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ABSTRACT

PAIRED READING INTERVENTION FOR LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT STUDENTS

Name: Vo, Tuongvi, N.
University of Dayton

Advisor: Dr. Susan Davies

The purpose of this research was to determine the impact of an academic intervention called “Paired Reading” for three Limited English Proficient (LEP) students on their oral reading fluency. A multiple baseline across students design was used to evaluate the effectiveness of Paired Reading intervention program for three LEP students who are in the fourth grade. It was expected that the intervention would decrease errors and increase oral reading rates. The oral reading fluency rate of all three LEP students showed marked improvements after the intervention when compared to their performance during baseline. Two of the three students met their oral reading fluency goals. Previous studies support Paired Reading as an effective intervention for struggling readers. The present study supports the efficacy of this intervention for students with limited English proficiency.
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Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Background Information

The student population in the United States becomes more ethnically and linguistically diverse every year. According to the U.S. Bureau of Census (2008), the total number of students enrolled in public schools increased by 14% in the last decade, but the number of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students increased by 70%. The U.S. Bureau of Census (2008) predicted that the number of LEP students is projected to grow even more in the next decade. The growing number of LEP students in the public schools resulted in a dramatic demographic shift in the public school education system. Approximately 45% of teachers reported having at least one LEP student in their classrooms in 2002. In addition, national educational standards demand that LEP students take high-stakes tests normed for native speakers within two and a half to three years of going to school in the United States (No Child Left Behind, 2001).

Given this substantial increase in the LEP population in public schools, there is a need for effective reading interventions. This study is intended to fill this need by investigating the impact of an academic intervention called “Paired Reading” on the oral reading fluency of three LEP students. It is hypothesized that Paired Reading will increase participants’ oral reading fluency and accuracy.
**Definition**

It is required for public schools in the United States to define and provide linguistically appropriate interventions for LEP students in order to support their overall academic achievement. The federal government, as a part of Title II of the Improving American’s Schools Act of 1994, provided a definition of LEP students. An LEP student is a person who:

Has sufficient difficulty speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language and whose difficulties may deny such individual the opportunity to learn successfully in the classrooms where the language of instruction is in English or to participate fully in our society due to one or more of the following reasons: was not born in the United States or whose native language is a language other than English and comes from an environment where a language other than English is dominant; is a Native American or Alaska Native or who is a native resident of the Outlying Areas and comes from an environment where a language other than English has had a significant impact on such individual’s level of English language proficiency; or is migratory and whose native language is other than English and comes from an environment where a language other than English is dominant (IASA, 1994).

The purpose of this research was to determine the impact of an academic intervention called “Paired Reading” for three LEP students on their oral reading fluency. The independent variable was the Paired Reading intervention; the dependent variable was the participants’ oral reading fluency and accuracy. It was hypothesized that the Paired Reading intervention would increase the participants’ oral reading fluency and accuracy.
Chapter II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Limited English proficiency students have limited English language skills; therefore, they do not benefit from general education instruction when it is provided entirely in English without support. When considering a successful English as a second language (ESL) program or effective support, many factors need to be taken into consideration. This literature review outlines the population of LEP students in Ohio; legal responsibilities of schools, educators, and administrators; language development; and the roles of LEP students in regular and special education.

Limited English Proficient Students in Ohio

Approximately 35,000 LEP students were enrolled in the elementary and secondary public schools during the 2006-2007 school year in the state of Ohio. The Ohio Department of Education (2010) defines LEP students as “students who are not proficient in English as they enter school in the United States (p. 1).” LEP students have limitations in their ability to understand, speak, read and/or write in English. In addition, their language skills affect their school performance. Similar to the national trends, the number of LEP students reported in Ohio for school year 2006-2007 represented an increase of 68% over the number reported five years previously and an increase of 182% over the number reported 10 years previously. There are many other similar labels for LEP students including: English as a Second Language (ESL), English as a Foreign Language (EFL), Language-Minority Students (LMS), English Language Learners
(ELLs), Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CLD) and Potentially English Proficient (PEP). The preferred terms varied over the years, but some prefer the focus of the strength-based "Culturally and Linguistically Diverse" rather than the deficit model implied by the term "Limited English Proficient (Schon et al., 2008). The term LEP was chosen for this study to be consistent with the Ohio Language Proficiency Standards.

**Legal Responsibilities of School Districts**

Although the federal government provided a definition of a LEP student, the way each state defines LEP and the methods used for determining LEP status vary. For example, states use a home-language survey, teacher observation, language testing, informal assessment, or a combination of these approaches. Forty-nine states use a home-language survey and forty-eight states use a language-proficient test in their identification of students as LEP (Ochoa, 2005). In the case of Lau v. Nichols (1974), the U.S. Supreme court ruled that LEP students should be provided with appropriate language assistance and cannot be discriminated against educationally. Simply placing LEP students in a regular classroom is not sufficient, and schools must assist LEP students in attaining the level of English proficiency they need to succeed. However, similar to the decision, the Supreme Court did not mandate a particular educational program to address the needs of LEP students. School districts must decide which educational approach best meets the needs of LEP students. Regardless of the educational plan for developing English proficiency, LEP students need to develop English proficiency in the four communication domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing.

In the Provision of Equal Education Opportunities to Limited English Proficient
Students (2000), the U.S. Department of Education provides guidelines to school districts regarding their legal obligation to LEP students. First, school districts must identify all students whose primary or home language is other than English. Then, the district needs to assess all students to determine their level of English language proficiency and whether they need special language assistance in order to effectively participate in the district’s instructional program. Once LEP students are identified, the types of special language services programs that are needed are identified and implemented. Similar to the national standards, there is no specific type of intervention program a school district must follow in Ohio. However, the program must be based on sound theory and best practice to effectively meet the needs of LEP students. School districts are expected to provide properly trained staff and to ensure appropriate curricular materials. School districts are responsible for monitoring students’ progress on a regular basis and to take steps to modify the program if the students are not making reasonable progress.

