

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 364 833

CS 011 474

AUTHOR Jarvis-Janik, Margaret  
 TITLE The Effectiveness of ESEA Chapter I Pull-Out Programs on Reading Achievement.  
 PUB DATE [93]  
 NOTE 18p.  
 PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.  
 DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Elementary School Students; Hispanic Americans; \*Instructional Effectiveness; Intermediate Grades; \*Program Effectiveness; \*Reading Achievement; \*Reading Programs; Reading Research; Remedial Reading

IDENTIFIERS Chicago Public Schools IL; Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; \*Pullout Programs

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the effectiveness of an Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Pull-out program on the reading achievement of Hispanic fifth- and sixth-grade participants. Earlier research on the effectiveness of such programs was inconclusive. Subjects, 30 randomly chosen students from a Chicago public school who received instruction in an ESEA Pull-out program while in fourth and fifth grade and 30 randomly chosen students from the regular reading program, completed the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, which served as the pre- and posttests. Results indicated no significant changes in reading achievement of both groups. (One table of data is included; contains 19 references). (RS)

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
 \* from the original document. \*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

Margaret Jarvis-Janik

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ESEA CHAPTER I  
PULL-OUT PROGRAMS ON READING ACHIEVEMENT

ED 364 833

**BEST COPY AVAILABLE**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*M. Jarvis Janik*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CS011474

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ESEA CHAPTER I  
PULL-OUT PROGRAMS ON READING ACHIEVEMENT

There has been an interest in the relevance of the Chapter I ESEA Reading Pull-out program in regards to the reading achievement gains of the ESEA students. This study will investigate the effectiveness of ESEA Pull-out programs. More research is needed to assess effective pull-out programs for the disadvantaged learners who progress at a much slower rate than the average learner. Consequently, additional research is needed to replicate previous studies, to add to the state of knowledge in this area, fill in a much needed information gap on the learning styles of children and confirm findings of similar studies. However this student will deal with Hispanic students in ESEA Pull-Out reading programs. The findings will be of value and interest to administrators, teachers, parents and the general public.

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was originally enacted in 1965 (P.L. 89-10) as a cornerstone of President Lyndon B. Johnson's "War on Poverty." It was the federal government's first wide and direct involvement in elementary and secondary education. There were two reasons why President Johnson succeeded where earlier attempts to secure federal school aid failed. The enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 barred aid to segregated schools, settling a dispute that had killed many school-aid bills. Also, the program focused aid on individual disadvantaged children, rather than provide general aid, allowing administration to negotiate a compromise that allowed for the participation of even children in private schools, thus, winning the support of the Catholic lobby without alienating traditional aid supporters.

One issue was left unresolved during the Congressional debate: was Title I truly an anti-poverty program or a device that made it politically possible for the federal government to provide general aid to schools? (Educational Funding Research Council, 1992-93).

Many of the program's supporters viewed it as simply a way to achieve the goal of aiding schools, and many school officials were happy to follow that interpretation, spending Title I funds on such things as upgrading the general appearance of segregated black schools without providing new programs. In the late 1960's reports of abuses began to surface, contributing to the major revisions of Title I.

Congress also felt other pressures. While those in favor of the program envisioned a vast program that would improve the education of poor children, federal resources were becoming less and less and it made sense to fund only the neediest children. Political opposition, particularly

CSO11474

from the Nixon administration, led supporters not only to target funds more narrowly to children most likely to benefit and show demonstrable gains, but also to use monitoring and testing mandates.

Therefore, to ensure that funds would be targeted and not be treated as general aid, Congress developed a series of programs in the 1970's that exist today. In the 1970 amendments Congress added fiscal rules barring the use of Title I funds to supplant state and local funding. In 1974, parent advisory councils were required at the school and district levels and strengthened in 1978.

In 1981, Ronald Reagan swept the White House with an agenda that abolished the Education Department, consolidating education programs into a block grant, and reducing their funding. The ECIA loosened fiscal rules, regulations, and restrictions on selection of schools and state monitoring requirements and essentially eliminated parental involvement. The law also renamed the program Chapter I.

