grade.

Table 5

Kindergarten ACCESS scores

Language Domain / Student		Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing	Oral Language	Literacy	Comprehension	Overall Score
Twin A									
	Scale Score	290	271	132	213	281	173	179	205
	Proficiency Level	5.2	2.0	1.2	1.9	2.9	1.6	1.6	1.8
Twin B									
	Scale Score	333	314	100	202	324	151	170	203
	Proficiency Level	6.0	3.0	1.0	1.8	4.9	1.4	1.5	1.7

Note. Scale Score=100-600 possible. Proficiency Level 1-6 possible.

Table 6

First Grade ACCESS Scores

Language Domain / Student		Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing	Oral Language	Literacy	Comprehension	Overall Score
Twin A									
	Scale Score	295	326	283	263	311	273	287	284
	Proficiency Level	4.0	3.3	4.0	2.8	3.7	3.1	4.0	3.3
Twin B									
	Scale Score	295	403	266	255	349	261	275	287
	Proficiency Level	4.0	6.0	2.9	2.5	5.6	2.6	3.4	3.4

Note. Scale Score=100-600 possible. Proficiency Level 1-6 possible.

Conclusion

The analysis of the four assessments used to determine the achievement of Twin A and Twin B showed Twin B to have made accelerated growth when compared to Twin A. Twin B was the student which received one to one Reading Recovery first and the growth he made during this time allowed him to make the gains necessary to catch up to his grade level peers. Although Twin A received more interventions, the small group interventions he received were not enough to catapult him to the same achievement as his grade level peers.

Chapter V: Discussion

This was a case study which followed a pair of ELL struggling readers and the interventions they received in first grade. When comparing the scores from the various assessments, the twins began first grade at approximately the same level with the exception of their reading ability. Twin A was beginning to put the reading process together whereas Twin B was not able to read a simple text. At the end of first grade, the opposite was true. Twin B made great progress and finished reading above grade level. Twin A made good progress in first grade, but finished below grade level expectations in his reading ability.

Limitations

The limitations of this study included the small scale of the exploration. This was the literacy journey of two students and did not reflect all ELL students and their path to becoming proficient readers. Therefore, the results of this study cannot be generalized beyond this study.

Conclusions

The key questions in this case study were as follows: To what extent did the interventions allow Twin B and Twin A to achieve reading growth, to what extent did the order of interventions affect Twin B's and Twin A's reading achievement, and during which intervention did Twin B and Twin A show the most reading growth.

Key Question Number One.

Key question number one addressed the question of did the interventions allow Twin A and Twin B to achieve reading growth. The answer to that question was answered by their assessment scores listed in the tables. While both boys made nice gains during their year in first grade, Twin B made better gains than Twin A. According to the benchmark standards for DIBELS and the grade level standards for reading text levels, Twin B finished at or above the end of first grade standard. On the other hand, while Twin A made adequate progress, he

finished the year in the at-risk category for Oral Reading Fluency on the DIBELS assessment. He also finished reading slightly below grade level standards on the reading text levels. His classroom guided reading level as recorded by Table 4 showed Twin A finished the year reading at a level H. The end of first grade standard for Bridge View Elementary is level I.

Twin B began first grade three levels behind the first grade reading expectation. Twin B was able to make accelerated gain throughout first grade to finish one reading level above first grade expectations. Twin A began first grade reading two levels behind the first grade reading expectation. Twin A did make some accelerated gains to finish the year one reading level below first grade expectations. Twin A struggled to make the progress necessary to finish on goal in the month of November and December. The purpose of interventions was to provide ELL students with instruction geared to their specific needs in order to accelerate their learning (Kamps et. al, 2007). According to the data, Twin A and Twin B both made accelerated progress throughout first grade. Twin A made accelerated progress in the respect he began first grade two reading levels behind his peers and finished one reading level behind his peers. Twin B made accelerated progress in the respect he began first grade three reading levels behind his peers and finished one reading level about his peers.

Key Question Number Two.

