

READING INTERVENTION'S AFFECT ON ORAL RETELLING ABILITIES IN  
KINDERGARTEN

A Master's Research Project Presented to

The Faculty of the Patton College of Education and Human Services

Ohio University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Education

by

Kelly Ann Dunick, Reading Education

June, 2011

This Master's Research Project has been approved  
for the Department of Teacher Education

---

Dr. William Earl Smith, Associate Professor, Education

---

Dr. John Henning, Professor and Chair of the Department of Teacher Education

**Table of Contents**

<b>Chapter 1 – Introduction to the Study.....</b>	<b>5</b>
Purpose of the Study.....	6
Definition of Terms.....	7
Limitations.....	7
Summary.....	8
<b>Chapter 2 – Review of Literature.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Chapter 3 – Methodology.....</b>	<b>18</b>
Descriptions of Participants.....	18
Informed Consent Procedures.....	19
Steps Taken to Identify Confidentiality of the Data.....	19
Demographics.....	20
Sampling.....	20
Description of Instrumentation.....	21
Summary.....	22
<b>Chapter 4 – Results.....</b>	<b>24</b>
Analysis of Data.....	27
Summary.....	28
<b>Chapter 5 – Conclusion and Discussion.....</b>	<b>30</b>

Limitations of Results.....30

Conclusions.....31

Recommendations for Future Research.....32

**References.....33**

**CHAPTER 1**

As a reading intervention teacher, it is my responsibility to provide children with supplemental instruction to increase their abilities in all areas of reading. Comprehension is a huge part of reading, and assessing comprehension can tell us a lot about the reading skills a student possesses. One way to check comprehension is through oral retellings. My goal for this study is to find out if reading intervention has a positive effect on a kindergartener's ability to orally retell a story that is read to him or her.

The question I want to answer through this research project is, "does reading intervention have any affect on kindergartners' ability to orally retell a story?" In my intervention classroom, I have noticed that children seem to struggle retelling a story in their own words. I am curious to discover the differences in oral retellings between kindergarten students that come to intervention and students who do not come to intervention. My hypothesis is that reading intervention will have a positive affect on oral retellings of kindergarten students.

I service 20 kindergarten students for intervention in a school in Southeastern Ohio. To determine what students need to be placed in reading intervention, teachers rely on DIBELS (Dynamic Indicator of Basic Early Literacy Skills) scores. Students can fall into three categories on this: "no risk, strategic, or high risk." These levels are determined based on the students scores compared to a set goal for each part of the year. If a student reaches in the goal in 2 or more of the categories, he will be in the "no risk" category. If a student is under the goal in 3 of the categories, he is in the "high risk" group. The "strategic" category is when students meet only half of the set goals for that period in the year. For this study, I randomly selected 5 students that fell into the "strategic" category on DIBELS who are in reading intervention. A control group will be made of 5 students who scored "strategic" that are not in reading intervention, but have similar DIBELS

scores to the 5 who are in intervention. I will read, “A Sick Day for Amos McGee” by Phillip C. Stead (2010), to each student individually. Each student will be asked to retell the story in his or her own words. Each retelling will be scored using a rubric consisting of scores for different parts of the retelling. These parts include the setting, theme, plot, resolution, and sequence. The scores between students in reading intervention and those who are not will be compared. I will repeat this same retelling after students have been in intervention for 6 weeks, to see if the scores change.

I am interested in the results of this study because I have observed how much trouble students have with this particular area of reading. I am also curious to see if the scripted series, Leveled Literacy Intervention by Fountas & Pinnell, we use for reading intervention at my school, is an effective tool for intervention. If my hypothesis is correct, the study will show that intervention is effective in helping children’s oral retelling comprehension.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to see if reading intervention has any affect on a kindergarten student’s ability to orally retell a story. Being able to recall and retell events from a story out loud is an important skill, but one I have noticed my students in reading intervention struggle with. Since intervention is a classroom used to provide supplemental help, I want to see if the intervention program my school is using, is affecting this ability in kindergarten students.

### **Definition of Terms**

The terms used in this research project will be defined in this section of the paper. Terms were defined using dictionary.com.

