

Adolescent Struggling Readers in Urban Schools: Results of a Latent Class Analysis

Irma F. Brasseur-Hock

Michael F. Hock

Gina Biancarosa

Michael J. Kieffer

Donald D. Deshler

December 31, 2009

The research reported here was supported by the Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education by grant R305G04011 to *The University of Kansas Center for Research on Learning*. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not represent views of the Institute or the U.S. Department of Education.

Abstract

In the present study, our goal was to identify unique clusters of Adolescent Struggling Reader (ASRs) and examine the reading skill profiles each cluster presented. We assessed 319 students attending urban schools on three standardized measures of reading comprehension and eight standardized measures of component skills, including vocabulary, listening comprehension, word- and text-level reading accuracy and fluency. The mean age of the students was 14.9 years, and they were entering 9th grade students. Using Latent Class Analysis (LCA), we identified four empirically distinct levels of reading comprehension and classified a subsample of students as below-average comprehenders ($n = 195$). Within this subsample, we performed a second LCA that identified five sub-groups with distinct profiles of component skills. These results suggest a great deal of heterogeneity in strengths and weaknesses of component reading skills within the ASR group, implying the need for diagnostic assessment and differentiated intervention.

Recently, a great deal of attention has been focused on adolescent literacy, particularly as it relates to reading proficiency (Biancarosa & Snow, 2004; Christenbury, Bomer, & Smagorinsky, 2009; IRA, 2009; National Center for Educational Statistics, 2004). While this trend is welcomed by researchers, practitioners, and policy makers, many claims about the nature of the reading challenges faced by Adolescent Struggling Readers (ASRs), especially those in urban schools, are largely lacking scientific foundation. Evidence that describes the reading skill profile of ASRs and that further identifies statistically unique sub-groups of struggling readers is limited. This limitation presents a serious challenge for those designing interventions intended to have a significant impact on the achievement performance of ASRs. Because of the continued magnitude of the achievement gap and the limited amount of instructional time available to close the gap with ASRs, it is important to increase the precision with which we can identify subgroups of ASRs so interventions can be better tailored to the unique needs of students and optimize the return on investment of our intervention work. In this study, we use Latent Class Analysis to identify and describe the reading component skill profile of homogeneous sub-groups of ASRs to help inform such efforts.

The Challenge

The magnitude of challenges facing adolescents, especially those who attend urban high schools, is striking. For example, in some of the largest urban school districts, nearly 65% of all adolescents read below the “satisfactory” level on state reading assessments (Council of Great City Schools, 2001). Consequently, these students are unable to understand and respond to the complex literacy demands of secondary school subject-matter courses (Hock et al., 2009; Lee, Grigg, & Donahue, 2007). The reading achievement scores for adolescents who struggle with learning have remained virtually unchanged for the last 30 years with 70% of the students at the

Basic or Below Basic level and unable to understand complex material written at grade level (Lee, Grigg, & Donahue, 2007). Collectively, these data are being characterized as one of the most pressing crises facing the educational system in the U. S. (Deshler, 2006; Kamil, et al., 2008; Scammacca, Roberts, Vaughn, Edmonds, Wexler, Reutebuch, & Torgesen, 2007).

A variety of factors have contributed to the literacy crisis confronting large portions of our high school populations. One of the most important is the ineffectiveness of instruction that is provided to many adolescents who struggle with reading (Kamil, 2003). While there are some adolescents who leave elementary grades as virtual non-readers or who are severely deficient in word recognition, the largest group of ASRs is hypothesized to be those who have acquired some, but not sufficient, reading skills to enable them to escape the “fourth-grade slump ” (Biancarosa, Palincsar, Deshler, & Nair, 2007; Chall, 1983). Specifically, nearly 65% of ASRs in poor urban settings fall between the 5th and the 30th percentile in reading performance (Council of Great City Schools, 2001; Curtis, 2002), raising the hypothesis that these students have some decoding skills, but perhaps not at a level that enables them to deal fluently with subject-matter reading demands (Biancarosa et al., 2007). In addition, there is reason to believe that they lack the required skills and strategies to meet comprehension expectations (Biancarosa et al., 2007). However, in the absence of data on their component skills using multiple, independent measures, it is unclear whether these claims are justified.

A limited understanding of the component reading skill profiles of this heterogeneous population and the consequent lack of targeted intervention may be at the root of the continued poor literacy performance of ASRs. That is, if literacy instruction is not aligned with the unique profiles of ASRs, closing the academic literacy gap experienced by ASRs may be impossible. Thus, knowledge of the unique needs of sub-groups within the general category of ASR may

help inform instruction that addresses the specific needs of struggling readers (e.g., Connor, et al., 2009; Connor, Morrison, Fishman, Schatschneider, & Underwood, 2007; Mellard, Fall, & Mark, 2009)

Theoretical Underpinnings

The ultimate goal of our study was to identify specific clusters of ASRs and the unique reading component skill profiles they present. Our primary motivation was to inform instruction and policy by adding to the empirical knowledge base about ASR's differences in reading. Theoretically, we framed our analysis of the data using an overarching view of reading comprehension as described in the Simple View of Reading (Gough & Tunmer, 1986; Hoover & Gough, 1990).

The Simple View of Reading proposes that reading comprehension is a product of word recognition and linguistic comprehension (Gough & Tunmer, 1986; Hoover & Gough, 1990). This view does not deny the complexities of reading, but rather divides them into two components. The word recognition component is responsible for translating print into language, and the comprehension component makes sense of this linguistic information. The word recognition component encompasses efficient decoding, accurate sight-word recognition, fluent word reading and access to appropriate words in the reader's mental lexicon that provides semantic information at the word level. Thus, efficient word recognition allows the reader to quickly pronounce a word and triggers recognition of words acquired through language experiences (e. g., prior knowledge). Linguistic comprehension is defined as knowledge of facts and concepts, vocabulary, language and text structures, and verbal reasoning structures and strategies. Some researchers refer to linguistic comprehension as a language comprehension since measures of language comprehension seem to capture that domain (e.g., Catts et al., 2005).

