

# The Impact of a Reading Intervention for Low-Literate Adult ESL Learners

# **The Impact of a Reading Intervention for Low-Literate Adult ESL Learners**

December 2010

**Larry Condelli**  
**Stephanie Cronen**  
**Johannes Bos**  
American Institutes for Research

**Fannie Tseng**  
**Jacklyn Altuna**  
Berkeley Policy Associates

**Melanie Ali**, Project Officer, Institute of Education Sciences

**NCEE 2011-4003**  
**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**U.S. Department of Education**

Arne Duncan

*Secretary*

**Institute of Education Sciences**

John Q. Easton

*Director*

**December 2010**

This report was prepared for the Institute of Education Sciences under Contract No. ED-01-CO-0026/0025. The project officer was Melanie Ali in the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.

IES evaluation reports present objective information on the conditions of implementation and impacts of the programs being evaluated. IES evaluation reports do not include conclusions or recommendations or views with regard to actions policymakers or practitioners should take in light of the findings in the reports.

This report is in the public domain. Authorization to reproduce it in whole or in part is granted. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, the citation should be: Condelli, L., Cronen, S., Bos, J., Tseng, F., and Altuna, J. (2010). *The Impact of a Reading Intervention for Low-Literate Adult ESL Learners* (NCEE 2011-4003). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

To order copies of this report,

- Write to ED Pubs, Education Publications Center, U.S. Department of Education, P.O. Box 22207, Alexandria, VA 22304.
- Call in your request toll free to 1-877-4ED-Pubs. If 877 service is not yet available in your area, call 800-872-5327. Those who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) or a teletypewriter (TTY) should call 800-437-0833.
- Fax your request to 703-605-6794 or order online at <http://www.edpubs.gov>.

This report also is available on the IES website at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/>.

Upon request, this report is available in alternate formats such as Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette. For more information, please contact the Department's Alternate Format Center at 202-205-8113.

## Acknowledgments

This study represents a collaborative effort of adult education programs, schools, teachers, researchers, students and the developers of the text *Sam and Pat*. We appreciate the willingness of the programs, schools, teachers and students to volunteer for the study, try new instructional materials and approaches, and respond to many requests for data and access to classrooms.

We were also fortunate to have the advice of an expert technical working group. Members included Russell Gersten, University of Oregon's Instructional Research Group; Daphne Greenberg, Georgia State University; Larry Hedges, Northwestern University; Robinson Hollister, Swarthmore College; Rebecca Maynard, formerly at the University of Pennsylvania, now at the Institute of Education Sciences (IES); Robin Scarcella, University of California-Irvine; and Anne Whiteside, City College of San Francisco. We also benefitted from the informed feedback on the report from Terry Salinger and Dan Sherman at the American Institutes for Research (AIR).

We would like to thank the *Sam and Pat* team who provided the teacher training and guidance during the study, including Jo Anne Hartel, Whit Hendon, Betsy Lowry, and John Strucker of World Education. We also thank the Mathematica team led by Susan Sprachman and Kathy Buek for leading the student pre- and post-testing for the study; John Sabatini, Jane Shore and Jennifer Lentini at the Educational Testing Service (ETS) for making sense of the test data and ensuring data quality; Anestine Hector-Mason, Dahlia Shaewitz, Suzannah Herrmann, and Lauren Amos for coordinating and conducting the classroom observations; Erin Hamilton, Andrea Harvey, and Erika Salomon for their support to the staff conducting data collection and processing; Castle Sinicrope at Berkeley Policy Associates (BPA) for analysis support; and all the AIR, BPA, Lewin Group, and Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. staff who worked with programs and schools to make the study happen: Mike Fishman, Mary Farrell, Karen Gardiner, Bret Barden, Rachel Augustin, Rachel Cook, Serena Retna, Sophie Shen, Lynne Blankenship, Julie Young, Anne Self, Chris Pefature, and Savitha Moorthy.