*DIBELS*: Dynamic Indicator of Basic Early Literacy Skills. It measures the 5 Big Ideas in early literacy as identified by the National Reading Panel: Phonemic awareness, alphabetic principal, accuracy and fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary.

*Comprehension*: The capacity of the mind to perceive and understand; power to grasp ideas; ability to know.

*Retelling*: A new, and often updated or retranslated, version of a story. In this paper, the retellings are done orally from the child's point of view after hearing a story.

*Intervention*: The act or fact or a method of interfering with the outcome or course especially of a condition or process.

### **Limitations**

I foresee a variety of limitations to this study. The numerous limitations make it hard for the results to be used in other classrooms. This particular research project is being used to help me determine how effective the scripted series I use at my school for reading intervention is and how it affects the particular students in the school.

The first limitation is the small sample size of participants in the study. I am only using 10 students, and of those 10, only 5 are actually in reading intervention. The other 5 are acting as the control group. I am also the only one conducting the research. The fact that the sample size is so small does not show a sample relative to a larger population. All of my students come from the same area geographically therefore their background knowledge, limitation in diversity, and race are all very similar. This limitation of diversity makes it hard to compare the results of the study to other classrooms or schools.

Another limitation I foresee is the way in which I interact with my students. Since I interact with these students every day, there is an established relationship between the participants and myself. I might score something differently than another researcher based on what my students say. This limitation would make it hard to get similar results for the study to be done in another school.

All of these limitations make the external validity of this study weak. While the results will help me to determine the effectiveness of the intervention program at my school, they cannot be translated into other schools or classrooms. The results are meant to help me see if intervention has any affect on oral retelling abilities.

### **Summary**

I am a reading intervention teacher for 20 kindergarten students. I am interested in finding out what kind of effect the reading intervention I am providing has on oral retelling abilities of kindergarten students. I will test this by comparing scores of individual story retellings before they enter reading intervention and 6 weeks after they have been in intervention.

I am hypothesizing that reading intervention will have a positive effect on oral retellings of kindergarten students. The results of this study will help me determine the effectiveness of the reading intervention program that is used in my school.

## **CHAPTER 2**

I have read a variety of literature related to my research question, “does reading intervention have any affect on a kindergartner’s ability to orally retell a story?” In my reading intervention classroom, I have noticed that my students struggle when it comes to comprehension and discussing texts we have read. This made me interested in finding out what kind of effects the intervention has on the students’ skills in this area.

### **Review of the Literature**

The following review of literature is organized into two categories. The first category is literature about oral retelling and comprehension in early childhood settings. These articles discuss instructional strategies and provide more in depth information on

different aspects that affect comprehension and retelling skills. The second category is a review of literature about reading intervention programs and the effects they have on early literacy skills. Since I am using a scripted program in my intervention series, it is important to understand the types of reading interventions, the components, and the positives and negatives of those types.

### **Oral Retelling and Comprehension in Early Childhood Settings**

Throughout the literature I have read on retelling and comprehension skills, two main themes kept appearing. The first is how storytelling and certain classroom practices enhance language and literacy abilities, such as comprehension. The second is how storytelling enhances knowledge of story structure. Both of these themes are important in relation to this study. The rubric that is being used for the retellings is mainly based on the elements of the story structure. Also, the oral retellings done by the participants can provide insight into their comprehension of a specific text.

In the article, The Effects of Storytelling and Story Reading on the Oral Language Complexity and Story Comprehension of Young Children, the authors write about the importance of storytelling and story reading on language and literacy growth of young students. Storytelling is when the teacher tells a story to the students and story reading is when a story is read from a book (Isbell, Sobol, Lindauer, and Lowrance, 2004). In this article, a study was conducted to explore the ways that these two aspects of literacy influence language development and story comprehension. This is important for classroom and intervention teachers to know in order to successfully present literature to their students in ways that will help them grow as readers. In one section the authors write, “Story reading can foster communication opportunities for young children” (158). When children are able to communicate ideas more often, it gives them practice in

retelling stories, which can help with the development of different areas comprehension. These researchers found that both storytelling and story reading produce positive gains in oral language (Isbell, Sobol, Lindauer, and Lowrance, 2004).