The interaction of these two components results in reading comprehension (Gough & Tunmer, 1986; Hoover & Gough, 1990). Both of these theoretical components are essential to developing fluent and effective reading comprehension but neither is sufficient on its own.

In the Simple View of Reading, skilled reading requires both bottom-up and top-down processes that are not always sequential but rather occur simultaneously and in relationship to each other. If one component is weak, then efficient and effective comprehension is difficult. For example, if word recognition accuracy is poor and effortful, comprehension of text will be limited, as most cognitive energy will be required to make sense of words in text (e.g., Adams, 1990; Ehri, 1997; Ehri, 1998; LaBerge & Samuels, 1974; Perfetti, Marron, & Foltz, 1996; Torgesen, 1999; Torgesen, Wagner, & Rashotte, 1994). Similarly, if linguistic comprehension is limited, even though words can be read accurately and with acceptable pace, understanding of text may be limited due to vocabulary, semantics, lack of prior knowledge, or text structure knowledge deficits (e.g., Catts, Fey, Zhang, & Tomblin, 2002; Catts & Hogan, 2005; Kintsch, 1998; McCardle, Scarborough, & Catts, 2001). Numerous studies have been conducted to demonstrate the effects of each of the components described above (e.g., Foorman, Francis, Fletcher, Schatschneider, & Metha, 1998; Rashotte, MacPhee, & Torgesen, 2001; Torgesen, et al., 2001). The results of such studies show that each component is necessary for proficient reading comprehension and that neither is independently sufficient for comprehension. However, little empirical evidence exists showing whether the component reading skills identified in the Simple View hold for ASRs entering high school. Additionally, there is little empirical evidence that a two-component view of reading as described in the Simple View holds for older struggling readers.

One implication of this componential theory of reading is that there may be sub-groups of struggling readers who have weaknesses in specific component skills, leading researchers to investigate whether there is empirical evidence for heterogeneity in the sources of reading difficulties. If specific sub-groups of readers are empirically identified among the population of ASRs that both support the Simple View and expand theoretical knowledge of ASRs, our overall understanding of reading development may be enhanced. For example, we may be able to answer questions like, “Have most ASRs acquired at least a basic command of word level skills as described in the Simple View, and therefore, struggle with comprehension primarily because of language comprehension deficits or will they cluster into unique classes with distinct component skill profiles that may include both word level and language comprehension deficits?”

In the present study, ASRs were administered a battery of reading component measures aligned with the two main components of the Simple View of reading in an effort to determine if the model holds for ASRs or if it might differ. For example, we sought first to determine if ASRs who were poor comprehenders lacked word level skill proficiency (i.e., phonics, decoding, word recognition, and fluency skills) or do they lack skills related to language comprehension (i.e., vocabulary, semantics, lack of prior knowledge, or text structure knowledge deficits). Second, we wanted to determine whether ASRs fit empirically unique groups that were statistically distinct within the structure of the Simple View of Reading. Limited research on reading skill profiles has been conducted with the targeted age group and no studies have been conducted to determine ASR profiles linked to the Simple View of Reading.

Previous descriptive studies have been conducted in order to describe the reading skill profiles of struggling readers. Although these studies have added to our understanding of the reading skills of struggling readers, the data are limited and do not include high school readers. Moreover,

findings are often contradictory. Therefore, the field would benefit from additional research in this area.

Foundational studies with children. Research indicates that a significant number of children have reading disabilities but little research has been conducted that describes the characteristics of these children and their reading skill profiles (Badian, 1999; Shaywitz, Escobar, Shaywitz, Fletcher, & Makuch, 1992). One study that did look at student characteristics and reading sub-groups with a population of young readers was conducted by Konold, Juel, McKinnon, and Deffes (2003). In this study, a multivariate analysis of early reading skill acquisition of students five to ten years of age was conducted. The researchers analyzed a large subset (n= 1,604) of the standardization sample for the Woodcock Diagnostic Reading battery (Woodcock, 1991). In a descriptive analysis, they identified six distinct and homogeneous core profiles. They found that there was a developmental shift in skills and abilities that influence reading proficiency with strength in phonological processing outweighing other strengths at age five. They also found that strengths in comprehension knowledge and short-term memory were of greater importance in reading proficiency for ten year-olds. Additionally, while overall reading skill profiles were stable and somewhat flat for all readers in all six groups, overall ability mediated reading success and distinguished reading subtypes. An important finding was that there seem to be multiple paths to reading proficiency.

Vellutino, Tunmer, Jaccard, & Chen (2007) studied children in grades 2 and 3. They administered a large battery of tests to the children that measured specific reading sub-skills and reading-related cognitive skills. The same tests were also administered to an older group of students in grades 6 and 7, allowing for age-group comparisons. The students were from middle and upper middle class schools. Students included in the study scored at the >90 standard score level on at least one of the subtests of the WISC-R (Wechsler, 1974). Key findings for younger students indicate that

word identification and related phonological skills on one hand and reading comprehension on the other were strong. In contrast, the relationship between language comprehension and reading comprehension was stronger for the older group. Importantly, the researchers found that language comprehension becomes the dominant process in reading comprehension when the reader has become proficient in word identification. Thus, the link between word level and language level skills and processes were affirmed. Both of these studies help establish a foundation for research with older populations.