**Educators and Administrators**

Teachers and administrators need to use effective strategies for all young students, but especially for LEP students from culturally diverse backgrounds. One of the most important keys to student success is the preparation and expertise of the educators who serve them (Ortiz et al. 2006). In contrast to the growing number of LEP students in the public school system, early childhood educators and school personnel remain predominately White and from middle-class backgrounds (Whitebrook, 2003). According to the National Center for Educational Statistics (2004), schools with the highest percentages of LEP students are more likely to employ new teachers and to assign teachers without the necessary credentials to teach in bilingual education and ESL
classrooms. Lack of access to qualified teachers may be one of the reasons for the low academic achievement of LEP students. In addition, approximately 60% of the deans of colleges of education who responded to a questionnaire about their pre-service teacher education programs indicated that their colleges’ coursework did not adequately focus on culturally and linguistically diverse learners (Futrell, Gomez, & Bedden, 2003).

Limited English Proficient Students and Culture

Given the increased number of LEP students in the public school system, interventions that are effective in improving the language abilities of these students are essential. However, schools continue to have difficulty with assessment, professional development, and service delivery for LEP students (Rinaldi et al., 2008). In order to service LEP students appropriately, educators must understand that LEP students are from culturally diverse backgrounds. Culture influences both how LEP students approach learning and how they are socialized into language proficiency. For example, cultural expectations of the home and school may differ, and the student may initially feel uncomfortable or confused in the school setting. Espinosa (2005) suggested that teachers should take considerable time to get to know their students, backgrounds, skills and needs. By collecting relevant information about the students and families, teachers can better understand the meaning of the home language and culture of the student in their classroom.

Language Development: The Primary School Years

The primary school years typically include kindergarten through third or fourth grade, and it is during these years that most children learn how to read. Learning how to read has a profound effect on children’s knowledge about language. There is a change
from the kind of language the child hears in the school during the early grades versus
language at home. The change requires understanding of different types of semantic
structures. At the beginning of the primary school years, students already have
accumulated a sizeable knowledge of vocabulary. For LEP students, the size of
vocabulary is generally lower than non-LEP peers. Interestingly, the LEP students’
vocabulary size in the native language predicts reading comprehension in English
(Conroy, 2005). One dramatic change that occurs over the early grades of primary school
is the increase in the automaticity of structural knowledge usage. LEP students may find
acquisition of these new structures difficult because they do not have the vocabulary or
the basic structural knowledge needed. The types of structures used are coupled with an
increasing frequency. For example, in the area of syntactic development, sentences
become longer due to increased knowledge of sentence structures that combine single
sentences.

**Second Language Acquisition**

School psychologists and instructional providers need to understand the stages of
second language acquisition in order to effectively assist LEP students (Ochoa, 2005).
According to second language acquisition theory, there are four stages that students
learning a second language go through: preproduction, early production, speech
emergence, and intermediate fluency. Stage one usually occurs during the first three
months of exposure to a second language. During this time students may be silent as they
focus on comprehension and familiarize themselves with hearing a second language. As
LEP students progress through stage one, they may provide only "yes," "no," or one-word
responses. After approximately three months, the student typically enters into stage two,
early production, which usually last three to six months. During this stage there is still a focus on comprehension, but students begin to use one- to three-word phrases. Stage three is the speech emergence stage, generally lasting from six months to two years. During stage three, there is increased comprehension. Sentence length increases as vocabulary expands (Terrell, 1977). Intermediate fluency for LEP students is usually reached after two to three years when vocabulary becomes more extensive with fewer grammatical errors made (Ochoa, 2005).

**Limited English Proficient Students and Response to Intervention**

Response to intervention (RtI) is a three-tiered method of academic intervention use in education. RtI has two main purposes: 1) to provide early, effective assistance to children who are having difficulty learning and 2) to serve as a data-based process of identifying learning disabilities. There are 3 tiers within the RtI framework: primary (tier 1), secondary (tier 2), and tertiary (tier 3). In Tier 1, universal screening is completed on all students and data is collected. The students are identified using benchmark scores. Tier 1 consists of general education instruction along with building and class wide efforts geared towards LEP students. Tier 2 consists of general education instruction plus specialized intervention that is provided in small groups. In Tier 3, individual assessment and targeted intervention is provided for students. RtI might be more beneficial to LEP students than the traditional discrepancy models because it is a proactive model that identifies at-risk students early. The traditional discrepancy models which identify students for special education rely heavily on standardized achievement and intelligence tests. These models do not service LEP students well because few standardized tests have sufficient reliability and validity for LEP students. Using a three-tiered RtI model
has resulted in higher gains in language skills than English as a second language (ESL) instruction alone. The small group instruction of at-risk learners is a pre-referral intervention that can significantly impact students’ educational outcomes and reduce the number of students being referred for special education (Kamps et al. 2007).

**Special Education**

The issue of disproportionate representation of minority students in special education programs has been ongoing for over three decades (Artiles, Trent, & Palmer, 2004). Specifically, in school districts with high minority enrollments and high poverty levels, there is an overrepresentation of LEP students in special education emerging by Grade 5 and remaining clearly visible until Grade 12 (Artiles et al., 2002). At times, LEP students’ underachievement or lack of response to classroom instruction results in a referral to special education. However, research indicates that in addition to the increase in the LEP population, there is also an increase in the population of LEP in special education services (Conroy, 2005). Approximately 56% of LEP students being serviced in special education are referred for reading problems and 24% are serviced for speech or language impairment (NICHD, 2000). Artiles and colleagues (2002) concluded from a study with 11 urban school districts in California that LEP students are 27% more likely than English-proficient students to be placed in special education in elementary grades and almost twice as likely to be placed in secondary grades. As the rate of English language proficiency increases, the rate of placement in special education decreases. If a disability is determined, LEP students with disabilities, compared to their non- LEP peers, are likely to be instructed in more restrictive settings, receive fewer language supports, and have more long-term placements and less movement out of special
Service Delivery

To assist LEP students with their disabilities, recommendations should be made based on several factors. First, the interventions must be consistent with their Individual Educational Plan (IEP). Second, there must be some research evidence on the validity and effectiveness of interventions to justify their use. Many different interventions for these students have been used; however, there is not sufficient research evidence to support the effectiveness or validity of these interventions (Thurlow et al. 2000).

