

GWENDOLYN BLASINGAME TAYLOR

The Impact of Literacy Collaborative and Success for All on the Reading Achievement of
Third- and Fifth-Grade Students

(Under the direction of SALLY J. ZEPEDA)

The purpose of this study was to analyze the impact of the Literacy Collaborative and Success for All programs reading achievement. The study compared the effects of Literacy Collaborative on the reading achievement of third- and fifth-grade students with the effects of Success for All on the reading achievement of third- and fifth-grade students. The sample consisted of 265 students (112, Literacy Collaborative; 153, Success for All) attending two public elementary schools in a southeastern state.

Two suburban, school-wide Title I elementary schools within the same school district were compared using a non-equivalent control group design. School A had implemented the Literacy Collaborative program, and School B had implemented the Success for All program. The schools were selected based on their demographic similarities and their having met the qualifications for implementation of the respective whole-school reform models. Independent variables were group membership (Literacy Collaborative, Success for All), gender (male, female), socioeconomic status (free lunch, reduced-price lunch, paid lunch), and race/ethnicity (black, white). The dependent variable was reading achievement as measured by mean normal curve equivalent (NCE) Total Reading subtest scores on the Stanford Achievement Test Series, Ninth Edition (Stanford 9), with Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) mean Total Reading subtest scores as the covariate. Data from the spring 2001 administration of the Stanford 9 and data from the spring 2000 administration of the ITBS were collected and analyzed statistically, along with student demographic data. The data were analyzed using the

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences and Analysis of Covariance and produced the following results:

There was no statistically significant differences between the reading achievement of third- and fifth-grade students participating in the Literacy Collaborative program compared with the reading achievement of third- and fifth-grade students participating in the Success for All program. Students participating in the Success for All program achieved significantly higher reading scores than their peers participating in the Literacy Collaborative program. There were no statistically significant differences in reading achievement according to gender, socioeconomic status, and race.

INDEX WORDS: Achievement, Reading Achievement, Literacy, Title I, Whole-School Reform

THE IMPACT OF LITERACY COLLABORATIVE AND SUCCESS FOR ALL
ON THE READING ACHIEVEMENT OF THIRD AND FIFTH GRADE STUDENTS

by

GWENDOLYN BLASINGAME TAYLOR

B.S., Fort Valley State University, 1983

M.S., Fort Valley State University, 1986

Ed.S., Georgia Southwestern State University, 1990

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2002

© 2002

Gwendolyn Blasingame Taylor

All Rights Reserved

THE IMPACT OF LITERACY COLLABORATIVE AND SUCCESS FOR ALL
ON THE READING ACHIEVEMENT OF THIRD AND FIFTH GRADE STUDENTS

by

GWENDOLYN BLASINGAME TAYLOR

Approved:

Major Professor: Sally J. Zepeda

Committee: Dr. Kan Chandras
Dr. Curtis Martin
Dr. Thomas Holmes
Dr. David Weller

Electronic Version Approved:

Gordhan L. Patel
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2002

DEDICATION

To Dr. Sally J. Zepeda, for opening up her home and heart to me
and for believing in me.

To Charlie and Donkor for being with me every step of the way. Donkor,
Always remember: In order to accomplish your goals in life,
you must work hard and put God first.

To Henry and Bernell Blasingame for supporting me in all my endeavors,
and for always being there for me in the rain and the sunshine.

To Mr. Robert Sipe who has been a blessing to me and has made
me a better and stronger person in the field of education.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Above all else, I must give thanks and honor to God, my Lord, and my Savior. It is a blessing to have a career that I love even on the tough days. I am thankful to my Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, for granting me this blessing and helping me to realize I am not special, just blessed.

I am thankful for the support from my family. Charlie and Donkor, thank you for your patience and understanding. Donkor, you are my inspiration and motivation. Always keep the positive attitude you have.

To Mr. and Mrs. Henry Blasingame, thanks for instilling in me the certainty that I can do anything if I set my mind to it as long as I put God first.

To my buddy Donald Warren, thank you for encouraging me to go back to school and for being my study buddy. You will always be my dear buddy for life.

To Sabrina Warren, thank you for your patience and understanding. I know that there were many times you and Charlie had to give up your plans so Donald and I could make trips to Athens or study.

To Ronnie, Carita, Mercedes, and Brittney Walker, thanks for always being there for my family and lending a helping hand.

To my siblings and their families and to my in-laws, thank you for your encouragement.

To Dr. Anthony Strange, thank you for all your help with the statistically data.

To my wonderful friends, thank you for the encouraging words: Mr. and Mrs. Porter, Dr. Ann William Brown, Mrs. Danielle Bester, my gym buddies, Sylvia McCray, Cynthia Hammond, my book club, and the ones I forgot to name.

Thank you Mr. Robert Sipe for being a mentor in my life, and Dr. Anthony Strange for being assisting me with the statistical aspects of this dissertation.

Last but not least, my sincere appreciation is extended to my advisor, Dr. Sally J. Zepeda, for her support, guidance, and unrelenting encouragement to finish this work. I am also grateful to Dr. Thomas Holmes, Dr. Dave Weller, Dr. Curtis Martin, and Dr. Kan Chandras for graciously agreeing to serve on my committee, providing suggestions when needed and offering advice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background.....	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Importance of the Study	5
Purpose of the Study.....	6
Hypotheses	7
Definition of Terms	8
Limitations	10
Organization of the Study.....	10
II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	12
Introduction	12
Restructuring and Whole-School Reform	13
Effective Literacy Programs	17
Gender, Socioeconomic Status, Race-Ethnicity, and Achievement	21
Literacy Collaborative	23
Reading Recovery	27
Success for All.....	29

Chapter Summary.....	33
III RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES	35
Restatement of the Problem.....	35
Null Hypotheses	35
Research Design	36
Population and Sample	36
Instrumentation.....	38
Data Collection Procedures	43
Data Analysis.....	44
Chapter Summary.....	45
IV FINDINGS	47
Descriptive Characteristics	48
Testing of the Hypotheses	50
V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	61
Summary of Purpose	61
Summary of Procedures	61
Summary of Findings	62
Conclusions and Implications	63
Recommendations	64
REFERENCES	65

LIST OF TABLE

Table	Page
1 Descriptive Characteristics	49
2 Means and Standard Deviations for Pretest (ITBS) Scores	50
3 Reading Achievement Posttest Scores by Group Membership	51
4 Analysis of Covariance for Reading Achievement by Group Membership	52
5 Reading Achievement Means by Gender.....	54
6 Analysis of Covariance for Reading Achievement by Gender.....	55
7 Reading Achievement Means by Socioeconomic Status	56
8 Analysis of Covariance for Reading Achievement by Group Membership and Socioeconomic Status	57
9 Reading Achievement Mean by Race/Ethnicity.....	58
10 Analysis of Covariance for Reading Achievement by Group Membership and Race/Ethnicity.....	59

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

Merseth (1996) asserted that the 1983 release of A Nation at Risk, subsequently followed by the Carnegie Report, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century in 1986 brought about present reform movements. Americans were warned in A Nation at Risk (1983) that the U.S. educational system was in need of repair and that a rising tide of mediocrity in education threatened the nation's ability to remain economically competitive. Following this report, schools and school districts in various locations have tried myriad types of comprehensive school-wide reforms.

Almost two decades after the publication of A Nation at Risk (1983), school reform has become a permanent part of the educational landscape. Initially, the drive to reshape the nation's schools was viewed as an event, a one-time activity that would fix the problems and then recede (Lashway, 1999). According to Saban (1997), the nature of school reform has moved from top-down mandates to site-based innovation and from piecemeal programs to systematic restructuring. The school reform movement encompasses an array of transformational ideas: schools as learning communities, the central role of professional development, meaningful parent involvement, and change as a developmental process.

Current school reform efforts arise not just from concern about schools' deficiencies but also with more basic worries about economic, social and political trends such as an economic downturn in the early 1980s, concern over American

competitiveness in the global economy, the need to address demographic shifts, an unraveling of the social fabric, cynicism about government and changing political philosophies that encompass decentralization, populism, and choice (Murphy & Adams, 1998).

In 1986, the National Governors' Association issued reports acknowledging that "American society was undergoing profound changes, largely as a result of the combined effects of demographic changes affecting the family, the workforce, and the schools, as well as changes in America's competitive position in the world economy" (Cohen, 1988, p. 1). Cohen (1988) reported:

The need for continuing educational reform is rooted in three inescapable realities. First, the economic well being of the states and their citizens is increasingly dependent upon a well-educated and highly skilled workforce. Second, the health of our economy as well as the stability of our democracy requires schools and colleges to effectively educate all students. The continuing high proportion of students at risk of academic failure deprives our economy of needed manpower, and threatens our democratic institutions. As a result of academic failure, far too many of our citizens are condemned to unproductive lives. Third, public education is big public business. (p. 1)

For more than three decades, the main tool for raising educational performance nationwide has been the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), more specifically Title I (Sherwood, 1999). The Title I initiative was the largest federally funded program designed to provide schools having high numbers of at-risk students additional resources to appropriately and adequately address the literacy deficiencies plaguing many school districts. Unfortunately, the Title I program is has been criticized because of its then perceived and now proven lack of positive impact on student achievement (Natriello, McDill, & Pallas, 1990).

Compensatory education efforts over the past decade have failed to close the achievement gap. The lack of positive results from traditional programs targeting students who perform low in reading is cause for concern. Ultimately, the growing interest in a comprehensive approach to school reform rests on the realization that more traditional approaches have not worked as well as expected for large numbers of at-risk children (Educational Research Service, 1998).

Changes in 1988 and 1994 broadened Title I by supporting school-wide projects, enrichment programs for all students in schools with a majority of Title I students. The assumption was that the most effective reform involved the entire school, not individuals or classrooms. The Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) program, a federal program passed by Congress in 1997, encouraged schools to reexamine how—and how well—they operated as a whole (Sherwood, 1999).

In recent years, a new generation of programs have become available to educators with a promise that they would help all students, even those on the margin, succeed in school. These programs have in common the assumption that school reform, to bring about measurable improvement, must be embraced by the entire school (McChesney, 1998). In fall 1987, Congress appropriated \$150 million to implement proven models and strategies for “whole-school restructuring.” From this federal Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) program money, \$120 million was earmarked for competitive grants to schools that received Title I funds to provide academic support and learning opportunities for children from low-income families (House Res. 2264). The legislation established criteria for CSRD efforts and gave states and schools wide latitude to implement whole-school models or to develop their own research-based reforms aimed

at helping all children meet challenging state standards (Education Commission of the States, 1998). As a result, many reform models have been developed, each having been developed within the contexts of the communities in which students are served with specific guidelines for improving student achievement.