## **Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest<sup>1</sup>**

The research team for this study consisted of a prime contractor, American Institutes for Research (AIR), and four subcontractors, BPA, ETS, the Lewin Group, and Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. None of these organizations or their key staff has financial interests that could be affected by findings from the Study of the Impact of a Reading Intervention for Low-Literate Adult ESL Learners. No one on the technical working group, convened by the research team approximately once per year to provide advice and guidance, has financial interests that could be affected by findings from the evaluation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Contractors carrying out research and evaluation projects for IES frequently need to obtain expert advice and technical assistance from individuals and entities whose other professional work may not be entirely independent of or separable from the particular tasks they are carrying out for the IES contractor. Contractors endeavor not to put such individuals or entities in positions in which they could bias the analysis and reporting of results, and their potential conflicts of interest are disclosed.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>xi</b>
Summary of Study Design and Methods.....	xiv
The Adult ESL Literacy Intervention: <i>Sam and Pat</i> .....	xvi
Summary of Study Findings.....	xvii
Generalizability of the Study Findings.....	xxi
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction and Overview .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Selection of the Adult ESL Literacy Intervention.....	2
Research Questions .....	3
Summary of Study Design .....	3
Standard ESL Instruction: The Control Group .....	4
The Adult ESL Literacy Intervention: <i>Sam and Pat</i> .....	5
Overview of <i>Sam and Pat</i> .....	5
Intended Use of <i>Sam and Pat</i> .....	7
Teacher Training and Follow-Up Technical Assistance .....	8
Organization of the Report.....	10
<b>Chapter 2: Study Design and Methods.....</b>	<b>11</b>
Selection of Adult ESL Programs and Sites.....	11
Recruitment and Random Assignment of Teachers and Students .....	13
Teachers.....	13
Students .....	14
Data Collection.....	17
Teacher Data Form (2008) .....	17
Teacher Data Form (2009) .....	17
Student Intake Form .....	20
Student Assessments .....	20
Daily Student Attendance Sheets .....	22
Classroom Observations.....	22
Integrity of Random Assignment .....	23
Baseline Equivalency of <i>Sam and Pat</i> and Control Groups.....	23
Student Movement Between Groups.....	23
<b>Chapter 3: Instruction and Attendance During the Study .....</b>	<b>28</b>
Description of Instruction in <i>Sam and Pat</i> Classrooms .....	29
General Class Duration.....	29
Proportion of Instructional Intervals Incorporating <i>Sam and Pat</i> Materials .....	30
Use of Instructional Practices in Support of <i>Sam and Pat</i> .....	31
Two-thirds of <i>Sam and Pat</i> Classes Observed Met Fidelity Criteria .....	33

Context of Implementation in <i>Sam and Pat</i> Classrooms .....	34
Accessing Implementation Supports .....	34
Preparation Time for <i>Sam and Pat</i> Lessons .....	35
Lesson Number Completed .....	35
Use of Materials Other than <i>Sam and Pat</i> .....	36
<i>Sam and Pat</i> and Control Group Differences in Instruction and Student Attendance.....	37
More Reading Instruction Observed in <i>Sam and Pat</i> Classes, while More English Language Instruction Observed in Control Classes .....	37
No Group Differences in Hours of Class Attended.....	39
<b>Chapter 4: Impacts on Reading and English Language Skills .....</b>	<b>41</b>
Estimation Model .....	41
Impacts on Students’ Reading and English Language Skills .....	42
No Impacts on Reading Outcomes .....	42
No Impacts on English Language Outcomes .....	43
Putting the Findings into Context.....	43
Subgroup Analyses.....	46
Overview of Subgroups.....	46
No Impacts on Reading and English Language Outcomes Found for Subgroups Based upon Native Language and Cohort.....	48
Some Suggestive Evidence of A Positive Impact on Reading Outcomes for Lower Literacy Students.....	48
<b>Chapter 5: Non-Experimental Analyses .....</b>	<b>53</b>
No Direct Relationship Between Reading or English Language Instruction and Outcomes.....	54
Positive (although Weak) Relationship Between Attendance and Reading and English Language Outcomes.....	55
Student Exposure to Reading or English Language Instruction Unrelated to Most Reading and English Language Outcomes Measured, Although Weak Relationships Found Between Exposure to Instruction and One English Language Outcome .....	56
<b>References .....</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>Appendix A: Assessment Selection, Administration, and Scoring .....</b>	<b>A-1</b>
Assessment Selection .....	A-1
Test Administration Preparation and Methods.....	A-3
Test Administrator Recruitment and Training .....	A-4
Data Collection for the Full Study.....	A-6