Schools have various programs to support LEP students without disabilities. An immersion program allows students to learn everything in English. Teachers using immersion programs generally try to deliver lessons in simple and understandable language that allows students to internalize English while experiencing the typical educational opportunities in the curriculum. Sometimes students are pulled out for “English as a Second Language” (ESL) programs. ESL programs provide LEP students with instruction in English, but geared for language acquisition. In contrast to immersion and ESL programs, bilingual education provides instruction in English and the child’s first/home language. These settings have at least one teacher who is fluent in the child’s first language. The goals are to transition LEP students into English as quickly as possible, while maintaining and supporting primary language development while also supporting English acquisition. Lastly, some schools have a primary or native language program where all interactions are in the child’s first or primary language. The teachers must be fluent in the child’s home language. The goals include development and support for the child’s first language with little or no systematic exposure to English (Espinosa,
Prior to a referral for special education, it is recommended that schools implement pre-referral interventions as a way to reduce inappropriate referrals to special education. Implementation of meaningful pre-referral strategies within general education should be a part of the referral process; however, despite the recommendation for pre-referral interventions, there are limited implementations of pre-referral strategies in daily practice. Instead of providing early interventions to students at-risk for reading difficulties, students are pushed toward a formal evaluation (Artiles, Trent, & Palmer, 2004; Ortiz & Yates, 2001).

Because most referrals come from teachers, it is important for teachers to have adequate knowledge of language acquisition in all phases of instructional, pre-referral, referral, and assessment processes, especially when students seem delayed in acquiring both their first language and English. Additionally, it is essential to consider contextual features, socio-cultural factors, school and program characteristics, and students’ opportunities for learning in all phases of instruction (Salend & Salinas 2003). Salend and Salinas (2003) further recommended organizing multidisciplinary teams to ensure that experts in second language acquisition are included, offer training, and consider factors associated with second language acquisition. It is especially helpful to have more options within general education for supporting students who show initial signs of struggling to learn (Ortiz, 1997; Ortiz & Yates, 2001). Moreover, Barrera (2003) advocated using curriculum-based assessment and testing students on material to which LEP students are exposed to in class as a way of monitoring their progress and
determining who should be referred.

While there are many obstacles to assessing the language and academic skills of LEP students, it can be detrimental to misidentify students for special education services when they do not have a learning disability. The consequences with mis-identification might include loss of time for the student in learning to read, loss of student motivation to learn, and students receiving a quality and type of instruction that might hinder their language development (Espinosa, 2005). Thus, research suggests that the most effective reading instruction for LEP students begins early in the classroom and includes explicit instruction in the development of specific reading skills (NRP, 2000).

Assessment Practices and Eligibility Decisions

The two most significant factors in determining special education placement are test performance and teacher referral. Test results come from assessments with students, but assessment of LEP students can be challenging due to a number of reasons. One reason includes difficulty in finding qualified trainers, as well as finding and using appropriate assessments (Schon et al., 2008). In addition, few school psychology training programs offer bilingual specialization and training, so practitioners have had to develop these skills on their own (Paredes Scribner, 2002). Abedi (2002) recommended finding alternative ways of assessing LEP students’ strengths instead of using standardized intelligence tests, which tend to underestimate the potential of culturally and linguistically diverse students. For example, observations of students can be conducted in different settings as part of any evaluation. Assessors should pay greater attention to cultural and affective considerations when evaluating students (e.g., sources of potential conflict, motivation). Attention should be given to students’ native language and to the
role of language acquisition when determining whether a student may have a learning disability. For example, assessors should keep in mind that weak auditory processing skills could relate to language acquisition rather than to a processing disorder or learning disability. Klingner and colleagues (2006) advocated for students to be evaluated in their first language as well as in English to determine predictors of reading achievement. Regardless of their native language, daily practices show that most students were tested in English without accommodations, and the interpretation of results disregarded language difference. Native language information was rarely considered when making placement decisions. Alarmingly, only 1% of assessors attempted to determine if a discrepancy occurred in both English and the student’s native language (Ochoa et al., 1996). Harry and colleagues (2002) found that assessors seemed to rely heavily on the results of English-language testing to the exclusion of native language test results, and they gave inadequate attention to language acquisition issues as a possible explanation for students’ struggles to learn. This is disconcerting because LEP students with lower levels of proficiency in their native language and English have the highest rate of identification in the special education categories. In addition, more LEP students tend to be placed in the learning disability category than in the language and speech impairment category (Artiles et al., 2005).

**Interpreters**

At times, an interpreter is needed when assessing an LEP student depending on the level of proficiency. Ochoa and colleagues (1996) examined the use of interpreters by the school psychologists and found that although more than half had used interpreters, only 37% of the interpreters had received any formal training. Paredes Scribner (2002)
provided a list of topics that should be addressed when training interpreters. These include "cultural consultant" training, legal requirements, assessment terminology, confidentiality and neutrality, and administration skills. Cultural consultant training is needed to help the assessment team build a positive relationship with the family. The interpreter can play a pivotal role in helping the team become aware of any sensitive issues that might impact communication with the family. It would be valuable if the interpreter were familiar with legal requirements such as parent rights and due process, as well as understanding the special education process and services offered. It is essential that the interpreter understands and uses appropriate terminology specific to the assessment in the native language and in English. The interpreter should be neutral and maintain confidentiality. Lastly, if interpreters are expected to assist with assessments, such as obtaining language samples or conducting informal assessments of literacy skills in the native language, then they need to be specifically trained in these areas (Paredes Scribner, 2002).

**Instructional Programs**

In addition to knowledge about the second language acquisition process, school psychologists need to be familiar with different types of instructional programs that are effective with LEP students as well as typical outcomes related to these programs. Lessow-Hurley (2005) presented an overview of different types of instructional programs for LEP students. A main factor that distinguishes the different programs is the final goal of the instructional program. Some instructional programs focus on learning the new language while others focus on maintaining the native language while learning a new language. Transitional programs focus on development of the new language skills with
the expectation that most children within three years of participation will be ready to move into an English-only classroom, and transitional programs are one of the most common instructional programs today. Another program with a focus on learning a new language is English Immersion or Structured Immersion, where the student is in an English-speaking classroom with supports. The Two-way Immersion Program groups students from two language backgrounds with an emphasis on fluency in both native and new language. Research in this area has found that Two-way Immersion programs are most effective and English Immersion programs are least effective (Lessow-Hurley, 2005).