By exposing children to multiple literary experiences in the classroom, teachers can help increase students' reading skills, including comprehension. According to Lesley Morrow, "active participation in literary experiences enhances the development of comprehension, oral language, and a sense of story structure" (1985). In her article, she describes retelling stories as an active procedure that may aid in comprehension. Like Isbell, Sobol, Lindauer, and Lowrance, Morrow seems to agree that having children participate in literacy experiences, especially storytelling is an important part of early childhood education. In this article, Morrow also went on to explain how there is little research on retelling in the young grades, and that it is not part of the classroom very often. She did a study to see if retelling practice would help improve comprehension in kindergarten students. The more students are able to have the opportunity to retell stories, the more their comprehension improves (Morrow, 1985). Morrow said, "each time children retold a story, they were actively involved." This goes back to what she stated earlier in her article about students being actively involved in literary experiences.

After reading the research, it is obvious that giving children chances to emerge themselves in literary experiences will help develop aspects of their reading. Retelling and storytelling experiences seem to help young children improve their comprehension. If teachers of young children are able to include this in their daily schedules, reading skills could increase early in school, which could possibly prevent reading problems.

Another reoccurring theme in the articles that were reviewed was how storytelling can improve knowledge of story structure. These literary conventions include point of

view, plot, style, characterization, setting, and theme (Mallan, 1991). Lesley Morrow wrote, “Children who are not aware of story structure tell fractured stories with various elements missing, unexplained, or out of sequential order” (page 648). She goes on to explain the role that active retellings can play in the development of a concept of story structure. When children are given multiple experiences of storytelling and opportunities to retell stories, they will begin to develop a sense of story structure, which will ultimately help their oral retelling abilities (Mallan, 1991).

Louise Phillips goes on to agree with Mallan about the importance of oral retellings and storytelling in the classroom. With more practice different levels of comprehension skills can be developed. Phillips writes, “These skills are highly useful for reading comprehension” (page 5). When a child orally retells a story, he or she is demonstrating part of his or her comprehension ability through the elements of the story structure that are included. Encouraging children to develop and use their schema for story retelling will help them learn what to expect in a story and how to decide what is important to remember (Morrow, 1985).

In order to have students become better at retelling stories while improving their comprehension, teachers need to implement strategies to help them succeed in this area. Different suggestions for instructional strategies to use in the classroom reoccurred throughout the articles that were reviewed for this research. Isbell, Sobol, Lindauer, and Lowrance write, “Meaningful experiences, during the early years, can provide language opportunities to enhance and sustain language growth” (page 157). The biggest way teachers can help students reading skills is by providing the meaningful experiences these authors describe.

### **Early Education Reading Interventions**

“20% of children and adults have significant difficulty with reading acquisitions” (Lyon & Moats, 1997). Schools and different reading organizations have recognized this large number across the United States. Implementing reading interventions is one way to help the students who are struggling with reading. Many articles discussing the effectiveness and different types of reading interventions were reviewed for this study. Most of the articles reviewed discussed the effects reading intervention has on comprehension skills.

Once children fall behind, there is a difficult time closing the reading achievement gap in later grades. This is why the prevention of early reading failure has been a major issue in the field of education (Morris, Perney & Tyner, 2000). The No Child Left Behind Act also prompted schools to improve reading instruction. According to Lyon and Moats, most children are dependent on effective reading instruction to learn at optimal levels. Reading intervention provides children, who are struggling, the opportunity to learn specific reading strategies, with more individualized attention. This is especially important in the early grades of elementary school. O’ Connor and Notari-Syverson said, “guidance goes a long way in the spectrum of learning” (1995). The results of their study suggested that intervention delivered by kindergarten teachers were an effective way to improve literacy outcomes of students (1995).

Edmonds, Vaughn, Wexler, Reutebuch, Cable, Tackett, and Schnakenberg did a synthesis of reading interventions and the effects they had on reading comprehension for struggling readers. The different interventions they address in their study are decoding, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. After reviewing multiple types of interventions, they found that students with reading difficulties and disabilities can improve their comprehension when provided with a targeted reading intervention in

comprehension, multiple reading components, or, to a lesser extent, word reading strategies (292). The most important result they found from this study was, that when taught specific reading comprehension practices, struggling readers can improve their reading comprehension (292). This, however, seems like a setback for saying that reading intervention, in general, can improve reading comprehension, because not all interventions teach specific comprehension strategies.

