

What Works Clearinghouse



Reading Mastery

Effectiveness No studies of *Reading Mastery* that fell within the scope of the Beginning Reading review meet WWC evidence standards. The lack of studies meeting WWC evidence standards means that, at this time, the WWC is unable to draw any conclusions based on research about the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of *Reading Mastery*.

Program Description¹

Reading Mastery, one of several curriculum components that constitute the Scientific Research Associate's Direct Instruction curriculum, is designed to provide systematic instruction in English language reading. *Reading Mastery* is a full-year curriculum and is available in two versions, *Reading Mastery Classic* levels I and II (for use in grades K–3) and *Reading Mastery Plus*, an integrated reading language program for grades K–6. The program begins by teaching phonemic awareness and sound-letter correspondence and progresses to word and passage

reading, vocabulary development, comprehension, and building oral reading fluency. Later lessons emphasize accurate and fluent decoding while teaching students the skills necessary to comprehend and learn from expository text. Lessons are designed to be fast-paced and interactive. Students are grouped by similar reading level, based on program placement tests. The program includes placement assessments and a continuous monitoring component.

The WWC identified 61 studies of *Reading Mastery* that were published or released between 1985 and 2007.

Fifteen studies are within the scope of the review and have an eligible design, but do not meet WWC evidence standards.

- Six use quasi-experimental designs, but do not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.
- Nine studies have a confounding factor, such as combining with other interventions, which makes it impossible to attribute the observed effect solely to *Reading Mastery*.

Thirty studies are outside the scope of the review because they have an ineligible design that does not meet WWC evidence standards, such as having no comparison group.

Sixteen studies are out of the scope of the review, as defined by the Beginning Reading protocol, for reasons other than study design.

- Ten studies either do not include or report disaggregated results for students in grades K-3.
- Six studies are not studies of the effectiveness of *Reading Mastery* or do not measure the impact of *Reading Mastery* in outcomes domains identified in the review protocol.

¹The descriptive information for this program was obtained from a publicly-available source: the program's website (https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/Research/Reading/RM_Results_Brochure_low.pdf, downloaded June 2008). Further verification of the accuracy of the descriptive information for this program is beyond the scope of this review.

References

Studies that fall outside the Beginning Reading protocol or do not meet evidence standards.

- Airhart, K. M. (2005). The effectiveness of Direct Instruction in reading compared to a state mandated language arts curriculum for ninth and tenth graders with specific learning disabilities. Nashville, Tennessee: Tennessee State University. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample within the age or grade range specified in the protocol.
- Ashworth, D. R. (1999). Effects of Direct Instruction and basal reading instruction programs on the reading achievement of second graders. *Reading Improvement*, 35(4), 150–156. The study does not meet WWC standards because the measures of effect cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—there was only one unit of analysis in one or both conditions.
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Council of Chief State School Officers. (2003). City Springs Elementary School, Baltimore, MD. In *Results with Reading Mastery* (pp. 14–15). New York: McGraw-Hill. The study is ineligible for review because it does not disaggregate findings for the age or grade range specified in the protocol.
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Council of Chief State School Officers. (2003). Eshelman Avenue Elementary, Lomita, CA. In *Results with Reading Mastery* (pp. 16–17). New York: McGraw-Hill. The study is ineligible for review because it does not disaggregate findings for the age or grade range specified in the protocol.
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Council of Chief State School Officers. (2003). Fort Worth Independent School District, Fort Worth, TX. In *Results with Reading Mastery* (pp. 4–5). New York: McGraw-Hill. The study is ineligible for review because it does not disaggregate findings for the age or grade range specified in the protocol.
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Council of Chief State School Officers. (2003). Lebanon School District, Lebanon, PA. In *Results with Reading Mastery* (pp. 8–9). New York: McGraw-Hill. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample within the age or grade range specified in the protocol.

- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Council of Chief State School Officers. (2003). Park Forest-Chicago Heights School District 163, Chicago, IL. In *Results with Reading Mastery* (pp. 10–11). New York: McGraw-Hill. The study is ineligible for review because it does not disaggregate findings for the age or grade range specified in the protocol.
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Council of Chief State School Officers. (2003). Portland Elementary School, Portland, OR. In *Results with Reading Mastery* (pp. 2–3). New York: McGraw-Hill. The study is ineligible for review because it does not disaggregate findings for the age or grade range specified in the protocol.
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Council of Chief State School Officers. (2003). Roland Park Elementary/Middle School, Baltimore, MD. In *Results with Reading Mastery* (pp. 12–13). New York: McGraw-Hill. The study is ineligible for review because it does not disaggregate findings for the age or grade range specified in the protocol.
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Council of Chief State School Officers. (2003). Wilson Primary School, Phoenix, AZ. In *Results with Reading Mastery* (pp. 6–7). New York: McGraw-Hill. The study is ineligible for review because it does not disaggregate findings for the age or grade range specified in the protocol.
- Brent, G., Diobilda, N., & Gavin, F. (1986). Camden Direct Instruction project 1984–1985. *Urban Education*, 21(2), 138–148. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent at baseline.
- Carlson, C. D., & Francis, D. J. (2002). Increasing the reading achievement of at-risk children through Direct Instruction: Evaluation of the Rodeo Institute for Teacher Excellence (RITE). *Journal of Direct Instruction*, 3(1), 29–50. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the measures of effect cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—the intervention was combined with another intervention.