According to Keltner (1998), whole-school restructuring was developed in response to the growing dissatisfaction with the traditional piecemeal reform, which focused on isolated educational gaps. Comprehensive school reform relies on the simultaneous change of all elements of a school's operating environment. Obey and Porter (1997) stated:

Comprehensive school reform focuses on reorganizing and revitalizing the entire school rather than on isolated, piecemeal reforms and on providing teachers with training, materials and support they need to help students reach challenging academic standards. In comprehensive school reform, a 'design' becomes the basis for all operations and activities within a school, and provides a vision that helps the school focus its efforts, engage teachers in their work, and build strong parent and community support.
(p. 7)

Statement of the Problem

The problem for this research was to determine if implementation of whole-school reform models resulted in improvements in reading achievement of third- and fifth-grade students in selected schools in a southeastern state. If successful restructuring is defined as a process that results in improved academic achievement, did the Success for All Program provide a framework for greater achievement than that occurring in schools using the Literacy Collaborative program?

Lack of positive results from traditional programs targeting students who perform low in reading is cause for concern. Ultimately, the growing interest in a comprehensive approach to school improvement rests on the realization that more traditional approaches

have not worked as well as expected for large numbers of at-risk children (Educational Research Service, 1998).

The intent of the original Title I legislation, passed in 1965, was to provide funding to schools to improve the educational achievement of economically disadvantaged, low-achieving students. Consistent with this tenet, Title I students were served through pullout models in which funds were targeted directly to these eligible students. By the late 1980s, however, research had failed to identify consistently satisfactory levels of improvement in the academic achievement of disadvantaged students served through Title I programs. At the same time, some study results suggested a potentially more successful approach. A focus on improving an entire school, rather than relying on a pullout model, often resulted in increased levels of learning for all students in the school, including the economically disadvantaged children Title I was designed to serve (Slavin, Karweit, & Madden, 1989).

Importance of the Study

When viewed as a philosophy that advocates reflecting, rethinking, and restructuring, systematic reform has great potential to improve education (Thompson, 1994). Studies suggest that school-wide projects increase at-risk students' achievement gains (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993; Stringfield et al., 1997; U. S. Department of Education, 1990; Wong, Sunderman, & Lee, 1996).

While there are sizeable numbers of whole-school reform models, evidence of their effectiveness is scanty. The American Institutes for Research (2001) rated 24 whole-school reform models. Only three—Success for All (Pre-K - 6), High Schools That Work, and Direct Instruction (K-6)—demonstrated, through rigorous scientific

studies, a strong positive impact on student achievement. For the other 21, the evidence was lacking. This study affords an opportunity to expand the research base.

This study is particularly important when one considers the expenditure of funds to implement these reform models. In 1998, Congress provided another year of CSRD funding: \$120 million under Title I, and \$25 million was provided under the Fund for the Improvement of Education. These funds supported continuation of grants to schools' second year of CSRD (Sherwood, 1999). For fiscal year 2000, Congress appropriated \$170 million to support comprehensive reforms in schools eligible for Title I funds. An additional \$50 million was available for all public schools, including those eligible for Title I. A total of \$260 million has been appropriated for the CSRD program for fiscal year 2001. The fiscal year 2001 budget for CSRD program includes a \$40 million increase in the Title I/Section 1502 portion. Fiscal year 2001 funds may support more than 2,500 new schools around the country (U.S. Department of Education, 2001).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to analyze the impact of the Literacy Collaborative and the Success for All programs on the reading achievement of third- and fifth-grade students in a single school district in a southeastern state. The study compared the effects of Literacy Collaborative on the reading achievement of third- and fifth-grade students with the effects of Success for All on the reading achievement of third- and fifth-grade students. While there have been a number of studies of the effectiveness of whole-school reform models, in 2001, when the study was initiated, there appeared to be little existing research comparing the two particular types of whole-school reform initiatives as they affected student reading achievement.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested in this study:

1. There will be no statistically significant difference between the reading achievement test scores of third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Literacy Collaborative program and the reading achievement test scores of third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Success for All program.
2. There will be no statistically significant difference between the reading achievement test scores of third- and fifth-grade students, according to gender, who participated in the Literacy Collaborative program compared with third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Success for All program.
3. There will be no statistically significant difference between the reading achievement test scores of third- and fifth-grade students, according to socioeconomic status, who participated in the Literacy Collaborative program compared with third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Success for All program.
4. There will be no statistically significant difference between the reading achievement test scores of third- and fifth-grade students, according to race/ethnicity, who participated in the Literacy Collaborative program compared with third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Success for All program.

Definition of Terms

The following are definitions and clarifications of terms as they were applied in this study. These commonly used terms are defined as follows:

Literacy Collaborative. A classroom-based program designed to increase literacy achievement of all students. The Literacy Collaborative program helps schools meet this goal by providing a framework that connects reading and writing, and by training a building-level literacy coordinator. Reading Recovery must be available in Literacy Collaborative schools to provide a safety net for at-risk children (Center for Early Literacy, 2000).

Reading Recovery. A short-term, literacy intervention program designed by Marie Clay to assist children in first grade who are having difficulty learning to read and write. Children eligible for the program are identified by their classroom teachers as the lowest in their class in reading acquisition. The program is designed to move children in a short time from the bottom of their class to the average where they can profit from regular classroom instruction (Swartz & Klein, 1994).

Socioeconomic status. The term refers to the free, reduced, or paid lunch status of students enrolled during the 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 school years.

Success for All. A comprehensive, research-based restructuring reading program was developed by Slavin (1991) at Johns Hopkins University. The school-wide program uses prevention and intensive early intervention to achieve and maintain success throughout the elementary years (Schaffer, Nesselrodt, & Stringfield, 1997).

Whole-school (or comprehensive school) reform. The term is a broad brush that covers a diverse set of nationwide and local programs. In their most visionary expression, these reforms are cross-disciplinary efforts that involve home, school, and community in the intellectual development and personal nurturing of all children (McChesney, 1998).

Literacy Collaborative is a based program designed to increase literacy achievement for all students. The Literacy collaborative program helps school meet this goal by providing a literacy framework that connects reading and writing and by training a building level literacy coordinator. Reading Recovery must be available in Literacy Collaborative schools to provide a safety net for at risk children. Children eligible for the program are identified by their classroom teachers as the lowest in their class in reading acquisition. The program is designed to move children in a short time from the bottom of their class to the average where they can profit from the bottom of their class to the average where they can profit from regular classroom instruction.

Success For All is a comprehensive, research based restructuring reading program for elementary school based on the following principles: (a) Emphasis on prevention, early and intensive intervention and tutoring for students with academic difficulties. (b) Incorporation of state of the art curriculum based assessments, (c) Pre-school kindergarten instruction with story telling and language development, and (d) Adaptations for Spanish and English as a second language. There must be a family support program engaging parents, community members and integrated services. Also, extensive professional development throughout the year for teachers and administrators is needed.

The fundamental difference between the two programs, Literacy Collaborative and Success for All—is not in the methods of delivery or content. In the Success for All Program, the school system must commit to extensive staff development prior to and during the duration of the program. If a school does not commit to the ongoing staff development in the Success for All Program, the program will not be offered. In addition to the teachers who will be teaching in the Success for All Program, administrators at both the building and district levels must be involved in staff development related to the parameters of the program. Training occurs during the summer and throughout the year. To this end, training and ongoing staff development are the only differences between the two programs.

Limitations

The limitations of the study follow:

1. The study was conducted in two elementary schools in a single school system.
2. The sample was not randomly selected, but consisted of existing heterogeneously grouped third- and fifth-grade students.
3. Due to the nature of the study, treatments of all respective groups were not administered on the same day, but during a nine-month school term.

Organization of the Study

The study was organized in the following manner. Chapter I includes the problem background, statement of the problem, importance of the study, purpose of the study, hypotheses, definition of terms, and limitations. Chapter II includes a review of relevant research and literature. Chapter III details the research methodology, design, and

procedures for data analysis. Chapter IV reports the findings, and Chapter V presents a summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to analyze the impact of the Literacy Collaborative and the Success for All programs on the reading achievement of third- and fifth-grade students in a single school district in a southeastern state. The study compared the effects of Literacy Collaborative on the reading achievement of third- and fifth-grade students with the effects of the Success for All Program on the reading achievement of third- and fifth-grade students.

The literature review examined the effects of different whole-school methodologies on student performance. The theory underlying any study of the effects of whole-school reform methodologies is that the whole-school reform has an effect on the educational process and the academic achievement of students.

The literature review begins by discussing school-based restructuring (including definitions and key elements of successful restructuring efforts). This is followed by an examination of literature on early literacy initiatives, generally. The next section of the literature review examined the Literacy Collaborative program. The fourth section of the review examined the Reading Recovery program. The fifth section examined the Success for All program. Finally, the review concluded with a discussion of the relationship between the review of the literature and the present study.

Restructuring and Whole-School Reform

Horace Mann launched the common-school movement in 1837 (Kaestle, 1990). Mann's agenda was to establish universal, publicly supported primary schooling (Kaestle, 1990; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Another reform activity occurred during the late 1800s, when Calvin M. Woodard of Washington University of St. Louis began a campaign to provide a three-year secondary school program. This new program combined the study of mathematics, drawing, science, language, history, and literature with instruction in vocations such as carpentry, bench and machine work, and wood turning (Cremin, 1964). This reform movement was the beginning of the secondary vocational education movement.

The launching of Sputnik in 1957 served as the catalyst for school reform during the late 1950s. Sputnik provided a challenge to America's technological supremacy—more mathematics and science in schools (Cremin, 1964). During this period, psychologist Jerome Bruner influenced schools with his writings on new mathematics and science curricula (Kaestle, 1990).

In the 1960s, proponents of the civil rights movement insisted that schools address societal issues such as racism and poverty. The Coleman Report (1966) generated solemn concerns and dissatisfactions toward the public schools. In the late 1970s, a back to basics movement surfaced because of the steady decline of achievement on test scores in reading and mathematics.

Federal legislative involvement in education can be traced to the launching of Sputnik in 1957, and legislative involvement was renewed again in the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983), better known as A Nation at

Risk. In the 1990s, the Clinton Administration's education policies concentrated on accountability. The administration was committed to setting and supporting new national standards requiring schools to be more accountable for student progress in learning. The administration also strongly supported efforts to enhance pre-school services and instructional programs in the lower grades (Scribner & Layton, 1995).

In 1983, Secretary of Education Terrell Bell appointed the National Commission on Excellence in Education. In a report entitled A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform (1983), the National Commission on Excellence in Education warned that America's mediocre performance was allowing many nations to forge ahead of the United States in educational competence. A tide of mediocrity was threatening to engulf the public schools of America, and even the survival of the country (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983).

The Effective Schools Movement (Lezotte & Bancroft, 1985) of the 1980s identified three specific attributes of effective school improvement effects:

1. They focus on both quality of education and quality of educational opportunity.
2. They are grounded in research.
3. The instructional components of the model are data-driven (Local school instructional decisions are dependent upon the weight of measurable or observable evidence).

Edmonds (1983) believed that a high expectation for students was the most powerful of the items correlated with effective schools because a high expectation was something over which the school had control.