Scoring Quality .....	A-7
Reliabilities of the Post-Tests During the Study .....	A-8
<b>Appendix B: Supplemental Tables and Figures for Chapter 2 .....</b>	<b>B-1</b>
<b>Appendix C: Classroom Observation Methods and Instrument.....</b>	<b>C-1</b>
Observation Training and Methods.....	C-1
Training .....	C-1
Scheduling and Preparing for the Observation.....	C-1
Conducting the Observation .....	C-2
Data Quality Control Procedures and Analysis.....	C-2
<b>Appendix D: Power Calculations and Impact Estimation Methods .....</b>	<b>D-1</b>
Power Analyses .....	D-1
Missing Data Approach.....	D-1
Covariate and pre-test data .....	D-1
Post-test data.....	D-1
Estimation Model .....	D-3
Adjusting for Multiple Comparisons.....	D-6
<b>Appendix E: Supplemental Tables for Chapter 3.....</b>	<b>E-1</b>
<b>Appendix F: Supplemental Analyses for Chapter 4 .....</b>	<b>F-1</b>
Additional Sensitivity Analyses .....	F-4
Correcting for “No-Shows” .....	F-4
Spline Estimation.....	F-5



## LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

---

### Tables

Table ES.1: Data Collection Schedule.....	xv
Table 2.1: Number of Classes and Students in the Study, Overall and by Site.....	13
Table 2.2: Data Collection Schedule .....	19
Table 2.3: Percentage of Teachers, Classes, and Students Participating in Data Collections, by Group .....	20
Table 2.4: Assessment Administration Schedule, by Test.....	22
Table 2.5: Teacher Background Characteristics, by Group (Percentages) .....	24
Table 2.6: Student Background Characteristics, by Group (Percentages).....	25
Table 2.7: Mean Student Assessment Scores at Beginning of Term, by Group .....	26
Table 2.8: Number and Percent of Students Who Attended Unassigned Study Classes, by Crossover Type .....	27
Table 3.1: Percent of Instructional Intervals During Which <i>Sam and Pat</i> Materials Were Used in <i>Sam and Pat</i> Classrooms .....	30
Table 3.2: Percent of Instructional Intervals During Which <i>Sam and Pat</i> Teachers Engaged in Practices in Support of <i>Sam and Pat</i> .....	31
Table 3.3: Percent of Observations During Which All Fidelity Criteria Were Met in <i>Sam and Pat</i> Classes.....	33
Table 3.4: Number of Times Each Support for <i>Sam and Pat</i> Was Accessed, as Reported by <i>Sam and Pat</i> Teachers .....	34
Table 3.5: Average Number of Minutes Per Week Spent Preparing to Teach Study Class, as Reported by <i>Sam and Pat</i> Teachers.....	35
Table 3.6: Final <i>Sam and Pat</i> Lesson Number Covered in Class, as Reported by <i>Sam and Pat</i> Teachers.....	36
Table 3.7: Percent of Teachers Who Reported Supplementing <i>Sam and Pat</i> Instruction With Other Materials During the Study, by Frequency of Use, as Reported by <i>Sam and Pat</i> Teachers .....	36
Table 3.8: Number of Classroom Observations, by Cohort and Group.....	37
Table 3.9: Percent of Instructional Intervals Spent in Key Instructional Areas, by Group.....	38
Table 3.10: Hours of Attendance, by Group.....	40
Table 4.1: Impact of <i>Sam and Pat</i> on Reading and English Language Outcomes .....	43
Table 4.2: Mean Pre- vs. Post-Test Scores on Reading and English Language Assessments .....	44