Many articles agreed with Edmonds, Vaughn, Wexler, Reutebuch, Cable, Tackett, and Schnakenberg, in saying reading intervention has positive outcomes for struggling readers. In the article, *Early Steps: Replicating the Effects of a First-Grade Reading Intervention Program*, Morris, Perney, and Tyner discuss an intervention called Reading Recovery, and a replicated intervention called Early Steps, which is based on Reading Recovery. Reading Recovery focuses most on language context (story reading and sentence writing), but they also try to include letter instruction when necessary (Morris, Perney & Tyner, 2000). They write, “the children who benefited most from the intervention were those who were the lowest in reading ability at the start of the school year” (page 681).

In their study, these authors compared a group in the replicated reading intervention group and a control group, which did not receive intervention. Scores from pre-tests on alphabet knowledge, concept of word, phoneme awareness, and word recognition were similar for both groups. After the intervention, the post-tests show drastic differences in scores between the intervention group and the control group (Morris, Perney & Tyner, 2000). Comprehension scores, however, did not have as dramatic of a difference between the groups scores in the post-test. This may be because

the focus of intervention does not deal directly with comprehension skills, rather it focuses on letters, words, and phonics.

The authors of the article *Critical Conceptual and Methodological Considerations in Reading Intervention Research* also agree that reading intervention can have positive effects in young children. Lyon and Moats write, “initial data obtained from longitudinal studies suggest that early direct instruction in phoneme awareness and sound-symbol knowledge (phonics, within a complete reading program, increases decoding skills, word recognition abilities, and, reading comprehension in at-risk kindergarten, first, and second grade students (page 579). In their article, they write that the type of intervention will affect specific areas of reading where the students are likely to succeed. This coincides with the findings of Edmonds, Vaughn, Wexler, Reutebuch, Cable, Tackett, and Schnakenberg. When an intervention is specific toward a certain part of reading, such as phonics, students are more likely to become successful at phonics, but may not improve other reading skills.

All of the articles agreed that early reading intervention does have a positive effect on a struggling reader’s skills. In Lyons and Moats article, they touch on the challenges of researching reading interventions. Research on intervention has been around for a while, but it is hard to come to one generalization about intervention because each type is so different (Lyons & Moats, 1997). While reading intervention seems to have positive effects, it is hard to say what makes those positive effects, because of different methodologies and different needs of students. From all of the articles reviewed, they all seem to agree that it is important to help struggling readers early in their school career, and intervention is one positive way to do this.

## Summary

All of the articles I read provided insight into the importance of fostering reading and language skills early in a child's school career. Teachers can help improve children's comprehension and retelling abilities in a variety of ways. For struggling readers, it is hard for children to orally explain everything they know (Isbell, Sobol, Lindauer & Lowrance, 2004). By giving children the opportunity to have storytelling and story reading experiences in the classroom, teachers can help give them the opportunity to increase these skills. Morrow also suggested giving children the opportunity to emerge themselves into language experiences (1985). Research shows that it is important to take classroom time to give children opportunities to provide meaningful literacy experiences in early childhood classrooms.

To help struggling readers it is also important to provide intervention when necessary. In the article, *A Synthesis of Reading Interventions and Effects on Reading Comprehension Outcomes for Older Struggling Readers*, the authors found that different types of interventions can positively affect specific areas of reading. Schools need to understand the needs of their students to provide to be able to provide the best intervention for their students. Overall, reading intervention seems to have a positive effect on reading skills.

## CHAPTER 3

### Methodology

I am currently investigating the research question, “does reading intervention have any effect on a kindergartner’s ability to orally retell a story?” As a kindergarten reading intervention teacher, I have noticed that most of children struggle with the comprehension part of reading. I am interested to see if reading intervention can help improve that specific skill, and want to use the results of this study to evaluate the scripted series I am using for reading intervention at my school. I will score 10 kindergarten students’ oral retellings of a story that is read aloud to obtain the data that I will use to help answer this research question.

