Conceptual and Research Basis for
Failure Free Reading

Conceptual and Research Basis for
FAILURE FREE READING

Abstract: Failure Free Reading is a highly-structured language intervention designed to support the development of vocabulary, fluency and comprehension for K-adult non-readers of English.

Failure Free Reading is a reading intervention program designed for the lowest performing learners (bottom 15 percent scores on standardized tests) including non-readers in grades 1 through adult. The program is used by English Language Learners (ELLs), learning disabled, special education, at-risk, alternative education students, and adult non-readers. Failure Free Reading was developed by Dr. Joseph Lockavitch, Ed. D., a former classroom teacher, school psychologist, university professor, and special education director.

The Failure Free Reading program is taught by certified and non-certified individuals in regular classrooms, extended day programs, pull-out situations, and lab settings. Failure Free Reading lessons are typically 45-60 minutes long and are taught in a one-to-one or small group format. Teachers present the material in a highly reinforcing and non-threatening learning environment.

Failure Free Reading's five-step instructional process begins with a pretest followed by an oral guided lesson, computer guided instruction, print-based activities, and a post-test/comprehension test. Program materials consist of interactive software, student workbooks, reinforcement activities, independent reading booklets, instructional readers, flashcards, parent communication letters, story books, and teacher directed lessons. The software provides audio delivery of age-appropriate, decodable texts. The print reinforcement exercises include matching, word illustration, sentence illustration, sentence unscramble, and alphabetical order.

The Failure Free Reading vocabulary words are based on the Evaluation Description Language (EDL) Core Vocabulary[i] and are organized into four color-coded instructional levels.

SECTION 1: CONCEPTUAL BASIS

Failure Free Reading's purpose is to enable non-readers to build vocabulary and fluency by experiencing comprehension and engagement with age (or developmentally) appropriate texts. These goals are consistent with the research-based concept of providing high-success reading opportunities for students at every level of ability and age throughout the curriculum. For non-readers, and particularly older non-readers, this need becomes an overwhelmingly difficult challenge for teachers to address, particularly for teachers in the content-areas.[ii] Those students fall through the cracks in the tertiary progression of grade-level instruction.

They need highly therapeutic support if they are to ever become readers at all, much less catch up to grade level instruction.

Such therapeutic language development is the essence of Failure Free Reading. The program controls for repetition, sentence structure and story content. Every lesson begins with a scripted direct instruction exercise designed to enhance students' vocabulary, listening and speaking skills.

A unique feature of the program is that using a computer-based diagnostic pretest, students are placed in Failure Free Reading at their individual reading comprehension level of frustration (or "Challenge Level"), not their instructional level. Teachers are normally taught to assess students' independent, instructional and frustration levels, and that engagement can occur only at the first two. Failure Free Reading does just the opposite.

Failure Free Reading's scaffolding, repetition, reinforcement, and monitoring makes it possible for the students to perform successfully at their level of frustration. Succeeding at the frustration level establishes efficacy by enabling them to immediately begin comprehending at an age appropriate level. As their negative self-concepts are thus "disproved," they begin to build confidence which many of them have never experienced in school. In short, they start to believe in themselves. This approach is consistent with research: reading content to children at levels that they can not read independently increases their vocabularies and stimulates their desire to read.[iii]

Consistency and Challenge

Failure Free Reading's unique language-based approach enables non-readers to meet the same basic instructional needs shared by all learners, including the need to:

- Read independently with age-appropriate materials
- See immediate progress and experience success - which builds confidence
- Learn at the maximum rate
- Self-correct and learn by doing

All students, including non-readers, share the need to be challenged. This is a difficult task for teachers when students have given up on themselves following years of pronounced failure. The unique Failure Free Reading scaffolds make it possible to establish high expectations and successful learning experiences for even the lowest-performing students.

The student need for a consistent approach is especially important in special education. Cognitively-challenged students in particular thrive on structure and routine. The program's explicit instruction and repetition enables these students to always know what is coming next, and what is expected.

