Integrated Fluency Instruction: Three Approaches for Working with Struggling Readers

Melanie KUHN *
Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

Timothy RASINSKI
Kent State University, Kent, OH, USA

Belinda ZIMMERMAN
Kent State University, Kent, OH, USA

Abstract

Effective fluency instruction should focus on reading with understanding, rather than simply reading quickly or expressively. This article outlines three research-based instructional approaches that assist students in developing accurate, automatic word recognition and prosody; at the same time, they ensure learners attend to the text's meaning as they read. All three approaches integrate instructional principles known to improve reading fluency (modeling, scaffolding, repetition, and extensive opportunity for the reading of connected text). They are also clear and easy-to-implement and have proven successful with struggling readers. As a result, these approaches contribute to learners' reading success both within and outside of the classroom.

Keywords: Reading fluency, Struggling readers, Reading instruction, Oral reading, Classroom interventions, Accuracy, automaticity, Prosody, Comprehension, Achievement gains, Reading ability, Teaching methods, Repetition, Word recognition

Introduction

Caleb's mother used to describe him as energetic and creative. However, lately she has noticed that he has become quite a serious and tired second grader, at least when asked to complete his twenty minutes of daily reading homework. On this particular day, Caleb's mother was beside herself. She had just opened a note from his teacher saying that Caleb was not making appropriate progress in reading and that he required more practice at home

---

* ✉ Melanie Kuhn, Boston University School of Education, Department of Language and Literacy, 2 Silber Way, Boston, MA 02215, United States or e-mail her at melaniek@bu.edu

– and perhaps even additional tutoring or intervention in school. His teacher further shared that during self-selected reading, Caleb rarely completed the books he started. More troubling, he was not able to make reading "sound like talk", and he rarely read in phrases or sentences. Instead, connected text was treated as a list of individual words that Caleb tried to sound out. This word-by-word-reading was painfully slow and his reading accuracy, expression, and comprehension were suffering as well. Whether at home or school, when Caleb was asked to read, his shoulders slumped, he placed his head close to the page, pointed slowly to each word, and often incorrectly proceeded to read the print. Even though his mother tried to encourage him to "take his time" and "sound it out," she expressed exasperation that she just did not know how to help him. As a result, she watched him struggle daily despite his working incredibly hard. Clearly, Caleb was losing his motivation, confidence, and interest in reading. His teacher continued to search for research-based strategies that would ameliorate the learning to read trajectory for Caleb and the other struggling readers in her class. His mother wondered if this meant he would continue to function well below his peers and would always find school difficult.

This vignette underscores that reading is a complex process that requires much more than word decoding. Fluent readers read with appropriate speed, expression, phrasing, and comprehension. Struggling readers, like Caleb, often lack fluency in their reading, pore over each individual word, and in turn, are unable to self monitor or grasp what the text is about. How can teachers best assist children to prevent or reverse this downward spiral in the classroom – and involve parents in the process?

Normal development of reading fluency, as well as other reading competencies, is the result of practice in reading. As students engage in guided and independent reading, their ability to recognize words improves, their vocabulary increases, their comprehension advances, and their reading fluency, both in terms of word recognition automaticity and prosody, improves. However, despite solid basic reading instruction, a significant number of students will still struggle in their fluency development. For these students a more direct and intensive form of fluency instruction may be appropriate. In this article we discuss several promising intensive and integrated approaches for improving students' reading fluency.

Integrated Approaches to Fluency Instruction

The fluency instruction approaches or routines presented in this article combine previously identified instructional principles (Rasinski, 1989) into three cohesive fluency curricula (Kuhn, Schwanenflugel, Morris, Morrow, Woo, Meisinger, Sevcik, Bradley, & Stahl, 2006; Rasinski, 1989). First, the approaches provide young or struggling learners with extensive opportunities to read *connected text*. Second, the approaches provide feedback and *modeling* that emphasize appropriate word recognition, phrasing and expression. Third, they incorporate sufficient support – or *scaffolding* – to allow readers to work with challenging reading materials (grade level or higher). Fourth, the instructional routines involve students in *repeated* exposures or readings of texts.