In 1988 the most recent re-authorization restored some of the parental involvement and administrative rules eliminated by ECIA. The Hawkins-Stafford Amendments (P.L. 100-297) extended Chapter I through September 30, 1993. This targeted more funds to neediest areas and added the program improvement plan to failing schools (Educational Funding Research Council, 1992-93).

Title I of the Hawkins-Stafford Act signed into law by the President of the United States in April of 1988 amended the Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) of 1965 and re-authorized Chapter I of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA). This law will be in effect until the end of 1993 and is referred to as ESEA Chapter I. Principle themes of this legislature is to promote access to quality education for educationally deprived students. There was extensive debate over what should be included and what should be omitted. Overwhelming support for the Chapter I program from both parties in Congress and from the administration ensured that the program would expand.

Under the direction of Congress, the U.S. Department of Education implemented a process of negotiated rule making procedures where organizational representatives, practitioners, parents and other participants in the development of the rules and regulations were to partake in the ESEA program planning.

The basic concept of the 1988 legislation remained the same as the subsequent re-authorizing legislature which was the original Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) for 1965. Funding under this act is to be used to provide supplementary education services to the most educationally needy students who reside in eligible school

attendance areas. These services must be supplementary and categorical and may not supplant services for which local and state funds are required.

The following information covers major changes in the new rules and regulations governing Public Law 100-297 that affects classroom teachers. A Program Improvement Plan must be put into effect for any school showing a declining achievement level or failure to meet desired outcomes which the local school system has established. The local educational agency (LEA) must annually review the performance of schools with a program improvement plan until student performance has increased. If a student fails to show a gain or does not meet desired outcomes the LEA, with the local school, must review the program and determine whether the special educational needs of that student are being met. Modifications in the program are to be made to improve the educational achievement of that student. If those changes do not work a thorough needs assessment must be done. The student improvement plan is required where a student fails to meet the desired outcome regardless of how the other students do in the ESEA program in that particular school.

Parental involvement is the next significant change to the program improvement plan. Congress has a deep concern that parents have a meaningful involvement in Chapter I programs. Parents are to become more involved in the education of their children, with the aid of the Chapter I program, through the implementation of program activities and procedures concerned with their children's education.

The 1988 legislation of the ESEA program states that the purpose of this program is to improve the educational opportunities of educationally deprived children by helping these student succeed in the regular program of the LEA, improve achievement in basic and more advanced skills, and attain grade-level proficiency. The 1988 legislation also defines more advanced skills as those that included reasoning, analysis, interpretation, problem-solving, and decision-making as they relate to the subjects in which instruction is provided for in programs funded by Chapter I. The focus of change is the mastery of these skills as part of the basis for assessing students and evaluating programs. This is seen in the requirement that the desired outcomes or goals for Chapter I participating children be stated in terms of basic and more advanced skills which the LEA has determined that all children must master.

Disadvantaged children are not to be subjected to different academic expectations than other students under this new law. Therefore, the reporting of test data of participating ESEA students must include problem solving and reading comprehension scores. My research paper will focus

on the effect of ESEA Pull-out reading program on the reading achievement as seen on the reading comprehension grade on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills.

Another important feature of the ESEA Chapter I program is the coordination of the instructional objectives and curriculum with those of the regular school classroom program. Congress has allocated time and resources so that the Chapter I and regular programs of instruction meet the special educational needs of Chapter I pupils. Where there is no coordination between the two programs pupils who are already having major difficulties in school are unable to take on additional responsibilities.

Also the attendance of children participating in the Chapter I program influences the success of the program and is used in the formal evaluation of student success. Therefore, congress requires accurate student attendance be kept for evaluation purposes (Hawkins-Stafford Act, 1988).

This briefly summarizes the 1988 amended Act of 1965 which brought many changes to the original 1965 Act.

Mary LeTendre (1991), head of Chapter I stated, "We'd either pull the plug or get out the clappers" when told that Chapter I had raised the achievement of students only marginally.