Younger adolescents. Buly and Valencia (2003) examined the reading skills of 108 fifth-grade students who scored poorly on the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL). Students who participated in the study scored at levels 1 and 2 (on a scale of 1 to 4) on the reading portion of the assessment. At the district level, 57% percent of the students were Caucasian and 43% were students of color. Students in the sample performed poorly on all reading measures, including word identification, phonemic awareness, comprehension, vocabulary, rate, and expression. However, three factors accounted for 78% of the variance on the WASL scale scores: word identification, meaning, and fluency.

The authors found that poor student performance on the state reading assessment was due primarily to issues related to reading fluency and comprehension. Further, word-level problems contributed minimally to poor reading performance, and only about 9% of the students in the sample were poor readers in terms of word recognition, fluency, and meaning. Thus, most struggling readers in the study needed instruction primarily in comprehension and fluency, with very few needing instruction in all three areas.

In another descriptive study, Leach and colleagues (2003) studied late-identified reading disability (RD) in a sample of 161 fourth and fifth graders. The sample consisted primarily of

Caucasian students; only 5% of the students were students of color. Ninety-five of these young adolescents were considered typically achieving readers, and 66 were identified as having some type of RD based on a standard score of 86 or less on reading comprehension tests.

On the basis of reading skill component scores, the authors assigned students to one of four groups; (a) the RC group, which included students with good word-level skills but poor comprehension; (b) the WL group, which consisted of students with deficits in word-level skills but good comprehension; (c) the WL-RC, group in which students had deficits in both word-level and comprehension skills; and (d) the NRD group, in which deficits were not detected in either word-level or comprehension skills.

In the groups with reading deficits, 35% of the students had word-level processing deficits with adequate comprehension (WL), 32% had deficits in comprehension with adequate word-level skills (RC), and 32% had deficits in both word-level and comprehension skills (WL-RC). Thus, about two thirds of the poor readers had comprehension deficits, and about 2/3 had word-level deficits. Additionally, 41% to 47% of the poor readers were late-developing RD in that they had adequate reading skills before the fourth grade.

Older adolescents. In a longitudinal study of students followed from second grade through eighth grade, Catts et al. (2005) examined the word recognition and listening comprehension skills of poor readers over time. They assessed students at grades 2, 4, and 8. Within the first portion of the study, the authors used data from 527 students who participated in a longitudinal and epidemiological study through eighth grade. A regression analysis showed that word recognition and listening comprehension accounted for 76.6% (second grade), 71.8% (fourth grade), and 72.8% (eighth grade) of the composite variance in measures of reading comprehension across grade levels. Word recognition and listening comprehension varied in their unique contributions to reading

comprehension across grade levels and across time. For example, word recognition played a large role in predicting reading comprehension in the early grades, whereas listening comprehension was significantly more predictive of overall reading comprehension as students grew older.

For the second portion of the study, the authors selected from the sample of 527 students who could be identified as poor readers ($N=154$). Eighth-grade readers in this analysis clustered into one of three skill categories: (a) dyslexic or students with deficits in word recognition but adequate listening comprehension (13.3%); (b) mixed RD or students with deficits in both word recognition and listening comprehension (36%); and (c) specific comprehension deficit or students with adequate word recognition but deficits in listening comprehension (30%). Thus, Catts et al. (2005) found that about 49% of the eighth-grade poor reader group had poor word recognition and about 66% had poor comprehension.

These findings clarified the influence that developmental stages have on student reading skill profiles. For example, in the second-grade analysis, listening comprehension accounted for only 9% of the unique variance in reading comprehension, whereas in the eighth-grade analysis, it accounted for 36% of the unique variance. Thus, these findings support the developmental nature of reading and highlight the shifting importance that word-level and language comprehension skills play in predicting reading comprehension. Also, according to Catts et al. (2005), by the eighth grade, word-level reading skills contribute minimally to reading comprehension, and the percentage of poor readers who struggle with comprehension nearly doubles by the fourth and eighth grades. Catts et al. (2005) also found evidence of a fourth-grade slump, whereby students considered to be satisfactory readers in second grade were identified as struggling readers by fourth grade.

Adults. Sabatini (2002) examined the impact of rate or speed of processing on reading proficiency in adult struggling readers. While this study focused on key reading and ability elements

(rate or speed of processing) with a somewhat older population, the study also provided profiles of reading component skills by examining how comprehension, word-level skills, and basic processing speed vary across word recognition skill levels in adult proficient and struggling readers. In addition, the researcher found that overall ability played a significant role in determining proficiency in both word-level skills (decoding and rate) and comprehension. Adult readers in the study presented significantly different profiles in terms of reading ability. Specifically, the proficient group possessed both accurate and efficient word-level skills, the average group demonstrated adequate word-level skills, but they were not automatic in their use, and the low group struggled with accuracy in word-level reading as well as with efficiency in reading rate. A key mediator of reading proficiency seemed to be processing speed and general ability, especially for the two lower reading groups. Thus, adult struggling readers present heterogeneous reading profiles and may require differentiated instruction in multiple reading skills to meet their needs.

Taken together across the age span, these studies bring clarity to the discussion about the reading skill profiles of struggling readers. However, none of these studies occurred with older adolescents in high school settings and the extent to which the findings can be generalized to them is unknown. Additionally, none of the studies focused on struggling readers in urban schools with the intent to capture the range of skills possessed by this specific population. Furthermore, the results of these studies are somewhat mixed. For example, Buly and Valencia (2003) found only 9% of the population to have reading significant deficits in word identification, fluency, and comprehension. In contrast, Catts et al. (2005) and Leach et al. (2003) found between 49% and 67%, respectively, of the struggling reader group to demonstrate deficits in word identification and comprehension.