In 1986, the Carnegie Forum issued another landmark report entitled A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. This report stated the need to restructure schools to provide a professional environment for teachers, one that would free them to decide how best to meet state and local goals for children while holding them accountable for progress in meeting these goals. Restructuring is the method of educational reform associated with planning and implementing modifications of schools and school districts or both (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1993). Restructuring became the descriptor term for the modern reform process.

Tye (1987) listed expectations and practices in the American education system which must be changed in order for restructuring to occur. These practices included the physical arrangement of classrooms, outside control over policies and pedagogy, the stagnation of the curriculum, rigid schedules, the reliance on textbooks, the use of test scores as sole measures of success, and the practice of tracking.

Restructuring has been touted as the answer to many problems that plague American schools (Pipho, 1992). In a summary of recent literature pertaining to restructuring, Bailey (1991) listed the following tenets, which characterized successfully restructured schools:

1. There is clear evidence that a school must first identify its needs for change and this effort is best accomplished through strategic planning.
2. District office staff must support school building level changes and allow for greater decentralization in decision-making.

3. Change will not occur without sustained involvement and support of the staff in the local school. The level of involvement of the individuals in the school is as critical as the change itself.
4. There exists a strong need for calculated, participatory systems, cooperative efforts, and group consensus.
5. The application of action research, decision-oriented research, and organizational diagnosis of the local school culture at the local school level have a greater potential for successful change than any outside-directed mandated change.
6. Research demonstrates that proper management of conflict has a positive result in schools. Conflict must be seen as natural to all organizations as a resource of energy and a way to broaden views and values of the individuals within the school (Bailey, 1991).

In 1993, President Bill Clinton signed into law the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. The goals included raising academic standards, supporting professional development, expanding the use of technology in the classroom, and increasing parent and community involvement (U. S. Department of Education, 1993).

Schlechty (1993) proposed four key questions that must be answered for restructuring to occur:

1. What is the new circumstance or system that we are trying to create?
2. Can it be done?
3. Should we do it?
4. How do we do it? (p. 47)

There is a growing interest in applying principles for managing and improving business to the school setting (Holt, 1993). Gordon, Morgan, and Ponticell (1994) stated, “We see FutureWork as being based on the Work Force Education Triad of training, skills, and education” (p. 11). Cognitive-based instruction is an integral part of this triad and has implications for education. Many problem solving and thinking skills involve a nonspecific cognitive activity that can be generalized across many content areas. According to Gordon et al., “the cognitive view of learning believes that something is understood when it is meaningfully integrated into the learner’s existing knowledge base” (p. 17). The three instructional models—mastery learning, personalized systems of instruction, and tutoring—which served as the basis of Gordon, Morgan, and Ponticell’s research in training and development programs for work force education appear to be applicable and transferable to the teaching and learning processes in public schools.

Effective Literacy Programs

Reading is the cornerstone of all school-based learning, yet reading failure is pervasive. In 1998, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) conducted a national reading assessment of fourth graders, eighth graders, and twelfth graders to facilitate the understanding of educational trends in the United States. The results of these assessments have been used by national and state officials as a common yardstick of academic performance (Donahue, Voelkl, Campbell, & Mazzeo, 1999). The results of the 1998 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) showed 38% of fourth-grade students and 26% of eighth-grade students reading at a “below basic” level of achievement (National Center for Education Statistics, 1999). Georgia’s performance in terms of achievement levels was as follows:

- In 1998, the percentage of Georgia fourth-grade students who performed at or above the Proficient level was 24%. This percentage was smaller than the percentage of the nation's fourth-grade students who performed at the same level (29%).
- The percentage of fourth-grade students performing at or above the Proficient level in Georgia did not differ significantly in 1998 (24%) from that in 1992 (25%).
- The percentage of fourth-grade students performing at or above the Proficient level in Georgia did not differ significantly in 1998 (24%) from that in 1994 (26%).
- In 1998, the percentage of eighth-grade students performing at or above the Proficient level in Georgia was 25%. This percentage was smaller than that of students across the nation (31%) (Donahue, Voelkl, Campbell, & Mazzeo, 1999).

Pflaum (1980) studied reading instructional programs and the effects of these programs that did not have phonics instruction versus those containing some phonic emphasis. It was found that intensive phonics instruction produced slightly better word recognition and paragraph reading. The study also pointed out that a particular model (i.e., structural linguistics and phonics-based programs, basal programs) was not as important as the focused techniques of the teachers of reading.

Pressley, Rankin, and Yokoi (1996) studied a sample of the best kindergarten, first-grade, and second-grade teachers who had experienced success in promoting literacy achievement in students. They found that regardless of whether the teachers

characterized themselves as whole language or skills-based, they all successfully taught reading using a balanced and comprehensive approach.

In a study of five reading programs, Pikulski (1994) concluded that reading program success depended upon many factors and included (a) development of the total program, (b) extra time for some students, (c) special instruction for at-risk students, (d) simple texts, (e) progressive reading fluency, (f) phonics instruction, (g) writing, (h) ongoing assessment, and (i) accomplished teachers.

Most improvement programs have common goals and premises and have similar components of the teaching-learning process. These factors included clear learning goals, instruction, learning through formative assessment, feedback or enrichment, and summative evaluation of student learning (Guskey, 1990).

Short, Kane, and Peeling (2000) investigated effective strategies to help third-grade students who had reading difficulties. At the time of the study, Short was a reading professor at James Madison University. Kane and Peeling taught third grade at an elementary school in Virginia. Under Short's supervision, Kane and Peeling committed to a yearlong literacy project to improve the reading skills of the children in their class.

Short et al. (2000) analyzed students' reading ability in September using test data from the previous school year, a review of cumulative folders, observed oral reading habits, and conducted an assessment of comprehension skills. Students' reading levels, strengths, and areas of need were determined based on results of the Qualitative Reading Inventory II. The primary intervention for this project was a small-group approach, which focused on "rereading familiar text; shared and guided reading, which incorporated strategy use in decoding unfamiliar words; and shared and guided writing" (Short et al.,

2000, p. 287). The data suggested that teachers divide their classes into four groups and work with each group on these specific tasks for at least 25 minutes each day. In addition to these components, the teachers incorporated analysis of words using instruction of specific word patterns.

Results from the study showed that third-grade students in these classes made significant progress. At the beginning of the school year, testing showed the following:

Ninety-four percent of the children could read the preprimer passage with greater than 90% accuracy, and 77% could read the primer passage and the level 1 passage with 90% accuracy. Fifty-five percent of the children could read the level 2 passage with greater than 90% accuracy, and 33% of the students could read the level 3 passage with 90% accuracy. None of the children could read the level 4 or level 5 passages with 90% accuracy. By the end of the school year (May), 100% of the children could read the preprimer and primer passages with greater than 90% accuracy, while 94% of the students could read passages at levels 1 and 2. The most dramatic progress was shown at passage levels 3, 4, and 5. At the end of the year, 88% of the children were reading level 3 passages, 72% were reading level 4 passages, and 44% were reading level 5 passages with 90% accuracy. (Short et al., 2000, p. 293)

According to Herb and Bufalino (1997), *Supporting Literacy in the Classroom* (SLIC) is another early intervention literacy program that was created to help at-risk readers. This program was developed when educators in an urban school district realized that several of their first-grade students failed to make the expected progress in the Reading Recovery program. The purpose of creating SLIC was to provide literacy instruction in the regular classroom that would supplement what the students were receiving through Reading Recovery. SLIC's theoretical framework incorporates elements of Success for All, the Winston-Salem Project, and the Ohio State University Early Literacy Program, referred to as ELP. When implementing ELP, the teachers used "read alouds, shared reading, guided reading, independent reading, interactive writing, and independent writing" (Herb & Buffalino, 1997, p. 92).

Quatroche (1999) examined the most effective strategies for helping struggling readers. A review of successful intervention programs indicated that using explicit techniques to teach word analysis and phonological awareness was a key element. It was noted that successful programs also used a variety of strategies to test reading comprehension. A final element that seemed consistent among effective programs was the use of a variety of reading materials that students were encouraged to read over and over again.

It is apparent that several early intervention programs exist to help students with reading difficulties (Adler & Fisher, 2001; Hoover & Fabian, 2000; Leslie & Allen, 1999; Wasik & Slavin, 1993). It is also apparent that many of the programs share common elements.

Gender, Socioeconomic Status, Race-Ethnicity, and Achievement

Studies completed in reading show that females outperformed males in reading ability. According to Yarborough and Johnson (1980), females have demonstrated higher verbal skills and higher scores on standardized tests, especially in the primary grades, and they learn to read at an earlier age than males. Additionally, a lower percentage of females were referred to remedial programs than males.

Halle, Kurtz-Costes, and Mahoney (1997) indicated that gender and race/ethnicity appear to interact with family income and affect student achievement. They stated that typically students from low socioeconomic and minority backgrounds were more likely to begin with lower academic performance and gradually fall behind in their studies. Further, minority students are over-represented among students who are retained, referred to special education, and who drop out of school.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (1996), 29.3% of students receiving some type of special education were black. Of this total percentage of students, 19.5% were black males, while 9.8% were black females. Ten percent of all students who dropped out of school in 1994 were black. There was substantial variation in average performance among black and white student groups. White students had significantly higher scores, on average, than did black students.

Alexander and Entwisle (1988) asserted that low-income black children, who already lag behind academically in the early elementary years, were three times more likely to be in classes for the mentally retarded, and were at least three times as likely to drop out of school than their more advantaged peers.

In terms of average reading scale scores for Georgia's public school students, the NAEP 1998 State Report indicated the following:

1. In 1998, White fourth-grade students in Georgia had an average scale score that was higher than those of Black and Hispanic students.
2. The average scale score of White, Black, and Hispanic fourth-grade students in Georgia did not differ significantly in 1998 from in 1992.
3. The average scale score of White, Black, and Hispanic fourth-grade students in Georgia did not differ significantly in 1998 from in 1994.
4. In 1998, White eighth-grade students on Georgia had an average scale score that was higher than those of Black and Hispanic students. (Donahue et al., 1999)

Socioeconomic status (SES) has been correlated to school success. Much research, beginning with the Coleman Report (Coleman et al., 1966) has shown that SES

is strongly related to academic achievement. Clark (1983) studied African-American students from poor homes and found a relationship between SES and academic achievement. According to Walker-Dalhouse (1993), the single best predictor of school reading achievement is low socioeconomic status, from which low achievers seem to suffer disproportionately.