Key question number two asked if the order of interventions affected the growth of Twin A and Twin B's reading achievement. The researcher believed the answer is yes. Twin A received more small group language interventions than Twin B did. However, the additional language interventions did not translate into greater language growth. On the other hand, Twin B received one to one Reading Recovery earlier and longer than Twin A. This did translate into greater reading and language growth. Mohr (2004) argued the best teacher for ELL students was the reading specialist. This case study proved to have similar finding.

Twin B finished first grade with a higher reading achievement than his brother Twin A. Because Twin B received Reading Recovery for the first round, he received 20 weeks of Reading Recovery. The researcher believed the order of interventions impacted the achievement of Twin B for two reasons. First, Twin B was given one to one reading instruction for 20 weeks at the beginning of the school year. This allowed Twin B to received quality reading instruction he could build upon for the remainder of the school year. The second reason the researcher believed the order of interventions affected the growth of Twin B's reading achievement was because positive learning behaviors are a byproduct of one to one instruction. Because Twin B received one to one reading instruction first and for longer, he was taught how to be an active learner earlier in the year. Twin B was taught metacognitive skills through his Reading Recovery lessons. The researcher believed this learning translated into different behavior and attitudes in the regular classroom setting. Twin A received Reading Recovery, but because it was later in the year and for only 14 weeks, he did not learn how to monitor his learning until much later in the school year.

Key Question Number Three.

Key question number three asked which intervention did Twin A and Twin B show the most reading growth. The intervention which allowed the boys to make the most reading growth was Reading Recovery. Because of the one to one nature of the program, it allowed for the student to be taught within the student's zone of proximal development. As Clay (2002) stated Reading Recovery is not a program the student is required to fit into, but rather the program is designed around the needs of the child. This allowed for the most growth to take place. Reading Recovery also meets the recommended requirements of an intervention program because it employs the five key components of literacy instruction which included phonemic awareness,

phonics, fluency comprehension, and vocabulary (Kamps et. al, 2007; McElroy, 2005; McCardle & Chhabra, 2006).

Along with utilizing instruction focused on the five components of literacy instruction, the one to one teacher to student ratio of Reading Recovery allowed students to learn how to learn. Because of the one to one nature of the program, they were expected to work hard and think for themselves. Reading Recovery trained their specialists to recognize when students needed an immense amount of support to acquire vocabulary and language skills. Reading Recovery provided their students with the knowledge of how to monitor their own reading, problem solve unknown words, use multiple cues to support his reading, and work independently.

Recommendations

Based on the assessment scores, the researcher recommended reading interventions are continued for struggling ELL readers. The reading interventions produced the greatest growth for both Twin A and Twin B. Twin B would be considered to be the more advanced in language and reading skills of the twins, and he received more reading interventions and less language interventions than Twin A.

The second recommendation is to discontinue the dual ELL services of struggling ELL readers. Twin A was given more interventions in language, yet he made less language gains and less reading gains than his brother. More attention needs to be dedicated towards instruction in their native language and improving work habits and learning behaviors. As stated by Mohr (2004) ELLs need help in the regular classroom learning how to be productive. At Bridge View Elementary the instructional day is seven hours. When lunch, recess, and specialists are extracted from the seven hours, there are 310 minutes for classroom instructional time. Out of 310 minutes, Twin A missed 60-90 minutes of classroom instruction per day in comparison to

the 30-60 minutes Twin B missed. On the days Twin A received dual ELL instruction, he was absent from the classroom for 30% of the day. The researcher believed this is too much time to be absent from the classroom.

The third recommendation is for Bridge View Elementary to reexamine its current ELL services. When a student received twice as much language instruction and made fewer gains, it would appear the program is not effective. As Cummins (1989) stated regarding his theoretical framework for bilingual education often when ELL children do not make adequate progress, it is believed it is the child rather than the program which needed remediation. Cummins believes the starting point of remediation should begin with the with the language programs. When ELL instruction was not modified to meet the needs of the learner, learning problems became more serious over time (Wilkinson, Ortiz, Robertson, & Kushner, 2006). Klinger, Artiles, and Barletta (2006) recommended four instructional interventions of combining phonological awareness instructions with activities that developed reading and English skills, teach vocabulary explicitly, teach ELL students key components of comprehension strategies, and encourage ELL students to build a strong foundation in their native language. It would be the recommendation of the researcher to teach ELL students with high-quality, research-based instruction.