Table 4.3: Grade Level or Age Equivalents (GLEs/AEs) for Pre- and Post-Test Means.....	46
Table 4.4: Impact of <i>Sam and Pat</i> on Reading and English Language Outcomes Among Students With a Non-Roman-based Alphabet Background.....	49
Table 4.5: Impact of <i>Sam and Pat</i> on Reading and English Language Skills Among Spanish Speaking Students.....	50
Table 4.6: Impact of <i>Sam and Pat</i> on Reading and English Language Skills Among Students With Lower and Higher Literacy Levels at the Beginning of the Term.....	51
Table 4.7: Impact of <i>Sam and Pat</i> on Reading and English Language Skills Among Students in Cohort 1 and Cohort 2.....	52
Table 5.1: Relationship Between Reading and English Language Instruction and Outcomes.....	54
Table 5.2: Relationship Between Hours of Attendance and Outcomes.....	56
Table 5.3: Relationship Between Exposure to Instruction and Outcomes.....	57
Table A.1: Correlations Between Post-Test Assessments (Full Sample).....	A-3
Table A.2: Percent Agreement on Item Scoring Between Testers and Expert Scorers, by Pre- and Post-Test Assessment.....	A-7
Table A.3: Post-Test Reliability Estimates.....	A-8
Table C.1: Average Percent Agreement Among Observers for Fall and Spring Terms.....	C-3
Table D.1: Predictors of Missing Post-Test (Probit Analysis), by Post-Test.....	D-2
Table E.1: Percentage Distribution of Final <i>Sam and Pat</i> Lesson Number Covered in Class, as Reported by <i>Sam and Pat</i> Teachers.....	E-1
Table E.2: Percentage Distribution of Students Attending Varying Numbers of Class Hours, Overall and by Group.....	E-1
Table E.3: Percentage Distribution of Students Attending Varying Percentages of Class Hours, Overall and by Group.....	E-2
Table F.1: Impacts Based on Reading Assessments Before Rescoring.....	F-1
Table F.2: Impacts Based on Scaled English Language Assessment Scores.....	F-1
Table F.3: Impacts Based on Raw Woodcock Johnson Scores.....	F-2
Table F.4: Mean Pre- vs. Post-Test Scores on Reading and English Language Assessments, by Group.....	F-3
Table F.5: Impacts After No-Show Correction.....	F-5
Table F.6: Impacts Estimated With Spline Terms.....	F-7
Table F.7: Number and Percentage of Students Meeting the Study's Definition of Lower Literacy, by Site.....	F-8

## Figures

Figure ES.1: Percent of Observed Instructional Intervals Spent in Key Instructional Areas, by Group .....	xix
Figure ES.2: Impact of <i>Sam and Pat</i> on Reading and English Language Skills: Differences Between <i>Sam and Pat</i> and Control Groups at the End of the Term .....	xx
Figure 2.1: Sample Selection Flowchart .....	16
Figure 2.2: Study Procedural Flow Chart .....	18
Figure B.1: Flow of Students From Random Assignment to Analysis .....	B-1
Figure F.1: Impacts on Woodcock Johnson Letter Word Identification Scale Scores, by Site .....	F-9
Figure F.2: Impacts on Woodcock Johnson Word Attack Scale Scores, by Site .....	F-10
Figure F.3: Impacts on SARA Decoding Scores, by Site .....	F-11
Figure F.4: Impacts on Woodcock Johnson Passage Comprehension Scale Scores, by Site .....	F-12
Figure F.5: Impacts on OWLS Scores, by Site .....	F-13
Figure F.6: Impacts on ROWPVT Scores, by Site .....	F-14
Figure F.7: Impacts on Woodcock Johnson Picture Vocabulary Scale Scores, by Site .....	F-15