Thomas and Collier (2002) summarized the main points regarding instructional programs. First, the best predictor of student achievement with learning a new language is the amount of the native language schooling. Second, providing bilingual or ESL services will increase student achievement significantly when compared with those who receive no services. Third, the minority language group receiving instruction in two languages for up to six years in length is the only model so far that has been found to enable students to reach average performance in both native and new language. Fourth, the minimum amount of time it takes to reach grade-level performance in a second language is four years, and students without any primary language schooling may never reach grade-level performance in learning a new language.

Specifically, similar to non-LEP students, there are many areas that contribute to LEP students’ literary development: phonemic awareness, phonics, oral reading fluency, vocabulary, reading comprehension, and writing. However, background and contextual factors influence the acquisition of literacy in a second language (August & Shanahan,
The knowledge and use of their native language in the context where they are learning their second language will affect LEP students’ success. In order to read and write in a second language, children need to have oral ability in the language. They need the ability to use academic discourse and know vocabulary. Literary language knowledge is acquired through experiences such as listening to book reading, story telling, and interactions with adults. Being literate in another language can be an advantage in learning English, but children learning to read and write in English as a second language still need to acquire the idiosyncrasies of the English language, such as specific sound-letter correspondences, semantic, vocabulary knowledge, and text structure (Menyuk & Brisk, 2005).

**Interventions, Teaching Strategies and Approaches**

Numerous classroom and instructional approaches can be effective for LEP students. Research has shown that LEP students tend to be behind their monolingual English-speaking peers in their levels of academic achievement. Specifically, there is growing evidence that LEP students often struggle more in the areas of reading vocabulary and comprehension, but tend to perform at or even above the level of their English-speaking peers in the areas of spelling and word recognition (Echevaria, Short, & Powers, 2006). Dreher and Gray (2009) suggested an intervention technique that emphasizes the structure of the text to improve vocabulary and comprehension. This method of teaching young LEP students how to identify and use the compare-contrast text structure activates and extends their background knowledge, thereby expanding vocabulary knowledge.

Espinosa (2008) offered specific researched-based suggestions to support English
acquisition for young children who are not native English speakers, including:

- A consistent and predictable routine that frequently uses cooperative learning groups, small group interactions, and regular opportunities for LEP students to converse informally with English speaker supports second language learning (Carrey, 1997).

- Small peer groups that give children opportunities to learn English in non-threatening, secure environments promote friendships among children who speak different languages (Carrey, 1997).

- Allow children to practice following and giving instructions for basic literacy tasks such as turning pages during reading, using pictures to tell a story, telling a story in sequence, and noting the names of main characters in a story (Carrey, 1997).

- Allow for voluntary participation instead of strictly enforced turn-taking or teacher-led lessons (Garcia, 2003).

- Help young English learners become a part of the social fabric of the classroom by systematically including a mix of first- and second-language children in organized, small group activities (Garcia, 2003).

- Embed all instruction in context cues that connect words to objects, visuals, and body movements. By connecting words with concrete objects and physical movements, the probability those children will understand their meaning increases (Tabors, 1997).

- Repeat words and directions frequently and explicitly throughout the day, calling attention to their sounds and meanings (Tabors, 1997).
• Modify language use so that it is comprehensible for young second-language learners. Make it as simple, direct, and concrete as possible while systematically introducing new words that are unfamiliar (Garcia, 2003).

Beginning readers should be provided with instruction in specific skills such as how to manipulate phonemes. Gyovai (2009) found that young readers need to develop the ability to hear and manipulate sounds (i.e., phonemes) prior to being able to make sense of printed symbols (i.e., letters and letter combinations). Manipulation consists of segmenting phonemes into smaller units of speech and/or blending them into words to develop phonological awareness. Young learners need frequent opportunities to practice these skills and thus develop reading fluency (i.e. speed and accuracy) along with vocabulary knowledge and text comprehension strategies. All five components (phonological awareness, alphabetical principle, fluency, vocabulary knowledge, and text comprehension strategies) are necessary to be a good reader (Gyovai, 2009).

**Paired Reading Intervention**

The foundation of an effective English literacy program for LEP students is similar to that of an effective literacy program for English speakers. Several strategies are successful with LEP students including explicit instruction, incorporating interactive teaching, instructional modifications, and if possible, the teaching of literacy skills in their primary language (Coleman & Goldenberg, 2010). Klingner and colleagues (2006) recommended the following strategies: combine phonological awareness with other reading and English language development activities; teach and encourage the use of reading comprehension strategies; and provide explicit vocabulary instruction to facilitate reading comprehension in the student’s first and second language if possible. It would be
helpful for students to develop a strong foundation in their first language as a way to promote literacy in both their native language and in English (Klingner et al., 2006).

Paired Reading is an effective intervention that targets fluency and word identification. Paired Reading improves word identification, fluency, and comprehension for low-performing elementary grade readers, including students with ADHD. Paired Reading is well liked by parents and children alike because it is simple. It can easily be a school-based or home-based intervention that parents can use to improve their children’s reading performance. Paired Reading sessions should be conducted at least four times a week, whether at home or at school (Rathvon, 2008; Fiala & Sheridan, 2003). While there have been interventions with LEP students examining different reading strategies and instructions, there have not been a previous study examining the efficacy of Paired reading on LEP students. Curriculum-based measurement (CBM) in reading should be used to assess students’ oral reading fluency before, during, and after intervention. CBM should also be conducted frequently and the results graphed and shared with the student.

Summary

When considering a successful English as a second language program or effective intervention, many factors need to be taken into consideration. Young children from diverse backgrounds can achieve language proficiency and school success if educators and administrators approach teaching them with careful assessment and collaborative partnerships with families. In addition, the cultural and linguistic strengths they bring to the classroom, when viewed as assets, can be transformed to lifelong skills and build long lasting self-confidence.
Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

Research Question and Hypothesis

The purpose of this research was to determine the impact of an academic intervention called “Paired Reading” for three Limited English Proficient (LEP) students on their oral reading fluency. The independent variable was the Paired Reading intervention; the dependent variable was the participants’ oral reading fluency and accuracy. It was hypothesized that the Paired Reading intervention would increase the participants’ oral reading fluency and accuracy.

