

The Effect of Tutoring on Reading Achievement for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities and Students Receiving Title I Services

The investigation described in this report occurred under the auspices of Project MORE (Mentoring in Ohio for Reading Excellence), coordinated by the Putnam County Educational Service Center, evaluated by the Center for Evaluation Services at Bowling Green State University, and funded by the Ohio General Assembly in collaboration with the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities.

Abstract

This empirical study investigated the effects of tutoring on the reading achievement of elementary students with specific learning disabilities as well as students receiving Title I reading programs in Project MORE (Mentoring in Ohio for Reading Excellence). This school-based action research highlights volunteer tutors, early reading instruction, reading interventions, and one-to-one instruction. Students were pre and post tested on both informal and standardized measures of reading performance. Intervention students were matched and compared to control students in similar school districts. The results demonstrated significant positive effects for the intervention. Generally, intervention students had month-for-month gains and outperformed comparison students in reading over the six month period.

The Effect of Supplemental Tutoring

Reading First has identified a current national priority as teaching an increasingly diverse population of children to read (Hitchcock, Prater, and Dowrick, 2004). It is no secret that students who read below grade level face many challenges in school. According to Morris, Tyner, and Perney (2000), this is because reading provides access to much of what is considered important in the school curriculum across a variety of subject areas. Students who fall behind during the early years of elementary school have an extremely difficult time closing the reading achievement gap in later grades (Morris et al., 2000). In addition, Elbaum, Vaughn, Hughes, and Moody (2000) state that students who fail to acquire basic reading skills during early grades are at risk not only for school failure, but also for “negative outcomes beyond the school years” (p. 605). The importance of reading intervention in these early years of formal education is emphasized by Hecht and Greenfield (2001), who note that few changes in individual reading skills occur after the third grade. Additionally, poor academic outcomes, increased problem behaviors, higher probability of dropping out of school, limited employment opportunities, and a higher likelihood of living in poverty are all more likely to result following failure to acquire literacy skills in the early elementary grades (Hitchcock et al., 2004). Though the importance of reading intervention and remediation is clear, the empirical literature, unfortunately, does not readily agree on one best program. Still, several themes stand out: supplemental instruction, such as one-on-one peer tutoring, to support general education reading instruction, individualized interventions based on student needs, diagnostic and prescriptive teaching, and progress monitoring.

Elbaum et al. (2000) found one-to-one instruction as a supplement to classroom teaching to be “the most effective way of increasing students’ achievement” (p. 605) and noted that it has been “validated by empirical research, especially for students who are considered at risk for school failure or have been identified as having reading or learning disabilities” (p. 605). The only significant period of oral reading practice and intensive phonics instruction for at-risk students may be through supplementary tutoring (Vadasy, Sanders, & Peyton, 2005). One-on-one tutoring has been reported to be one of the best methods for working with students who are at risk, with specific and statistically significant student gains in reading resulting from supplemental instruction (Caserta-Henry, 1996; Elbaum, et al., 2000; Hayden, 1995; Hecht & Greenfield, 2001; Hedrick & Pearish, 1999; Invernizzi, et al., 1996; Jordan, Snow, & Porche, 2000; Morris, Tyner, & Perney, 2000; Pikulski, 1994; Saenz & Fuchs, 2002; Stage & Jacobsen, 2001; Tancock, 1994). Research shows that with many struggling readers, expert, individual tutoring produces on-level reading achievement (Allington, 2004). A key element of successful one-on-one tutoring is tailoring lessons to meet individual student needs (Al Otaiba & Pappamihiel, 2005; Hayden 1995; Invernizzi, Juel & Rosemary, 1996; Morris, Tyner, & Perney, 2000; Tancock 1994).