Some of the differences among these studies might be attributable to their focus on different parts of the age span, but they are just as likely due to important differences in their purposes. For example, while Catts and colleagues sought to investigate the contributions of language impairment to reading skills over time and Vellutino and colleagues sought to describe the etiology of reading disability over time, Buly and Valencia sought to describe the reading skills of students failing a state reading test, and Leach and colleagues sought to establish whether reading difficulties can truly emerge later in development. These differences in their purposes led to very different approaches to sampling, measures, and methods.

Suited to their different purposes, each study utilized a unique approach to sampling, measures, and analysis methods, but more importantly the studies differed considerably in whether and how they defined poor readers before investigating sub-types of struggling readers. Reviewed here are just four of the studies to illustrate the wide range in methodology. Konold and colleagues sampled the full range of achievement from a test-standardization sample and used cluster analysis to define their struggling readers based on their performance on measures of reading skills thought to underlie reading achievement: short-term memory, processing speed, two measures of phonological awareness, and two measures of language comprehension. Vellutino and colleagues stratified their sample based on four levels performance on a single reading comprehension measure (severely impaired, moderately impaired, average, and good readers) and then employed confirmatory factor analysis using at least two measures of each theorized latent construct. In contrast, Buly and Valencia's sample was defined struggling by virtue of students having failed the state reading test, multiple measures were reduced to three factors (word identification, fluency, and meaning) using exploratory factor analysis, and then used cluster analysis to define sub-types of struggling readers based on their performance on the

three factors. Consistent with many other studies of struggling readers, Catts and colleagues used a cut-score to define poor readers: in this case performing 1 *SD* or more below the mean on a composite of three reading comprehension measures. They then defined sub-groups of struggling readers again using 1 *SD* cut-scores, this time on composites of listening comprehension and of word recognition. However, the authors also noted that examination of a bivariate scatterplot of struggling readers' performance on the listening comprehension and word recognition composites revealed that readers did not fall into clear sub-groups but rather into one data cloud; thus, the choice of cut-scores seemed primarily responsible for their definition.

The differences among these four studies alone lay bare how influential the choice of method is in a study of sub-types of struggling readers. Although each of these methods has some strengths relative to the purposes of the individual studies, none of them utilize modern model-based techniques for differentiating between struggling and average performing readers across several measures of reading comprehension. In particular, the use of cut-scores, while offering advantages for clinical diagnoses, may not necessarily represent the qualitative breaks in the distribution that empirically separate struggling readers from others, as suggested by the findings of Catts and colleagues. In addition, it should also be noted that most of the studies reviewed adhered strictly to a Simple View definition of component reading skills and did not assess oral reading fluency or processing speed, with the exception of Konold and colleagues and of Buly and Valencia. It remains unclear how findings might differ were a wider range of measures used and were measures not constrained to represent one or another latent construct prior to struggling reader sub-type definition. The present study adds to this literature in four ways: by investigating sub-types of struggling adolescent readers, an understudied population; by using multiple measures and avoiding cut-scores to define struggling readers; by defining sub-

types of struggling readers using multiple indicators of a range of component skills; and by employing latent class analysis, the benefits of which are described in detail in the methods section.

Research Question

Given the limited research on overall reading skill profiles and the non-existence of research that examines ASRs in urban schools, our goal was to identify and describe the reading skill profiles of unique groups of ASRs attending urban schools. Following an analysis to identify struggling adolescent readers using multiple measures, we asked: Do adolescents with below-average comprehension exhibit differentiated profiles of component reading skills including word reading accuracy, word-level and passage-level fluency, and oral language?

METHOD

Overall Sampling Plan

The current study took place in the context of a larger descriptive study of adolescent readers (Authors, 2009). The overall sampling plan was to recruit approximately 60 students in each of the five categories of the Kansas Reading Assessment (KRA) (i.e., unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, advanced, and exemplary) so that adequate sub-groups of students could be assessed and their reading skill component profiles analyzed (Kansas Department of Education, 2005). The goal was to differentiate the skill profile of adolescent readers, both proficient and struggling, using a common and standardized measure like that offered by the KRA continuum of reading proficiency (see measures section for a full description).

This approach has the advantage of maximizing statistical power across the entire range of the achievement distribution and thereby increasing the precision with which we can estimate population means for and detect differences between profiles in the tails of distribution, where

the data would otherwise be sparse. Without such a sampling plan, it is possible that we would have lacked sufficient power to detect profiles that are less common in the population of adolescent readers or to differentiate between somewhat similar skill profiles. The disadvantage of this approach is that it somewhat limits our ability to make generalizations about the prevalence of particular skill profiles beyond the current sample.

We were able to obtain data on a single cohort of 345 students entering their ninth-grade year. Students came from two small urban junior high schools and two urban middle schools, which fed into three urban high schools in two mid-western cities. Participating students who attended the feeder middle schools were recruited during the end of their eighth-grade year, and students missed during the first testing period and those coming from other middle schools were assessed at the commencement of the ninth-grade year. Students ranged in age from 13.45 years to 17.5 years with an average age of 14.9 years. The urban community consisted of 145,004 residents; the smaller urban community consisted of 81,873 residents (U.S. Census Bureau, 2002).

Analytic Sample for the Latent Class Analysis

We restricted the original sample of 345 students to the 319 students with complete data on all measures. As a result, each achievement level had a minimum of 55 students. Excluded students were not significantly different from included students on a range of demographic indicators. A demographic summary of the analytic sample is in Table 1.