Although similar in the embodiment of these principles, the three approaches to fluency instruction differ in distinct ways: Fluency Oriented Reading Instruction (FORI) uses scaffolded repetition over multiple days as the backbone of its fluency instruction; Wide Reading Fluency Oriented Reading Instruction (Wide FORI) uses the scaffolded reading of a more extensive range of texts; and the Fluency Development Lesson (FDL) employs scaffolded repetitive readings of a text in one day. Current research indicates that all three of these approaches are effective in assisting learners in making the transition to fluency, when used as a part of a larger reading curriculum. In the remainder of this article, we describe the

three approaches in greater detail and discus issues related to their successful implementation.

Identifying Texts

Before discussing these reading fluency approaches in detail, we want to address the principle of using of challenging texts, since this diverges quite significantly from the conventional notion of using of instructional level texts for reading instruction (Kuhn et al., 2006). When it comes to selecting texts, it is critical to stress the role they will play in the lessons' success. Because the teacher will be providing significant scaffolding or support as part of each lesson, it is essential that the texts used be appropriately challenging. As such, we feel that students need to be reading from material that is generally at or somewhat above their grade level placement (e.g., second graders should be reading texts identified as levels J-P; Fountas & Pinnell, 1999). Such texts can readily be found in a school's basal reading program, literature anthologies, trade books, or, in the case of the FDL, poetry collections.

The structure, support, and repeated exposure and reading embedded in the FORI, Wide FORI, and FDL approaches will help students, even those reading below grade level, to read the assigned material successfully by the end of the lesson and accelerate their progress in fluency and overall reading achievement. When these lessons are used regularly over the course of the year, independent reading skills will gradually improve as a result of the amount of time students spend reading and *mastering connected text*.

FORI

Fluency Oriented Reading Instruction (FORI). Our first instructional approach was designed to help teachers implement their district's mandate that students be taught using only grade-level texts. This was seen as particularly problematic by many of the district's teachers, since many of their students were reading below grade level and these texts would likely be at the children's frustration level. As a result, the teachers and their colleagues at the local University worked together to develop a weekly lesson plan that would help make the material more accessible for their students. The approach presented here, Fluency-Oriented Reading Instruction (FORI; Stahl & Heubach, 2005), follows a basic format that allows for the *gradual release of responsibility* (Pearson & Gallagher, 1983; Vygotsky, 1978) for the reading of a particular text over the course of the week. The lesson plan is based on a five-day cycle, with the teacher providing full support for the material early on and lessening the support as the week continues so that, by the week's end, the children should be able to carry out the reading on their own.

Introducing the text (Day 1). Since the FORI approach relies on intensive repetition over multiple days, a single text is selected for a five-day lesson cycle. The week begins with an introduction of a new text on Monday (assuming an uninterrupted school week). This can be done through a range of pre-teaching activities including the building of background knowledge, the use of webbing, or the pre-teaching of vocabulary. This component of the FORI program should include activities that are typically used for a given selection. For example, if the story deals with life in the 1890's, the teacher would want to build background knowledge by discussing how different the students' lives would have been without cars, television, or even radios!

After introducing the text, the next step involves reading the week's selection aloud to the class while students follow along with their own copies. This is important for a number of reasons. First, it provides students with a sense of the selection as a whole; by doing this, they have an opportunity to understand the story before they have to read it themselves.

Second, the teacher's expressive, skilled rendering of the text serves as a model of fluent reading for students, allowing them to hear what their own reading should ultimately sound like. Finally, this reading presents students with the opportunity to see and track the words as they are being pronounced – without the demands of trying to decode them independently.

Following the read-aloud, the students should participate in a discussion of the text. This discussion may involve traditional question and answer sequences, but can also expand to encompass alternative approaches such as graphic organizers (e.g., story maps) or response-oriented instruction. We consider a comprehension focus early in the lesson to be important because it emphasizes that the construction of meaning is the primary purpose for reading. Since young readers spend significant amounts of energy on word recognition, they may otherwise develop the mistaken notion that correct word identification is the most important component of reading. By focusing students on the construction of meaning early in the lesson, it helps redirect students' attention toward comprehension, something they will hopefully continue to build on in the future (Hoffman & Crone, 1985).