References *(continued)*

- Comprehensive School Reform Quality Center. (2006, November). CSRQ center report on elementary school CSR models. Washington, DC: Comprehensive School Reform Quality Center, American Institutes for Research. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Flores, M. M., & Ganz, J. B. (2007). Effectiveness of Direct Instruction for teaching statement inference, use of facts, and analogies to students with developmental disabilities and reading delays. *Focus on Autism & Other Developmental Disabilities, 22*(4), 244-251. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Gunn, B., Smolkowski, K., Biglan, A., & Black, C. (2002). Supplemental instruction in decoding skills for Hispanic and non-Hispanic students in early elementary school: A follow-up. *Journal of Special Education, 36*(2), 69-79. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the measures of effect cannot be attributed solely to the intervention – the intervention was combined with another intervention.
- Additional Citation:
Gunn, B., Smolkowski, K., Biglan, A., Black, C., & Blair, J. (2005). Fostering the development of reading skill through supplemental instruction: Results for Hispanic and non-Hispanic students. *Journal of Special Education, 39*(2), 66-86.
- Humphries, T., Neufeld, M., Johnson, C., Engels, K., & McKay, R. (2005). A pilot study of the effect of direct instruction programming on the academic performance of students with intractable epilepsy. *Epilepsy & Behavior, 6*(3), 405-412. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Jones, C. D. (2002). Effects of Direct Instruction programs on the phonemic awareness abilities of kindergarten students. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63*(03), 902A. (UMI No. 3044898). The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the measures of effect cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—the intervention was combined with another intervention.
- Jordan, N. L. (2005). Basal readers and reading as socialization: What are children learning? *Language Arts, 82*(3), 204-213. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Joseph, B. L. (2000). Teacher expectations of low-SES preschool and elementary children: Implications of a research-validated instructional intervention for curriculum policy and school reform. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65*(01), 35A. (UMI No. 3120273). The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Kamps, D., Abbott, M., Greenwood, C., Arreaga-Mayer, C., Wills, H., Longstaff, J., et al. (2007). Use of evidence-based, small-group reading instruction for English language learners in elementary grades: Secondary-tier intervention. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 30*(3), 153-168. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the measures of effect cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—the intervention was combined with another intervention.
- Kamps, D. M., & Greenwood, C. R. (2005). Formulating secondary-level reading interventions. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 38*(6), 500-509. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- League, M. B. (2001). The effect of the intensity of phonological awareness instruction on the acquisition of literacy skills. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 62*(10), 3299A. (UMI No. 3027542). The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent at baseline.
- Mac Iver, M. A., & Kemper, E. (2002). The impact of Direct Instruction on elementary students' reading achievement in an urban school district. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 72*(2), 197-220. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the measures of effect cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—the intervention was not implemented as designed.
- Marchand-Martella, N. E., Martella, R. C., Kolts, R. L., Mitchell, D., & Mitchell, C. (2006). Effects of a three-tier strategic model of intensifying instruction using a research-based core reading program in grades K-3. *Journal of Direct Instruction, 6*(1), 49-72. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.