### **Description of Participants**

There are 10 participants in this study. All of the participants are kindergarten students at the school where I teach. They are all five and six years old. All students in the study are Caucasian. The group of participants consists of five boys and five girls. Four of the ten students are on free or reduced lunch at the school. None of the students in the study wear glasses or have any hearing impairments.

All 10 participants are kindergarten students without IEPs. Every one of the students scored in the “strategic” category on the DIBELS assessment. Five of the students are currently in my reading intervention classroom, five are not in any special intervention. All participants are from the same homeroom classroom.

### **Informed Consent Procedures**

Since all of the participants in this study are students in the school where I teach, consent was not necessary. The students in the study will not be doing anything differently than they normally would during their day, so there is no reason to obtain

consent. Students who are receiving the reading intervention are students that would normally come to my classroom during the day. Students are expected to learn the material being taught and participate in the activities during intervention, just as they would every other day. The students in the control group will continue to stay in their regular classroom and are expected to learn what they normally would in their classroom.

Since there is no change in the daily schedule or activities of the students, there is no need to get parental consent. There is no potential harm or risk for the participants in this study, since it is taken place during their normal school day. Finally, I was given formal consent by the school principal to do this study with the kindergarten students.

### **Confidentiality Procedures**

The participants in this study are all students with whom I am familiar since I am teaching some of them and work at the school they all attend. Since there are only 10 participants it makes it easy for me to remember each child's name. To ensure confidentiality I am going to use the students' initials in my results. By using initials, no outside person will be able to identify which student is which. I will safely secure a master copy of the names and initials used in the study in a locked area. Once the study is over, the master copy will be destroyed so no participants' confidentiality will be affected.

### **Demographics**

The school where I am conducting this research project is located in the region of Southeastern Ohio. This area of the state is very rural and poor. The school district encompasses 169 square miles; therefore enrollment rates are very high in the entire district. The area of the school district is a medium to high poverty level. This reflects

some of the students in the school. Some of the students in the school are above the poverty level, but many fall into the medium-high poverty level category.

The elementary school where I teach consists of classrooms for grades Pre-K to 5<sup>th</sup>. There are six classrooms per grade. The average teacher to student ratio is 1:20. There are approximately 782 students enrolled in this school.

Of those 782 students, 52% come from families that are labeled “economically disadvantaged.” The school population is mostly Caucasian, with only about 2% of the students of races other than white. 23% of the students in the school have disabilities. On the most recent state report card, the school fell into the “continuous improvement” category, which means that 50-74.9% of the state indicators were met during the standardized testing. ([www.ode.state.oh.us](http://www.ode.state.oh.us))

### **Sampling**

For my research project, I will randomly select participants. All kindergarten students that fall into the “strategic” category from one kindergarten classroom on the second DIBELS benchmark assessment will be grouped together. Students that are reading intervention will be in one group, and students that stay in the regular classroom will be the control group. I will randomly select five students from the reading intervention group and five students from control group. By randomly selecting the students, I am strengthening the external validity of the study. This sample will be representative of all kindergarten students in intervention and not in intervention.

### **Instrumentation**

For this research experiment, I am going to work with the ten students individually during the school day. Once I have randomly selected the ten students from

the larger population, I will have each child come to the intervention classroom. First I will ask each of the students if they are familiar with the story of “Goldilocks and the Three Bears.” I will have them try to recall details they remember from this story for a quick “practice” of what I am expecting them to do for the research. I plan to explain to the children that I will read them a story and then they will have to tell me what happened in the story in their own words. Once I have done this with each child, I will read “A Sick Day for Amos McGee” by Phillip C. Stead (2010) aloud to each student individually.

After I have read the book aloud, I will ask each child to tell me what happened in the story. To make sure scoring is consistent and fair, I will not ask questions to prompt their thinking. I will only listen to what they say, record each retelling, and score their responses.

Each child’s oral retelling will be recorded on a rubric. The rubric consists of five areas of story telling. These include setting, theme, plot, resolution, and sequence. Each of the five sections is worth ten points, making the total number of possible points on the rubric 50. Once all of the initial retellings are complete I will organize the results in a graph that compares scores of children in reading intervention and those who are not.