Echo reading (Day 2). On the second day (usually a Tuesday), instruction consists of an echo reading of the text. In this component, the teacher reads two or three sentences aloud to the students who then "echo" or read back what has been read by the teacher. The purpose of reading several sentences aloud at one time, instead of just one sentence or a phrase, is to prevent students from relying on their memory to repeat the text. Instead, they are forced to focus on the words in order to echo the passages correctly. The teacher may also intersperse echo reading of the text with questions to keep students focused on the text's meaning and prevent the procedure from becoming rote. After completing the echo reading, the teacher should provide students with activities associated with expanding their understanding of the text, such as written responses, or the opportunity to work on other aspects of the literacy curriculum.

Students' at-home reading should also begin on the second instructional day since they should now be comfortable enough with the text to begin reading it on their own or with limited help. In order to achieve additional practice, the teacher should ask students to take the text home and read it to (or with) either a family member or a friend. For the remainder of the week, the students' homework is determined by the amount of continued support they will need in order to develop fluency with the selection. If a learner has achieved mastery of the text, he or she should have the opportunity to spend the time reading a book of her or his own choosing independently. If, on the other hand, the student requires additional support, he or she should continue to bring the week's primary reading selection home throughout the week to read again for homework.

Choral reading (Day 3). The FORI lessons continue on day 3 (usually Wednesday) with the teacher leading students in a *choral reading* of the text. This activity is the shortest of the week since it consists of the teacher and her class reading the entire text in unison. It is important that the teacher monitors the children during all the components of the instruction to ensure they are actively engaged in the oral reading of the text. This can be achieved most easily by walking among the learners or by having the students who are most likely to be off-task sit near the teacher or a more diligent student. As noted above, the students should either re-read that week's selection or a book of their own choosing for homework on the third as well as the fourth days.

Partner reading (Day 4). The final re-reading of the text involves a *partner reading* of the selection on day four (usually a Thursday). Partners can be selected in several ways, but self-selected partners and the pairing of more capable readers with their less skilled peers are

highly effective in promoting both on-task behavior and cooperation between partners. Once the students are paired, each is responsible for reading approximately a page of text (completing the sentence or paragraph they are currently working on if it continues onto the next page), before allowing their partner to take over and read the next page. The partners act as a coach for one another, offering assistance and encouragement to their partner as needed. If time allows, upon completing their initial reading of the text, the students can switch assigned pages and read through the selection a second time.

Extension activities (Day 5). On the final day (usually a Friday), students complete extension activities, such as written responses or further discussions of the text, with the teacher or, if the selection has been covered thoroughly, other literacy activities unassociated with the text. Depending on the number of times students read the text at home, the total number of repetitions for each selection will range between four and seven readings over the course of the week**.** While some discretion can be used regarding the number of days required to cover a given story or expository selection, depending on its length, we have found that the outlined lesson plan works extremely well for the vast majority of passages at these reading levels.

In a study of 18 children, randomly selected from five classrooms, engaged in a FORI of one passage over the course of one week it was found that, on average, the students went from a reading rate of approximately 78 words correct per minute (wcpm) to nearly 120 (wcpm). Using Hasbrouck and Tindal's (2006) fluency norms, these students went from the 25th to the 75th percentile in terms of their reading fluency improvement. We consider this to be significant progress indeed.

Wide Reading Fluency Oriented Reading Instruction

Wide-Reading FORI (Wide FORI) incorporates the same principles presented in FORI; however, rather than reading a single text repeatedly over the course of a week, in this component, students read three texts over the same five day period. The general protocol for Wide FORI is outlined below.

Introducing the text (Day 1). The first day of the lesson plan parallels the FORI lesson. It begins with pre-reading activities for the primary text of the week. This may involve building background knowledge, developing vocabulary, or making predictions about the content of the passage. Next, the teacher reads the text aloud while students follow along in their own copies. Finally, the students engage in a discussion of the selection with the teacher and may also be provided other opportunities to respond to the passage, such as completing a graphic organizer.

Echo reading of Primary Text (Days 2). The second day also parallels the FORI protocol with the teacher and students echo reading the story from the previous day. Again, the procedure involves the teacher reading the section of the text (usually several lines or a paragraph at a time) while the students echo read the same text. The teacher also has the option, depending on the amount of time available, of allowing students to partner read the text after the completion of the echo reading. This provides the students with the opportunity to work with a partner in order to re-read the entire text.

