

# Florida Center for Reading Research

## SRA Corrective Reading

### What is Corrective Reading?

*Corrective Reading* is a comprehensive intervention program designed for students in grades 4-12. It targets students who are reading one or more years below grade level and is appropriate for students who are in special education classrooms as well. The 3 essential goals of the program are increasing reading accuracy (decoding), developing reading fluency, and building reading comprehension. *Corrective Reading* can be implemented in small groups (4-5 students) or whole-class format. Each lesson is 45-minutes in length and intended to be taught by teachers 4-5 times per week.

The program is tightly sequenced, offering 2 distinct Intervention Strands: Decoding and Comprehension. There are 4 levels at each of these two strands that address varied reading skills and ability levels. The Decoding strand is appropriate for students that have trouble identifying words, understanding how the arrangement of letters in a word relate to its pronunciation, and whose reading rate is inefficient. Comprehension programs are suitable for students that have limited vocabulary, narrow background knowledge and inadequate thinking skills. The Decoding strand lesson format incorporates word-attack skills practice, group reading, individual reading checkouts, and workbook exercises. The Comprehension strand lesson format synthesizes thinking operations, workbook exercises, information, and oral group work.

The number of lessons within the program varies depending on the strand. Both Comprehension and Decoding have three levels devoted to half-year implementation (Levels, A, B1, B2) and one level devoted to full year implementation (Level C). The Decoding strand contains 65 lessons in level A, B1, B2 and 125 lessons in level C. The Comprehension strand contains 60 lessons in level A and B1, 65 lessons in level B2, and 140 lessons in level C.

Teacher materials include a Series Guide (contains reproducible placement tests and sample lessons), Teacher Decoding Presentation Book (provides explicit step-by-step script, chalkboard activities, and point system chart), Teacher Comprehension Presentation Book (provides explicit step-by-step scripts, vocabulary activities, and point system charts), Teacher Guide (contains tips and techniques for correcting mistakes, summarizes strategies, and additional ideas for teaching specific skills and motivating students), Blackline Masters (provide additional practice exercises), Sunshine State Standards/Benchmarks Checklist (illustrates correlation to daily lessons), Ancillary Materials (include standardized test format booklets), and Mastery Test Packages (include Test Administrator's manual).

Student materials consist of Hard-Cover Student Decoding Textbooks (Levels A, B1, B2, C), Hard-Cover Student Comprehension Textbooks (Levels A, B1, B2, C), Student Decoding Workbooks (Levels A, B1, B2, C), and Student Comprehension Workbooks (Levels A, B1, B2, C). Both strands of the program (Decoding and Comprehension) contain Placement and Mastery Tests.



## How is the Content and Instructional Design of Corrective Reading Aligned with Scientifically Based Reading Research?

In order for a comprehensive program to be fully aligned with scientifically based reading research (SBRR), its instructional content includes all 5 components of Reading (Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension). In addition, its instructional design incorporates explicit instructional strategies, coordinated instructional sequences, ample practice opportunities, and aligned student materials. *Corrective Reading* is consistent with SBRR.

Phonemic Awareness (PA) is taught directly in the early levels of the program (Decoding strand, Levels A and B1). Phoneme segmenting, blending, and manipulating are essential elements in these early lessons. Auditory activities are present in each lesson (decoding strand, levels A, B1, B2) and begin with easier PA activities, later progressing to more difficult tasks while following the continuum of word types. The teacher models PA and provides guided practice.

Phonics instruction is systematic and explicit. Only frequent, highly regular letter-sound relationships are taught. Segmenting and blending previously learned sounds are included in each lesson. Letter-sound correspondences are taught to mastery and reviewed frequently. Once letter sounds have been mastered, they are immediately applied to reading words, sentences, and text (Decoding strand, levels A, B1, B2). Decodable text is provided for practice of applying skills with phonic elements and there is an emphasis on reading multisyllabic words.

Fluency instruction is addressed in the Group Reading and Reading Checkout parts of each lesson (Decoding strand, levels B1 [beginning at lesson 7], B2, C). The research-based strategy, partner reading, is utilized during the Reading Checkout section. The teacher models prosody and immediate feedback is given to students in the form of a formal correction procedure. Fluency goals are included and require students to meet a precise criterion for rate and accuracy. In particular, Decoding strand level A requires students to master reading 60 words per minute (WPM) with 90% accuracy, levels B1 requires reading of 90 wpm with 98% accuracy, level B2 requires reading 120 wpm with 98% accuracy, and level C requires reading 150 WPM.