I will work with the reading intervention students for a six-week period before re-testing them. Students who are not in reading intervention will stay in their regular classroom during the six weeks. I plan to use the scripted series, *Leveled Literacy Instruction*, I use for reading intervention during that six-week period with the students in the study. I will work on comprehension strategies and have conversations about books we read, but will not do anything differently than I normally would have done. At the end of the six weeks, I will meet, again, with the same ten children individually to test their retellings. I will read “Swimmy” by Leo Lionni (1963) aloud to each of them

individually and record, and score their retellings. Reading a different book will eliminate a practice effect on the scores for the children. I will then organize those into a graph and analyze results from before and after the intervention.

### **Summary**

The research I am conducting will be done with kindergarten students at the school where I teach. I plan to use students from my intervention classroom and students that are not in my intervention room as participants. Once initial oral retelling scores are recorded and organized, I will teach my intervention students as I normally would, using the scripted series, for six weeks. After those six weeks, I will reassess students the exact same way I did the first time. I hope to discover the affects, if any, reading intervention has on the students' ability to retell a story aloud.

## CHAPTER 4

The research question I wanted to answer was, ““does reading intervention have any effect on a kindergartner’s ability to orally retell a story?” I was interested in seeing if the reading intervention program, used at the school where I teach, increases reading comprehension, but more specifically students’ retelling abilities. I conducted research for approximately 2 months. I first collected information from children’s retellings. I read “A Sick Day for Amos McGee” to 10 children individually. 5 of the 10 students were entering my reading intervention classroom and the other 5 acted as the control group. After I read the story to the students, I recorded their retellings, and analyzed them based on a rubric. The rubric contains scores for different components of story structure: setting, plot, resolution, and sequence. After 6 weeks of reading intervention, I reassessed both sets of children using the book, “Swimmy” by Leo Lionni (1963) to see the differences in both retellings, and to compare the control group to the students receiving intervention.

### Results

The following page contains tables with the scores of the pre-intervention retellings. Table 1 has scores for students in the control group, and Table 2 shows the

Student	Setting Score (out of 10)	Theme Score (out of 10)	Plot Score (out of 10)	Resolution (out of 10)	Sequence (out of 10)	Total Score (out of 50)	Percentage
<b>L.C.</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>33.6</b>	<b>67%</b>
<b>M.M</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>26.3</b>	<b>52.6%</b>
<b>H.W.</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>92%</b>
<b>J.J.</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>38.6</b>	<b>77.2%</b>
<b>A.G.</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>28.6</b>	<b>57.2%</b>

scores for the students who were going into intervention. Each table shows the scores for the components of the story structure, the total score, and the percentage of the total points they scored on their retelling.

### **Control Group: First Retelling Scores**

### **Intervention Students: First Retelling Scores**

As seen in the tables, for the pre-retellings, the control group averaged a higher score than the students that were going into intervention. Students going into reading intervention all scored very similar total scores, where the students in the control group had a wide range of scores. The next two tables show the scores for the post-retellings. Table 3 shows the scores for the control group, and Table 4 shows the scores for the intervention group. The (+) and (-) signs indicate an increase or decrease from pre-scores.

Student	Setting Score (out of 10)	Theme Score (out of 10)	Plot Score (out of 10)	Resolution (out of 10)	Sequence (out of 10)	Total Score (out of 50)	Percentage
<b>G.M.</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>28.6</b>	<b>57.2%</b>
<b>A.D.</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>24%</b>
Student	Setting Score (out of 10)	Theme Score (out of 10)	Plot Score (out of 10)	Resolution (out of 10)	Sequence (out of 10)	Total Score (out of 50)	Percentage
<b>L.D.</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>27.6</b>	<b>55.2%</b>
<b>G.M.</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>36.6</b>	<b>73.2% (+)</b>
<b>H.O.</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>28.3</b>	<b>56.6% (+)</b>
<b>A.D.</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>23.3</b>	<b>46.6% (+)</b>
<b>I.D.</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>24.3</b>	<b>48.6% (+)</b>
<b>H.O.</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>33.4</b>	<b>53.2% (-)</b>
<b>J.A.</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>31.6</b>	<b>63.2% (+)</b>