Extension activities (Day 3). Wide FORI begins to deviate from the FORI lesson plan on the third day. Rather than choral reading the material, students complete extension activities for the story (this parallels day 5 of the FORI approach). These can include written responses, such as presenting alternative endings or creating questions for discussion, or oral discussions, for example asking students to focus their attention on plot or character development. Since the Wide FORI protocol involves dealing with the week's primary

selection in three days instead of five, such activities are vital to strengthen the students' understanding of the text.

Echo reading (Days 4 & 5). The fourth and fifth days of Wide FORI involve echo reading and discussing a second and third text with students. Since the students are only working with the material for one day, it is important that the teacher works with them to develop their understanding of the selection. The Common Core Sate Standards repeatedly refer to this as "close reading" and this reading process is required across all grade levels. Again, if time is available, students can be asked to partner read these texts after completing their echo reading and discussion of the text for its meaning.

As with FORI instruction, both the primary text selection and the additional texts should be sent home for re-reading by the students. Thus, while the emphasis within Wide FORI is on the reading of multiple texts, some degree of repetition is incorporated in the approach.

In a large scale study of the implementation of FORI, Wide FORI, and a more typical reading instruction over the course of school year, researchers found that students in both the FORI and Wide FORI demonstrated statistically significant and substantial gains in word recognition and comprehension over students who received the more conventional reading instruction (Kuhn, et al., 2006). Moreover, students in the Wide FORI treatment also demonstrated significantly greater improvements in oral reading fluency as well. If comprehension improvement is the ultimate goal of fluency instruction, then both FORI and Wide FORI appear to be effective.

Wide FORI or FORI? We recommend the WFORI over the FORI for two reasons: First, we found the students in the Wide FORI instruction did somewhat better than did their peers in the FORI group (although this difference was not significant – and both groups did better than their peers in the control classrooms). Second, research conducted by Mostow and Beck (2005) also indicates that students learn to read a new word more easily when they encountered it in different contexts than when they encountered it repeatedly in the same context. That is, students are more likely to learn the word *blue* in the phrases, the *blue* car, the *blue* dress, and the *blue* sky, than if they were to see the phrase, the *blue* car three separate times. It may be that Wide FORI benefits children by indirectly providing repetition of words (and phrases) across a range of contexts and content.

Having said this, there is a plethora of evidence (e.g., Dowhower, 1989; Kuhn & Stahl, 2003; Rasinski & Hoffman, 2003; Rasinski, Reutzel, Chard, & Linan-Thompson, 2011) indicating that guided and supported repeated readings of texts has distinct benefits for students, especially for selections that introduce students to new concepts and vocabulary, and those benefits appear to extend beyond those texts that are repeatedly read. It may be that the ideal combination is the use of scaffolding with a range of texts read once, or perhaps twice, and the use of scaffolding with particular texts read repeatedly and which is used depends on both the text and the reason(s) it is being read.

Fluency Development Lesson

The Fluency Development Lesson (FDL) incorporates the same principles found in FORI and Wide FORI. However, rather than spreading the lesson components over multiple days, each FDL occurs in one day. The reasoning behind this single day approach is that students with difficulties in reading fluency lag in terms of normal reading development. For them to catch up their progress must be accelerated. This can occur in several ways, including condensing what is normally a multiple day lesson in other fluency instruction (e.g. repeated readings over the course of multiple days) to provide the intensity in instruction that may lead to accelerative progress.

Second, students who struggle in reading often do not view themselves as making substantial progress in their reading development. When students regularly see themselves reading texts in disfluent ways, they begin to view this disfluent reading as normal; this, in turn, limits their potential for developing their reading to the point where it is fluent like their more advanced classmates. Because students essentially learn to read text fluently with each daily lesson when using the FDL, they see themselves as making progress and recognize that they can achieve the same level of fluency as their more high achieving classmates.