Many educators believe in the personal attention that Chapter I students receive in the Pull-out reading programs. But also noted is the idea that students miss out on important in-class teaching while in Chapter I Pull-out room and, therefore, make it harder rather than easier for them to keep up with the regular classrooms. LeTendre (1991) said, "that the prevalence of pull-outs results in students' receiving on average only 10-15 minutes more instruction a day than they would get without Chapter I (p.72)."

Chapter I is the largest federal program for elementary and secondary schools. During the 1992-1993 school year, this program funnelled approximately \$6.1 billion to local school districts to fund supplementary, compensatory services for disadvantaged children.

State agencies will receive another \$487.3 million to directly provide Chapter I services to certain special populations such as handicapped children, migratory children and neglected or delinquent children in state institutions. A small amount of additional money is available for school improvement activities, state administration, technical assistance, and evaluation and research. Research is where more money should be allocated so as to improve the gains of the ESEA students, whether it be in a Pull-out program or some other special program for the disadvantaged student. The research will provide for the advancement of better programs.

Appropriations for the basic grants program have risen from \$1.1 billion for the 1965-1966 school year to \$6.1 billion for the school year 1992-1993 (federal fiscal year 1992). The Bush administration requested an appropriation for \$6.2 billion for federal year 1993 and proposed that \$100 million increase come in the form of concentrated grants. This is a tremendous amount of money allocated for the disadvantaged student and there should be more research in this field in order to educate the disadvantaged student to a greater degree.

Chapter I must be re-authorized in 1993 and Congress is expected to consider many changes to the law. "The Clinton administration wants to make federal aid to elementary and secondary schools contingent upon state adoption of goals and standards for what children should learn. The development of goals, standards and assessments has been a voluntary part of President Clinton's Goals 2000 plan and a similar school reform proposed by President George Bush." (Buckman, 1993). Under this new bill public schools' aid depends on states joining the standards movement. If states do not comply then aid would be withheld. The Education Department assistant secretary for elementary and secondary education stated that most states have already developed their own standards and tests for what they wish children to know. Therefore, I think that research on the testing of children in the ESEA program is very much needed in the Clinton years ahead.

"On Sept. 14 the Education Department plans to unveil their proposals to re-authorize the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, which provides about \$10 billion a year to schools - about 7 percent of all the money spent on elementary and secondary education. Secretary of Education Richard W. Riley is scheduled to testify before House members Sept. 23" (Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, Sept. 1993, p.2394).

The Chapter I program has come under criticism because of its focus on low-level rote learning Pull-out programs that continuously use low-level skills that do not increase the quality and amount of instructional time and, therefore, would not meet the new federal requirements. Many ESEA reading and math Pull-out programs are under attack for this particular reason. Previously, educators believed that basic skills had to be learned by drills before disadvantaged children could go on. Now, this is being questioned and especially of the ESEA reading and math Pull-out programs.

Clinton's Goals 2000 requires that states would have to outline content and standards of what children are expected to know in the Chapter I program and how this is to be achieved. States would have to do this in order to receive any Chapter I funding.

Because the Goals 2000 program will be voluntary, the Clinton administration will have states develop their own standards under the Chapter I program if they wish to apply for Chapter I money or they may choose not to participate. There is still time to assess the Pull-out program as Clinton's proposal to overhaul the ESEA Chapter I program is due to be re-authorized by the end of fiscal year 1994. Clinton's Act would replace current multiple choice basic skills tests for Chapter I students with a set of assessments designed to find out if students are meeting the state content standards (Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, Sept. 1993, p.2394).

Also, the Clinton Act would prohibit schools from using Chapter I money only to teach low-level skills through repetition drills. The administration wants more creative, higher level concepts and skills taught. More research is needed to see if this is being done in the ESEA Pull-out reading programs.

Despite noteworthy gains, especially in reading, a gap in achievement still exists between disadvantaged youngsters and their better-off peers, and Clinton's Act offers the chance to close the gap. Further research is needed to study achievement gains of the ESEA student.