Compensation VS Remediation

The remediation of deficits doesn't work for many low-performing students, particularly when using the highest level of attainment growth in comprehension as an outcome measure. The Failure Free Reading model is compensatory. It believes that all students carry with them inherent strengths, the trick is to allow these strengths to emerge. Unfortunately, in other interventions, focus is on their weakness. By controlling for certain language variables, Failure Free Reading has demonstrated that even students with IQs in the 40-60 range have sufficient aptitude to be able to experience comprehension success either at his or her age or developmentally appropriate interest level.

Researcher Sandra McCormick[iv] defined non-readers as: "(the) complete absence of word recognition (although) extreme disability cases may show some inconsistent knowledge of words (typically learned from a) primer. But, generally, despite extended instruction, the number of words known by these students ranges only from 2 to 50." These students are also typically so deficient in a broad range of language skills that they can't even participate in remedial program instruction. While schools are often able to provide some form of remedial instruction to struggling readers, most lack the resources, knowledge or appropriate learning programs to help the hard-core non-readers, particularly as they become older.

Deficient Oral & Print Vocabulary

Students from families of lower socioeconomic status often enter school significantly delayed in a broad range of pre-reading skills.[v] Such "at-risk" students typically have great difficulty with the meanings of language (semantics) because of a lack of exposure to the language skills necessary for reading and writing success (vocabulary, speaking, listening). Many are born into homes where their parents either do not speak the language or are language-deprived themselves.

A child growing up in a limited language family environment may hear one-half to one-third as many spoken words as children in more affluent households.[vii] The limited language environment child might know 3,000 words by age 6, while the high language environment child might have a vocabulary of 20,000 words. This gap tends to widen the longer

> *Research has documented that the size of a young child's vocabulary is a strong predictor of reading. Preschoolers with large vocabularies tend to become proficient readers (National Research Council, 1998).* [vi]

children are in school. By the time they reach high school, the impact on academic achievement is insurmountable; ninth grade students will never comprehend ninth grade material with a fourth grade vocabulary. Children who enter the upper elementary grades with significant vocabulary deficits also show increasing problems with reading comprehension, even if they have good word identification skills." [viii]

Unfortunately for these students, while vocabulary instruction has been demonstrated to improve word knowledge and comprehension, teachers spend little time explicitly teaching or reinforcing new vocabulary. At-risk students especially need to be systematically exposed to a large volume of words within meaningful contexts and to challenging language.

Syntax

Many students, including those coming from homes in which standard English is not the dominant language, fail to develop an understanding of the rules of grammar. For lack of a better term, they are "syntactically challenged." This is best illustrated in their spoken and written expression. They have great difficulty getting past what linguists call "the surface structure" or grammar of a passage. Because they don't understand how the text is written, they have more difficulty in reading for meaning.

Insufficient Background Knowledge

Insufficient background knowledge also hinders learning when students lack the vocabulary and frames of reference necessary to form appropriate mental pictures and build new knowledge and concepts.[ix] Numerous research studies have identified a strong relationship between levels of general background knowledge and academic achievement.[x] Students cannot read if they can't relate.

Lack of Engagement

A critical area of scientific reading instruction not addressed by the National Reading Panel[xi] is reading engagement. This is remarkable because the essential nature of engagement is well-documented by research. For example, in an extensive review of instructional factors influencing academic achievement, Guthrie and Wigfield (2000)[xii] reported that the level of student engagement and its sustainability over time is the *overriding factor* through which classroom instruction influences student outcomes.

Poor Self-concept

A positive self image becomes harder to sustain as children fall behind their peers. Most at-risk children arrive at Kindergarten with no concept that they lack preparation. Their experience of failure is crushing. Poor readers frequently reject remedial instruction because they don't want to be seen as being different from

their achieving peers. Many of these students specialize in "fake reading," or they carry around text books in order to make it appear that they can read. This is especially true for adolescents who feel demeaned and humiliated by the use of primary age materials.