Of course, because the goal of the FDL is to read a new text well on a daily basis and because the FDL is limited to approximately 20-30 minutes in length, it is critical that the selection chosen are authentic and that they allow mastery in relatively short periods of time. We have found that poetry and other rhythmic texts, (e.g., song lyrics, speeches) are ideally suited for the FDL. Poetry for children is usually short in length, which lends itself to quick mastery. Moreover, the rhythm and rhyme often embedded in poems for children add to the predictability and memorability of the texts, thus adding to their ability to be quickly mastered. It should be noted that in recent years, poetry has been relegated to an increasingly marginal place in the reading and language arts curriculum (Gill, 2008) despite the fact that new iterations of reading standards (e.g. Common Core State Standards, 2014) specifically mention poetry as a text genre that should be part of an ideal and effective reading instruction program.

Ostensibly, the goal of the FDL is for students to reach a point where they can read a new text accurately, fluently, and with good comprehension each day. The lesson is intended to be implemented daily, though depending on the exigencies of classroom and clinical schedules, it can be modified to 3-4 times per week and still be effective. Each lesson requires two copies of the daily text to be provided for each student; one display copy for teacher modeling and group reading and one for the students to place in their poetry notebooks and share with parents/caregivers. The actual lesson requires about 40 minutes at the outset. However, as the lesson becomes more routinized and teacher and students become more familiar with the instructional protocol, the time involved can be reduced to 20-25 minutes per day. The steps involved in the FDL are as follows:

1) The teacher reintroduces the text from the previous day's lesson and invites students, individually or in groups, to read/perform it for the class.

2) The teacher next introduces a new text and reads it to the students two or three times while the students listen to the teacher's reading or follow along silently. The text can be a poem, a text segment from a trade book or the class reading program, etc. The teacher can change the prosodic nature of the modeled reading or make some intentional errors in word recognition, phrasing, etc. in subsequent rereadings of the text.

3) Teacher and students discuss the nature and content of the passage as well as the quality of teacher's readings of the passage. Which one of the readings did students find most fluent? Why?

4) Teacher and students then read the passage chorally several times. Antiphonal reading and other choral variations (e.g. echo reading) are used to create variety and maintain engagement.

5) Teacher organizes students into pairs or trios. Each student then practices the passage multiple times while the partner(s) listens and provides support and

encouragement. The goal is to reach a point where all students are able to read the text fluently and meaningfully.

6) Individuals and groups of students perform their reading for the class or other audiences such as another class or teacher, a parent visitor, the school principal or other school staff. Students can also record their reading for later playback or to be archived.

7) After having read the text several times, students may have it or a portion of it memorized and so when they perform (step 6 above) may not be attending to the words on the pages as they should. So, shortly before or after the students perform, the students and their teacher engage in a study of selected words from the text. The teacher and students harvest four to eight words they think are interesting words from the text to add to the individual students' word banks and/or the classroom word display. The words on the classroom word display are read daily by students. The teacher encourages students to use the words in their own oral and written language.

The teacher leads the students in five to ten minutes of word study. The word study activities can take a variety of forms; here are a few:

a. Play a word game using the chosen (and other) words (e.g. Wordo – word bingo).

b. Sort the words by presence or absence of various features (vowel sound, number of syllables. presence of a consonant blend).

c. Expand on certain word families present in the chosen words. For example if the word *gold* was harvested, the teacher can point out the "–old" word family and brainstorm other words that contain that pattern (e.g. *bold, fold, oldest, cold, mold, hold, sold*).

d. Create cloze sentences/passages in which the harvested words are used to fill in the missing blanks in the sentence or passage.

e. Engage in a word building exercise in which new words are created by changing, adding, subtracting, or rearranging letters from a given word.

8) Students take a copy of the passage home to continue their practice of the passage with parents and other family members. The other copy of the passage is kept in their fluency notebook for further practice and performing in school.
9) The instructional routine then begins on the following day by rereading the passage from the previous day (step 1) and then introducing and mastering a new passage (steps 2-9).