The research literature also supports using a comprehensive instructional design, which undergirds the classroom teacher by supplementing direct instruction, and uses psychometric assessment or other diagnostic

measurements to determine needs, eligibility, and progress. Leal, Johanson, Toth, and Huang (2004) state that “tutoring is most effective when five specific factors are the foundation for tutoring: one-on-one tutoring, supervision by certified reading specialists, intensive instruction, programs that are assessment based, and regular reflective evaluation on the part of the tutor” (p. 76). Many researchers advocate implementing a mentoring system that supports, but does not supplant or supersede, the reading instruction given by the general education teacher and that is assessed and monitored for efficacy (Al Otaiba & Pappamihel 2005; Caserta-Henry, 1996; Elbaum, Vaughn, Hughes, & Moody, 2000; Hayden, 1995; Hecht & Greenfield, 2001; Hedrick & Pearish, 1999; Invernizzi, Juel, & Rosemary, 1996; Jordan, Snow, & Porche, 2000; Morris, Tyner, & Perney, 2000; Pikulski, 1994; Saenz & Fuchs, 2002; Stage & Jacobsen, 2001; Tancock, 1994). Researchers have used a variety of formal and informal assessment tools to evaluate reading progress (e.g., Letter-Word Identification and Passage Completion subtests of the Woodcock Johnson).

Project MORE implemented two individualized reading interventions: HOSTS (Help One Student To Succeed) program and the Reading-Tutors program as its reading interventions. The HOSTS and Reading-Tutors programs employ the best practice themes described above: one-on-one mentoring, individualization, diagnostic measurement to determine students’ needs, and a comprehensive design to enable low-achieving students to improve reading and problem solving skills (Education Commission of the States, 1999). The goals of the HOSTS and Reading-Tutors programs are to: (1) improve academic achievement in reading, (2) build student problem solving skills, and (3) improve student behavior, attitudes and self-esteem (ESC, 1999). The specific purpose of this study was to investigate the effect on the reading achievement of students with reading disabilities of the HOSTS and Reading-Tutors programs during one school year.

The objective of the HOSTS and Reading-Tutors tutoring programs is not to replace general education instruction in reading, but rather to supplement it. The programs include structured mentoring to a child who is identified as a struggling reader by a community volunteer. In order to be cost effective, mentors are typically solicited from the community by the school. Mentors can be high school students, retirees, college students, professionals, laborers, parents, essentially anyone who the participating school can recruit, train, and commit to the tutoring program. Use of such individuals as mentors with training and assistance from teachers is widely supported in the professional literature (Al Otaiba & Pappamihel, 2005; Caserta-Henry, 1996; Elbaum, et al., 2000; Hayden 1995; Invernizzi, Juel & Rosemary, 1996; Morris, Tyner & Perney, 2000; Wasik, 1998).

Methods

Participants

Forty-three elementary schools across Northwest Ohio participated in Project MORE for the present study. The majority were small town or rural schools. Generally, the schools were rated as “Effective” on the State of Ohio Report Card and the total cost to educate one student at the Project MORE schools averaged \$8,069. Of the schools that reported data, eighty-nine percent of students in the schools served by Project MORE were Caucasian, nine percent Hispanic, ten percent African-American, five percent Multi-racial, and three percent Asian-American or Native American. On average, 15% of the population at Project MORE schools were students with disabilities. Forty-five percent of Project MORE students were receiving Free or Reduced Lunch.

Schools within the comparison group were matched to Project MORE schools based on Ohio Similar Districts Software. There were 21 comparison schools utilized in the study across Northwest Ohio. These schools had a variety of core curricula, but did not provide reading mentoring. The comparison schools were also small town or rural schools. Generally, the schools were rated as “Effective” on the State of Ohio Report Card. The average cost per student at comparison schools was \$8,198. Eighty-five percent of students in the schools served by the comparison schools were Caucasian, eight percent Hispanic, four percent African-American, seven percent Multi-racial, and seven percent Asian-American or Native American. On average, 15% of the comparison schools’ populations were students with disabilities.

A total of 63 Project MORE 2nd grade students and 27 2nd grade comparison students with specific learning disabilities participated in the study. A total of 31 Project MORE 2nd grade students and 22 2nd grade comparison students with cognitive disabilities participated in the study. A total of 86 Project MORE 2nd grade students and 130 comparison 2nd grade students who were receiving Title I services participated in the study.