Participants

The study was conducted at a suburban school district located in central Ohio. It is the 18th largest school district in Ohio. There are 14 buildings; approximately 10,500 students are currently enrolled in the district. The student demographics are as follows: 71.1% White, 17.9% African-American, 3.1% Asian, 2.4% Hispanic, 0.1% American Indian, 5.4% Multi-racial, 17.1% economically disadvantaged, and 11.1% students with disabilities. Approximately 3.5% are LEP students. The elementary level ranges from kindergarten to fourth grade. The teacher to student ratio is one to 26 at the elementary level.

The study was conducted at one of the elementary schools with an enrollment of approximately 510 students; more than 30 students have been identified by the school district as LEP students. The researcher used the Tier I and Tier II school data along with
the ESL teacher’s recommendation for LEP students for participation. Teacher nominations were based on their experience and acquaintance with these students and their performance in school. The final group of participants consisted of three LEP students, two of whom were at a similar English language proficiency level. Participants needed to read at least 80 words per minute in English, and had not successfully exited from the ESL program.

The study lasted for fourteen weeks with three LEP students: Student 1, Student 2, and Student 3. All three students were in the fourth grade; however, only Student 1 and Student 2 were attending ESL classes regularly during the study. Student 3 was on monitored status because of her level of English proficiency. Student 1 was African American. Student 1’s family moved to the U.S. in 2009 from Ethiopia, Africa. He has been in the U.S. for about 2 years. His native language was Tigrigna. While student 1’s guardians spoke mostly Tigrigna at home, student 1 was encouraged to speak English at home. Student 2 was Mexican American. Student 2’s family moved from Mexico when he was about five years old. Student 2 and his family speak mainly Spanish at home. Student 3 was born in the U.S. Student 3 spoke a combination of Urdu and Laotian at home. Student 3 was a combination of Pakistani, Laotian, and American. The children spoke English at school; however, the amount of English spoken in the home varied.

**Research Design**

A multiple baseline across participants design was used to analyze the effects of the Paired Reading intervention on LEP participants’ oral reading fluency and accuracy. The local norms were established using Tier I and II data previously collected in the school. The school utilized the STAR Early Literacy program for the dual purposes of
screening and progress monitoring to assess general readiness, phonemic awareness, and phonics of the elementary students.

For the first participant, the researcher collected baseline data once a week for five weeks. The intervention was implemented for nine weeks. The researcher collected baseline once a week for seven weeks for the second participant. The intervention was implemented for seven weeks. For the third participant, the researcher collected baseline once a week for nine weeks. The staggering baseline design was chosen in order to reduce threats to validity of the study as well as provide stronger support for the results. The intervention was implemented for the third participant for five weeks. As the participants progressed through the intervention, progress was monitored weekly to assess the intervention effectiveness. The participants’ oral reading fluency and accuracy were monitored with curriculum-based measurement (CBM) oral reading probes. The median of three CBM oral reading probes was used to progress monitor. The source of the baseline and progress monitoring reading was from AIMSweb. The intervention integrity checklist (see Appendix C) was implemented each time the intervention was delivered to ensure accuracy of the intervention. The researcher completed the intervention integrity checklist.

**Procedures**

A letter was sent to potential participants’ parents through the school by the researcher. The primary researcher’s contact information was provided for parents who may have questions about the study. Parents who chose to allow their child to participate signed an informed consent form (see Appendix A) that provided the details of the study, including giving the researcher permission to work directly with their children. Parents
were informed that participants’ names and any other identifying information would be kept confidential. In addition to the consent form, parents were invited to meet with the researcher and the teachers at school to discuss the study. An interpreter read and explained the consent form to the parents in their native language.

Paired Reading intervention began with a brief warm-up during which the researcher talked about the events of the day with the participant. A timer was set for 10 minutes. The researcher chose a passage to read from among the students’ levels reading materials. The researcher began by reading simultaneously with the student (duet reading), and adjusted the reading rate as needed to mirror the participant’s reading rate. When the participant made an error, the researcher pointed to the place of error, provided the correct word, and had the participant repeat it and then reread the entire sentence. Errors were defined as (1) substitutions, (2) omissions, (3) additions, and (4) hesitations lasting longer than a count of three. After the error correction procedure, the researcher and participant began duet reading again. When the participant gave the signal to read alone, the researcher quietly praised the participant (e.g. “Good, go ahead,” “OK,” “Right”) and let the participant began reading alone. The researcher gave nonverbal approval (nod, smile, or thumbs-up) as the participant read independently. When a participant made another error, the researcher used the same correction procedure. The participants were praised at least once more during the session for positive reading behaviors, such as sounding out a word and attempting a difficult word. The session ended with a brief discussion about the material that had been read and praised for the participant’s effort. Paired Reading was conducted with each participant for 10 minutes per session, and at least 4 days a week (see Appendix B).
After four intervention sessions were completed per week, the researcher administered three CBM probes to participants at the end of each week in order to progress monitor. The middle score of the three reading probes was used for progress monitoring. The intervention integrity assessments (Appendix C) were implemented each time the intervention was delivered to ensure accuracy of the intervention. The intervention occurred during the participants’ “Intervention and Enrichment” period designated for intervention assistance, along with a portion of the English language services period. The teacher was given the Intervention Acceptability Questionnaire (see Appendix D) prior to intervention implementation to ensure it was an intervention that was acceptable in the classroom setting.

**Data Collection**

The researcher collected baseline data once a week during the baseline period. The participants were given CBM oral reading probes once a week to measure their reading fluency and accuracy during the baseline period. During the intervention phase, the researcher recorded the participant’s reading fluency and accuracy at least four times a week during intervention implementation. In addition, the participants’ oral reading fluency and accuracy were monitored with three curriculum-based measurement oral reading probes. The source of the baseline and progress monitoring reading were from the AIMSweb Reading Curriculum-Based Measurement (R-CBM). The middle score of the three R-CBM oral-reading probes was recorded for progress monitoring.
Chapter IV

RESULTS

The researcher calculated the g-index for effect sizes, performed visual analyses of the graphed data, and conducted goal attainment scaling in order to analyze the data. The AIMSweb Growth Table for the local school was used to establish the weekly growth rate for the students. It included the school-wide reading norms. The g-index was used because the intervention resulted in student learning; therefore, the trend is not likely to revert to baseline level if the intervention is withdrawn. When compared to the baseline, intervention conditions produced an increase in words read correctly per minute for all three students.