# THE IMPACT OF A READING INTERVENTION FOR LOW-LITERATE ADULT ESL LEARNERS

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

According to the 2008 program year statistics from the U.S. Department of Education (ED), 44 percent of the 2.4 million students in the federally funded adult education program in the United States were English as a second language (ESL) students (ED, 2010). Of these, about 185,000 were at the lowest ESL level, beginning literacy. These students, many of whom face the dual challenge of developing basic literacy skills—including decoding, comprehending, and producing print—along with proficiency in English, represent a range of nationalities and cultural backgrounds. Although the majority of students come from Mexico and other Spanish-speaking countries, there are also students from Africa, India, the Philippines, China, Vietnam, and the Caribbean (Wrigley, Richer, Martinson, Kubo, & Strawn, 2003).

Adult basic education (ABE) and ESL programs, authorized by the Workforce Investment Act and also funded with state and local funds, are designed to assist students in their efforts to acquire literacy and language skills by providing instruction through local education agencies, community colleges, and community-based organizations. The content of instruction within ESL classes varies widely. It is often designed to assist students in their efforts to acquire literacy and language skills by providing a combination of oral language, competency-based work skills, and literacy instruction (Condelli, Wrigley, Yoon, Cronen, & Seburn, 2003). There is, however, little rigorous research that identifies effective instruction. A comprehensive review of published research studies on the effects of literacy interventions for ABE and adult ESL learners (Condelli & Wrigley, 2004) found that out of 17 adult education studies that used a rigorous methodology (i.e., quasi-experimental or randomized trials), only 3 included adult ESL learners (Diones, Spiegel, & Flugman, 1999; St. Pierre et al., 1995; St. Pierre et al., 2003). Furthermore, among the 3 studies that included adult ESL learners, only 1 presented outcomes for those learners, and that study experienced substantial methodological problems that limited the validity of the findings (e.g., a 40 percent overall attrition rate and different attrition rates in the intervention vs. control groups; Diones et al., 1999).

To help improve research-based knowledge of effective instruction for low-literate ESL learners, the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance of ED's Institute of Education Sciences contracted with the American Institutes of Research (AIR) to conduct a Study of the Impact of a Reading Intervention for Low-Literate Adult ESL Learners. The intervention studied was the basal reader *Sam and Pat, Volume I*, published by Thomson-

Heinle (2006). The study team consisted of AIR, Berkeley Policy Associates (BPA), the Lewin Group, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., Educational Testing Service (ETS), and World Education.

The goal of this study was to test a promising approach to improving the literacy skills of low-literate adult ESL students under real-world conditions. In their review of the research on ESL instruction in related fields, including adult second language acquisition, reading and English as a foreign language instruction, Condelli & Wrigley (2004) concluded that instruction based on a systematic approach to literacy development was a promising intervention for low-literate adult ESL learners that would be valuable to study (Brown et al., 1996; Cheek & Lindsay, 1994; Chen & Graves, 1995; Carrell, 1985; Rich & Shepherd, 1993; Roberts, Cheek & Mumm, 1994). Specifically, the factors identified as defining a systematic approach to literacy development included: (1) a comprehensive instructional scope that includes direct instruction in phonics, fluency, vocabulary development and reading comprehension, (2) a strategic instruction sequence, (3) a consistent instructional format, (4) easy-to-follow lesson plans, and (5) strategies for differentiated instruction.

*Sam and Pat* was selected as the focus of the study because it offers an approach to literacy development that is systematic, direct, sequential, and multi-sensory. It also includes multiple opportunities for practice with feedback. Consistent with characteristics identified as promising by Condelli & Wrigley (2004), *Sam and Pat* provides opportunities for cooperative learning, real world tasks, and an explicit focus on reading. In addition, the text was developed for and had been used by the developers with students similar to the study population (literacy level ESL learners).