SECTION 2: RESEARCH BASIS

Failure Free Reading's methodology draws from the research of Elisabeth Wiig & Eleanor Semel, Charles Hargis, Jane Braunger & Jan Lewis, and Elfrieda Hiebert. Hargis researched the use of repetition as a catalyst to increase achievement in vocabulary development. Wiig and Semel confirmed the need to teach sentence structure to struggling readers.[xiii] Braunger and Lewis authenticated the importance of interpretable story content as it relates to prior knowledge.[xiv] Hiebert and Hargis' work validates the importance of those controls: abundant graphical information, meaningful story content, and simplified sentence structure.[xv]

Vocabulary

Not surprisingly, research has shown that low-performing readers have the weakest vocabularies, and they lack the vocabulary necessary to understand grade-level texts even if they can identify the printed words.[xvi] Pre-teaching is especially important for poor readers as learning vocabulary from unfamiliar context is not effective for them. Failure Free Reading presents vocabulary as a prerequisite to oral reading, comprehension and fluency. Sight and content vocabulary are explicitly and systematically taught within each lesson.

A key vocabulary section is presented in each reading passage. 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 by spelling words, reading words/sentences, and writing words/sentences. Repeated exposure to oral language is known to improve vocabulary growth. Reading to children extends not only their recognition of new words but also their ability to use these words in their own retellings.[xviii]

> *"Rich and robust vocabulary instruction goes beyond definitional knowledge; it gets students actively engaged in using and thinking about word meanings and in creating relationships among words"*
> *(Diamond & Gutlohn, 2006).*[xvii]

NRP reported that combining explicit vocabulary instruction with a direct reading application is highly effective, and that programs which combine the direct explanation of words within texts are the most effective (NRP Subgroups, p.4-3). NRP also reported that computer-assisted vocabulary instruction may be more effective than traditional methods, listening to others read was a way of enhancing students' incidental

vocabulary knowledge, and pre-teaching vocabulary in assigned materials facilitated comprehension (NRP Subgroups, p. 4-4).

Multiple Exposures and Contexts

Students differ considerably in the rate at which they learn new words. Some students require a tremendous amount of repetition – much more than is presented in core or remedial reading programs. In an exhaustive review of reading strategies for non-readers, McCormick (1994),[xix] concluded that the lowest literacy students (regardless of age) must have repeated exposure to print materials within many different instructional contexts. Non-readers needed significantly more exposures to produce "automaticity."

McCormick also found that the students engaged in highly sequenced, cumulative learning opportunities presented in a consistent, multi-contextual format showed significant growth and that at-risk students needed pronounced practice with new material within a consistent and systematic environment. In 1992, Hargis confirmed the importance of repetition in promoting the instant recognition of high frequency, non-decodable words.[xx]

Fluency

> *In a study of first grade students with severe reading disabilities Hargis (1992) found the lower a student's reading level (RL), the more repetitions were required to achieve automaticity. Students reading at grade level (GL) needed a minimum of 76.12 repetitions versus 34.5 repetitions for those reading at grade 3 (G3) -- regardless of age and IQ. The correlation coefficient for the relationship between RL and repetitions was an amazing -0.9317![xxi]*

Fluency is the ability to read orally with speed, accuracy and proper expression. Failure Free Reading supports the development of fluency through a combination of vocabulary instruction and practice, oral modeling, repeated exposures to words and sentences, and independent reading of texts in meaningful contexts. The NRP reported that reading requires skills that extend beyond the single-word level to contextual reading, and this skill can best be acquired by practicing reading texts in meaningful contexts.

Comprehension

Failure Free Reading supports comprehension by developing each student's background knowledge and core vocabulary using the simplest possible syntax and rhetorical structures, and by building listening comprehension. Comprehension of printed language lags behind that of spoken language well past third grade not just for poor readers, but all readers.[xxii]

The program's explicit comprehension instruction includes summarizing main ideas, predicting what text will follow, drawing inferences, author's intent, and monitoring for misunderstanding. Failure Free Reading also incorporates a strong pre-teaching component with each lesson, along with questioning. In each lesson, comprehension questions are asked immediately after the story is read aloud by the teacher. Evaluation questions are posed so that students expand on the ideas presented in the text. An oral procedure is provided to assess students' understanding of previously read text.