[Table 1 About Here]

Measures and Instruments

Instruments were selected and grouped within a reading-component framework identified

in the literature as essential to the reading success of younger and adolescent readers (Curtis, 2002; NICHD, 2000) and responsive to the Simple View of Reading theoretical model discussed earlier. The measures consisted of a battery of language and literacy tasks selected to cover a range of specific component skills. Although the multiple measures can be grouped by broad latent constructs (e.g., WLPB Word Attack and WLPB Letter-word Identification are both decontextualized word reading accuracy measures), they were selected to tap slightly different aspects of these constructs. We chose not to create composites of the measures for this analysis, because we hypothesized that we might be able to differentiate groups of students based on performance on different aspects of a latent construct (e.g., students who demonstrate weaknesses in phonological decoding, tapped by the word attack task, but not sight word reading accuracy, tapped by the letter-word identification task). Unlike some previous studies, we approached this as an empirical question rather than as an a priori assumption that groups would (or would not) be differentiated along particular lines. The rationale for this approach is that only one prior investigation studied sub-types of struggling reader in this age range and this study found no clear differentiation among sub-types based on two a priori constructs: listening comprehension and word recognition (Catts et al., 2005). Though widely theorized (e.g., Biancarosa & Snow, 2004; Kamil, 2003), it remains unproven that a wider range of skills reliably differentiates struggling readers when they are adolescent.

Reading comprehension. The Kansas Reading Assessment (KRA) (Kansas DOE, 2005) is a group-administered test given annually in the spring to students in the 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, and 11th grades to measure AYP as defined in the NCLB Act of 2000. By the end of eighth grade, students are assessed on their proficiency in comprehending narrative, expository, and technical text. Measures are also taken of such skills as identification of main ideas, details, and the

author's purpose, comparing, contrasting, problem solving, and using text organizers.

Additionally, students are assessed on fluency, decoding, and prior knowledge. The KRA was used as the tool to select participants for the stratified study sample and as a measure of reading comprehension for analyses. The KRA scores used were proficiency levels from 1 to 5; although more finely graduated scale scores would have been preferable, these were not available from the participating schools.

Reading comprehension was assessed with three measures, the WLPB-R Passage Comprehension subtest (Woodcock, 1991), the GORT-4 (Wiederholt, & Bryant, 2001) and the Kansas Reading Assessment (Kansas DOE, 2005). The KRA was also used as the selection tool and was described earlier. The WLPB-R comprehension subtest requires the reader to silently read a sentence or a short passage and supply a word that fits the meaning and context of the passage. This modified cloze procedure measure is completed in about 6 minutes. The GORT-4 comprehension subtest requires the reader to read graded passages orally and to respond to comprehension questions read by the examiner and presented in a multiple-choice format. Passages range from about 20 to 160 words in length. The task takes about 10 minutes; two forms (A and B) are available.

Word Reading Accuracy. Two measures of word-level reading skills were administered. Word decoding and word identification were measured using the Word Attack and Word Identification subtests of the Woodcock Language Proficiency Battery-Revised (WLPB-R; Woodcock, 1991). The Word Attack subtest requires individuals to apply phonics and structural analysis skills to pronounce nonsense words ordered in increasing difficulty. The publisher reports reliability estimates that are greater than .90. The Letter-Word Identification subtest uses real letters and words in isolation, graded in order of difficulty. Participants read the increasingly

difficult letters and words until a ceiling score is attained. The reliability of this subtest also exceeded .90. Each subtest takes about 5 minutes to administer. The tests are administered individually.

Reading Fluency. Fluency was assessed using three norm-referenced subtests. First, the Test of Word Reading Efficiency (TOWRE) Sight Word Efficiency subtest (Torgesen, Wagner, & Rashotte, 1999) measures the number of real printed words accurately decoded within 45 seconds. This subtest has two forms (A and B) of equivalent difficulty. The reported reliability is .84 for students age 10-18 years. Second, the TOWRE Phonemic Decoding Efficiency subtest measures the number of pronounceable nonwords that are accurately decoded within 45 seconds. Its reliability is .89 for students age 10-18 years. Overall testing time is 2-3 minutes for each of the subtests.

Finally, the Gray Oral Reading Test-4 (GORT-4) was administered to evaluate oral reading rate and accuracy (Wiederholt, & Bryant, 2001). The GORT-4 is comprised of 12 passages. Participants are required to read aloud passages as quickly and as accurately as possible and then answer five comprehension questions. For each passage administered, and depending on basal and ceiling criteria, the examiner documented the time in seconds required to read the passage, the total number of reading errors, and responses to comprehension questions. The GORT-4 rate and accuracy subtest scores are summed to provide an overall reading fluency score. Reported reliability is .92 for the fluency measures.

Vocabulary and language comprehension. Receptive oral vocabulary was assessed using the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Third Edition (PPVT-III; Dunn & Dunn, 1997). The PPVT-III requires the student to point to the one of four pictures that represents a stimulus word pronounced by the examiner. The words become increasingly difficult. Test administration takes

10-12 minutes. Reading vocabulary was assessed using the Woodcock Language Proficiency Battery-Revised (WLPB-R; Woodcock, 1991) Reading Vocabulary subtest. The Reading Vocabulary subtest is comprised of two parts that assess a person's knowledge of Synonyms and Antonyms, respectively. The Synonym portion measures participants' ability to identify a word that has the same or nearly the same meaning as the test item presented by the examiner. The Antonym portion measures participants' ability to identify a word whose meaning is the opposite or nearly the opposite in meaning of the test item presented by the examiner. Performance on the Synonym and Antonym portions of the Reading Vocabulary subtest forms a single index of expressive vocabulary. Reliability exceeds .90.

Language comprehension was assessed using the WLPB-R Listening Comprehension subtest (Woodcock, 1991). The test focuses on a number of semantic operations beginning with simple verbal analogies and associations and moving to the ability to infer implications. This 38-item cloze procedure requires the participant to listen to a sentence and then supply a key word that completes the meaning of the sentence. The task requires about 10 minutes. Reliability exceeds .90.