Intervention

Project MORE provided the overall structure to deliver the HOSTS and Reading-Tutors interventions. There is a one-to-one mentor-to-student ratio for Project MORE students during tutoring sessions. Mentors attended a two-hour training prior to mentoring and received feedback and guidance from the program coordinator on a regular

basis. All of the Project MORE students were pretested to identify instructional reading level and skill deficits. Once a child's reading level and deficit areas were determined, a reading prescription was created. This prescription became the framework for the mentoring lesson plans.

Tutoring records, including progress-monitoring graphs, and end of the year post testing results were completed and distributed for Project MORE students. Mentoring time was primarily supplemental to reading instruction in general and/or special education classes. The coordinator developed lesson plans and the mentors delivered individualized instruction.

Students and mentors met in one-to-one tutoring sessions three to four days per week. A student may have had as many as four different mentors in the course of a week, but generally, mentors remained constant throughout the year except for college students. Each mentoring session lasted 30 minutes. Mentoring typically occurred in a classroom, but occasionally hallways were used. All lessons were structured in the same way and consisted of three instructional segments, described below. In addition to structuring lesson delivery, the lesson plan became a communication tool by which the mentor was guided through the lesson. Mentors provided the MORE Coordinator with feedback related to the student's level of attainment for the objectives covered.

HOSTS. The first ten minutes of the reading/language arts lessons consisted of guided reading instruction using an appropriately leveled reading book or basal reader. Next, the child and mentor worked for 10 minutes on spelling and vocabulary generated from classroom activities, which included word recognition (fluency and comprehension) and vocabulary development (meanings, structure, and relationships). The final ten minutes focused on specific skill development. The HOSTS Coordinator selected appropriate objectives from the student's prescription, and the mentor utilized a variety of resources, including high response instructional games, manipulatives, or kits or cards to promote specific skill building. Areas of reinforced practice included word analysis, vocabulary, comprehension, study skills, and writing.

Reading-Tutors. The Reading-Tutors program provides on-line instructional resources with research-based best practices for use in one-on-one tutorial sessions (Reading-tutors.com, 2006). Specifically, they allow tutors to use developmentally appropriate resources for instruction and provide opportunities for repeated practice – an effective strategy recognized by research. The Reading-Tutors website (reading-tutors.com) was developed specifically for Project MORE. This website is an immense repository of instructional materials developed for use in one-on-one tutoring. The companion website, Readinga-z.com, contains 2,000 downloadable books for use by tutors and for students to take home to extend reading time. The Reading-Tutors website contains the following instructional components: 400 comprehensive lesson plans with teaching tips, instructional resource packets, formative and summative assessments, and tutor program resources covering lessons in alphabet, phonological awareness, phonics, high-frequency words, fluency, and comprehension. In addition, the site contains guidelines on building a tutoring program, recruiting volunteers, training and supervising volunteers, and identifying students' needs, honoring mentors and tutees, and using the website. The assessment tools are patterned after DIBELS and other commonly used reading assessments. The 400 tutor packets are organized into six categories covering key areas of literacy development cited by the National Reading Panel. They include Alphabet Recognition, Phonological Awareness, Phonics, High-Frequency Word Recognition, Fluency, and Reading Comprehension. Each Reading-Tutors lesson structures the activities the volunteer tutor uses to build literacy in the various key literacy categories. The activities and resources are designed to align with and support typical classroom instruction (Reading-Tutors.com, 2006).

Dependent Measures

A team of trained graduate students traveled to each experimental and comparison school to administer the pretests and posttests. Two standardized reading assessments, Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) and Woodcock-Johnson III Reading Achievement Battery, were utilized.

Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS). DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency (DORF) is a standardized, individually administered test of accuracy and fluency with connected text. The passages are calibrated for the goal level of reading for each grade level. Student performance was measured by having students read three passages aloud, each for one minute. The number of correct words per minute was the oral reading fluency rate. Following DORF assessment, students' scores were categorized as "Low Risk," "Some Risk," or "At-Risk." Students in the At-Risk category qualified for Project MORE reading intervention. Test-retest reliability over the course of several days is .90. (DIBELS Technical Reports, 2003). The DORF is highly correlated ($r = .89$) with the Woodcock Johnson Reading Fluency among students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Wilson, Jones, Rychener, & Current, 2005). Finally, students' DORF performance was significantly correlated with Ohio's Fourth Grade Reading Proficiency Test (Vander Meer, Lentz, & Stollar, 2005).