Sentence Structure

For many non-readers including ELLs who lack sufficient understanding of the rules of grammar, core and remedial reading programs are too syntactically complex. This is especially true of commercial "hi/low" materials. Such texts routinely contain stilted sentences, phrases, or an abundance of dependent clauses. Wiig and Semel (1980)[xxiii] suggested that the structural complexity of all written materials for language and learning-disabled students should incorporate the following adaptations:

1. The order-of-mention of critical content words should match the order-of-action
2. The order or sequence of the individual phrases in sentences should be controlled and adapted to conform to the order of kernel sentences
3. Sentence length should be strictly controlled
4. Sentences with embedded clauses or with nesting of embedded clauses should be rewritten and presented in their logical format, and
5. Sentence sequences and paragraphs have limited pronoun usage.

Failure Free Reading controls for these elements. Complex sentence structures are kept to a minimum and the initial level stories are written in the easiest form of syntactic comprehension - the kernel sentence (simple, active, positive, and declarative). Complex structures are introduced only after intensive pre-teaching on the part of the instructor. Failure Free Reading controls for language processing deficits by managing for such variables as multiple meaning words, idiomatic expression, figurative speech, uncommon names, and dates and places. Nothing is taken for granted. An analysis of Failure Free Reading using the Botel Syntactic Complexity Formula verifies that they control for the use of zero-count and one-count structures (with zero being the easiest and three being the hardest) within a meaningful context.[xxiv] The program's higher level stories were written from the EDL core vocabulary graded word list of critical science, social studies, health, and math content vocabulary.

Story Content

Prior knowledge includes general knowledge acquired as result of a person's cumulative experiences both in and out of school, and specific prior knowledge needed in order to understand a specific text. Many poor readers are deficient in both of these areas to the degree that it undermines their ability to comprehend. Readers understand what they read only as it relates to what they already know.[xxv] In Failure Free Reading, every instructional step is taken to insure that students can relate to the content contained in the reading materials. Each new piece of information is a logical extension of the preceding material. Figurative language is minimized and the stories are about concepts the students understand.

Instructional Design

Failure Free Reading provides students with multiple exposures to words and sentences within multiple, meaningful contexts through the use of teacher-guided reading and language lessons, text materials (readers, booklets, and reinforcement activities) and computer-aided instruction. A typical classroom consists of three centers: oral language, computer assisted and independent reinforcement. Students rotate through all three centers.

Structured, Explicit Direct Instruction

Each Failure Free Reading lesson begins with a scripted (direct instruction) language development exercise delivered by the teacher and designed to enhance listening comprehension, vocabulary development and speaking. Each lesson is organized into five steps: Preview, Listen, Present, Read, and Review. The instruction is explicit and comprehensive, more intensive, and more supportive than regular classroom instruction, and is consistent with current research on instruction for children who have difficulty learning to read.

Multiple Exposures and Contexts

In Failure Free Reading, students are explicitly taught one passage at a time, with repeated exposures to individual words, sentences and word meanings. Students learn the first unit during the first day and review the first unit on the second day before being introduced to the next unit. On the third day, the instructor reviews the prior two lessons before introducing the new material. This process repeats until the students have mastered the entire theme. Some educators may experience this level of repetition as tedious, but for fragile at-risk learners and special education pupils with limited cognitive abilities and extremely limited vocabularies, this high level of repetition is essential to learning. Students are not bored because they are working at their level of level of frustration. Boredom in Failure Free Reading is an indication of inappropriate placement.

Students are also actively engaged in higher-order thinking activities to promote knowledge and growth in vocabulary, syntax and comprehension. Each lesson includes teacher-guided questions designed to produce deductive and inductive thinking strategies. This engagement in literate conversation is something that most non-readers have never had the opportunity to experience. Research supports the need to engage in legitimate conversation around texts in order to build comprehension.[xxvi]

Guided Repeated Oral Reading

The research-based strategy of guided repeated oral reading is utilized in each Failure Free Reading lesson through the computer-based instruction component. Each passage is carefully constructed within texts that are meaningful. The talking software models prosody prior to independent reading. The use of the computer for this instruction facilitates repeated exposures to controlled passages that would be extremely arduous for a teacher to personally deliver. Guided repeated oral reading procedures that include guidance from teachers, peers or parents had a significant and positive impact on word recognition, fluency and comprehension across a range of grade levels and all levels of ability (NRP Subgroup 3.3).