Using the FDL on a daily or near daily basis can lead to significant improvements in various aspects of reading. For example, in a university-based reading clinic setting co-directed by two of the authors, there is an ideal opportunity to work exclusively with students who struggle in reading. At the clinic, the FDL serves as the core lesson. In fact, two recent studies examining the usefulness of the FDL to assist primary-aged struggling readers in making gains in fluency and overall reading development (Zimmerman & Rasinski, 2013; Zimmerman, Rasinski, Kruse, Was, Dunlosky, & Rawson, in press), have indicated that the

students receiving the FDL treatment made significant gains from pre-test to post-test in the areas of word recognition, fluency, and comprehension, even when compared to a control group. Moreover, teachers employing the FDL have been very enthusiastic about its use as they see previously "stalled" students now making substantial progress in their reading. It is important to note, however, that the FDL is not just a clinical practice. It is an instructional routine that includes components that any teacher can implement and modify in any reading context to meet the fluency, word recognition, and comprehension needs of students.

Conclusion

As a result of our research and experiences with all three approaches, we consider the FORI, Wide FORI, and FDL fluency lessons to be viable approaches for developing reading fluency among primary grade students or students at other grade levels experiencing difficulty in fluency development. Classroom teachers and interventionists can choose the lesson structure that best fits their particular circumstances. Teachers who have used these approaches have found them to be effective and easy to implement, and the students have genuinely enjoyed them. Moreover, the demonstrable improvements in fluency and other reading competencies make them highly motivating for students as well. Importantly, in this period of high levels of accountability, there is a substantial body of research that supports integrated fluency instruction, based on the known principles of effective fluency instruction, in general and specifically the approaches described in this article (Kuhn, et al., 2006). The research suggests that the results of integrated fluency instruction can be generalized across a range of SES levels and classroom and clinical settings. This research also indicates that fluency instruction, whether based upon more intense repetition or the supported reading of a wider range of texts, is effective.

For us, the most critical feature is the amount of time our students spent reading authentic and connected text – a minimum of 20 minutes per day. We cannot emphasize enough that both of these methods are designed to increase student engagement with print and that it is essential that our students read aloud at least 20-30 minutes per day during this very important phase in children's reading development. However, there is a second element to this equation. The engagement with text must be undertaken with extensive scaffolding since these methods employ texts that are challenging for most children. We feel that this procedure is especially important for struggling readers because it gives them the opportunity to work with and be successful with grade level texts, even though much of this material is written at a level that is considerably higher than many of these learners can comfortably decode. Research indicates that when the texts being used were not sufficiently challenging, students did not make significant progress. It is the scaffolding of challenging texts provided through the FORI, Wide FORI, and FDL approaches, whether through repetition or modeling (e.g. the use of echo, choral, and partner reading), that allows students to read text that would otherwise be considered frustrating.

This approach is quite different from the commonly used strategy of selecting a text based on children's reading level. Current best practice generally recommends that instructional level texts be read at approximately 95% level of accuracy, based on the Betts (1946) notion of instructional, independent, and frustration. However, when the goal is fluency and the learners are provided with a variety of supports, such as are available with these fluency-oriented approaches, students are able to read texts at a higher difficulty level than would generally be suggested – texts that would normally be considered to be beyond their ability. Further, reading richer texts benefits children by exposing them to a wider variety and volume of words as well as a greater range of concepts. Both of these factors

contribute to good decoding and comprehension skills (e.g., Beck, McKeown, & Kucan, 2002; Guthrie, 2004). They also serve to narrow the gap between more and less skilled readers that develops – and often widens – as students progress through their school years (Stanovich, 1984).

At the same time, we would not suggest that children should be given a text of that is completely beyond them, even with support. Rather, we agree with Stahl and Heubach's (2005) suggestion that, with strong support, children can benefit from texts that they have an accuracy rate of approximately 85%. The level of support offered to students should be commensurate with the difficulty of the text. More challenging reading material requires more scaffolding for students. Further, it is worth bearing in mind that the more difficult texts are for children's reading ability, the more support they will need from scaffolding, repetition, or additional reading at home. When the texts are closer to the children's reading level, it is likely that less scaffolding will be needed to support their reading development. In fact, scaffolding would likely be of far less benefit when students use text at their independent – or even the high end of their instructional – level since they can handle such material with minimal support (e.g., Hollingsworth, 1970).