The Instructional Dimensions Study (IDS) was a study held by the National Institute of Education (NIE) to study compensatory education. The study was based on data which was collected in the 1976 and 1977 school years (Cooley, 1980). Reading and mathematics classroom structures were assessed with their level of achievement. Compensatory programs such as pull out programs were compared to in class programs and the achievement rates of both were assessed. The data for the study were used from 400 purposely selected first and third grade classrooms. Classrooms varied on student backgrounds and from urban settings. The final sample was made up of 400 in 100 schools from fourteen districts (Riddle, 1984).

The IDS attempted to assess the effectiveness of compensatory education and focused only on the educationally disadvantaged. It also examined the differential effects of pull-out programs, common to Chapter I. It used achievement measures that were the same in all classrooms. This gave the study strengths.

This IDS study cited three important findings (NIE, 1977; Cooley and Leinhardt, 1980). It found that for the 400 first and third graders studied individualized instruction did not make a difference in achievement.

It was found that whether students were taught individually or in groups they achieved the same amount. It also found that pull-out programs were better for some groups than for other groups. In-class programs were more

effective for first graders. Pull-out programs in mathematics benefited third graders, but, showed no difference in reading achievement. Lastly, the study found that the instructional time, size of the group, and match between curriculum and the content of the achievement test were more significantly correlated to student achievement (Linn, 1982). William Cooley and Gae Leonard (Cooley, 1978), as part of a NIE evaluation of compensatory education assessed effective practices of either pull-out programs or in-class programs and concluded that no one program, individualized or group is better.

Several studies suggest that pull-out programs have little effect on quality of instruction variables (Archambault, 1986). Also a large amount of research criticized pull-out programs (Glass and Smith, 1977). Some research stated that pull-out programs caused confusion with regular in-class instruction (Allington, 1986).

Other questions raised by previous research were did the pull-out programs result in lack of co-ordination between the compensatory and regular in-class instruction (Johnson, Allington, and Afflerbauch, 1985). Because Chapter I legislature gave schools so much room in servicing the programs there was also a need to look at the various implementation of the programs (Cooper, 1986).

Kimbrough and Hill (1981) found that compensatory programs seemed to only replace regular classroom instruction, especially in reading, although some schools reported that there was not a loss in achievement due to the pull-out programs (NIE, 1977).

According to the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development (Rowan, Brian, 1986), it was pointed out that researchers who argue the fact that Chapter I programs take away valuable learning time from regular classroom instruction may be wrong in their estimations of time (Lingnon and Doss, 1982). Instead of adding the amount of time students spend in in-class regular instruction, many schools just redistributed a set time of instructional time across programs. This does not give Chapter I extra time for additional learning.

Some researchers believe that pull-out programs are for reasons other than learning programs. Pull-out programs can easily be traced by "audit trail" making authorities able to verify compliance within the Chapter I regulations (Allington, 1986). In other words the pull-out programs are not solely to teach the needed reading programs to a high degree of achievement.

A report was produced for the annual evaluation of Title I Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) (1981). The report was organized into six sections: 1) Programmatic Goals; 2) Evaluation Techniques; 3) Findings; 4) Discussion;

5) Summary and Conclusions; and 6) Abstracts of Project Reports. These are annual technical reports that are issued by the Department of Federal Evaluation Resource Services which evaluate projects funded under ESEA Chapter I. Their study found that the long term effects of Chapter I intervention are positive, the results appear moderated, the effect being more found in mathematics than in reading gains. To the degree that standardized test scores show evidence of the positive gains of the ESEA programs on the students, the data indicates that positive changes are taking place at a slow pace.

A study was conducted on the long term effects of the ESEA Chapter I Reading Program on reading achievement by Kilian and Kagen (1981). The effect of the Chapter I reading program was examined with a group of students as they progressed from grades two through six. The number of students who fell below the twenty-third percentile on a reading achievement test (the criterion for Chapter I participation) was tabulated for each year to determine the program's effectiveness both in selecting the students and in improving student reading ability. The results showed that Chapter I intervention reduced the number of students scoring below the twenty-third percentile at the time the students were tested in the third grade, but these gains were not maintained after third grade. The achievement records of individual students showed that both the students who were remediated successfully by Chapter I participation in the early grades and then discharged (to continue with regular classroom reading instruction) and the students who were achieving well in the early grades without the help of Chapter I began to fall behind after third grade.