The average number of words read per minute during baseline for Student 1 was 86 (see Figure 1). According to the district norm at their school, Student 1 was ranked at 10th percentile when compared to their local peers. Student 1’s g-index score was .70, indicating a positive improvement from baseline to intervention phase, and a moderate effect size. The expected growth for typical same-age peers depended on the reading level of the peers. For a student reading at Student 1’s level (86 wpm at the winter benchmark), the rate of improvement is approximately .9 words per week. Student 1 gained approximately 8 more words than his peers. The goal of the intervention was for the target group to increase their oral reading fluency; therefore, the Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS) was +1 (see Table 1), indicating a slight improvement over expectation.
for Students 1. Student 1’s total word increased was 16 in new AIMSweb passage each session from baseline to intervention phase. The average gain across students was 16 words per minute.

The average number of words read per minute during baseline for Student 2 was 93 (see Figure 1). According to the district norm at their school, Student 2 was ranked at 10th percentile when compared to their local peers. Student 2’s g-index score was .25, indicating a positive improvement from baseline to intervention phase, but a small effect size. For a student reading at 2’s level (93 at the winter benchmark), the rate of improvement is approximately .9 words per week. Student 2 did not gain as many words as his peers. The Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS) was +1 (see Table 1), indicating a slight improvement over expectation for Students 2. Student 2’s total words increased were 5 in new AIMSweb passage each session from baseline to intervention phase.

The average number of words read per minute during baseline for student 3 was 152 (see Figure 1). According to the district norm at their school, student 3 was at the 50th percentile when compared to local peers. Student 3 was on monitored status so she did not attend ESL classes regularly, but the ESL teacher was checking on her periodically. Even though Student 3 was reading at the 50th percentile when compared to her peers during the winter benchmark, the ESL teacher was concerned because Student 3 had not made adequate progress during the first half of the school year based on local progress monitoring data. Student 3’s g-index score was .66, indicating a positive improvement from baseline to intervention phase, and a moderate effect size. For a student reading at Student 3’s level (153 wpm at the winter benchmark), the rate of improvement is approximately 1.1 words per week. Student 3 gained approximately 21
more words than her peers from the intervention. The GAS for Student 3 was +2, indicating much improved change from baseline (see Table 1). Student 3’s total word increased was 26 in new AIMSweb passage each session from baseline to intervention phrase.

At the end of intervention, the group had increased their average words read correctly per minute and oral reading fluency. The intervention was implemented with 100% integrity for all three students indicating that the intervention was easy to implement. Additionally, the teacher indicated a high percentage of intervention acceptability. She rated either “agree” or “strongly agree” in all the areas of intervention acceptability; however, she noted the time-intensive nature of the intervention. Paired reading was not as consistent with other classroom interventions because it required a large amount of time, and it would be challenging for a teacher to deliver Paired Reading to all the students in the class without assistance.
Figure 1. Students’ total WRC per minute during baseline and intervention phases.
Table 1. *Goal Attainment Scaling for students 1, 2, and 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Attainment</th>
<th>Student 1’s average reading fluency scores</th>
<th>Student 2’s average reading fluency scores</th>
<th>Student 3’s average reading fluency scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much Worse [-2]</td>
<td>Student 1’s average oral reading fluency (ORF) is less than 70 words per minute (wpm).</td>
<td>Student 2’s average oral reading fluency (ORF) is less than 76 words per minute (wpm).</td>
<td>Student 3’s average oral reading fluency (ORF) is less than 135 words per minute (wpm).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly worse than expected [-1]</td>
<td>Student 1’s average oral reading fluency (ORF) is 71-86 wpm.</td>
<td>Student 2’s average oral reading fluency (ORF) is 77-92 wpm.</td>
<td>Student 3’s average oral reading fluency (ORF) is 136-151 wpm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change [0]</td>
<td>Student 1’s average oral reading fluency (ORF) is 86 wpm.</td>
<td>Student 2’s average oral reading fluency (ORF) is 93 wpm.</td>
<td>Student 3’s average oral reading fluency (ORF) is 152 wpm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Improved [+1]</td>
<td><strong>Student 1’s average oral reading fluency (ORF) is 87-102 wpm.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Student 2’s average oral reading fluency (ORF) is 94-109 wpm.</strong></td>
<td>Student 3’s average oral reading fluency (ORF) is 153-168 wpm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much Improved [+2]</td>
<td>Student 1’s average oral reading fluency (ORF) is 103-118 wpm.</td>
<td>Student 2’s average oral reading fluency (ORF) is 109-124 wpm.</td>
<td><strong>Student 3’s average oral reading fluency (ORF) is 169-184 wpm.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DISCUSSION

The purpose of this research was to evaluate the effectiveness of Paired Reading for three LEP students in a suburban elementary school. A multiple baseline across subjects design was used to analyze the effects of intervention on students’ oral reading fluency and accuracy. The hypothesis of this study was that LEP students who received Paired Reading intervention would improve in oral reading fluency and accuracy.

Limited English proficient students are in need of instructional approaches because research has shown that LEP students tend to be behind their monolingual English-speaking peers in their levels of academic achievement. Specifically, there is growing evidence that LEP students often struggle more in the areas of reading vocabulary and comprehension (Echevaria, Short, & Powers, 2006). Dreher and Gray (2009) suggested an intervention technique that emphasizes the structure of the text to improve vocabulary and comprehension. Paired Reading was chosen for this study because it is an effective intervention that targets fluency and word identification.

This study helped the students improve their fluency and accuracy. The results for students 1 and 3 demonstrated that Paired Reading intervention is effective for increasing the oral reading fluency and accuracy for LEP students. The intervention implemented in this study provided LEP students with opportunities to read frequently, and enabled prompt feedback and frequent monitoring. As a result, Student 1 gained
eight more words than his peers, while student 3 gained twenty one more words than her peers after the intervention was implemented.