The impact study used an experimental design to test the effectiveness of *Sam and Pat* in improving the reading and English language skills of adults enrolled in 66 ESL literacy classes at 10 sites. The study addressed three key research questions:

1. How effective is instruction based on the *Sam and Pat* textbook in improving the English reading and language skills of low-literate adult ESL learners compared to instruction normally provided in adult ESL literacy classes?
2. Is *Sam and Pat* effective for certain subgroups of students (e.g., native Spanish speakers)?
3. Is there a relationship between the amount of instruction in reading or English language skills and reading and English language outcomes?

This report describes the implementation of *Sam and Pat* at the study sites, compares the instruction and student attendance in *Sam and Pat* classes with that in the standard adult ESL classes, and examines the impact of *Sam and Pat* on reading and English language outcomes. In addition, the report examines the relationship between instruction, attendance, and student outcomes.

The study produced the following key results:

- ❖ ***More reading instruction was observed in Sam and Pat classes, while more English language instruction was observed in control classes.*** The *Sam and Pat* classrooms spent more time on reading development instruction (66 percent of observed intervals in *Sam and Pat* classrooms compared to 19 percent in control classrooms), and the difference was statistically significant. Conversely, the control classrooms spent more time on English language acquisition instruction (68 percent of observed intervals in control classrooms compared to 27 percent in *Sam and Pat* classrooms), and this difference was also statistically significant.
- ❖ ***Although students made gains in reading and English language skills, no differences in reading and English language outcomes were found between students in the Sam and Pat group and students in the control group.*** On average, students participating in the study made statistically significant gains in reading and English language skills over the course of the term (effect sizes of 0.23 to 0.40). However, there were no statistically significant impacts of *Sam and Pat* on the reading and English language outcomes measured for the overall sample.
- ❖ ***There were no impacts of Sam and Pat on reading and English language outcomes for five of six subgroups examined.*** For students with relatively lower levels of literacy at the start of the study, there was some suggestive evidence of a positive impact on reading outcomes.<sup>2</sup> Among students with lower levels of literacy at the beginning of the term, *Sam and Pat* group students scored higher on the Woodcock Johnson word attack (decoding) assessment than control group students (effect size = 0.16). Because this difference was not significant after adjusting for multiple comparisons, however, it is possible that the effect is due to chance alone.

---

<sup>2</sup> Lower literacy was defined as scoring at a Grade 2 equivalent or below on the Woodcock Johnson Letter-Word Identification and Word Attack subtests (raw scores of 31 and 9, respectively).

## Summary of Study Design and Methods

The study was designed to estimate the impact of *Sam and Pat* relative to standard ESL instruction (i.e., the kind of instruction ESL students in study sites would receive in the absence of the study) on reading and English language outcomes.

The evaluation employed a randomized research design that included the following:

- ❖ 10 adult education program sites;
- ❖ 33 teachers;
- ❖ 66 classes; and
- ❖ 1,344 low-literate adult ESL learners.

The program sites were a purposive sample. From among the states with the largest adult ESL enrollments, we selected sites that had enrollments of adult ESL literacy learners large enough to support the study design, 2 or more classes for ESL literacy students that met at the same time and in the same location, and an enrollment process that would accommodate random assignment.

Within each site, teachers and students were randomly assigned to one of two groups:

- ❖ The *Sam and Pat* group, which was intended to include a minimum of 60 hours of *Sam and Pat*-based instruction per term, with any remaining class time being spent on the standard instruction provided by the program; and
- ❖ The control group, which consisted of the standard instruction provided by the program.

Teachers (or classes) within each program site were randomly assigned in pairs, so that, within each pair, the *Sam and Pat* and control class met at the same time, in the same or an adjacent building, and for the same number of hours. Data collection for the study occurred between September 2008 and May 2009 with two cohorts of students, one that attended in fall 2008 and the second in spring 2009. Students were tested on the study's battery of assessments, which included tests of reading and English language skills at the beginning of the term and after about 12 weeks of instruction. A description and schedule for the study's data collections are provided in Table ES.1.