The Chapter I program helped less than half of the students, and many students, especially those with low ability, needed continued assistance in order not to fall behind their peers. These results conflict with results from single-year evaluations mandated for all Chapter I programs, suggesting data from just a single year may offer incomplete or even distorted information on whether students are learning to read better.

Gastright (1983) conducted a study which tested the hypothesis that the reading gains of compensatory education pupils in grades one to four, exposed to intensive reading wiseness instruction would not differ significantly from the reading gains in a randomly assigned control group. Schools offering ESEA Title classes (N=48) were randomly assigned to the treatment and control groups. Approximately four hundred students in each grade received twenty hours of test wiseness instruction as part of one hundred hours of supplementary reading instruction between the pretest and the post test of the California Achievement Test. The

implementation procedures of RMC Model A were observed and the NCE gains of the school units were analyzed separately for the two grades using a t test. The null hypothesis was supported in both cases. Extensive evidence was collected to show that the materials were used by the treatment teachers. Survey results indicated that teachers were quite positive about the commercially prepared mini-tests and felt they would improve reading gains for the ESEA students. This seems to me that there are various means to produce higher reading gains other than through direct reading instruction such as the ESEA pull-out program.

The effect of ESEA Pull-out programs on reading achievement is inconclusive. Some research finds the pull-out approach beneficial; other research finds the pull-out approach of little value. Much money is allocated to this very important governmentally funded program and research is needed to see if this program can meet the new federal requirements.

Therefore, there is a continual need to research the Pull-Out programs effect on the reading achievement of fifth and sixth graders. The results are inconclusive.

1. What is the effect of the Chapter I ESEA Pull-out reading program on the reading achievement of fifth and sixth grade participants?
2. What is the effect of gender on the Chapter I ESEA Pull-out program on the reading achievement of fifth and sixth grade participants?
3. What is the effect of the grade level of the Chapter I ESEA Pull-out reading program on the reading achievement of fifth and sixth grade participants?
4. What is the effect of attendance of the Chapter I ESEA Pull-out reading program on the reading achievement of fifth and sixth grade participants?

Research:

Hispanic fifth and sixth grade students who receive Chapter I Pull-out reading instruction will obtain different reading achievement scores than those who receive regular classroom instruction.

Operational:

Hispanic fifth and sixth grade students who receive ESEA (Chapter I) Pull-out reading instruction will obtain different reading achievement scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills than those who receive regular classroom instruction.

Null:

Hispanic fifth and sixth grade students who receive Chapter I Pull-out reading instruction will not obtain significantly different reading achievement scores on the I.T.B.S. than those who receive regular instruction.

Procedures

Population/Sample

The population/sample for this study was selected from 60 fifth and sixth grade students from a Chicago public school. The school is located in the inner-city south side of Chicago. It has a population of 1003 students in Kindergarten through eighth grade. The background of the students is 86.7% Hispanic and 3.8% white and are of the low socioeconomic status (90%). The stability rate is 98.1% and the mobility rate is 13.3%. The attendance is 94.4% as recorded on the 1992-93 State Report Card.

For the purpose of this study 60 Hispanic fifth and sixth grade students presently enrolled at the school were selected. School records showed that while in fourth and fifth grade, thirty of these students received reading instruction in the ESEA Pull-out program in the reading laboratory. Thirty students were selected at random from the

ESEA Pull-out program and thirty students were selected from the regular reading program from grades five and six.