Procedures

Participants were tested individually during one 2- to 2.5-hour testing session after school or on a Saturday at participants' schools in a quiet classroom or the library. A total of 16 examiners participated in administering the test battery. All examiners completed an extensive six-hour training conducted by the investigators regarding administration and scoring procedures for each test within the assessment. The first assessment was observed one-on-one for consistency in following the script, and the student record booklet was reviewed for recording/scoring accuracy, followed by immediate feedback. Reliability checks were completed

for each measure that involved scorer judgment. Two scorers independently scored 10% of the student responses on the GORT, the WLPB-R word attack subtest, and the TOWRE subtests for sight word reading and phonemic word reading. The inter-scorer reliability was 96.5% on the GORT-4, 92% on the WLPB-R, and 95.5% on the TOWRE.

Data Analysis

Latent Class Analysis (LCA) was used to describe identify below-average comprehenders as well as describe the component skill profiles of below-average comprehenders. Because LCA has yet to be used extensively in reading research, a discussion of its purposes and strengths is warranted here. LCA is conceptually related to cluster analysis, in that it is a multivariate method designed to identify unobserved (or latent) subpopulations of individuals based on multiple observed measures (Lazarsfeld & Henry, 1968; Lubke & Muthén, 2005). LCA uses maximum likelihood estimation to fit a hypothesized model in which membership in a specified number of latent classes is related to performance on the included measures and to produce fitted probabilities of class membership for individuals. The observed measures can be categorical or continuous as in the present study (note that LCA with continuous observed variables is sometimes referred to as Latent Profile Analysis, although recent frameworks and software such as MPLUS do not make this distinction). Each latent class can be interpreted as a subpopulation with homogenous profiles on the multiple observed measures included in the analysis, while the differences between the latent classes indicate heterogeneity in the population studied.

LCA has several advantages over non-parametric cluster analysis approaches, such as mean centroid cluster analysis. First and foremost, as a model-based method, LCA provides statistical tests and goodness of fit indices for testing inferences about the number of classes that exist in the population of interest. These tests are considered to be much more rigorous than the arbitrary

criteria used in traditional cluster analysis (Lubke & Muthén, 2005; Magidson & Vermunt, 2002). The model-fitting process begins with a one-class model to which additional classes are added one at a time, and statistical tests are conducted at each step to determine if the additional class significantly improves the goodness of fit of the model. Simulation studies in the statistical literature have found that these tests are robust and specific in determining when latent classes can and cannot be differentiated in the population (e.g., Yang, 2006; Tofinghi & Enders, 2006; Lo, Mendell, & Rubin, 2001). Most recently, Nyland, Asparouhov, and Muthén (2007), using a Monte Carlo simulation, found that the bootstrapped Likelihood Ratio Test is a robust and consistent indicator for the existence of additional classes in the population, at various sample sizes and with various assumptions. It is this test that in the present study, we used this test as the primary statistical criterion for determining the number of classes, although we combined this with other indices and theoretical concerns as recommended by Lubke and Muthén (2005) and others.

Second, unlike traditional cluster analysis approaches, LCA provides standard errors associated with the parameter estimates for the means of each latent class on the multiple meanings. This allows one to construct 95% confidence intervals and to determine on which measures two similar classes converge and diverge by examining where those intervals overlap. For instance, examining these confidence intervals might indicate that two classes of poor readers are differentiated from one another on word reading measures but do not perform significantly different on oral language measures. In the present study, we used this advantage of LCA to interpret the strengths and weaknesses of each profile relative to the others. It also allowed us to determine on which measures a given class was significantly below meaningful benchmarks on national norms (i.e., standard scores of 100 and 85).

Third, LCA has an advantage over non-parametric cluster analysis methods in that it allows for statistical tests of whether substantive variables predict class membership, a technique which was used in the current study to investigate whether comprehension level predicted component skill profile. It is worth noting that although some LCA models invoke an assumption of conditional independence of indicators, such that the multiple measures are assumed to be uncorrelated within each latent class, this assumption can be relaxed (as in the models fitted below) when there are theoretical reasons to consider specific indicators to be correlated within class.

Results

Preliminary Analyses to Identify Below Average Comprehenders

Preliminary analyses indicated that adolescents presented at least four empirically different levels of reading comprehension. A sequence of LCA models fitted with increasing numbers of latent classes indicated several categorically different levels of reading comprehension achievement, based on students' performance on the three measures of reading comprehension. It should be noted that although the sample was stratified based on KRA performance, this measure was used in the analysis to define struggling readers because its inclusion adds to the reliability of profile distinctions. Second, it may be that KRA levels may differentiate some levels of reading achievement better than others, and as indicated in the findings below this is indeed the case.

In each model, the three measures were allowed to correlate within class, thus relaxing the assumption of conditional independence; this decision has theoretical support in that the three measures would be expected to correlate even after partially out class membership (as well as empirical support based on the residual covariances from models that did not include these

correlations). Table 2 provides the goodness-of-fit statistics for the two-class, three-class, four-class, and five-class models.

The four-class solution indicating four levels of reading comprehension was chosen, based on the Bootstrapped Likelihood Ratio Test, several goodness-of-fit statistics, and substantive concerns about whether additional classes reveal interesting and theoretically interpretable sub-populations, as recommended by Lubke and Muthén (2005). In particular, we found that the addition of a third and fourth class each yielded a statistically significant improvement in the model fit ($\Delta-2LL = 48.738$; $\Delta df = 4$; $p < .0001$ and $\Delta-2LL = 29.061$; $\Delta df = 4$; $p < .0001$, respectively). The addition of a fifth class also led to a statistically significant improvement in the model fit ($\Delta-2LL = 17.993$; $\Delta df = 4$; $p < .0001$), however the fifth class was quite small (less than 2% of the sample) and difficult to interpret as a meaningfully distinct group of students.