Despite the effectiveness of these approaches, fluency oriented instruction is not for all children. For example, students who are already fluent readers are better off working with content area text and challenging fiction, rather than engaging in the approaches outlined here. However, for many children to become successful readers, they need to make accelerated progress. While this progress will look different across the grades and for different goals, one goal involves assisting children in developing their ability to read grade level text with fluency and comprehension. The programs presented here can help students make such progress.

●　　●　　●

Melanie KUHN is an associate professor in Literacy Education at Boston University. Her research interests include literacy instruction for striving readers, comprehension development, vocabulary instruction and text complexity. She has authored or co-authored numerous articles, chapters, and books on fluency, including *Developing fluent readers: Teaching fluency as a foundational* skill through the Guilford Press.

Timothy RASINSKI is a professor of curriculum and instruction in the Reading and Writing Center at Kent State University, Kent, OH, USA. His scholarly interests include reading fluency and students who struggle in learning to read. He has written extensively on reading fluency and is author of *The Fluent Reader* (Scholastic), a prominent professional book on fluency.

Belinda ZIMMERMAN is an assistant professor of Literacy and Early Childhood Education at Kent State University where she teaches graduate and undergraduate courses in literacy education and is director of the KSU reading clinic. Her research centers on helping struggling readers to achieve success and in assisting both pre-service and practicing teachers in providing the highest quality literacy instruction possible for all learners.

References

Beck, I.L., McKeown, M.G., & Kucan, L. (2002). *Bringing words to life: Robust vocabulary instruction*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Betts, E.A. (1946). Foundations of reading instruction. New York: American Book Co. Common Core State Standards Initiative (204). Common Core State Standard Initiative. Downloaded June 24, 2014 from: http://www.corestandards.org/.

Dowhower, S. (1989). Repeated reading: Theory into practice. *The Reading Teacher, 42*, 502-507.

Fountas, I.C., & Pinnell, G.S. (1999). Matching books to readers: Using leveled books in guided reading, K-3. Portsmouth, NH : Heinemann.

Gill, S. R. (2007). The forgotten genre of children's poetry. *The Reading Teacher, 60,* 622-625.

Hasbrouck, J., & Tindal, G. A. (2006) Oral reading fluency norms: A valuable assessment tool for reading teachers. *The Reading Teacher, 59*(7), 636-644.

Hoffman, J. V., & Crone, S. (1985). The oral recitation lesson: A research-derived strategy for reading basal texts. In J.A. Niles & R.V. Lalik (Eds.), *Issues in literacy: A research perspective, 34th yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 76-83). Rochester, NY: National Reading Conference.

Kuhn, M., Schwanenflugel, P., Morris, R., Morrow, L, Woo, D., Meisinger, E., Sevcik, R., Bradley, B., & Stahl, S. (2006). Teaching children to become fluent and automatic readers, *Journal of Literacy Research, 38*, 357-387.

Kuhn, M. R., & Stahl, S. A. (2003). Fluency: A review of developmental and remedial practices. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*, 3-22.

Pearson, P.D., & Gallagher, M.C., (1983). The instruction of reading comprehension. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 8*, 317-344.

Rasinski, T. V. (1989). Fluency for everyone: Incorporating fluency in the classroom. *The Reading Teacher, 42*, 690–693.

Rasinski, T.V., & Hoffman, J.V (2003). Oral reading in the school curriculum. *Reading Research Quarterly, 38*, 510-522.

Stahl, S.A., & Heubach, K.M. (2005). Fluency-Oriented Reading Instruction. *Journal of Literacy Research, 37,* 25-60.

Stanovich, K.E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly, 21*, 360-407.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). Mind in Society. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Zimmerman, B.S., Rasinski, T.V., & Malewski, M. (2013). When kids can't read, what a focus on fluency can do: The reading clinic experience at Kent State University. In E. Ortleib, E. Cheek (Eds.), *Advanced Literacy Practices: From the clinic to the classroom* (pp. 137-160). United Kingdom: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Zimmerman, B.S., Rasinski, T.V., Kruse, S.D., Was, C., Dunlosky, J., & Rawson, K. (in press). Enhancing outcomes for struggling readers: An empirical analysis of the Fluency Development Lesson. *International Journal of School and Educational Psychology*.

www.iejee.com

This page is intentionally left blank