Woodcock-Johnson (WJ) Reading Achievement Test III. Four subtests of the Reading Battery of the Woodcock-Johnson III were utilized as an individual standardized reading assessment (i.e., Letter-Word

Identification, Reading Fluency, Passage Comprehension, and Word Attack). The Letter-Word Identification, Reading Fluency, and Passage Comprehension subtests were combined to form the Broad Reading cluster score, and the Letter-Word Identification and Word Attack subtests were combined to form the Basic Reading Skills cluster (Mather & Woodcock, 2001). The Broad Reading ($r = .97$) and Basic Reading Skills ($r = .95$) have excellent test-retest reliability. The WJ Reading Achievement Test III also has significant concurrent validity with the Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement (K-TEA) and the Wechsler Individual Achievement Test (WIAT) Reading Composites (McGrew & Woodcock, 2001). The Woodcock Johnson is a widely used, well-supported research tool in special education, where individual administration, relevant subtest reports, and pre- and post-test comparisons are required.

Results

Project MORE pretest-posttest gains were examined with Related-Sample t-tests to examine the reading gains for students receiving reading mentoring over a six-month period of time. Then, seven ANCOVAs were performed to examine the difference between the reading gains made by Project MORE students versus similar control group students that did not receive additional reading mentoring.

The Pre and Posttest Scores of Project MORE

Project MORE students' pre-posttest scores were compared to examine their reading gains using Related Sample t-tests. Results were disaggregated by program (Reading-Tutors, HOSTS), grade level and disability status or Title I status. DORF and WJ III (Broad and Basic Grade Equivalent scores) were examined. There was approximately six months between the pretest and the posttest. For the DORF, the mean reading gain was 20 words-per-minute. Overall, both Reading-Tutors and HOSTS students had month-for-month reading gains for both WJ III Broad and Basic subscale.

The Pre and Posttest Scores of Project MORE versus Comparison Schools

Project MORE students versus matched students at similar schools who did not receive reading mentoring were compared using ANCOVAs to examine reading gains. The control variables were the students' pretest scores. The dependent variables were the posttest scores. Results were disaggregated by grade level and disability or Title I status. For both DIBELS and Woodcock Johnson assessments, standard score gains were examined. There was approximately six months between pretest and posttest. In all but one of the analyses, Project MORE students had higher standard score gains at the posttest. In one analysis, both groups had the same posttest standard score for the Basic Reading cluster. For DIBELS, Project MORE Oral Reading Fluency gains ranged from five to eight words-per-minute more than comparison students. Generally, Project MORE student's standard scores on most categories of the Woodcock-Johnson Reading Achievement ranged from one to seven points higher for both students with Specific Learning Disabilities and students receiving Title I services than comparison students (see Tables 1-3). Reading areas in which Project MORE students with Specific Learning Disabilities in the 2nd grade outperformed comparison students at a statistically significant (.05) level in the DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency (DORF) assessment and in Basic Reading for the Woodcock-Johnson (See Table 1). Project MORE students with Cognitive Disabilities in the 2nd grade outperformed comparison students at a statistically significant (.05) level in the following areas: on the DORF assessment and Reading Fluency on the Woodcock-Johnson (See Table 2). Project MORE students who received Title I reading mentoring in the 2nd grade outperformed comparison students at a statistically significant (.05) level in the following areas: DORF and Broad Reading and Basic Reading for the Woodcock-Johnson (See Table 3).

Discussion

Major Findings

There were three important results of this study. First, the reading achievement gains for the students who received the Project MORE intervention averaged more than one month gain for every month of intervention. This is quite important because students with Specific Learning Disabilities, students with cognitive disabilities, and students in Title I reading typically make achievement gains at a rate well below the average of their normally achieving peers. Second, in 6 out of the 9 group mean comparisons Project MORE students statistically significantly outperformed comparison students. Thus, over 66% of comparisons favored Project MORE students to a significant degree. These findings were spread across both the fluency and standardized reading measures, for

both students with SLD, CD, and Title I students. Of particular interest was the finding for all three groups that in Reading Fluency, as measured by correct words read per minute, Project MORE students statistically significantly outperformed control students. In addition to being statistically significant, the average difference between groups of nearly 5-8 more correct words read per minute by MORE students is educationally important. Third, in all but one comparison, Project MORE students outperformed control students and in no case did control students outperform Project MORE students. Thus, not only did 66% of comparisons statistically significantly favor Project MORE students, but also in all but one of the remaining group comparisons Project MORE students outperformed, though not statistically significantly, comparison students.