Each spring, the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) are given to the students attending the Chicago Public schools. Two sample groups of the fifth and sixth grade students were identified from the school, those who had received reading instruction in the ESEA reading laboratory and those who had received reading instruction in the regular classes. The grade level reading score on the ITBS obtained in the spring of 1993 for each subject in the sample was compared to the reading level recorded for the Spring of 1992 testing which allowed for a measure over a twelve month period. Scores of the students from two grades were used. A pre-post test control group design was used.

Iowa Test of Basic Skills, 1987 edition Level 9-14, Form 7 and 8. The Test Critiques Compendium Review of Major Test from the Test Critiques Series by 1987 edition; present the ITBS on an outstanding example of normed achievement test battery. In all respects the test appeared to be built upon modern measurement practices. The concurrent availability of the Test of Achievement and Proficiency (9-12) and the Cognitive Abilities Test (K-12) along with the measures of listening, writing, social studies, and science provides school districts with a comprehensive Grades K-12 achievement and ability testing program.

One criticism from the above reviewer was a concern in its packaging. so many sections are involved in the packaging that the reviewer thinks that it causes confusion.

The reviewer also feels that more validity evidence addressing the author's recommendations for possible uses of the ITBS would be desirable. The reviewer thinks that the recommended uses of the ITBS would be desirable, but more evidence to support them would add to an outstanding testing package.

Sufficient information about test reliability has been reported. Estimates of equivalent form and internal consistency reliability (along with other descriptive statistics) are reported for each form of each subtest at all levels. A number of coefficients representing the stability of test scores over a period of a year are also reported. However, the reviewer feels that the value of this information is very limited for achievement test; the information seems to say more about the nature of the instruction rather than the tests themselves.

The reviewer feels that one special feature of the reliability reporting is that of the inclusion of information having to do with the precision of score estimation at various ability levels. Test reliabilities for the subtests tend to be in the .80s and .90s and somewhat lower for level 5 and 6 subtests.

The findings of this study will have some limitations in terms of the following:

1. The findings are applicable only to the population.
2. Validity and reliability of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) for the population
3. The two groups may not be equivalent in terms of IQ, age, socioeconomic status, ability, readiness, maturation, gender, similar, learning environments in classroom, stanine scores, etc.
4. The school cumulative records may not be accurate.
5. All records requested by the researcher may not be available.

The research assumes the following:

1. The ITBS is valid and reliable for the population.
2. The two groups are assumed to be equivalent in terms of IQ, age, socioeconomic status, ability, readiness, maturation, gender, similar learning environments in classroom, stanine scores, etc.
3. School cumulative records are accurate.
4. All records requested by the researcher are available.

ESEA Pull-out Program - as defined by a method of instruction by which students on or below stanine 3 are targeted and receive special reading in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Pull-out reading lab. Specific skills are taught.

Reading Achievement - as defined by the reading subtests of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) 1992-1993 scores.

The finding will be tabulated in terms of means and standard deviations. The t test will be employed at the .05 level of confidence to determine if there is any significant difference between the mean scores. The reading gains of both groups will be compared.

Findings of the Study

The samples for the study included fifth and sixth grade students from a Chicago public school. Each Spring students take the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS). From these fifth and sixth grade students, two groups were randomly selected. Subjects in one group were given the ESEA pull-out reading program while the subjects in the other group were not given the program. Results from 1991 ITBS reading subtest were used as a pretest and results from the 1992 ITBS reading subtest were used as a posttest. A t test ( $p < .05$ ) for independent sample was done on these four sets of scores to determine if there was a statistically significant change in the reading achievement gains after the ESEA pull-out reading program. Table 1 summarizes the statistical analysis.

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and t Tests for the ESEA Pull-out Group and the Regular Reading Group Reading Achievement Scores

## Reading Grade 5 (N=30)

	Pull-out	Regular	t
M	1.50	1.00	
SD	.660	.100	
			0.12

## Reading Grade 6 (N=30)

	Pull-out	Regular	t
M	1.30	1.20	
SD	.65	.41	
			0.38

\*Significance at the 0.5 level

Examinations of the 1991 and 1992 pretest and posttest gains indicate that the Pull-out program and the regular reading program were not significantly different for either group (grade five or grade six). The mean group of the fifth graders 1.50 and 1.00 and the mean grade of the sixth graders 1.30 and 1.20 is not significantly different. This finding which is presented (see Table 1 concludes that the two groups were both equivalent in reading in the Spring of 1991 and 1992.