Vocabulary is present in the program as a prerequisite to comprehension. In particular, a vocabulary section is included in every lesson before Group Reading (decoding strand, level C). Vocabulary instruction directly teaches important, difficult, and useful words. Listening, reading, and speaking vocabularies are addressed in the format of the daily lesson. Students are provided with multiple opportunities to work with new words in reading sentences, paragraphs, and longer text. The meanings of the most common prefixes and suffixes are taught before connecting them to words. Previously introduced words are reviewed cumulatively over several lessons.

Comprehension is taught using questioning, a research-based strategy proven to increase understanding. Questions are dispersed throughout the text. Prediction questions are provided at the beginning so that students may anticipate text content and activate prior knowledge (Decoding strand, levels B1, B2, C). Expository text is provided to teach cause/effect, inference, main idea, text structure, and sequence (Comprehension strand, levels B1, B2, C). In addition, students are taught how to locate, and interpret graphs, maps, charts, and diagrams.

SRA offers a plethora of professional development using a "scaffolding" approach to facilitate fidelity of delivery. Each summer, two intensive training sessions are offered for teachers. Professional Development for school administrators is

provided at the awareness level. Administrators receive special training (½ day) designed to familiarize them with program monitoring techniques and devices. Throughout the school year, smaller sessions of teacher trainings are held (1 day for the decoding strand and ½ day for the comprehension strand). During the first year, schools receive 3 consultation visits (1 visit for a demonstration lesson taught by a consultant, 2 visits for on-going coaching).

In the second year, the visits decrease from 3 to 2 (for coaching only). At this time, consultants are also targeting exemplary teachers to act as school-wide mentors. In the third year, visits decrease from 2 to 1 (program monitoring or coaching). Professional development by *SRA* can be customized to meet the needs of the individual school by providing more intensive training where needed (or focusing on small or large student population).

### Research Support for Corrective Reading

*SRA Corrective Reading* was developed in 1975. It was later revised and published as Decoding B of the 1978 Corrective Reading Series. In 1990, another revision occurred (Campbell, 1984). *SRA Corrective Reading* has been widely implemented in the United States and used in England. *SRA* reports results of studies implemented in both countries.



One study was conducted in a K-6 elementary school (large urban school district in the Southwest of the United States) in 1993 with 26 students (Vitale, Medland, Romance, & Weaver, 1993). *SRA Corrective Reading* was implemented in two randomly assigned, Chapter 1 classrooms (grades 4-6). Students received instruction in the program for 1 hour per day, 5 days per week in a whole-group format. The treatment group (Chapter 1 students receiving the program) was compared against 1 randomized control group and 2 quasi-experimental control groups (Chapter 1 students not receiving the program). After an 85-day treatment period (January–May), in a pre and posttest design, students were administered the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS). When their performance was compared to the previous years performance on the same test, the treatment group (N=26) gained 1.6 months in Reading and 2.1 months in Vocabulary whereas the control group (N=unknown) gained .8 months in Reading and .6 in Vocabulary. Though these are substantial gains for the treatment group in comparison to the control groups, it is unknown whether these differences were statistically reliable, which limits the interpretation of these findings. Although the author reports favorable improvement relative to the quasi-experimental control groups, the lack of information (i.e., group size, pretest scores, classroom instruction, etc.) renders these comparisons uninterpretable.

Another study, that did not use random assignment, was implemented in two remedial reading classes in England in 1982 (Gregory, Hackney, & Gregory, 1982). Two teachers implemented the *SRA Corrective Reading* program for 4 hours a week (2 days per week, 1 class period; 1 day per week, 2 class periods), 3 days each week over 5 months. In a pre and posttest design, students were administered the Daniels and Diack Test of Reading Experience in January and June 1980. On average in 5 months, the treatment group (N=11) gained approximately 22 months whereas the control group (N=8) gained substantially less (approximately 2.5 months).

Whereas many other studies have been conducted of *Corrective Reading*, the designs of these studies did not allow for interpretation regarding the efficacy of the program. However, one relevant meta-analysis of Direct Instruction programs

(including versions of *Corrective Reading*) did find support for this instructional method (Borman, Hewes, Overman, & Brown, 2002).