Limitations

The results from this evaluation must be interpreted with caution due to several limitations. Though control schools were matched with Project MORE schools using Ohio's Similar District Software, random assignment was not utilized. The realities of service delivery within and across school districts and the requirements of the Special Education IEP process prevented the evaluation from using an experimental design. The study examined two similar one-on-one reading mentoring programs versus a control group that offered no reading mentoring. Students in each program were mentored three days a week for 30 minutes. There were no significant differences between the two reading mentoring programs so they were combined as one group then compared to the control group, however this creates an implementation threat to the internal validity of the study.

In spite of the above limitations, this study demonstrated that a cohesive remedial intervention that delivered the Reading Tutors and HOSTS program, one-to-one instruction with trained volunteer mentors, and scientifically-based instructional techniques, could statistically significantly increase the reading achievement of students with serious reading disabilities. Perhaps most important, Project MORE was conceived, administered, and delivered not in a clinic or university-based laboratory, but in typical school districts with all students who qualified for SLD, CD, and Title I services. Finally, the personnel involved in implementing Project MORE were the teachers, paraprofessionals, and administrators who provided day-to-day services in their home districts.

References

- Allington, Richard L. (2004). Setting the record straight. *Educational Leadership*, 61(6), 22-25.
- Al Otaiba, S., & Pappamihiel, N.E. (2005). Guidelines for using volunteer literacy tutors to support reading instruction for English language learners. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 37(6), 6-11.
- Caserta-Henry, C. (1996). Reading buddies: A first grade intervention program. *The Reading Teacher*, 49(6), 500-503.
- DIBELS Technical Reports. (2003). *Assessment committee analysis of reading assessment measures*. Report retrieved November 6, 2006, from http://dibels.uoregon.edu/techreports/dibels_5th_ed.pdf
- Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S., Hughes, S. V., & Moody, S. W. (2000). How effective are one-on-one tutoring programs in reading for elementary students at risk for reading failure? A meta-analysis of the intervention research. *Journal of Education Psychology*, 92(4), 605-619.
- Good, R.H. & Kaminski, R.A. (2002). DIBELS oral reading fluency passages for first through third grades (Technical Report No. 10). Eugene, OR: University of Oregon. Retrieved November 6, 2006 from http://dibels.uoregon.edu/techreports/DORF_Readability.pdf
- Hayden, R. (1995). Training parents as reading facilitators. *The Reading Teacher*, 49(4), 334-336.
- Hecht, S. A., & Greenfield, D. B. (2001). Comparing the predict validity of first grade teacher ratings and reading-related tests on third grade levels of reading skills in young children exposed to poverty. *School Psychology Review*, 30(1), 50-69.
- Hedrick, W. B., & Pearish, A. B. (1999). Good reading instruction is more important than who provides the instruction or where it takes place. *The Reading Teacher*, 52(7), p 716-726.
- Hitchcock, C.H., Prater, M.A., & Dowrick, P.W. (2004). Reading comprehension and fluency: Examining the effects of tutoring and video self-modeling on first-grade students with reading difficulties. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 27(2), 89-103.
- Invernizzi, M., Juel, C., & Rosemary, C.A. (1996). A community volunteer tutorial that works. *The Reading Teacher*, 50(4), 304-311.
- Jordan, G. E., Snow, C. E., & Porche, M. V. (2000). Project EASE: The effect of a family literacy project on kindergarten students' early literacy skills. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 35(4), 524-546.
- Leal, D., Johanson, G., Toth, A., Huang, C.C. (2004). Increasing at-risk students' literacy skills: Fostering success for children and their preservice reading endorsement tutors. *Reading Improvement*, 41(2), 75-89.