**Control Group: Second Retelling Scores****Intervention Group: Second Retelling Scores**

Student	Setting Score (out of 10)	Theme Score (out of 10)	Plot Score (out of 10)	Resolution (out of 10)	Sequence (out of 10)	Total Score (out of 50)	Percentage
<b>L.C.</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>92% (+)</b>
<b>M.M</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>34.6</b>	<b>69.2% (+)</b>
<b>H.W.</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>38.6</b>	<b>77.2% (-)</b>
<b>J.J.</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>36.6</b>	<b>73.2% (-)</b>
<b>A.G.</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>34.6</b>	<b>69.2% (+)</b>

**Analysis of Results**

In the previous section it shows that almost every student's score increased from the first retelling to the second retelling. For students that received intervention, there was an average of 18.3% increase in their scores. The control group also shows an increase in scores from the first to second retelling. There was, however, one more student in the intervention group with an increased score, than there was in the control group. Research shows that reading intervention has a positive affect on comprehension skills (Edmonds, Vaughn, Wexler, Reutebuch, Cable, Tackett & Schnakenberg, 2009; Lyon & Moats, 1997; Morris, Perney & Tyner, 2000) and the results of this study seem to support that.

The texts I chose to use for the retellings were suggested from an expert on children's literature. She selected the two texts, because they both were short stories and

contained numerous characters, a problem, and a resolution. This made it easier for young students to be able to relate to the text and retell the story. I think pre-screening the texts helped give all 10 children the opportunity to be successful.

The control group stayed in their classrooms during the 6-week period between the first and second retelling. They participated in literacy activities their teacher did within her classroom. The intervention students spent some time in their rooms during their reading block, but also spent 30 minutes receiving additional help with literacy skills in my intervention room. When I took students for intervention, I followed the Leveled Literacy Intervention series we used at my school. One main focus of this program is comprehension. It suggests discussing the text before reading it with the students and to use questioning during and after the reading (Fountas & Pinnell, 2003). Doing this with the students during the 6 -week period could have impacted their comprehension skills, which is a reason for why the scores for the intervention group increased.

Another interesting thing I noticed from the first to second retellings was the increase in the numbers of details. All of the intervention students scored higher in the sequence/story structure section of the rubric on the post assessment. During intervention, we spent time noticing details and stopping to have discussions about what were reading. I think this played another role in why the student's scores increased. Only about half of the students in the control group got a higher score for story structure. During read alouds, it is easier to have meaningful discussions about texts with smaller groups of students. I think this is another factor that impacted the outcomes of this study.

I believe using the intervention series and by those 5 students receiving additional literacy instruction, it gave them more opportunity to increase their comprehension skills.

There has been considerable research that examines and supports both the effectiveness and the aspects of intervention that contribute to successful literacy development (Gregory & Schmitt, 2001). The results of this study support the effectiveness of intervention.

### **Summary**

My hypothesis for this study was that reading intervention would have a positive effect on a kindergarten student's ability to orally retell a story. The results from this study support my hypothesis. I expected the control groups average score to stay similar, with a little increase, to the initial retelling, but it actually decreased. The intervention students' score increased a pretty significant amount from the pre-retelling. This shows that the intervention was effective in helping the student's recall ability.

Most of the research I have read on intervention and recalling suggests that reading intervention has a positive effect in the literacy life of young children especially. While my study was done on a very small scale, the results positively reflect what the research says.

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **Conclusions and Discussions**

For this study I wanted to find out what kind of effect reading intervention has on a kindergarten student's ability to orally retell a text. I read a book to 10 students individually and had them retell the story to me. Using a rubric, I scored the retellings of each student. Based on DIBELS scores, half of the students entered reading intervention for 6 weeks and half stayed in the regular classroom for reading. After 6 weeks, I had the students do another story retelling with a different book. I compared the scores of the first and second retellings and the differences in scores between the intervention and control group.

### **Limitations of Results**

The research I conducted gave me positive results for this specific study, but there are some limitations to the results. The first limitation is the amount of students in the study. With the small number of participants in the study, it is hard to determine if the results are very accurate. If the study had had more students, it would give more opportunity for a larger variety of scores, which would make the results compatible on a larger scale. Unfortunately with the amount of students in the school, this was the largest number of students I was able to get to participate in the study.