In terms of average reading scale scores for Georgia's public school students, the NAEP 1998 Reading State Report showed the following:

1. Fourth-grade students in Georgia eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average reading scale score of 193. This was lower than that of students not eligible for this program (227).
2. Fourth-grade students in Georgia eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average scale score (193) that was lower than that of similar fourth-grade students in the nation.
3. In Georgia, the average reading scale score of eighth-grade students eligible for free/reduced-price lunch was 241. This was lower than that of students not eligible for this program (267).
4. Eighth-grade students in Georgia eligible for free/reduced-price lunch had an average scale score of 241 that was lower than that of similar eighth-grade students nationwide (246). (Donahue et al., 1999)

Literacy Collaborative

The Literacy Collaborative (formerly Early Literacy Learning Initiative) is a classroom-based program designed to increase literacy achievement for all students. The Literacy Collaborative program helps schools meet this goal by providing a literacy

framework that connects reading and writing and by enlisting the support of a trained building level coordinator. Reading Recovery must be available in Literacy Collaborative schools in order to provide a safety net for at-risk children (Center for Early Literacy, 2000; Williams, 1998).

The Literacy Collaborative program offers an integrated approach to literacy learning. Each day children and teachers engage in shared reading, guided reading, and independent reading. They participate in shared reading, interactive writing, and guided and independent writing. Letters and words are learned in authentic reading and writing tasks. Data are collected and progress is monitored (Center for Early Literacy, 2000; Williams, 1998).

Literacy coordinators receive training in the implementation of the Literacy Collaborative framework. A school must train a literacy coordinator in order to be considered a Literacy Collaborative school. The training consists of six weeks (across the year) of intensive study of the Literacy Collaborative framework. Training is designed to prepare the literacy coordinator to serve the needs of his or her local school (Center for Early Literacy, 2000; Williams, 1998).

The Georgia State University Literacy Collaborative Program (2000) defined a Literacy Collaborative school as one with the following characteristics:

- Teachers and administrators in the school and school district have entered into a collaborative long-term relationship with a regional university that is implementing a research-based Literacy Collaborative program.
- The school forms a leadership team to support and monitor the program.

- The school has a trained Literacy Coordinator (LC) who teaches children daily (50% to 70%) in year 1. During the field year (year 2), the Literacy Coordinator continues to teach children (50% to 70%) and also provides staff development (30% to 50% time) including (a) providing an initial course for primary teachers, (b) providing in-class assistance to teachers by demonstration, coaching, and reflection on teaching, and (c) planning and working collaboratively with all teachers in the school.
- From the second year of participation, the majority of primary teachers at a school are engaged in the Literacy Collaborative training and follow-up support. The Literacy Coordinator and primary teachers are continually engaged in updating their knowledge and skills through ongoing training and support.
- There is a home reading program with parent outreach.
- Teachers in the school collect and analyze data to assess the effectiveness of the program (Georgia State University Literacy Collaborative Program, 2000).

The school-based planning team in a Literacy Collaborative school is comprised of the school principal and faculty representing grade levels and programs present in the school. The team is responsible for the development of a school plan to implement and support Literacy Collaborative. They discuss and plan together ways to support the Literacy Collaborative program in order to raise the literacy achievement in the school. Team members attend five full-day seminars where they learn about the Literacy Collaborative framework and its implementation. Team members complete tasks that allow them to experience elements of the Literacy Collaborative framework. The team

supports the Literacy Collaborative Coordinator by assisting in planning, decision-making, problem solving, and communication. Additionally, the team monitors targeted students and assessment data for evidence of improved literacy achievement (Center for Early Literacy, 2000; Georgia State University Literacy Collaborative Program, 2000).

Recently, Williams, Scharer, and Pinnell (2000) prepared the annual Literacy Collaborative Research Report in which they reiterated that the Literacy Collaborative involved the following factors:

- The curriculum is based on a comprehensive framework for literacy development that includes a wide range of reading and writing contexts.
- Professional development is available at the school site and includes a combination of class sessions, individual assistance, and coaching.
- Teachers new to the school (or to the framework) participate in intensive initial professional development taught by a literacy coordinator who is based in the school and also teaches there on a regular basis.
- After the initial training, teachers participate in a variety of ongoing professional development opportunities, including regular meetings, coaching, study groups, action research, and others.
- There is a full-time literacy coordinator who provides the professional development courses as well as in-class assistance and who also teaches children daily.
- There is a book room in the school that houses a leveled collection of books organized into a gradient of difficulty.
- Classrooms have extensive libraries of books, including leveled books, beautifully illustrated children's literature, informational books, poetry, series books, and references.
- Safety nets are provided, including one-to-one tutoring (Reading Recovery) for first-grade students as well as other extra help at various grade levels.
- There is a parent outreach program that includes books for students to take home and read. (p. 3)

In Georgia, the Literacy Collaborative program is operational in Clarke County, Cobb County, DeKalb County, Gwinnett County, Houston County, Lee County, and Tift County. The Georgia State University Literacy Collaborative Program is affiliated with The Ohio State University (Georgia State University Literacy Collaborative Program, 2000).

Reading Recovery

Reading Recovery, an early intervention model, came to this country from New Zealand. This reform was based on the research of Marie M. Clay. According to Allington (1992), Reading Recovery was designed to accelerate the cultivation of students who were having difficulty learning to read.

Children eligible for the program are identified by their classroom teachers as the lowest in their class in reading acquisition. The program is designed to move children in a short time from the bottom of their class to the average where they can profit from regular classroom instruction. This short-term, individually designed program of instruction allows children to succeed before they enter a cycle of failure. Reading Recovery is supplemental to classroom instruction and lasts an average of 12-20 weeks, at the end of which children have developed a self-extending system that uses a variety of strategies to read increasingly difficult text and to independently write their own messages (Swartz & Klein, 1994).

Swartz and Klein (1994) cited a number of key elements that make the program an important opportunity to reform how we teach children to read and write. Some of these elements are:

- Reading Recovery is an early intervention program that supports literacy. It is designed to concentrate resources on first-grade students as they begin to read.
- Reading Recovery serves the lowest achieving children. None of the historic reasons used to explain non-achievement (e.g., likely referral to special education, lack of parental support) are used to exclude children from the program.

- Reading Recovery is effective with diverse populations. Data collected on program success from different geographical regions and from various groups of children (those with ethnic, language, or economic differences) are comparable.
- Children develop a self-extending system of learning to read and write. Children learn the skills to be independent learners who will just need the support of regular classroom instruction rather than remedial programs.
- Student outcomes are sustained over time. Research on students after program completion has demonstrated continued growth in reading and writing without continued Reading Recovery support or other specific interventions.
- Program success is directly tied to student performance. Teachers are accountable for the amount of progress in reading and writing made by the children in the program.
- Reading Recovery is a nonprofit program. Unlike a host of other programs offered to the public schools, Reading Recovery has no royalties, sells no materials, and makes no profits.

Research on Reading Recovery revealed the following:

1. Approximately 75% to 85% of the lowest 20% of children served by Reading Recovery achieved reading scores in the average range of their class and received no additional supplemental instruction (Pinnell, DeFord, & Lyons, 1988).

2. The progress in reading and writing made by children in Reading Recovery is sustained and their performance in the average band has been measured up to three years after the children were discontinued from the program (Pinell, 1989).
3. Reading Recovery has been found to be cost effective when compared to remedial reading programs, special education placement, and primary grade retention (Dyer, 1992; Swartz, 1992).
4. Studies have shown Reading Recovery to be more effective in achieving short-term and sustained progress in reading and writing than other intervention programs, both one-on-one tutorial and small-group methods (Pinell, Lyons, DeFord, Bryk, & Seltzer, 1994).

Success for All

Success for All (SFA), a school-wide research-based reform model developed by Slavin and his associates at Johns Hopkins University, is based on the premise that all students can and must succeed in the early grades (Slavin, Madden, Dolan, & Wasik, 1996). The program is designed to prevent or intervene in the development of learning problems in the early years by effectively organizing instructional and family support resources within the regular classroom. In particular, the goal is to ensure that virtually every student in a high-poverty school will finish the third grade with grade-level reading skills. A corollary of “success for all” is that no student will be left to “fall between the cracks” (U. S. Department of Education, 1993).

The Success for All program is based on the premises that:

1. Every child can learn.

2. Success in the early grades is critical for future success in school.
3. Learning deficits can be prevented through intervention in preschool and the early grades by the improvement of curriculum and instruction, individual attention, and support for families.
4. Effective school reform programs are both comprehensive and intensive (Slavin, 1996; Slavin, Karweit, & Wasik, 1992; Wasik, & Slavin, 1990).

Success for All is a comprehensive restructuring program for elementary schools based on the following principles:

- Emphasis on prevention, early and intensive intervention, and tutoring for students with academic difficulties.
- Incorporation of state-of-the-art curriculum and instructional methods.
- Emphasis on the integration of phonics and meaning-focused instruction, cooperative learning, and curriculum-based assessments.
- Writing/language arts instruction emphasizing writer's workshops.
- Pre-school/kindergarten instruction with story telling and language development.
- Adaptations for Spanish and English as a second language.
- A family support program engaging parents, community members, and integrated services.
- Extensive professional development throughout the year for teachers and administrators (Success for All Foundation, 2001).

SFA emphasizes prevention and early intervention. The intervention includes the provision of high quality preschool or full-day kindergarten programs or both; research-

based curriculum and instructional methods in all grades; preschool to grade five, reduced class size, and non-graded organization in reading; activities to build positive relationships and involvement with parents; and other elements. Early intervention includes one-to-one tutoring in reading from certified teachers for students who are beginning to fall behind in the first grade and family support programs to solve truancy, behavior problems, emotional difficulties, or health and social services challenges (Balkcom & Himmelfarb, 1993).

Balkcom and Himmelfarb (1993) explained how the SFA program works:

- Preschool and kindergarten activities. A half-day program is provided for all children to enhance their development of language skills, school readiness, and a positive concept. A full-day kindergarten program continues the emphasis on language, using children's literature, and thematically related activities.
- Reading program. During daily 90-minute reading periods, students are regrouped by reading level across age lines. In grades K through 1, language skill development, auditory discrimination, and sound blending are emphasized, and phonetically regular mini-books are used for paired reading exercises. From grades 2 through 5, students use school- or district-selected reading materials, basals, and trade books.
- Tutors. Specially trained certified teachers work individually with all students in grades 1 through 3 who are not yet reading at grade level. Priority is given to first-grade students with learning disabilities as well as other students experiencing learning problems.

- Special education. Tutors evaluate the students' strengths and weaknesses and develop strategies to teach according to individual needs.
- Eight-week reading assessments. Students are assessed every eight weeks to determine the adequacy of their progress in reading.
- Family support team. The team is designed to work with parents to ensure their children's success. The team focuses on promoting parent involvement, developing plans to meet the needs of individual students who are having difficulty, implementing plans, and integrating community and school resources.
- Facilitator. A full-time facilitator works with teachers in each Success for All school to help them implement the reading program.
- Teachers and teacher training. Teachers and tutors receive three days of in-service training and detailed manuals at the beginning of each school year, and extensive classroom follow-up throughout the year.
- Advisory committee. An advisory committee, composed of the school principal, the program facilitator, teacher representatives, a social worker, and Johns Hopkins research staff, meets weekly to review program progress.