The four classes displayed relatively but not completely ordinal differences in reading comprehension achievement. Table 3 displays the predicted mean of each class on the observed measures, corresponding standard errors, and the proportion¹ and number of students in the sample classified into each class. In order from lowest to highest performance on all three measures, the groups were designated as *Struggling Comprehenders*, *Low Average Comprehenders*, *Average Comprehenders*, and *Advanced Comprehenders*. As shown in Table 3, each successive class demonstrates mean scores that are higher than the previous class on all three measures with typical differences between adjacent classes of roughly half a standard

¹ As noted in the Methods section above, the stratified sampling plan prevents us from making generalizations about the prevalence of these four classes in the broader population of adolescent readers. Thus, these proportions should not be interpreted as the proportion of adolescent readers in the population performing at each level of reading comprehension, but solely as the proportion of our sample classified into each latent class. Making broader generalizations about prevalence would require a simple random sample of adolescent readers or analytic techniques (e.g., weighting) that are beyond the scope of the current research questions and analyses.

deviation (7.5 standard score points on the GORT and WLPB-R or approximately .7 achievement levels on the KRA).

Despite this apparent ordinality, not all three measures differentiated between each pair of comprehender classes, as evidenced by the differences in predicted mean scores in adjacent classes on each measure. For instance, the WLPB-R scores differentiated the higher two classes from one another very well (as evidenced by their 29 standard score point difference) and differentiated the lower two classes well (as evidenced by their nearly 11 standard score point difference), however this measure did not differentiate between the low average and average comprehenders. The 2.34 standard score point fitted difference on the WLPB-R between these latter two classes is not statistically significant. Similarly, the KRA differentiated the lower three comprehender classes well (as evidenced by differences of more than 1 achievement level) but did not differentiate between the average and advanced comprehenders. The .17 levels difference on the KRA between these classes is not statistically significant. The GORT reading comprehension scores differentiated between adjacent classes more or less consistently across the four classes. The degree to which each of the three measures differentiated particular levels of readers differently does not reduce the trustworthiness of the classification of readers into these four levels. Rather, it indicates that none of the individual measures of reading comprehension could provide the same precision and reliability of classification across the range of achievement as a composite classification utilizing information from all three measures. The four latent classes described provide one such composite classification.

Profiles of Below-average Comprehenders

To address our research question, we examined the component skill profiles of students within the low average and struggling comprehender classes and identified five distinct skill

profiles. In so doing, we fitted sets of LCA models with increasing numbers of latent classes based on students' performance on the nine measures of component reading skills (GORT rate and accuracy; TOWRE sight word efficiency and phonemic decoding efficiency; PPVT vocabulary; and WLPB-R listening comprehension, letter-word identification, word attack, and reading vocabulary). We fitted models to the combined sub-sample of *Struggling* and *Low Average Comprehenders*, the combination of which we refer to as *Below-average Comprehenders*, and to each of these two sub-samples separately. We report here the results for the combined sample because the resulting skill profiles for the two separate sub-samples were also found to be represented in the combined sample.

Results indicated substantial heterogeneity within the population of below-average comprehenders. Table 4 provides the goodness-of-fit statistics for the three-class, four-class, five-class, and six-class models, as well as the estimated within-class correlations fitted for selected measures. The five-class solution was chosen, based on several goodness-of-fit statistics as well as substantive concerns. In particular, we found that the addition of a fourth and fifth class each yielded a statistically significant improvement in the model fit ($\Delta-2LL = 53.8$; $\Delta df = 10$; $p < .0001$ and $\Delta-2LL = 68.1$; $\Delta df = 10$; $p < .0001$, respectively), as indicated by the bootstrapped Likelihood Ratio Test. The addition of a sixth class also led to a statistically significant improvement in the model fit ($\Delta-2LL = 59.2$; $\Delta df = 10$; $p < .0001$), and although the sixth class essentially split the fifth class, it made both classes quite small (only 10 and 7 students respectively). In addition, the sixth class was difficult to interpret theoretically or practically. In each model, the assumption of conditional independence of indicators was relaxed for the eight pairs of measures listed in Table 4. Including each of these within-class correlations had both a

theoretical justification and improved the goodness-of-fit of the model, as evidenced by a series of Likelihood Ratio Tests (all p 's < .05).

Table 5 presents the fitted means and corresponding standard errors on the nine component reading skill measures for each of the five latent classes of below-average comprehenders, and Figure 1 displays the fitted mean for each class on each measure along with corresponding 95% confidence intervals. Although the five classes were found to be somewhat ordinal in the severity and multiplicity of their weaknesses, their skill profiles were not parallel; that is, when each class was compared to the next most similar class, it was found to differ significantly on some indicators but not on others. This indicates that each class shares some areas of strength and weakness with other classes, but also that each presents a unique profile. Below, we describe the skill profile of each class and interpret it relative to those of the other classes and to meaningful benchmarks on national norms, drawing on the confidence intervals displayed in Figure 1 determine when apparent differences are statistically significant.