Scaffolding

Failure Free Reading scaffolds instruction by having students work at their frustration levels and providing support that facilitates vocabulary and comprehension development. The multiple exposures and contexts, for example, facilitate students' ability to build on prior knowledge and internalize the new information. In scaffolded instruction, a teacher supports student learning and then gradually withdraws that support as students show they are capable of assuming more responsibility for their own learning.[xxvii]

One of the most important benefits of scaffolding is that it engages learners. Rather than passively listening, students are continually prompted to actively learn. For example, after each Failure Free Reading story is read to the student, the software presents a series of comprehension questions. If the student answers incorrectly, the program will not advance to the next screen. Instead, the question is repeatedly provided for the student until the right answer is selected. Scaffolding can also minimize the learner's level of frustration. This is extremely important with special needs students, who often become easily frustrated and then shut down and refuse to participate in further learning.

Multiple Modes of Instruction

Failure Free Reading combines teacher-directed instruction, computer-based instruction, and independent reading and workbook exercises. The program's scripts enable teachers to deliver instruction consistency and reliability regardless of their level of experience.

Software can improve students' motivation to become independent readers and can increase their sense of competency.[xxviii] Software also helps learners who are afraid or embarrassed to ask questions in front of the class.[xxix] This is especially important for older non-readers who are very concerned about what their reading peers think of them. Software also provides individualized scaffolding that meets the needs of each individual student in ways that would be extremely time-consuming for teachers to provide otherwise.

Hall, Hughes and Filbert (2000)[xxx] found that teacher-directed instruction supplemented with computer instruction produced superior outcomes to other supplemental interventions. Hall et all also investigated the effects of software-based instruction on reading for students with learning disabilities, and found that the software used by the students who made significant gains was carefully designed to incorporate systematic instructional procedures found to be effective in reading instruction (i.e. explicit, strategic, and scaffolded instruction, engaged time, success rate, and corrective feedback).

Failure Free Reading's individual component involves individual, self-selected reading. Copious research suggests that independent reading promotes fluency, vocabulary and comprehension (NRP Summary Booklet, p. 12). A recent review of 49 studies on independent reading time [xxxi] provided support for a moderately strong and positive relationship between reading exposure and reading outcomes. Forty-five of the studies reported positive results of improved reading scores, while four reported negative results that were not statistically significant. The optimum independent reading time appears to be 10 to 30 minutes a day in addition to some form of skills instruction. The 8 experimental studies provided clear causal evidence that students who have in-school independent reading time in addition to regular reading instruction, do significantly better on measures of reading achievement than peers who have not had reading time. Reading time was especially beneficial for students at earlier stages of reading development, in special education, in lower grades, those experiencing difficulties learning to read, and ELLs. The value of reading was also greater for students in rural and urban schools. The authors also examined the effects of reading time on students at varying levels of ability. Low ability readers benefited the most, performing significantly better on measures of vocabulary and comprehension than control group students of similar reading ability.

SECTION 3: THE IMPORTANCE OF READING ENGAGEMENT

Sustained reading engagement is strongly related to achievement in reading and it can also compensate for low achievement attributed to low family income and educational background.[xxxii] Engaged readers can overcome obstacles to achievement and become agents of their own reading growth.[xxxiii] Because students' perceptions of how competent they are as readers and writers affect their motivation, effective literacy instruction must address self-efficacy and engagement.[xxxiv] This is particularly important for older non-readers who lack confidence and motivation. They badly need to experience success, whereas remedial programs may not begin to show results for months ahead. Failure Free Reading supports this by establishing the task-specific phenomenon of self-efficacy with non-readers by convincing them that they have the ability to read at much higher grade levels with fluency and comprehension.