The outcomes at multiple SFA schools have been extensively evaluated since the program's inception. Early evaluations by program developers have shown positive results for all schools on reading measures. Smaller studies have shown consistently positive outcomes in areas such as improved attendance and a reduction in special education placements (Madden, Slavin, Karweit, Dolan, & Wasik, 1993; Slavin, Madden, Dolan, Wasik, Ross, Smith, & Dionda, 1996).

Research focusing on issues of program implementation indicated that in schools where high implementation levels are high, that is, in schools where individual components were rated highly by trainers, the effects on students' reading achievement were also strong. Conversely, in SFA schools where program implementations were weak, the effects on student achievement were also weak (Madden et al., 1993).

Success for All has shown significant and important advantages over control schools in achievement and in avoiding grade-level retention and special education referrals (Venezky, 1994). Slavin et al. (1996) found in their longitudinal study of SFA students in Baltimore schools that only 2% of the Success for All third-grade students (to include special education students) were reading two years below grade level compared to 9% of the control group. The Baltimore study also showed a reduction in special education placements of about one half.

As of the 2001-2002 school year, Success for All Foundation (SFAF) programs are being implemented in more than 1,800 schools in over 600 districts in 48 states in all parts of the United States, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. Versions of the model are also used in other countries, including England, Israel, Canada, Mexico, and Australia (Success for All Foundation, 2001).

Chapter Summary

In summary, there is presently, through the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRDR) program and Title I School-wide programs (Natriello & McDill, 1999) considerable impetus for implementing reforms through whole-school change models. Given the rigorous studies attempting to discern the most practical alternatives for improving students' academic achievement (Nunnery, 1998), policy makers need at

least a balance sheet showing the relative feasibility of different alternatives. According to Brown, Denton, Kelly, and Neal (1999), “Children experiencing reading problems often languish in the educational system” (p. 11). They further asserted that three most frequently used options—Title I services, retention in grade, and referral to learning disability programs—have generally been ineffective in lifting children out of the cycle of academic failure.

In this chapter, research was presented regarding school restructuring and whole-school reform and effective literacy programs. Literacy Collaborative, Reading Recovery, and Success for All as strategies for restructuring schools were also discussed. The present study focused on the impact of Literacy Collaborative and Success for All Programs on the reading achievement of third- and fifth-grade students. The literature reviewed suggested that the promise of restructuring lies in the strategies that have emerged from the exemplary practices of creative educators (whole-school design developers) and a growing number of pilot projects. The goal of this research was to determine which of the two reform strategies—Literacy Collaborative or Success For All—would improve student learning in two elementary schools in a single school district in Southeastern Georgia.

Administrators and teachers must have high expectation for all their students. All children, no matter where they come from must believe they can learn. Success in the early grades is critical for future success in school. Learning deficits can be prevented through intervention in preschool and the early grades by the improvement of curriculum and instruction, individual attention and support for families.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

The procedures of this study are discussed in the following pages. The chapter is organized as follows: (a) A restatement of the problem, (b) null hypotheses, (c) research design, (d) population and sample, (e) instrumentation, (f) data collection procedures, and (g) data analysis.

Restatement of the Problem

The problem of this research was to determine if implementation of whole-school reform models resulted in improvements in the reading achievement of third- and fifth-grade students in two selected elementary schools in a southeastern state. It was of interest to explore whether third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Success for All program attained greater levels of achievement than third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Literacy Collaborative program.

Null Hypotheses

1. There will be no statistically significant difference between the reading achievement test scores of third- and fifth grade students who participated in the Literacy Collaborative and the reading achievement test scores of third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Success for All programs.
2. There will be no statistically significant difference between the reading achievement test scores of third- and fifth-grade students, according to gender, who participated in the Literacy Collaborative compared with third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Success for All programs.

3. There will be no statistically significant difference between the reading achievement test scores of third- and fifth-grade students, according to socioeconomic status, who participated in the Literacy Collaborative compared with third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Success for All programs.
4. There will be no statistically significant difference between the reading achievement test scores of third- and fifth-grade students, according to race, who participated in the Literacy Collaborative compared with third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Success for All programs.

Research Design

The study utilized a causal-comparative research design. This research method was appropriate and practical for this study because the variables being examined already existed naturally within the subjects themselves and, therefore, did not lend themselves to more controlled experimental manipulation (Borg & Gall, 1989). Another advantage to using a causal-comparative design was that it allowed for the investigation of several relationships in one study. The goal of this study was to draw comparisons between critical variables that were different due to inherent characteristics of the participants.

Population and Sample

All participants in this study were enrolled in two public elementary schools in a central Georgia school district. Both schools serve suburban, diverse populations and are classified as School-wide Title schools. The accessible population used in this study came from these two public elementary schools and constituted a convenience sample size of 265 participants. The schools chosen to participate in the study were selected

based on their demographic similarities and their having met the qualifications for implementation of the Literacy Collaborative program and the Success for All program. The selected cohorts represented children from two elementary schools (School A and School B). The subjects in this study consisted 112 third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Literacy Collaborative program (School A) during 1999-2000 and 153 third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Success for All program (School B) during 1999-2000.

School A

In School A, where the Literacy Collaborative program is being implemented, 77.2% of the total school population met the federal guidelines for free or reduced lunch based on household size and income. The 1999-2000 preschool through grade 5 student population was 593. The school's population was 58.2% Black, 37.3% White, 2.2% Hispanic, 1.6% Asian, and 0.7% Multi-racial.

Classroom teachers held bachelors, masters, and specialists degrees. Twenty teachers held bachelor's degree; 22 teachers held master's degrees; 5 teachers held specialist degrees. The average service time of School A teachers for the 1999-2000 school year was 9.57 years. Three teachers taught third grade; four teachers taught fifth grade.

From the cohort of 112 students participating in the Literacy Collaborative program during 1999-2000, 58 (51.8%) were females, and 54 (48.2%) were males. Sixty-nine (61.6%) students received free lunch; 9 (8.0%) students received reduced-price lunch. Thirty-four (30.4%) students paid for their school lunch. Seventy-eight

(69.6%) students were Black; 34 (30.4%) students were White. Fifty (44.6%) students were third grade; 62 (55.4%) students were fifth grade.

School B

In School B, where the Success for All program is being implemented, 89.8% of the total school population met the federal guidelines for free or reduced lunch based on household size and income. The 1999-2000 preschool enrollment through grade 5 student population was 450. The school's population was 72.3% Black, 25.2% White, 1.2% Hispanic, and 1.0% Multi-racial.

Classroom teachers held bachelors and masters' degrees. Seventeen teachers held bachelor's degrees; 12 teachers held master's degrees. The average service time of School B teachers during the 1999-2000 school year was 9.47 years. Four teachers taught third grade; six teachers taught fifth grade.

From the cohort of 153 students participating in the Success for All program during 1999-2000, 74 (48.4%) were females; 79 (51.6%) were males. Sixty-six (43.1%) students received free lunch; 15 (9.8%) received reduced-price lunch. Seventy-two (47.1%) students paid for their school lunch. Eighty-two (53.6%) students were Black; 71 (46.4%) students were White. Seventy-five (49.0%) students were third grade; 78 (51.0%) students were fifth grade.

Instrumentation

Pretest data were collected using the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) published by Riverside Publishing Company. Posttest data were collected using the Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition (Stanford 9) published by Harcourt Educational Measurement.

Georgia law (O.C.G.A., Section 20-2-281) mandates that a nationally norm-referenced test be administered to students in grades 3, 5, and 8 in reading, mathematics, science, and social studies with results reported in percentile ranks and grade equivalents. State Board of Education Rule 160-3-1.07 requires that students in grades 3, 5, and 8 be tested with the complete battery of the Stanford 9 (Georgia Department of Education, 2000). Prior to 2000, the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) was used as the state norm-referenced test.

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS)

The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills is a norm-referenced test developed by Riverside Publishing Company. It is a group administered multi-level, paper and pencil test. The stated purpose of the test is to provide a comprehensive assessment of student progress in basic skills (Hoover et al., 1993). The ITBS was administered as a pretest and served as a covariate in the analysis of data.

The test reflects more than 50 years of test development experience and research measuring achievement and critical thinking skills. The scope and sequence of the content that is measured by the ITBS were developed from a review of national and state curricula and standards, content textbook series, instructional materials, and research by professors from the University of Iowa. These professors are the authors and editors of the test. The test was designed to incorporate the content standards that have been developed by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, the International Reading Association, the National Council of Teachers of English, the National Science Teachers Association, and the American Association of Science. The test was also

designed to measure skills and standards important to growth across the curriculum (Rahu, 1992).

The national standards established across grade and content areas may be reported to describe achievement based on expectations determined by a national panel of curriculum experts from across the United States. All items were tested for ethnic, cultural and gender bias, and fairness prior to the development of the final form of the test (Rahu, 1992).

Reliability.

The manual that accompanies the test presents the internal consistency estimates of reliability using the Kuder-Richardson Formula 20. The ITBS reliability estimates for both split half (.97 to .98) and equivalent form (.96 to .97) are very high. The ITBS Complete Battery average fall and spring reliabilities for Levels 9-14 are .86 and .87; the composite averages are .98 (Hoover et al., 1993).

Validity.

Content validity of the ITBS has been assessed by a number of researchers. The items used on the final version of the test have undergone item-by-item review by educators in the field of tests and measurement. Finally, the validation process involved field-testing in the school setting. Nambury Rahu, Professor of Psychology at the Illinois Institute of Technology reported in the Mental Measurements Yearbook (1992, p. 423) that based on research conducted using the *Detailed Skills Objectives with Item Norms* which accompanies the test, the content validity is excellent (Rahu, 1992).

Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition

The Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition (Stanford 9) measures students' school achievement in reading, language arts, mathematics, science, and social science. The Stanford 9 provides updated content that reflects the national curriculum and educational trends of the end of the twentieth century (Harcourt Educational Measurement, 1996). Reviewers of the Stanford 9 in the Thirteenth Mental Measurements Yearbook concurred that the 9th edition was truly different from previous editions with attention paid during test creation to (a) content of leading textbook series, (b) educational trends, and (c) standards of national professional organizations in content areas.

According to Conoley and Impara (1995), the tests were developed to have the highest degree of curricular validity for concepts and skills taught throughout the nation. During the test construction phase of the Stanford 9, each test item underwent intense review by content and curriculum specialists to ascertain that they were well constructed, adhered to the test blueprint, and were seemingly free from cultural, racial/ethnic, and gender biases with regard to content, style and vocabulary. The items on the Stanford 9 cover a broad range of material within each subject area. A range of item styles also is presented. Many items incorporate visual aids, while several require students to apply knowledge, and others ask them to draw parallels between two different sets of variables.

