

Extract from: <https://repository.library.northeastern.edu/files/neu:cj82nq86s/fulltext.pdf>

Effectiveness of Orton-Gillingham. O-G-based instruction is widely held by the International Association of Dyslexia, as well as many parents, to be the best means of remediating reading difficulties in individuals with dyslexia and other language based learning disabilities. In fact, Gillingham and Stillman's widely published book, *The Gillingham Manual: Remedial Training for Children with Specific Disability in Reading, Spelling, and Penmanship* states "that all children would benefit from the Alphabetic/Phonetic Approach" (1997, p.12). However, unlike the breadth of research detailing the effectiveness of scripted Direct Instruction, there is very limited research looking at the effectiveness of O-G-based instruction over the past seventy years that it has been in use (Chia & Houghton, 2011; Garan, 2005; Giess et al, 2012; Ritchey & Goeke, 2006; Rose & Zirkel, 2007). According to the National Reading Panel and the National Research Council committee on preventing reading difficulties, "the inclusion of explicit, systematic phonics (is) an essential component of reading instruction" (Campbell & Cooke, 2008; Ehri et al, 2001; NRP, 2000). The O-G approach has long used this very type of approach to teaching reading, spelling, and writing simultaneously, yet oddly there are fewer than 15 peer reviewed research studies outlining the instructional pedagogy as being effective (Ritchey & Goeke, 2006; Rose & Zirkel, 2007). There are few published studies to date that address the effectiveness of the pedagogy. And of those, none have been determined to meet the requirements of the What Works Clearinghouse primarily because the studies either did not use a comparison group or because the sample populations contained fewer than half of the subjects with dyslexia or learning disabilities, 51 leaving O-G based instruction labeled as scientifically unproven by the U.S. Department of Education (Ritchey & Goeke, 2006; Rose & Zirkel, 2007; Turner, 2008; U.S Department of Education, 2010). However, there are a few peer reviewed published studies that have found OG-based instruction to be effective over the past few years. Interestingly enough, those studies have focused upon the effectiveness of the pedagogy with students with other types of learning needs such as vision impairments or learners of English as an additional language, and while they have shown the approach to be effective for the unique populations included in their studies, they have not helped to demonstrate that the pedagogy initially designed to help struggling dyslexic students learn to read is actually able to do what it was designed to do (Jubran, 2012; Rowley, McCarthy, & Rines, 2014; Scheffel, Shaw, & Shaw; 2008).

Conclusion There is extensive research on the effectiveness of Direct Instruction programs such as Corrective Reading with at risk students, dating back more than forty years. Few studies in the seminal research on Direct Instruction have specifically looked at the effectiveness of the instructional pedagogy with students identified as having dyslexia or language based learning disabilities. Even fewer studies have been conducted to look at the effectiveness of the OrtonGillingham-based instructional pedagogy. To fill the gap in the research related to effectiveness of these reading intervention programs with elementary students identified as having dyslexia or language based learning disabilities, a protocol was designed and implemented in this study to assess and compare the effectiveness of the two instructional pedagogies. Having met all of the necessary assumption testing, analysis of variance (ANCOVA) was used to analyze the data. Based upon the findings, the null hypothesis was supported, as findings did not show a significant difference in student reading achievement between those students in treatment group 1 (Corrective Reading – Direct Instruction), treatment group 2 (Wilson – OrtonGillingham-based Instruction), or the control group. **This study failed to provide explicit evidence that elementary age students with dyslexia or language based learning disabilities who receive reading instruction using a systematic**

and sequential reading curriculum such as Direct Instruction's Corrective Reading or Orton-Gillingham-based Wilson make greater achievement 114 gains when compared to students who are instructed using teacher made or selected instructional materials. Furthermore, this study failed to provide quantitative evidence that students instructed using Direct Instruction's Corrective Reading curriculum make any greater gains in reading achievement when compared to students who are instructed using Orton-Gillingham-based Wilson curricula. However, the study was able to provide insight into the experiences of teacher and paraeducators as they implemented reading intervention curricula, and perhaps most notably their perceptions of the role scaffolding, multi-sensory learning, and communication play in the instruction of students with learning disabilities.