Failure Free Reading's explicit instruction and supports enable teachers working with students — particularly those who have low self-esteem and learning disabilities - with numerous and non-contrived opportunities to give positive feedback. This builds student motivation. The program's support for real-world connections to reading, interesting texts, supplemental reading, and positive social interactions also contribute to motivation and engagement.

Providing learners who are experiencing reading difficulties with clear goals for a comprehension task and then giving feedback on the progress they are making can lead to increased self-efficacy and greater use of comprehension strategies.[xxxv] Failure Free Reading provides explicit feedback in each lesson.

Finally, Failure Free Reading provides students with a consistent amount of daily reading time. Using the program, non-readers can spend up to 55 minutes of time engaged in constructive age-appropriate independent reading activities per instructional hour.

CONCLUSIONS

Designed as a highly-structured language intervention for non-readers of all ages, Failure Free Reading instruction is explicit, comprehensive, intensive, and supportive. The program's instructional design and methodology is fully grounded in research.

Reading Next

Failure Free Reading directly supports 10 of Reading Next's 15 recommendations for improving adolescent literacy:

Direct, explicit comprehension instruction
Effective instructional principles embedded in content
Motivation and self-directed learning
Text-based collaborative learning
Strategic tutoring
A technology component
Ongoing formative assessment
Extended time for literacy
Professional development
Ongoing summative assessment of students and programs

Bibliography

[i] Taylor, S., Frackenpohl, H., White, C., Nieroroda, B., Browning, C., & Birsner, E. (1989). *EDL core vocabularies*. Austin, Texas: Steck-Vaughn.

[ii] Allington, R. "The Missing Pillars of Scientifically-Based Reading Instruction." Wisconsin State Reading Association 2006 Convention, Keynote address. Milwaukee, WI.

[iii] Yatvin, J., Weaver, C. & Garan, E. *The Reading First Initiative: Cautions and Recommendations*. EdResearch.info. HYPERLINK "http://www.edresearch.info/reading_first/index.htm" http://www.edresearch.info/reading_first/index.htm.

[iv] McCormick, Sandra. (1994). "A Nonreader Becomes a Reader: A Case Study of Literacy Acquisition by a Severely Disabled Reader." *Reading Research Quarterly*, 29(2), 156-176.

[v] Hecht, S. A., Burgess, S. R., Torgeson, J. K., Wagner, R. K., & Rashotte, C. A. (2000). Explaining social class differences in growth of reading skills from beginning kindergarten through fourth grade. The role of phonological awareness, rate of access, and print knowledge. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal,* 12, 99-127.

[vi] National Research Council. (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, DC: National Accademy Press.

[vii] Hart. B. & Risley, T. R. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young American children*. Maryland: Paul H. Brooks.

[viii] Biemiller, A. (1999). Teaching vocabulary. *American Educator*. 25, 24-28.

[ix] Hasselbring, T. S., & Goin, L.I. (2004). "Literacy Instruction for Older Struggling Readers: What Is the Role of Technology?" *Reading & Writing Quarterly,* 20, 123-44.

[x] Marzano, Robert (2004). *Building Background Knowledge for Academic Achievement: Research on What Works in Schools*. Virginia: Association of Supervision & Curriculum Development.

[xi] National Reading Panel (2000). [cited in text as "Subgroup"]. Teaching students to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction: Reports of the subgroups (National Institute of Health Pub. No. 00-4754). Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

[xii] Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp. 403-422). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

[xiii] Wiig, E.H. & Semel E.M. (1980). *Language Assessment and Intervention.* Columbus: Charles E. Merrill.

[xiv] Braunger, J. & Lewis, J.P. (1997). *Building a Knowledge Base in Reading.* Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Laboratory's Curriculum and Instruction Services.

[xv] Hiebert, E.H. & Fisher, C.W. (April 2002). T*ext Matters in Developing Reading Fluency*. Paper presented at the International Reading Association, San Francisco, CA.