The Stanford 9 was the instrument used to assess the impact of the whole-school reform initiatives. The Reading Total sub-test, used in the current study, included two reading sub-tests, Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension:

- (a) The vocabulary sub-test focused on grade-appropriate reading vocabulary development at each level. Students are assessed on their knowledge of synonyms, their ability to determine which meaning of a multiple-meaning word is appropriate in a given context, and their ability to use context clues in order to assign meaning to an unknown word. (Harcourt Educational Measurement, 1996, p. 6)
- (b) The Reading Comprehension sub-test was composed of reading selections, accompanied by questions about each selection and focused on student understanding of three types of reading selections: recreational, textual, and functional. (Harcourt Educational Measurement, 1996, p. 7)

Reliability.

Kuder-Richardson 20 (KR-20) measures of internal consistency are given as evidence of reliability. KR-20 coefficients for each sub-test and composite test are provided separately for fall and spring administration and test forms. In general, the KR-20s for all ages and tests, most sub-scale coefficients are in excess of .85 or .90, and the total score and composite scores are almost in excess of .95 (Conoley & Impara, 1995).

Validity.

The Stanford Achievement Test Series, Ninth Edition, Technical Data Report (1997) reported validity data from the item-difficulty values, scaled scores demonstrating annual growth, correlation studies between assessment forms, adjacent grade level sub-tests, and test editions. The authors provided criterion and construct validity, but suggested that content validity should come from detailed, comparison studies of test

content and curriculum objectives of specific school systems contemplating use of the Stanford 9.

According to Conoley and Impara (1995), the Stanford 9 is a solid instrument that can provide schools with useful information about how well their students are satisfying the desired outcomes specified by curriculum and content experts relative to other students nationwide.

Reviewers of the Stanford 9 in the Thirteenth Mental Measurements Yearbook (1997) indicated that the 9th edition was truly different from previous editions with attention paid during test creation to (a) content of leading textbook series, (b) educational trends, and (c) standards of national professional organizations in content areas.

Scores are available for the total reading, mathematics, and language and overall scores for the partial, basic, or complete test battery. Several types of scores are available with the Stanford 9. In addition to the typical raw scores, percentile ranks, and scaled scores, the Stanford 9 provides stanines, grade equivalents, and normal curve equivalents (NCEs) (Conoley & Impara, 1995). NCE scores were used to analyze data. Because these scores are on the interval scale of measurement, they provide more comparable data.

Data Collection Procedures

Permission to access Stanford 9 and ITBS data for the student cohorts, for the purpose of analyzing it, was requested from the school district superintendent. Written authorization was granted to conduct the research (see Appendix A). In collaboration

with the testing director within the same school district, student data for the 1998-1999 and 1999-2000 school years were collected and analyzed statistically.

ITBS and Stanford 9 data in the reading area were collected and analyzed by gender (males, females), race/ethnicity (blacks, whites), and group membership (Literacy Collaborative, Success for All). Data regarding students' free, reduced, or paid lunch status were also requested and analyzed.

Research with Human Subjects

In order to assure that the study was conducted in an ethical manner, the researcher submitted the proposal to the University of Georgia's Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects for review and approval prior to implementation of research methodology as required by University and federal policies governing research with human subjects.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using version 10.0 of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, 2000). An alpha level of .05 was employed to test for statistical significance. Descriptive analyses, including frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations, were used to organize and summarize the data. The hypotheses were tested using analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) with pretest scores as the covariate. In the current study, ANCOVA was used to make statistical adjustments to the dependent variable, based on the correlation between the dependent variable and another variable, called the covariate (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996).

The independent variables in the study were gender (males, females), socioeconomic status (free lunch, reduced-price lunch, paid lunch), race/ethnicity

(blacks, whites), and group membership (Literacy Collaborative, Success for All). The dependent variable in this study was reading achievement as measured by the mean Stanford 9 NCE Reading Total score. The covariate in this study was the mean ITBS Reading Total NCE score.

The analysis of covariance was selected as the statistical measure for examining the data in order to test the research hypotheses because, as Shavelson (1988) stated, it can be used to “remove systematic individual differences among subjects from the estimate of experimental error” (p. 537). In the current study, the analysis of covariance was used to control for initial differences in the groups compared. In the analysis, the researcher wanted to “adjust” the posttest scores for pretest variability.

Chapter Summary

This chapter described the methodology and procedures used to gather data analyze the data. This chapter provided specific information on the null hypotheses, research design, population and sample, instrumentation, and data collection and analysis procedures. The research design was causal-comparative and the hypotheses addressed differences in reading achievement of third- and fifth-grade students participating in the Literacy Collaborative and Success for All programs as well as gender, socioeconomic, and racial/ethnic differences in reading achievement.

The population consisted of third- and fifth-grade students enrolled in two elementary schools in a single Georgia public school district. The instruments used were the Stanford Achievement Tests, Ninth Edition (Stanford 9) and the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS). ANCOVA, descriptives, and frequency distributions were used to analyze the data. An analysis of data, including tables and supporting narrative, is presented in

Chapter IV. A summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further research are presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER IV

FIINDINGS

The findings of the study are presented in this chapter. The purpose of this study was to analyze the impact of the Literacy Collaborative and the Success for All programs on the reading achievement of third- and fifth-grade students in a single school district in a southeastern state. The study compared the effects of Literacy Collaborative on the reading achievement of third- and fifth-grade students with the effects of Success for All on the reading achievement of third- and fifth-grade students. This purpose was accomplished through the compilation of 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 reading achievement data on students participating in the Literacy Collaborative program and compared to similar students participating in the Success for All program.

The findings are presented in two sections. The first section of the chapter presents descriptive data for the sample on the independent variables (group membership, gender, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and grade level) and for the dependent variable (reading achievement). Results of the hypotheses testing are included in the second section.

The statistical measures used in the study included descriptives, independent t test, and analyses of covariance. Decisions concerning the hypotheses were made at $p = .05$. All data were analyzed by computer using the SPSS General Linear Model (GLM) program; Internal Review Board (IRB) procedures were followed.

Descriptive Characteristics

Initially, 378 students' Stanford 9 and Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) reading test scores were selected to be analyzed. However, some test scores were not analyzed because of missing or incomplete reading achievement data. Only students with 1999-2000 ITBS scores and 2000-2001 Stanford 9 scores were included in the analysis. Data on students of races or ethnic background other than black ($n = 5$) were also eliminated due to low frequencies in cells. Data were collected and analyzed on a cohort of 265 students who were in third- and fifth-grades in 2000-2001. As noted in Table 1, 112 (42.3%) of these students had participated in the Literacy Collaborative program, while 153 (57.7%) had participated in the Success for All program. This group of 265 students was selected for this study on the basis of having remained at their respective schools during the 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 school years. Of this cohort group, 133 (50.2%) were males (54, Literacy Collaborative; 79, Success for All) and 132 (49.8%) were females (58, Literacy Collaborative; 74, Success for All). Of the 265 students whose data were analyzed, 160 (60.4%) were black (78, Literacy Collaborative; 82, Success for All) and 105 (39.6%) were white (34, Literacy Collaborative; 71, Success for All). There were 135 (50.9%) students receiving free lunch (69, Literacy Collaborative; 66, Success for All) and 24 (9.1%) receiving reduced-price lunch (9, Literacy Collaborative; 15, Success for All). There were 106 (40.0%) students who paid for their school lunch (34, Literacy Collaborative; 72, Success for All). One hundred twenty-five (47.2%) students were third grade (50, Literacy Collaborative; 74, Success for All); 140 (52.8%) students were fifth grade (62, Literacy Collaborative; 78, Success for All). See Table 1 for a complete summary of these findings.

Table 1

Descriptive Characteristics of Sample

Variable	Literacy Collaborative		Success for All	
	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%
Gender				
Males	54	48.2	79	51.6
Females	58	51.8	74	48.4
Total	112	100.0	153	100.0
Race/Ethnicity				
Blacks	78	69.6	82	53.6
Whites	34	30.4	71	46.4
Total	112	100.0	153	100.0
Socioeconomic Status				
Free Lunch	69	61.6	66	43.1
Reduced Lunch	9	8.0	15	9.8
Paid Lunch	34	30.4	72	47.1
Total	112	100.0	153	100.0
Grade				
Third	50	44.6	75	49.0
Fifth	62	55.4	78	51.0
Total	112	100.0	153	100.0

An independent t test was applied to the pretest data to compare the Literacy Collaborative cohort and the Success for All cohort for initial differences. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances was not statistically significant at the .10 level ($F = 3.162$, $p = .077$). There was no statistically significant difference at the .05 level, $t(263) = -.374$, $p = .709$, between the means of the two groups (see Table 2).

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Pretest (ITBS) Scores

Variable	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>
Group Membership			
Literacy Collaborative	43.37	17.14	112
Success for All	44.23	19.51	153

Note. Scores are reported as normal curve equivalents (NCEs).

Testing of the Hypotheses

Four null hypotheses were tested using analysis of covariance. Because the number of subjects in the comparison groups was unequal, homogeneity of variance factors were evaluated with the Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances.

Null Hypothesis 1

H_01 : There will be no statistically significant difference between the reading achievement test scores of third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Literacy Collaborative program and the reading achievement test scores of third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Success for All program.

The analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) procedure was employed, with group membership (Literacy Collaborative, Success for All) as the independent variable, NCE Reading Total scores from the ITBS as covariate, and NCE Reading Total scores from the Stanford 9 as the dependent variable, to test this hypothesis. Table 3 shows the reading achievement means by group membership.

Stanford 9 Reading Total scores yielded a mean normal equivalency (NCE) score of 40.58 (SD = 19.15). Results disaggregated by group membership indicated an average reading score of 37.17 (SD = 18.54) for students participating in the Literacy Collaborative program and 43.07 (SD = 19.26) for students participating in the Success for All program (see Table 3).

Table 3

Reading Achievement Posttest Scores by Group Membership

Group Membership	Posttest		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>
Literacy Collaborative	37.17	18.54	112
Success for All	43.07	19.26	36
Total	40.58	19.15	265

Note. Scores are reported as normal curve equivalents (NCEs).

The test of homogeneity of regression slopes (interaction between pretest and group membership) was not statistically significant at the .05 level, $F(1, 261) = .011$, $p = .918$. Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances was not statistically significant at the

.10 level ($F = .119$, $p = .730$); therefore, there is insufficient evidence to indicate that the assumption of equal variances was violated.

Using the pretest as a covariate, a statistically significant difference was found between the reading achievement means, $F(1, 262) = 11.438$, $p = .001$. These findings are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Analysis of Covariance for Reading Achievement by Group Membership

Source	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F-ratio</u>	<u>p</u>
Covariate					
ITBS	53983.294	1	53983.294	348.568	.000*
Main Effects					
Group	1771.374	1	1771.374	11.438	.001*
Within	40576.354	262	154.872		
Total	42347.728	264			

* $p < .05$.

The results indicated that there was a statistically significant difference in the mean reading achievement scores for students participating in the Literacy Collaborative program and those students participating in the Success for All program. Students participating in the Success for All program had significantly higher reading achievement scores. Based on these findings, H_01 : was rejected.