Another limitation is that I know the intervention students very well. This could have made me score their retellings differently than someone who did not know them as well. By being the only researcher, it provides consistency with the scores, but the scores could be biased based on what I know about the students or by what I thought they meant when they did their retellings. This would alter the scores than if someone else did the study.

If another researcher were to do this study in a different classroom or school, there is a chance the results could be the same; but they could also be very different. The type of intervention being used, the area where the school is, and the number of students in the study could all change results. Also, teachers have different teaching styles and all children interpret texts differently, which is another reason why this study could have different results if done by another researcher.

## **Conclusion**

After this 2 month-long study, I have come to the conclusion that reading intervention has a positive effect on a student's ability to orally retell a story. I have come to this conclusion based on research articles I have read about the topic and based

on the results of this study. The results showed a positive increase in oral retelling scores from before reading intervention to after a 6 week long reading intervention period.

The intervention program used at my school focuses on comprehension skills along with other early literacy skills. During the 6-week intervention children were exposed to a variety of texts. Before, during, and after the readings I would ask the children questions and have them discuss the story to help improve comprehension skills. I believe this played a big role in the results of this study. Reading intervention seems to have a positive effect, not only on reading skills, but on comprehension and retelling skills as well.

### **Recommendations for Future Research**

The first recommendation for future research would be to do this study in a number of grade levels. While comprehension skills obviously increase as students get older, it would be interesting to compare the scores of pre and post retellings after students enter intervention. This would also provide more feedback about the specific intervention being used at my school. Also, if this was done with a larger group of participants the results would be more likely to be compared to a larger population, making them more reliable and generalizable. Unfortunately I was limited in the grade and the number of students in this particular study, but I think if it was done on a larger scale it would show what the research says; that intervention increases comprehension skills in young students.

Another recommendation would be to continue the intervention with the students and do another retelling after six weeks. I think it would be interesting to see if retelling

scores would keep increasing over time, or begin to decline at some point in the students' education. Comparing this to students who stay in the regular classroom would be interesting as well.

I would also recommend doing this study with different types of intervention programs. Being able to compare programs and results would help validate what research says about the effects of reading intervention. For my school, the program seems to have positive effects, but this could differ at a different school using another intervention program.

## REFERENCES

Dictionary.com. (2011). *Find the Meanings and Definitions of Words at Dictionary.com*

Retrieved April 4, 2011, from <http://dictionary.reference.com>

Edmonds, M., Vaughn, S., Wexler, J., Reutebuch, C., Cable, A., Klingler, T.,

Schnakenberg, J. (2009, Spring). A Synthesis of Reading Interventions and Effects

on Reading Comprehension Outcomes for Older Struggling Readers. *Review of Educational Research, 79* (1), 262-300.

Gregory, A. & Schmitt, M. (2001). The Impact of an Early Literacy Intervention: Where Are the Children Now? *Literacy Teaching and Learning, 10* (1), 1-20.

Isbell, R., Sobol, J., Lindauer, L., & Lowrance, A. (2004, December). The Effects of Storytelling and Story Reading on the Oral Language Complexity and

- Story Comprehension of Young Children. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 32 (3), 157-163.
- Lionni, L. (1963). *Swimmy*. New York: Dragonfly Books.
- Lyon, G.R., Moats, L.C. (1997, November). Critical Conceptual and Methodological Considerations in Reading Intervention Research. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 30 (6), 578-588.
- Mallan, K. (1991). *Children as Storytellers*. Newton, Sydney: PETA
- Morris, D., Perney, J., Tyner, B. (2000). Early Steps: Replicating the Effects of a First Grade Reading Intervention Program. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92 (4), 681-693.
- Morrow, L. (1985). Retelling Stories: A Strategy For Improving Young Children's Comprehension, Concept of Story Structure, and Oral Language Complexity. *The Elementary School Journal*, 85 (5), 648-660.
- O'Connor, R. E., & Notari-Syverson, A. (1995, April). *Ladders to Literacy: The effects of teacher-led phonological activities for kindergarten children with and without disabilities*.
- Ohio Department of Education (n.d.), Ohio.gov, Retrieved on April 15, 2011 from <http://www.ode.state.oh.us>.
- Stead, P. (2010). *A Sick Day for Amos McGee*. New York: Roaring Brook Press.