[xvi] Biemiller, A. (1999). Teaching vocabulary. *American Educator.* 25,24-28.

[xvii] Diamond, L. & Gutlohn, L. (2006). *Vocabulary Handbook.* Consortium on Reading Excellence, Inc. Berkeley, CA.

[xviii] Eller, R., Pappas, C., & Brown, E. (1988). The lexical development of kindergartners: Learning from written context. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 20, 5-24.

[xix] McCormick, S. (1994). A nonreader becomes a reader: a case of literacy acquisition by a severely disabled reader. *Reading Research Quarterly,* 157-176.

[xx] Hargis, C.H., Terhaar-Yonkers, M., Williams, P.C., & Reed, M.T. (1992). *Tennessee Educator,* 22, 31-34.

[xxi] Ibid.

[xxii] Sticht, T. G. & James, J. H. (1984). "Listening and Reading." In R. Barr, M. Kamil, & P. Mosenthal (eds.) *Handbook of Reading Research*. New York: Longmans.

[xxiii] Wiig, E. H. & Semel E.M. (1980). *Language Assessment and Intervention.* Columbus: Charles E. Merrill.

[xxiv] Botel, M., Dawkins, J., & Granowsky, A. (1973). "A Syntactic Complexity Formula." pp. 77-86 in Walter Gintie, Ed., *Assessment Problems in Reading.* Newark, Del.: Internation Reading Association.

[xxv] Braunger, J. & Lewis, J.P. (1997). *Building a Knowledge Base in Reading.* Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Laboratory's Curriculum and Instruction Services.

[xxvi] Langer, J., Nystrand, M., & Gamoran, A. (2003). "Discussion-Based Approaches to Developing Understanding: Classroom Instruction and Student Performance in Middle and High School English." *American Educational Research Journal,* 40(3), 685-730.

[xxvii] Olson, J. & Platt, J. (2000). The Instructional Cycle. *Teaching Children and Adolescents with Special Needs,* 170-197. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

[xxviii] Kamil, M. L., Intrator, S. M., & Kim, H. S. (2000). The effects of other technologies on literacy and literacy learning. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp.771-788). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

[xxix] Hasselbring, T. S., Goin, L. , Taylor, R., Bottge, B., & Daley, P. (1997). The computer doesn't embarrass me. *Educational Leadership,* 55(3), 30-33.

[xxx] Hall, T.E., Hughes, C.A., & Filbert, M. (2000). Computer assisted instruction in reading for students with learning disabilities: A research synthesis. *Education and Treatment of Children,* 23(2), 173-193.

[xxxi] Lewis, M., & Samuels, S.J. (2003). "Read More—Read Better? A Meta-Analysis of the Literature on the Relationship Between Exposure to Reading and Reading Achievement." Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota. Available online: http://www.tc.umn.edu/~samue001/publications.htm

[xxxii] Campbell, J.R., Voelkl, K.E., & Donahue, P.L. (1997). *NAEP 1996 trends in academic progress* (NCES Publication No. 97985r). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

[xxxiii] Guthrie, J.T., Schafer, W.D., & Huang, C. (2001). Benefits of opportunity to read and balanced reading instruction for reading achievement and engagement: A policy analysis of state NAEP in Maryland. *Journal of Educational Research*, 94(3), 145-162.

[xxxiv] Alvermann, D. E. (2001). "Effective Literacy Instruction for Adolescents." Executive Summary and Paper Commissioned by the National Reading Conference. Chicago: National Reading Conference: 24-25. Available for download at HYPERLINK "http://www.coe.uga.edu/lle/faculty/alvermann/effective2.pdf" http://www.coe.uga.edu/lle/faculty/alvermann/effective2.pdf.

[xxxv] Schunk, D. H., & Rice, J. M. (1993). Strategy fading and progress feedback: Effects on self efficacy and comprehension among students receiving remedial reading services. *Journal of Special Education*, 27, 257-276.

Failure Free Reading
140 Cabarrus Avenue West
Concord, North Carolina 28025
1.800.542.2170
www.failurefree.com