Hypothesis 2

H₀2: There will be no statistically significant difference between the reading achievement test scores of third- and fifth-grade students, according to gender, who participated in the Literacy Collaborative program compared with third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Success for All program.

Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used, with gender (male, female) as the independent variable, NCE Reading Total scores from the ITBS as covariate, and NCE Reading Total scores from the Stanford 9 as the dependent variable, to test this hypothesis. Table 5 presents the reading achievement means and standard deviations by gender. The mean reading achievement scores were similar for male (M = 40.42, SD = 19.92) and female (M = 40.75, SD = 18.41) students.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances was not statistically significant at the .10 level (F = .734, p = .533); therefore, there is insufficient evidence to indicate that the assumption of equal variances was violated.

The ANCOVA employed to compare the means of gender classifications yielded a F ratio of 1.405 (p = .237), which was not statistically significant at the .05 level (see Table 6). Based on these findings, H₀2: was not rejected.

Table 5
Reading Achievement Means by Gender

Variable	Posttest		<u>n</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
Males	40.42	19.92	133
Literacy Collaborative	34.91	19.47	54
Success for All	44.18	19.46	79
Females	40.74	18.41	132
Literacy Collaborative	39.27	17.53	58
Success for All	41.89	19.11	74
Groups			
Literacy Collaborative	37.17	18.54	112
Success for All	43.07	19.26	153
Total	40.58	19.15	265

Note. Scores are reported as normal curve equivalents (NCEs).

Null Hypothesis 3

H_03 : There will be no statistically significant difference between the reading test scores of third- and fifth-grade students, according to socioeconomic status, who participated in the Literacy Collaborative program compared with third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Success for All program.

Table 6

Analysis of Covariance for Reading Achievement by Group Membership by Gender

Source	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F-ratio</u>	<u>p</u>
Covariate					
ITBS	53517.079	1	53517.079	345.163	.000*
Main Effects					
Gender	217.916	1	217.916	1.405	.237
Group	1813.495	1	1813.495	11.696	.001*
Interaction					
Group x Gender	79.838	1	79.838	.515	.474
Residual	40312.637	260	155.049		
Total	96811.878	264			

* $p < .05$.

Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was employed, with Group Membership (Literacy Collaborative, Success for All) and Socioeconomic Status (free lunch, reduced-price lunch, paid lunch) as the independent variables, NCE Reading Total scores from the ITBS as covariate, and NCE Reading Total scores from the Stanford 9 as the dependent variable, to test this hypothesis. Table 7 presents the reading achievement means and standard deviations by socioeconomic status.

Table 7

Reading Achievement Means by Socioeconomic Status

Variable	Posttest		<u>n</u>
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
Free Lunch			
Literacy Collaborative	35.18	17.44	69
Success for All	36.48	18.38	66
Reduced Lunch			
Literacy Collaborative	45.67	12.23	9
Success for All	45.79	18.09	15
Paid Lunch			
Literacy Collaborative	38.96	21.50	34
Success for All	48.55	18.67	72
Groups			
Literacy Collaborative	37.17	18.54	112
Success for All	43.07	19.26	153
Total	40.58	19.15	265

Note. Scores are reported as normal curve equivalents (NCEs).

Levene's Test of Homogeneity of Error Variances was not statistically significant at the .10 level ($F = .258$, $p = .856$); therefore, there is insufficient evidence to indicate that the assumption of equal variance was violated.

The ANCOVA employed to compare the means of socioeconomic classifications yielded a F ratio of 1.78 ($p = .171$), which was not statistically significant at the .05 level (see Table 8). Based on these findings, $H_0:3$ was not rejected.

Table 8

Analysis of Covariance for Reading Achievement by Group Membership by Socioeconomic Status

Source	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F-ratio</u>	<u>p</u>
Covariate					
ITBS	49211.565	1	49211.565	324.097	.000*
Main Effects					
Group	731.905	1	731.905	4.820	.029*
SES	540.590	2	270.295	1.780	.171
Interaction					
Group x SES	619.306	2	309.653	2.039	.132
Total					

* $p < .05$

Null Hypothesis 4

H_04 : There will be no statistically significant difference between the reading achievement test scores of third- and fifth-grade students, according to race, who participated in the Literacy Collaborative program compared with third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Success for All program.

Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to test this hypothesis utilizing the independent variables Group Membership (Literacy Collaborative, Success for All) and Race, NCE Reading Total scores from the ITBS as covariate versus the dependent variable Reading Achievement (NCE Reading Total scores from the Stanford 9). Means and standard deviations for reading achievement by race/ethnicity are shown in Table 9.

Table 9

Reading Achievement Means by Race/Ethnicity

Variable	Posttest		n
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
Black			
Literacy Collaborative	35.81	17.72	78
Success for All	38.21	17.29	82
White			
Literacy Collaborative	40.29	20.23	34
Success for All	48.68	20.01	71
Groups			
Literacy Collaborative	37.17	18.54	112
Success for All	43.07	19.26	153
Total	40.58	19.15	265

Note. Scores are reported as normal curve equivalents (NCEs).

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances was statistically significant at the .10 level ($F = 3.862$, $p = .002$); therefore, homogeneity of variances was not tenable. However, moderate divergence from assumptions of normality and homogeneity may exist without seriously affecting the validity of the F test (i.e., cause a Type I error) (Stevens, 1990).

The ANCOVA employed to compare the means of ethnic classifications yielded an F ratio of .140 ($p = .709$), which was not statistically significant at the .05 level (see Table 10). These results show that no differences existed according to race. Based on these findings, $H_0:4$ was not rejected.

Table 10

Analysis of Covariance for Reading Achievement by Group Membership by

Race/Ethnicity

Source	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F-ratio</u>	<u>p</u>
Covariate					
ITBS	49440.798	1	49440.798	317.624	.000*
Main Effects					
Group	1691.834	1	1691.834	10.869	.001*
Race/Ethnicity	21.764	1	21.764	.140	.709
Interactions					
Group x Race/Ethnicity	63.097	1	63.097	.405	.525
Residual	40471.196	260	155.658		
Total	96811.878	265			

These ANCOVA results show that, while no statistically significant differences existed between blacks and whites (37.04 vs. 45.97, respectively), those in Success for All scored higher in reading than their Literacy Collaborative peers (38.21 vs. 35.81, respectively).

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the summarized results of the study. Included in this chapter is a summary of the findings, the conclusions drawn from the study, recommendations, and implications for further research.

Summary of Purpose

The purpose of the study was to analyze the impact of the Literacy Collaborative and the Success for All programs on the reading achievement of third- and fifth-grade students in a single school district in a southeastern state. The study compared the effects of Literacy Collaborative on the reading achievement of third- and fifth-grade students with the effects of Success for All on the reading achievement of third- and fifth-grade students.

Summary of Procedures

Participants in this study were enrolled in two public elementary schools in a central Georgia school district. The accessible population used in this study came from these two public elementary schools and constituted a convenience sample size of 265 participants. The subjects in this study consisted of 112 third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Literacy Collaborative program (School A) during 1999-2000 and 153 third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Success for All program (School B) during 1999-2000.

Data gathered included reading achievement scores from the spring 2000 administration of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) and reading achievement scores

from the spring 2001 Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition (Stanford 9). Additional information was obtained on gender, socioeconomic status, and race/ethnicity.

The data were collected and analyzed statistically using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). An alpha level of $p < .05$ was used to determine statistical significance.

Summary of Findings

Four null hypotheses were proposed for this research:

H₀1: There will be no statistically significant difference between the reading achievement test scores of third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Literacy Collaborative program and the reading achievement test scores of third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Success for All program. Findings of the study indicated that the first hypothesis was rejected based on the analysis of data. Significant differences were found between the mean reading achievement scores of students participating in Literacy Collaborative and students participating in Success for All. Students receiving Success for All had significantly higher reading achievement test scores than their peers participating in the Literacy Collaborative program.

H₀2: There will be no statistically significant difference in the reading achievement test scores of third- and fifth-grade students, according to gender, who participated in the Literacy Collaborative program compared with third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Success for All program. Findings of the study indicated that the second hypothesis was not rejected based on the analysis of data. No significant differences were found in the reading achievement, according to gender, between

students participating in the Literacy Collaborative program and students participating in the Success for All program.

H₀3: There will be no statistically significant difference in the reading achievement test scores of third- and fifth-grade students, according to socioeconomic status, who participated in the Literacy Collaborative program compared with third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Success for All program. Findings of the study indicated that the third hypothesis was also not rejected based on the analysis of data. No significant differences were found in the mean reading achievement scores, according to socioeconomic status, between students participating in the Literacy Collaborative program and students participating in the Success for All program.

H₀4: There will be no statistically significant difference in the reading achievement test scores of third- and fifth-grade students, according to race/ethnicity, who participated in the Literacy Collaborative program compared with third- and fifth-grade students who participated in the Success for All program. Findings of the study indicated that the fourth hypothesis was not rejected based on the analysis of data. No significant differences were found in the mean reading achievement test scores, according to race/ethnicity, between students participating in the Literacy Collaborative program and students participating in the Success for All program.

Conclusions and Implications

The most important finding holds true to other research (Madden, Slavin, Karweit, Dolan, & Wasik, 1993; Slavin, Madden, Dolan, Wasik, Ross, Smith, & Dionda, 1996) that Success for All students, when compared with similar peer groups, demonstrated higher achievement. The findings also indicate that (a) male and female

students had similar reading achievement scores, (b) students receiving free lunch, reduced-price lunch, and paid school lunch had similar reading achievement scores, and (c) blacks and whites had similar reading achievement test scores. The results of this research also indicated that students studied have below average reading achievement scores.

Recommendations

The researcher recommends the continuation and extension of the Success for All program in the participating school district based on the data that showed that students participating in the SFA program achieved higher reading scores than their peers participating in the Literacy Collaborative program. Continued research across the district is needed to determine whole-school (restructuring) designs that prove more practical and beneficial.

The major recommendation for this study is that additional research be done using more than two schools and perhaps in more than one school system. A longitudinal study with greater control for extraneous variables could add greatly to the knowledge relating to reading achievement and restructuring or whole-school reform. Despite the statistical significance found in the current study, the limitations must be considered when examining the results. First, implementation quality was not considered in the analysis. Additionally, the identification of the critical influential elements of the reforms (Literacy Collaborative, Success for All) is beyond the scope of this study of student achievement.