- Mather, N., & Woodcock, R. W., (2001). *Woodcock Johnson III Tests of Achievement Examiner's Manual*. Itasca, IL: Riverside Publishing Company.
- McGrew, K. S., & Woodcock, R. W., (2001). *Woodcock Johnson III Technical Manual*. Itasca, IL: Riverside Publishing Company.
- Morris, D., Tyner, B., & Perney, J. (2000). Early steps: Replicating the effects of a first-grade reading intervention program. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 94*(4), 681-693.
- Official DIBELS Homepage (2003). DIBELS data system. Retrieved November 6, 2006, from http://dibels.uoregon.edu/data/DIBELS_Data_System_Desc.pdf
- Pikulski, J. J. (1994). Preventing reading failure: A review of five effective programs. *The Reading Teacher, 48*(1), 30-39.
- Reidel, J., Tomaszewski, T., & Weaver, D. (2003). *Improving student academic reading achievement through the use of multiple intelligence teaching strategies*. (Report No. CS 512364). Chicago, IL: Saint Xavier University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 479204).
- Saenz, L. M., & Fuchs, L. S. (2002). Examining the reading difficulties of secondary students with learning disabilities: Expository versus narrative text. *Remedial and Special Education, 23*(1), 31-41.
- Stage, S. A., & Jacobsen, M. D. (2001). Predicting student success on a state-mandated performance-based assessment using oral reading fluency. *School Psychology Review, 30*(3), 407-419.
- Tancock, S. M. (1994). A literacy lesson framework for children with reading problems. *The Reading Teacher, 48*(2), 130-140.
- Vadasy, P.F., Sanders, E.A., & Peyton, J.A. (2005). Relative effectiveness of reading practice or word-level instruction in supplemental tutoring: how text matters. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 38* (4), 364-380.
- Vander Meer, C.D., Lentz, F.E., & Stollar, S. (2005). *The relationship between oral reading fluency and Ohio proficiency testing in reading* (Technical Report). Eugene, OR: University of Oregon
- Wasik, B.A. (1998). Volunteer tutoring programs in reading: A review. *Reading Research Quarterly, 33*(3), 266-292.
- Wilson, R., Jones, E., Rychener, S., & Current, K. (2005). *Project MORE Evaluation Report 2004-2005*. Bowling Green State University, OH: Center for Evaluation Services

Project MORE was implemented by Jan Osborn, Superintendent of Putnam County ESC, Amy Freeman, Project MORE Director, and Margaret Burley, Executive Director of the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities.

Project MORE was evaluated by the Center for Evaluation Services at Bowling Green State University, Rich Wilson, Eric Jones, Stacey Rychener, and Kandy Current.

The Ohio General Assembly, in collaboration with the Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities, currently funded the Project MORE investigation described in this report with Title VI B dollars.

Table 1: Posttest Means and ANCOVA Results for 2nd Grade Students with Specific Learning Disabilities

	Project MORE Posttest Mean	Comparison Posttest Mean	F	p
<i>DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency</i>	38	30	10.9	.01
<i>Woodcock-Johnson III Reading</i>				
Broad Reading (SS)	83	81	2.3	.13
Basic Reading (SS)	85	81	5.3	.02

Pretest score is Control Variable

Table 2: Posttest Means and ANCOVA Results for 2nd Grade Students with Cognitive Disability

	Project MORE Posttest Mean	Comparison Posttest Mean	F	p
DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency	35	29	5.0	.03
<i>Woodcock-Johnson III Reading</i>				
Broad Reading (SS)	80	77	2.5	.12
Basic Reading (SS)	82	82	.1	.74

Pretest score is Control Variable

Table 3: Posttest Means and ANCOVA Results for 2nd Grade Students Receiving Title I Services

	Project MORE Posttest Mean	Comparison Posttest Mean	F	p
<i>DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency</i>	77	72	7.1	.01
<i>Woodcock-Johnson III Reading</i>				
Broad Reading (SS)	100	99	8.5	.00
Basic Reading (SS)	102	101	6.4	.01

Pretest score is Control Variable