References

Betts, J., Reschly, A., Pickart, M., Heistad, D., Sheran, C., & Marston, D. (2008). An examination of predictive bias for second grade reading outcomes from measures of early literacy skills in kindergarten with respect to English-language learners and ethnic subgroups. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 23(4), 553-570. doi: 10.1037/1045-3830.23.4.553

Caldwell, J. & Leslie, L. (2009). *Intervention strategies to follow informal reading inventory assessment: So what do I do now?*. (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Clay, M. (2002). *An observation survey of early literacy achievement*. (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Clay, M. (2005). *Literacy lessons designed for individual: Part two teaching procedures*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cummins, J. (1981). Empirical and theoretical underpinnings of bilingual education. *Journal of Education*, 163(1), 16-29.

Cummins, J. (1989). A theoretical framework for bilingual special education. *Exceptional Children*, 56(2), 111-119.

Dunn, M.W. (2007). Diagnosing reading disability: Reading recovery as a component of a response-to-intervention assessment method. *Learning Disabilities-A Contemporary Journal*, 5(2), 31-47.

Escamilla, K. (2009). English language learners: Developing literacy in second-language learners-report of the national literacy panel on language-minority children and youth. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 41(4), 432-452. doi: 10.1080/10862960903340165

Fishkin, O. (2010). Effective primary literacy strategies for English language learners. *Illinois Reading Council Journal*, 38(4), 14-19.

Fountas, I. & Pinnell, G. (1996) *Guided reading: Good first teaching for all children*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Kamps, D., Abbott, M., Greenwood, C., Arreaga-Mayer, C., Wills, H., Longstaff, J., Culpepper, M., & Walton, C. (2007). Use of evidence-based, small-group reading instruction for English language learners in elementary grades: Secondary-tier intervention. *Learning Disability Quarterly,* 30(3), 153-168.

Kindler, A. (2002). *Survey of the states' limited English proficient students and available educational programs and services: 2000-2001 summary report*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition.

Klinger, J.K., Artiles, A.J., & Barletta, L. (2006). English language learners who struggle with reading: Language acquisition or LD? *Journal of Learning Disabilities,* 39(2), 108-128.

Lenski, S., Ehlers-Zavala, F., Daniel, M.C., & Xiaoqin, S. (2006). Assessing English-language learners in mainstream classrooms. *Reading Teacher,* 60(1), 24-34. doi: 10.1598/RT.60.1.3

McCardle, P., & Chhabra, V. (2006, November). Commentary. *Elementary School Journal*, 107(2). 239-248.

McCormick, S. & Zutell, J. (2011). *Instructing students who have literacy problems*. (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

McElroy, E.J. (2005). Supporting English language learners. *Teaching Pre K-8,* 36(3), 8.

Mohr, K.J. (2004). English as an accelerated language: A call to action for reading teachers. *Reading Teacher,* 58(1), 18-26. doi:10.1598/RT.58.1.2

National Center for Educational Statistics. (2006). *The condition of education 2006*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Literacy Panel. (2006). *Developing literacy in second language learners: Report of the national literacy panel on language-minority children and youth*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Pu, C. (2010). Rethinking literacy instruction to non-LEP/ESL-labeled language minority students. *Literacy Teaching and Learning*, 15(1-2), 137-155.

U.S. Department of Education & National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2003). *National symposium on learning disabilities in English language learners. Symposium summary*. Washington, DC: Authors.

What Works Clearinghouse (2009). Reading recovery: What works clearinghouse intervention report. *What Works Clearinghouse*. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc.

Wilkinson, C.Y., Ortiz, A.A., Robertson, P.M., & Kushner, M.I. (2006). English language learners with reading related LD: Linking data from multiple sources to make eligibility determinations. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 39(2), 129-141.

Zehler, A., Fleischman, H., Hopstock, P., Stephenson, T., Pendzick, M., & Sapru, S. (2003). *Descriptive study of services to LEPT students and LEP students with disabilities. Volume 1: Research Report*. Arlington, VA: Development Associates.