REFERENCES

- Adler, M. A., & Fisher, C. W. (2001). Early reading programs in high-poverty schools: A case study of beating the odds. Reading Teacher, 54(6), 616-619.
- Alexander, K., & Entwisle, D. R. (1988). Achievement in the first two years of school: Patterns and processes. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 53(2), 1-57.
- Allington, R. L. (1992). How to get information on several programs for accelerating the progress of low-achieving children. The Reading Teacher, 46(3), 246-248.
- American Institutes for Research. (2001). An educator's guide to school-wide reform: Overview. Available: http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed434381.html
- Bailey, W. J. (1991). School-based management applied. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.
- Balkom, S., & Himmelfarb, H. (1993). Success for all. Education research consumer guide, number 5. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Borg, R. G., & Gall, M. D. (1989). Educational research: An introduction (5th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Brown, W., Denton, E., Kelly, P., & Neal, J. (1999). Reading Recovery effectiveness: A five-year success story in San Luis Coastal Unified School District. ERS Spectrum, 17(1), 3-12.
- Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. Washington, DC: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.
- Center for Early Literacy, College of Education and Human Development, University of Maine. (2000). Literacy Collaborative. Available: <http://www.ume.edu/cel/LC.htm>
- Clark, R. M. (1983). Family life and school achievement: Why poor black children succeed or fail. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Cohen, M. (1988). Restructuring the educational system: Agenda for the 1990s. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.
- Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McParkland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfield, F. D., & York, R. L. (1966). Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Conoley, J. C., & Impara, J. C. (1995). The twelfth mental measurements yearbook. Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.
- Cremin, L. A. (1964). The transformation of the school. New York: Vintage Books.

Donahue, P. L., Voelkl, K. E., Campbell, J. R., & Mazzeo, J. (1999). NAEP 1998 reading report card for the nation. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, U. S. Department of Education.

Dyer, P. C. (1992). Reading recovery: A cost-effectiveness and educational outcomes analysis. Spectrum: Journal of Research in Education, 10(1), 110-119.

Edmonds, R. R. (1983). Search for effective schools: The identification and analysis of city schools that are instructionally effective for poor children. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Education Commission of the States. (1998). Comprehensive school reform: Criteria and questions. Denver, CO: Author.

Educational Research Service. (1998). Comprehensive models for school improvement: Finding the right match and making it work. Arlington, VA: Author.

Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). Educational research: An introduction (6th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Georgia Department of Education. (2000). Georgia norm-referenced testing program, Stanford 9. Available: <http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/sla/ret/stan%2D9.html>

Georgia State University Literacy Collaborative Program. (2000). What is a literacy collaborative school? Available: <http://education.gsu.edu/lc>

Gordon, E. E., Morgan, R. R., & Ponticell, J. A. (1994). FutureWork: The revolution reshaping American business. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Guskey, T. R. (1990). Integrating innovations. Educational Leadership, 47(5), 11-13.

Halle, T. G., Kurtz-Costes, B., & Mahoney, J. L. (1997). Family influences on school achievement in low-income African American children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 89(3), 527-528.

Harcourt Educational Measurement. (1996). Stanford achievement test series: Guide for classroom planning (9th ed.). San Antonio, TX: Author.

Holt, M. (1993). The educational consequences of W. Edward Deming. Phi Delta Kappan, 74(5), 382-388.

Hoover, H. D., Hieronymus, A. N., Frisbie, D. A., Dunbar, S. B., Oberly, K. R., Cantor, N. K., Bray, G. B., Lewis, J. C., Qualls-Payne, A. L. (1993). Iowa tests of basic skills. Chicago, IL: The Riverside Publishing Company.

Hoover, M. R., & Fabian, E. M. (2000). A successful program for struggling readers. Reading Teacher, 53(6), 474-476.

House Res. 2264, 105th Cong., 1st Sess. (1997).

Impara, J. C., & Blake, B. S. (Eds.). (1998). The thirteenth mental measurements yearbook. Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Kaestle, C. F. (1990). Former reform. America's Agenda, 5(3), 32.

Keltner, B. R. (1998). Funding comprehensive school reform. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Distribution Services. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 424 669)

Lashway, L. (1999). Trends and issues: School reform. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Leslie, L., & Allen, L. (1999). Factors that predict success in an early literacy intervention project. Reading Research Quarterly, 34(4), 404-420.

- Lezotte, L. W., & Bancroft, A. (1985). School improvement based on effective schools research: A promising approach for economically disadvantaged and minority students. Journal of Negro Education, 54, 301-312.
- Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N. L., Dolan, L. J., & Wasik, B. A. (1993). Success for all: Longitudinal effects on a restructuring program for inner-city elementary schools. American Educational Research Journal, 30(1), 123-148.
- McChesney, J. (1998). Whole-school reform. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 478 388)
- Murphy, J., & Adams, J. E., Jr. (1998). Reforming America's schools. Journal of Educational Administration, 36(5), 426-444.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1996). The condition of education 1996. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: Author.
- Natriello, G., & McDill, E. L. (1999). Title I: From funding mechanisms to educational reform. In G. Orfield & H. DeBray (Eds.), Hard work for good schools: Facts not fads in Title I reform (pp. 31-45). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, the Civil Rights Project.
- Natriello, G., McDill, E. L., & Pallas, A. M. (1990). Schooling disadvantaged children: Racing against catastrophe. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Nunnery, J. A. (1998). Reform ideology and the locus of development problem in educational restructuring: Enduring lessons from studies of educational innovation. Education and Urban Society, 30(3), 277-295.
- Obey, D., & Porter, J. (1997). The road to better American schools. Available: <http://www.ael.org/rel/csr/about/html>
- Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (1993). Curriculum: Foundations, principles, and issues (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Pflaum, J. (1980). Reading instruction: A quantitative analysis. Educational Researcher, 9(7), 12-18.
- Pikulski, J. (1994). Preventing reading failure: A review of five effective programs. Reading Teacher, 48(1), 30-39.
- Pinell, G. S. (1989). Reading Recovery: Helping at-risk children learn to read. Elementary School Journal, 90(2), 159-181.
- Pinnell, G. S., DeFord, D. E., & Lyons, C. A. (1988). Reading Recovery: Early intervention for at-risk first graders. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Association.
- Pinell, G. S., Lyons, C. A., DeFord, D. E., Bryk, A. S., & Seltzer, M. (1994). Comparing instructional methods for the literacy education of high-risk first-graders. Reading Research Quarterly, 29(1), 9-38.
- Pipho, C. (1992). A decade of education reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 74(4), 278-279.
- Pressley, M., Rankin, J., & Yokoi, L. (1996). A survey of instructional practices of primary teachers nominated as effective in promoting literacy. Elementary School Journal, 96(4), 363-384.
- Quatroche, D. J. (1999). Helping the underachiever in reading. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 434 331)

- Rahu, N. (1992). Iowa tests of basic skills. In J. Kramer & J. Conoley (Eds.), Mental measurements yearbook (pp. 184-186). Lincoln, NB: Buros Institute of Mental Measurement.
- Saban, A. (1997). Emerging themes of national educational reform. International Journal of Educational Reform, 6(3), 349-356.
- Schaffer, E. C., Nesselrodt, P. S., & Stringfield, S. C. (1997). An analysis of destabilizing issues in ten promising programs. Baltimore: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk.
- Schenck, E. A., & Beckstrom, S. (1993). Chapter I school-wide project study: Final report. Portsmouth, NH: RMC Corporation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 365 768)
- Schlechy, P. C. (1993). On the frontier of school reform with trailblazers, pioneers, and settlers. Journal of Staff Development, 14(4), 46-51.
- Scribner, J. D., & Layton, D. (1985). The study of educational policies. Washington, DC: Falmer Press.
- Shavelson, R. J. (1988). Statistical reasoning for the behavior sciences (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.
- Sherwood, T. (1999). A practical look at comprehensive school reform for rural schools. Charleston, WV: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 425 047)
- Short, R. A., Kane, M., & Peeling, T. (2000). Retooling the reading lesson: Matching the right tools to the job. Reading Teacher, 54(3), 284-295.
- Slavin, R. E. (1991). Neverstreaming: Preventing learning disabilities. Educational Leadership, 53(5), 4-7.
- Slavin, R. E. (1996). Neverstreaming: Preventing learning disabilities. Educational Leadership, 53(5), 4-7.
- Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N. L., & Madden, N. A. (1989). Effective programs for students at risk. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L. J., & Wasik, B. A. (1996). Every child, every school: Success for all. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L. J., Wasik, B. A., Ross, S. M., Smith, L. S., & Dionda, M. (1996). A summary of research. Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 1(1), 41-76.
- Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Karweit, N. L., Dolan, L. J., & Wasik, B. A. (1992). Success for All: A relentless approach to prevention and early intervention in elementary schools. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Services.
- SPSS 10.0 for Windows [Computer software]. (2000). Chicago, IL: SPSS, Inc.
- Stringfield, S., Milsap, M. A., Yoder, N., Brigham, N., Nesselrod, P., Schaffer, E., Karweit, N., Dolan, L., Levin, M., Smith, L., Gamse, B., Puma, M., Rosenblum, S., Herman, R., Bedinger, S., Randall, B., & Stevens, R. (1997). Urban and suburban/rural special strategies for educating disadvantaged children. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Planning and Evaluation Service.
- Success for All Foundation. (2001). SFAF schools. Available: <http://www.Successforall.net/about/sfafschoools.htm>
- Swartz, S. L. (1992). Cost comparison of selected intervention programs in California. Sam Bernardino, CA: California State University.

- Swartz, S. L., & Klein, A. F. (1994). Reading Recovery: An overview. Literacy, Teaching and Learning: An International Journal of Early Literacy, 1(1), 3-7.
- Thompson, J. (1994). Systematic reform. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 370 178)
- Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). Tinkering towards utopia. America's Agenda, 5(3), 10-13.
- Tye, B. B. (1987). The deep structure of schooling. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(4), 281-284.
- U. S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research. (1990). Chapter I policy Manual. Basic programs operated by local educational agencies: Part A of Chapter I of Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 amended by Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert Stafford Elementary and Secondary Improvement Amendments of 1988. Washington, DC: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 323 274)
- U. S. Department of Education. (1993). Goals 2000: Educate America Act. Washington, DC: Author.
- U. S. Department of Education. (2001). The Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program. Available: <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/compreform/2pager.html>
- Venezky, R. L. (1994). An evaluation of success for all. Newark, DE: University of Delaware, Department of Education Studies.
- Walker-Dalhouse, D. (1993). Beginning reading and the African-American child at risk. Young Children, 49, 24-28.
- Wasik, B. A., & Slavin, R. E. (1990). One-to-one tutoring produces early reading success: Large gains justify costs. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 380 526)
- Wasik, B. A., & Slavin, R. E. (1993). Preventing early reading failure with one-to-one tutoring: A review of five programs. Reading Research Quarterly, 28(2), 179-200.
- Williams, E. J. (1998). The early literacy learning initiative research report. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.
- Williams, E. J., Scharer, P. L., & Pinnell, G. (2000). The literacy collaborative research report. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.
- Wong, K. K., Sunderman, G. L., & Lee, J. (1996). When federal Title I works to improve student learning in inner-city schools: Lessons learned in school-wide projects in Minneapolis. Philadelphia: Laboratory for Success.
- Yarborough, B. H., & Johnson, R. A. (1980). A six-year study of sex differences in intellectual functioning, reading/language arts achievement, and affective development. Journal of Psychology, 106(1), 55-61.