References *(continued)*

- O'Brien, D. M., & Ware, A. M. (2002, March). Implementing research-based reading programs in the Fort Worth Independent School District. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 7(2), 167–195. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent at baseline.
- Ryder, R. J., Burton, J. L., & Silberg, A. (2006). Longitudinal study of direct instruction effects from first through third grades. *Journal of Educational Research*, 99(3), 180-191. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the measures of effect cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—there was only one unit of analysis in one or both conditions.
- Ryder, R. J., Sekulski, J. L., & Silberg, A. (2003). Results of Direct Instruction reading program evaluation longitudinal results: First through third grade 2000–2003. Retrieved from University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee Web site: http://www.uwm.edu/News/PR/04.01/DI_Final_Report_2003. PDF. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent at baseline.
- Shippen, M. E., Houchins, D. E., Calhoon, M. B., Furlow, C. F., & Sartor, D. L. (2006). The effects of comprehensive school reform models in reading for urban middle school students with disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education*, 27(6), 322-328. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a sample within the age or grade range specified in the protocol.
- Smolkowski, K., Biglan, A., Barrera, M., Taylor, T., Black, C., & Blair, J. (2005). Schools and homes in partnership (SHIP): Long-term effects of a preventive intervention focused on social behavior and reading skill in early elementary school. *Prevention Science: The Official Journal of the Society for Prevention Research*, 6(2), 113-125. The study is ineligible for review because it does not include an outcome within a domain specified in the protocol.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2005). All grade 3 students in two Monroe, Wisconsin elementary schools score proficient or advanced in reading. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/monroe_di.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2005). Barren County elementary schools post highest reading scores ever. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/barren_di1.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2005). California blue ribbon school closes achievement gap with Reading Mastery. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/richfield_di.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2005). Delaware charter school students maintain high reading scores. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/east_side_di.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2005). Florida elementary students master reading in preparation for junior high. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/clay_hill_di.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2005). Miami elementary school boosts FCAT scores with Reading Mastery. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/parkway_di.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2005). Milwaukee elementary nearly doubles reading scores. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/honey_creek_di1.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2005). Oregon Reading First project uses Reading Mastery Plus as core reading program. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/MiltonFreewater_DI.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2005). Phoenix inner-city students strive toward national reading average. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/wilson_di.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.

References *(continued)*

- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2005). Reading Mastery helps Florida students advance two grade levels in reading. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/gulf_di.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2005). Reading Mastery Plus helps Colorado school achieve AYP for first time. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/ivywild_di.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2005). Washington elementary students excel on WASL, ITBS with Reading Mastery Plus. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/evergreen_di.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2006). Cleveland school keeps Reading Mastery as curriculum core. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/louisa_may_alcott_di1.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2006). DIBELS scores advance to grade level with Reading Mastery. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/Edgewood_DI.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2006). Exceptional education and regular education students excel with Direct Instruction. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/Iredell_DI_FNL.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2006). Florida school moves from D grade to A with Reading Mastery. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/AltaVista_DI.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2006). Native American school uses Reading First grant to implement Direct Instruction. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/NayAhShing_DI.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2006). Reading Mastery, Corrective Reading help students with disabilities achieve significant academic growth. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/Clover_DI.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2006). Reading proficiency more than doubles among Putnam County special education students. Retrieved from SRA Web site: <https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/PutnamCo.pdf>. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2006). Struggling Milwaukee readers make strong gains with Direct Instruction. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/EastHS_DI.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2006). Utah school district maintains high language arts scores with Direct Instruction. Retrieved from SRA Web site: <https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/Cache.pdf>. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2007). Low-performing Kentucky school on its way to high-performing with Reading Mastery. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/Highland_DI_FNL.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2007). Reading Mastery helps special education students meet state reading standards. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/Marmarton_DI.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2007). Reading scores rise at Alabama elementary with Reading Mastery Plus. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/ElbaElem_DI.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2007). SRA/McGraw-Hill's reading programs bring increases in Baltimore's scores. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/Baltimore_DI_07.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.

References *(continued)*

- SRA/McGraw-Hill. (2007). Title I schools in North Carolina district meet all-state reading targets with Direct Instruction. Retrieved from SRA Web site: https://www.sraonline.com/download/DI/EfficacyReports/Brunswick-ER_FNL.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Thames, D., Kazelskis, R., & Kazelskis, C. R. (2006). Reading performance of elementary students: Results of a five-year longitudinal study of direct reading instruction. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Birmingham, AL. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent at baseline.
- Thomson, B. (1991). Pilot study of the effectiveness of a Direct Instruction model (reading mastery fast cycle) as a supplement to a literature based delivery model (Houghton-Mifflin Integrated Reading Program) in two regular first grade classrooms. *Florida Educational Research Council Research Bulletin*, 23(2), 3–23. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent at baseline.
- Umbach, B., Darch, C., & Halpin, G. (1989). Teaching reading to low performing first graders in rural schools: A comparison of two instructional approaches. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 16(3), 112–121. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the measures of effect cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—the intervention was combined with another intervention.
- Wilson, P., Martens, P., & Arya, P. (2005). Accountability for reading and readers: What the numbers don't tell. *Reading Teacher*, 58(7), 622-631. The study is ineligible for review because it does not examine the effectiveness of an intervention.
- Wiltz, N., & Wilson, G. P. (2006). An inquiry into children's reading in one urban school using SRA Reading Mastery (direct instruction). *Journal of Literacy Research*, 37(4), 493-528. The study did not meet WWC evidence standards because the measures of effect cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—there was only one unit of analysis in one or both conditions.