The following tests were selected to measure the range of skills that could potentially be impacted by *Sam and Pat*-based instruction:

### Reading Skills

- ❖ Woodcock-Johnson Letter-Word Identification (WJID; Woodcock, McGrew, & Mather, 2001)
- ❖ Woodcock-Johnson Passage Comprehension (WJPC; Ibid.)
- ❖ Woodcock-Johnson Word Attack (WJWA; Ibid.)
- ❖ SARA Decoding (SARA Dec; Sabatini & Bruce, in press)

### English Language Skills

- ❖ Oral and Written Language Scales (OWLS; Carrow-Woolfolk, 1996)
- ❖ Receptive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test (ROWPVT; Brownell, 2000)
- ❖ Woodcock-Johnson Picture Vocabulary Test (WJPV; Woodcock, McGrew, & Mather, 2001)

**Table ES.1: Data Collection Schedule**

Data Collection	Respondent	Summer 2008	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	Type of Data
Teacher Data Form (2008)	Teachers	X	X		Teacher background information
Teacher Data Form (2009)	Teachers			X	Descriptive information about instructional materials used and <i>Sam and Pat</i> implementation
Student Intake Form	Site Staff on Behalf of Students		X	X	Student background information
Reading and English Language Pre-Tests	Students		X	X	Pre-test data
Reading and English Language Post-Tests	Students		X	X	Outcomes data
Daily Student Attendance Sheets	Teachers		X	X	Dosage/exposure to instruction
Classroom Observations	Evaluation Staff		X	X	Descriptive information about instruction in both groups



The basic analytic strategy for assessing the impacts of *Sam and Pat* was to compare reading and English language outcomes for students who were randomly assigned to either the *Sam and Pat* or the control group, after controlling for student and teacher background characteristics (e.g., gender and ethnicity). The average outcome in the control group represents an estimate of the scores that would have been observed in the *Sam and Pat* group if they had not received the intervention; therefore, the difference in outcomes between the *Sam and Pat* and control groups provides an unbiased estimate of the impacts of *Sam and Pat*.

## **The Adult ESL Literacy Intervention: *Sam and Pat***

The *Sam and Pat* textbook (Hartel, Lowry, & Hendon, 2006) is described by the developers as a basal reader or textbook that tailors the methods and concepts of the Wilson and Orton-Gillingham reading systems developed for native speakers of English (Wilson & Schupack, 1997; Gillingham & Stillman, 1997) to meet the needs of adult ESL literacy level learners.<sup>3</sup> *Sam and Pat* was designed to incorporate the following components of the Wilson/Orton-Gillingham systems:

- ❖ A focus on moving students systematically and sequentially from simple to complex skills and materials;
- ❖ The use of multisensory approaches to segmenting and blending phonemes (e.g., sound tapping);
- ❖ An emphasis on alphabets/decoding, fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension;
- ❖ The use of sound cards and controlled text (wordlists, sentences, stories) for practicing skills learned; and
- ❖ Continual review (cumulative instruction) of letters, sounds, and words already learned.

However, when writing *Sam and Pat*, the developers made variations on the base reading systems to make the text useful and relevant to the adult ESL literacy population for which the text was designed. Specifically, *Sam and Pat* differs from the base reading systems on four dimensions:

- ❖ The sequence in which the sounds of English are taught;
- ❖ The words chosen for phonics and vocabulary study;
- ❖ The simplification of grammar structures presented; and
- ❖ The added bridging of systematic reading instruction to ESL instruction.

---

<sup>3</sup> Although there is no available research on the effectiveness of *Sam and Pat*, the textbook and its accompanying training and technical support is based on these two reading systems (Wilson & Orton-Gillingham), which have shown promise in teaching struggling readers (Adams, 1991; Clark & Uhry, 1995; Kavenaugh, 1991; Torgesen et al., 2006).

## Thank You for previewing this eBook

You can read the full version of this eBook in different formats:

- HTML (Free /Available to everyone)
- PDF / TXT (Available to V.I.P. members. Free Standard members can access up to 5 PDF/TXT eBooks per month each month)
- Epub & Mobipocket (Exclusive to V.I.P. members)

To download this full book, simply select the format you desire below