After further examination of the 1991 and 1992 posttest scores reveal that the Pull-out ESEA reading group and the regular reading group have a mean (grade 5 = 1.5 and 1.0 and grade 6 = 1.3 and 1.2) and therefore are not significantly different. Thus, there is no statistically significant increase or decrease in the reading achievement of both groups.

The t scores for the fifth graders' gains 1992 (.012) and the 1992 scores (0.38) for the sixth graders gains show no significant changes in the reading for the two groups. The data leads to the acceptance of the null hypothesis: fifth and sixth grade students taught reading in the ESEA reading pull-out program will not differ in reading achievement than those students taught in the regular classroom.

This study might have resulted in different findings if the researcher had more control on method of data collection and if the population had been significantly larger, thereby, allowing more control of the extraneous variables as stated in the limitations. This study points to the need for more research using a larger sample and a longer time span as students participate in the compensatory programs for a longer time. Research shows that disadvantaged students progress at a slower rate. More research is necessary to improve the disadvantaged reading achievement programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allington, R.L. and P. Johnson. "The Coordination Among Regular Classroom Reading Programs and Targeted Support Programs." Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York, 1986.

Archambault, F. "Instructional Setting: Key Issue or Bogus Concern." Paper prepared for conference on the effects of alternate designs in compensatory education. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 1986.

Buckman, Jill. Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, Washington D.C. Sept. 11, 1993, 5:2394-95.

Chicago Public Schools. "ESEA Chapter I Individual School Report for the School Year 1990-91." Bureau of Research and Development, Chicago: 1992.

Cooley, W. W. and G. Leinhardt. "The Instructional Dimensions Study." Educational Evaluations and Policy Analysis, 1980, 2:7-25.

Cooper, Harris M. "Chapter I Programs Reduce Student-to-Teacher Ratios; But Do Reduced Ratios Affect Achievement?" Conference proceedings. Office of Research and Improvement, Washington DC: 1986

Educational Funding Research Council, Arlington, VA. 1993.

Evaluation of Title I (ECIA) Projects, Reports 8203, Washington, D.C.: 1980-81.

Gastright, Joseph F. "Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association" Montreal, Quebec: April 15, 1993.

Glass G.V. "Investigating Findings: The Meta-Analysis of Research." in L. Shulman (Ed.) Review of Research in Education. Itasca, IL: Peacock 1977.

Hawkins-Stafford Act. Washington, D.C.: 1988

Johnston, Peter H., Richard Allington and P. Afflerbauch. "The Congruence of Classroom Reading Instruction." Elementary School Journal, March, 1985, 84:465-477.

Kilian, Lawrence and Kagen, Edward. "Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association." Los Angeles, CA: April 13-17, 1981.

LeTendre, Mary J. "Improving Chapter I: Making the Promise Reality." Phi Delta Kappa, April 1991, 72: 577-580.

Lignon, Glynn D., and David A. Doss. "Some Lessons We Have Learned from 6500 Hours of Classroom Observation." Austin Independent School District. Office of Research and Evaluation, Washington DC: 1982.

Linn, R. L. "The Validity of Title I Evaluation and Reporting System." U.S. Department of Education. Washington, D.C. 1982.

National Institute of Education. "Administration of Compensatory Education." U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington DC: 1977.

National Institute of Education. "Administration of Compensatory Education." U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington DC: 1977.

Riddle, W. "Achievement Score Trends and Federal Involvement in Elementary and Secondary Education: An Exploration of Their Relationship." Library of Congress. Congressional Research Service. Washington, D.C.:1984.

Rowan, B.L. P. Guthrie, G.U. Lerand G.P. Guthrie. "The Design and Implementation of Chapter I Instructional Services: A Study of 24 Schools." Far West Laboratory. San Francisco, CA: 1986.