Similar to Kamps and colleagues (2007), the current study indicated that individual instruction for at-risk students can significantly impact students’ educational outcomes. As a result of the intervention, students 1 and 3 improved their oral reading fluency. The researcher considered contextual features, socio-cultural factors, school and program characteristics, and students’ opportunities for learning in all phases of the study (Salend & Salinas 2003). This study provided a consistent and predictable routine that frequently used one-on-one interactions and regular opportunities for LEP students to practice English. In addition, students 1, 2, and 3 were given the opportunities read in a non-threatening and secure environment, as suggested by Espinosa (2008), in order to support second language acquisition.

Paired Reading would not be recommended for students who are not fluent in decoding letter and words. The moderate effect size of the intervention result for student 1 indicated that due to the nature of the intervention, it would be most beneficial for students with some level of English reading fluency. Student 1 lived with his aunt and uncle. He has been in an English speaking school for at least two years. Teachers reported he was outgoing and talkative; therefore, his English skills were improving rapidly. His aunt and uncle were conversationally fluent in English. They reported that they tried to speak both English and Tigrigna at home. Student 1 asked questions and enjoyed duet reading with the researcher. His acceptance of the intervention could have had a possible effect on the results.

Student 2’s effect size was small when compared to the other two participants.
Student 2’s preference to read alone as opposed to paired reading could have had an effect on his oral reading fluency rate. While Student 3 preferred to read by herself for the most part, her initial oral reading fluency was stronger than Student 2. Student 2 did not seem as enthusiastic towards intervention as much as the other participants. It is hypothesized that student 2’s level of interest in the intervention could have had an impact on the results. In addition, student 2 has a large extended family when compared to the other participants. Student 2’s parents did not speak English at all; as a result Student 2 spoke mainly Spanish at home. It is possible that Student 2’s progress in English may be affected because he does not speak English as often at home.

The moderate effect size of the intervention result for student 3 indicated it was effective. Student 3 was recently placed on monitored only status for ESL. She received direct ESL services last year. Student 3 preferred to read by herself and gave the researcher the signal to read alone frequently. She talked with the researcher about her home life regularly and appeared to be comfortable with the researcher. Student 3’s mother was fluent in English. Student 3’s parents indicated student 3 is more fluent in English than Urdu or Laotian. They have always encouraged student 3 to speak more English at home than the other languages.

The intervention was implemented with 100% integrity for all three students. The researcher utilized the Intervention Integrity Checklist every time the intervention was delivered. The teacher rated the intervention high in acceptability because she believed Paired Reading was an acceptable intervention for the students’ achievement level. She was willing to use the intervention in the classroom, and the intervention did not result in negative side effects for the students. Paired Reading gave students opportunities to
practice reading in a structured setting. When the intervention was completed, students obtained reading skills that they could use in the classroom setting.

**Limitations**

The purpose of this research was to evaluate the effectiveness of Paired Reading for three LEP students in a suburban elementary school. As the results of this study indicate, LEP students who received Paired Reading intervention improved in oral reading fluency and accuracy; although, there were limitations to this study that should be noted. The students did not always receive intervention Monday to Thursday as intended. Also, the students did not receive baseline reading at the same time everyday, so the ESL teacher made that up during a different time of the day. Students 1, 2, and 3 missed seven, two and four days of intervention, respectively, due to illnesses and standardized grade level assessments.

Additionally, since it was not possible to control for the participants’ increased exposure to English outside of the intervention, the intervention might not be the primary reason for reading improvement for the students. There are many strategies for teaching LEP students with and without disabilities; therefore, the findings of this study may not extend to other LEP students, as there were only three students in the study and the needs of LEP students vary from student to student.

**Future Research**

There is a need for continued research with LEP students who are struggling readers given the large increase of LEP students in the school age population. It would be beneficial for additional studies to investigate the effectiveness of Paired Reading on a larger group of LEP students at various reading stages. The students in this study
represented a small population of the LEP student population. Additionally, students who participated in this study were making some progress in reading English before and during the intervention. However, these students may continue to need supplemental instruction in the future. The amount of supplemental instruction is unknown but it is necessary in order to ensure reading success throughout the grades. Another issue that remained unanswered from the current research is the value of each intervention component. Because of the reading intervention, the ESL support services, and extra RtI instructional support were delivered simultaneous, it is not possible to dissect the effects of each component on the students’ reading success.

**Implications for Practice**

The critical elements of the reading instruction program implemented in this study provided an opportunity for the three students to read, and to experience frequent successes, adequate feedback, practice, and frequent monitoring. These elements constitute an effective intervention for LEP students at risk. Paired intervention can serve as a valuable supplemental instructional program for LEP students who are emerging readers, and it is one that is easily implemented in the classroom or even home setting. Paired Reading is a low resourced intervention, and it is easy to implement.

In addition, the families of the students from this study were supportive of the intervention. Despite the various levels of English proficiency of the parents/guardians, they indicated that they encouraged their children to read as much as possible. This is an exploratory study, and it was conducted on LEP students without disabilities who are emergent readers. This study has shown that if students are explicitly informed of the
goals they need to achieve, as well as provided with constructive feedback and opportunities to read, they will become more effective readers.
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Appendix A

Informed Consent to Participate as a Research Subject

Project Title
“Academic Intervention for Limited English Proficient Students.”

Investigator
Tuongvi Vo, M.S.
Department of Counselor Education and Human Services
University of Dayton

Purpose of Research
The purpose of this research is to evaluate the effectiveness of a reading intervention called “Paired Reading” for three limited English proficient students. It is expected that Paired Reading will help improve the students’ oral reading fluency and accuracy.

Expected Duration of Study
The intervention should last for approximately 5 to 9 weeks for each student.