To conclude, the instructional content and design of *Corrective Reading* is consistent with Scientifically Based Reading Research. However, the existing research base provides only preliminary support for the program's efficacy. The basic problem with the research base is that most studies do not involve random assignment to instructional conditions. Additionally, the current research focuses almost solely on the decoding components of *Corrective Reading*. Therefore, the comprehension components have yet to be adequately researched. Currently, *Corrective Reading* is one of four reading programs being included in the Power4Kids Initiative, which is a randomized field trial of intervention methods for struggling readers in grades 3 and 5. Because of the design of this study, it will provide important new information both about the effectiveness of each of the methods in the study and also will examine their relative effectiveness when compared to one another.

## Strengths & Weaknesses

### Strengths of *Corrective Reading*:

- Lessons are explicit and systematic.
- Continual coaching is provided by consultants (e.g., classroom seating design, classroom/materials procedure, motivation activities).
- Practical training sessions are available throughout the year as "refresher" courses.
- Consultants are accessible via e-mail and telephone.
- Prompt customer service is available to receive materials ordered or missing items.
- Easy to follow ancillary materials are available for FCAT practice.
- Sunshine State Standards/Benchmarks checklist showing correlation to daily lessons is included with teacher materials.
- A comprehensive booklet of the research base which cites empirical studies using the program is provided.
- A Direct instruction video library for teachers that shows model lessons and real classroom scenarios is available.
- Teacher's manual is well organized with an "easy to follow" lesson plan.
- Minimal teacher preparation is required.

### Weaknesses of *Corrective Reading*:

- Fluency goals for the program are minimal.
- Some teachers may find it difficult to adapt to the repetitive style of instruction.

## Which Florida districts have schools that implement *Corrective Reading*?


Alachua	352-955-7527
Brevard	321-633-1000
Citrus	352-726-1931
Clay	904-284-6510
Collier	239-254-4100
Dade	305-995-1428
Duval	904-390-2115
Escambia	850-469-6130
Hernando	352-797-7001
Lee	239-337-8301

Marion	352-671-7702
Orange	407-317-3202
Pinellas	727-588-6011
Suwannee	386-364-2604

## For More Information

[www.sraonline.com/index.php/home/curriculumsolutions/di/correctivereading/102](http://www.sraonline.com/index.php/home/curriculumsolutions/di/correctivereading/102)

## References

- Beck, I. L., Perfetti, C. A., & McKeown, M. G. (1982). Effects of long-term vocabulary instruction on lexical access and reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 74*, 506-521.
- 
- Borman, G. D., Hewes, G. M., Overman, L. T., & Brown, S. (2002). *Comprehensive school reform and student achievement*. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk, Johns Hopkins University.
- Campbell, M. L. (1984). *Corrective Reading* program evaluated with secondary students in San Diego. *ADI News, 7*, 15-17.
- Foorman, B., Francis, D., Fletcher, J., Mehta, P., & Schatschneider, C. (1998). The role of instruction in learning to read: Preventing reading failure in at-risk children. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*, 37-55.
- Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., & Maxwell, L. (1988). The validity of informal reading comprehension measures. *Remedial and Special Education (RASE), 9*, 20-28.
- Gregory, R. P., Hackney, C., & Gregory, N. M. (1982). Corrective reading programme: An evaluation. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 52 (part 1)*, 33-50.
- Hasbrouck, J. E., & Tindal, G. (1992). Curriculum-based oral reading fluency norms for students in grades 2 through 5. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 24(3)*, 41-44.
- Vitale, M., Medland, M., Romance, N., & Weaver, H. P. (1993). Accelerating reading and thinking skills of low-achieving elementary students. Implications for curricular change. *Effective School Practices, 12*, 26-31.

Lead Reviewer: Sharon A. Smith, M.S.  
Date Posted: March, 2004

The content of this report is informational and factual. It is not to be construed as an advertisement, endorsement, or an officially "approved" product. Please view the Reader's Guide to FCRR Reports for an overview of the conditions under which these reports were prepared <http://www.fcrr.org/reports.htm>

Please send comments about this report to Marcia L. Grek, Ph.D.: [reports@fcrr.org](mailto:reports@fcrr.org)