Procedure
The researcher will assess the student’s current reading level for either 5, 7 or 9 weeks. The student will read a reading passage once a week to see how many words he or she can read in 1 minute. Then the researcher (or trained volunteer) will read with the student one-on-one for 10 minutes per day, 4 days a week. When the student makes a mistake, the researcher will stop reading, give the correct word, and have the student repeat the correct word, and then reread the whole sentence. Mistakes happen when the student reads the wrong word, leaves the word out, adds another word, or stops reading longer than 3 seconds. After the student is corrected, the researcher and student will continue reading together. When the student wants to read alone, the researcher will let him/her. The researcher and student will read for 10 minutes a day, 4 days a week. On the 5th day, the student will read for 30 minutes without the researcher’s help. The one-on-one duet reading pattern between the student and the researcher (or trained volunteer) will last 5, 7, or 9 weeks. The reading project will take place during the student’s “Intervention and Enrichment” time, along with a portion of English language services period. The student will not miss regular class due to this reading project. The researcher will send a letter home during the middle of the intervention to share progress.

Alternative Procedures
No alternative procedures exist in this research project.
Anticipated Risks and / or Discomfort
Your child might become frustrated if he or she does not know a word. However, the intervention will take place in a private space and the researcher or trained volunteer will provide support and encouragement for your child to try his or her best.

Benefits to the Participant
By participating in this research, your child might improve oral reading fluency and reading accuracy. You or your child can stop the intervention at any time for any reason without penalty.

Confidentiality
The records of your child’s participation in this research will only be disclosed to the building principal, ESL teacher, and the building school psychologist. No records of the students’ participation in this research will be disclosed to any others during or after the research study. The information collected will be kept in a locked cabinet in the researcher’s home. All participants’ names will be changed in the final report of the study to ensure confidentiality. The researcher will meet with you to discuss the intervention and explain confidentiality. The researcher will arrange for an interpreter at the meeting to assist you with any questions or concerns.

Contact Person for Questions or Problems
If research-related concerns arise, or if you have questions about the research, contact Tuongvi Vo, at tuongvi.vo@gmail.com, or thesis committee chair, Dr. Susan C. Davies, at sdavies1@notes.udayton.edu. Questions about the rights of participants should be addressed to Mary Connolly, at Chair of the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects, Science Center Room 240C, +2320, (937) 229-3493. Dr. Mary Connolly can also be reached by email at Mary.Connolly@notes.udayton.edu.

Consent to Participate
My child can participate in this research project. The researcher has adequately answered all questions that I have about this research, the procedures involved, and my child’s participation. I understand that the researcher named above will be available to answer any questions about intervention procedures throughout this research. I also understand that I may refuse to let my child participate and I can remove them from the study at any time without penalty. The researcher may also terminate my child’s participation in this research if she feels that it is in his/her best interest.

____________________________________
Child’s Name

____________________________________
Parent’s Name

____________________________________
Parent’s Signature
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Paired Reading

Purpose
To improve reading accuracy and rate with an easy-to-use paired reading procedure.

Materials
1. Copy of the story or materials currently being read in class or an older version of a basal reader corresponding to the child’s instructional level, one per child.
2. Timer or watch with sound device.
3. Form for recording Paired Reading sessions (optional).

Observation
1. Administered Curriculum-Based Oral Reading Probes (R-CBM) to a group of target students, using both the fluency and comprehension options.

Intervention Steps
1. The following Paired Reading procedures:
   a. Begin the session with a brief warm-up time during which you talk about the events of the day with the child.
   b. Set the timer for 10 minutes.
   c. Have the child choose a passage to read from among the materials sent by the teacher.
   d. Begin by reading simultaneously with the child (duet reading), adjusting your rate as needed.
   e. When the child makes an error, point to the place of error, provide the correct word, and have the child repeat it and then reread the entire sentence. Errors are defined as (1) substitutions, (2) omissions, (3) additions, and (4) hesitations lasting longer than a count of three.
   f. After the error correction procedure, begin duet reading again.
   g. When the child gives the signal to read alone, quietly praise the child (e.g. “Good, go ahead,” “OK,” “Right”) and let the child begin reading alone. Give nonverbal approval (nod, smile, or thumbs-up) as the child read independently.
   h. When a child makes another error, use the same correction procedure.
   i. Praise the child at least once more during the session for positive reading behaviors, such as sounding out a word and attempting a difficult word.
   j. End the session with brief discussion about the material that has been read and praise for the child’s effort.
2. Conduct Paired Reading with their children for 10 minutes per session, 4 day a week.

**Evaluation**

Compare R-CBM fluency and comprehension scores for the target students before and after implementation.
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Intervention Treatment Integrity Checklist

Checklist:

_____ 1. Begin the session with a brief warm-up time during which you talk about the events of the day with the child.

_____ 2. Set the timer for 10 minutes.

_____ 3. Have the child choose a passage to read from among the materials sent by the teacher.

_____ 4. Begin by reading simultaneously with the child (duet reading), adjusting your rate as needed.

_____ 5. When the child makes an error, point to the place of error, provide the correct word, and have the child repeat it and then reread the entire sentence. Errors are defined as (1) substitutions, (2) omissions, (3) additions, and (4) hesitations lasting longer than a count of three.

_____ 6. After the error correction procedure, begin duet reading again.

_____ 7. When the child gives the signal to read alone, quietly praise the child (e.g. “Good, go ahead,” “OK,” “Right”) and let the child begin reading alone. Give nonverbal approval (nod, smile, or thumbs-up) as the child read independently.

_____ 8. When a child makes another error, use the same correction procedure.

_____ 9. Praise the child at least once more during the session for positive reading behaviors, such as sounding out a word and attempting a difficult word.

_____ 10. End the session with brief discussion about the material that has been read and praise for the child’s effort.

_____ 11. Conduct Paired Reading with the children for 10 minutes per session, 4 day a week.
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**Intervention Acceptability Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. This is an acceptable intervention for the students’ achievement level.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Most teachers would find this intervention appropriate for the students’ achievement level.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would be willing to use this intervention in my classroom.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The intervention should prove effective in changing the students’ oral reading fluency and accuracy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The intervention would not result in negative side effects for the students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The intervention would be appropriate for a variety of students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The intervention is a fair way to handle the students’ achievement struggle.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I would suggest this intervention to other teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The intervention is consistent with those I have used in classroom settings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other skills related to the achievement struggle are likely to be improved by the intervention.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Goal Attainment Scaling Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Attainment</th>
<th>Student’s average reading fluency scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much Worse -2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly worse than expected -1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Improved +1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much Improved +2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>