The class that performed lowest on all measures was designated as *Readers with Severe Global Weaknesses* and is indicated by the red line in Figure 1. This class demonstrated skills that were more than one standard deviation below national norms on all measures; as shown by the confidence intervals in Figure 1, the means of this class were significantly different from a standard score of 85 on each measure. This class showed especially low performance on word reading accuracy measures, scoring on average more than two standard deviations below national norms on GORT passage accuracy, phonemic decoding efficiency, and word attack. This class performed significantly below all other classes on all of the reading accuracy and reading fluency measures

The next class was designated *Readers with Moderate Global Weaknesses* and is indicated by the green line in Figure 1; like the class of *Readers with Severe Global Weaknesses*, this class demonstrated below-average performance on all measures, though to a lesser degree, typically performing a standard deviation below national norms. Although the *Readers with Severe Global Weaknesses* had significantly lower performance than the *Readers with Moderate Global Weaknesses* on the reading accuracy and fluency measures, the two classes had equally low performance on the vocabulary and listening comprehension measures (as shown by the overlapping confidence intervals in Figure 1, the apparent differences between the two classes' estimated means on these measures were not statistically significant). It is also worth noting that both classes demonstrated relative weaknesses on tasks involving decoding of pseudo-words (word attack and phonemic decoding efficiency) compared to their performance on tasks involving sight words (letter-word identification and sight word efficiency), suggesting that they may over-rely on knowledge of known words rather than automatized decoding skill while reading. Together these two classes present difficulties in multiple component skills with similar levels of difficulty with language comprehension but differing degrees of difficulty with reading accuracy and reading fluency skills.

The third class, designated *Dysfluent Readers* and indicated by the orange line in Figure 1, demonstrated language comprehension and word reading accuracy skills in the average range but fluency skills (at both the word and passage levels) that were below-average. Specifically, their mean on WLPB Reading Vocabulary and WLPB Listening Comprehension was not significantly different from the national average (as shown by the confidence interval overlapping a standard score of 100). However, their performance on the four timed measures was significantly lower than the higher performing classes, not significantly different from the

Readers with Moderate Global Weaknesses, and substantially below their own performance on all of the other measures. Moreover, *Dysfluent Readers* performed significantly better than *Readers with Severe Global Weaknesses* on all assessed component skills, but were distinguishable from *Readers with Moderate Global Weaknesses* only in their language comprehension skills and on the WLPB letter-word identification task.

Alternately, the class designated *Weak Language Comprehenders* and indicated by the blue line in Figure 1 consistently demonstrated skills in the average range, except for a relative weakness in listening comprehension. As shown by the confidence intervals in Figure 1, the only measure on which this class performed significantly below the national mean of 100 was the WLPB Listening Comprehension measure. This class performs significantly better than the two lowest classes on all assessed skills, but is distinguishable from *Dysfluent Readers* in their reading accuracy and reading fluency. Furthermore, they show a relative strength in reading accuracy as is witnessed by the overlap of the confidence interval for WLPB word attack with a standard score of 115 (1 *SD* above the mean).

The final class, designated as *Weak Reading Comprehenders* and indicated by the purple line in Figure 1, demonstrated component reading skills that were all in or above the average range, suggesting that their specific weakness lie primarily in the task of reading comprehension itself. As shown in Figure 1, the confidence intervals for this class do not cover or fall below the national mean of 100 on any measure. It is probable that students in this class demonstrate weaknesses in skills not assessed in this battery of component skills, including potential difficulties with strategic processing of extended text, limited experience with particular genres of texts, or limitations in background knowledge necessary for comprehension of the passages on the reading comprehension measures. It is also possible that these students have all the requisite

skills and knowledge, but are disengaged from academic reading tasks to an extent sufficient to suppress their reading comprehension performance. Although *Weak Reading Comprehenders* significantly outperformed the lowest three class on all assessed skills, they are distinguishable from *Weak Language Comprehenders* primarily in their above-average passage reading rates, which were more than two-thirds higher than national norms. The extremely high reading rate of *Weak Reading Comprehenders* suggests an additional hypothesis: they may be reading through text at a speed that is not conducive to strategic comprehension. These competing hypotheses are considered further in the discussion.

To explore the extent to which these five skill profiles might be specific to *Struggling Comprehenders* or *Low Average Comprehenders*, we investigated whether students' classification into one of the five skill profiles differed as a function of their comprehender class (struggling vs. low), as determined by the first set of LCA models described above. An additional five-class LCA model was fitted that included students' comprehender class as a dichotomous predictor of skill profile class and compared this to a model in which comprehender class was unrelated to skill profile class. A log-likelihood ratio test confirmed that comprehender class did indeed significantly predict membership in skill profile class ($\Delta-2LL = 70.562$; $\Delta df = 4$; $p < .0001$), indicating that the differences in the distributions of *Low Average* and *Struggling Comprehenders* assigned to the five skill profiles was statistically significant.

To provide insight into the relationship between comprehension level and component skill profile, Table 6 displays the number and percentage of *Low Average* and *Struggling Comprehenders* in the sample who fell into each of the skill profile classes. As the table demonstrates, the most prevalent profile among *Struggling Comprehenders* was the *Readers with Moderate Global Weaknesses* profile: about half (49.6%) fell into this profile. Despite nearly

equal numbers of students from the two classes of comprehenders, the Dysfluent Readers profile was the most prevalent profile among Low Average Comprehenders (40.5%) but was only a distant second in prevalence among Struggling Comprehenders (22.3%).² Interestingly, a single class of comprehenders predominated in each of two of the skill profiles. Specifically, *Readers with Severe Global Weaknesses* were comprised almost exclusively of *Struggling Comprehenders*, whereas *Weak Reading Comprehenders* were comprised almost exclusively as *Low Average Comprehenders*.

Additionally, to investigate the extent to which the KRA achievement levels relates to component skill profiles, we cross-tabulated the prevalence of each component skill class by KRA level. As shown in Table 7, students scoring Proficient or below on the KRA can appear in any of the *Below-average Comprehender* classes, with the only exception being that no students scoring Unsatisfactory on the KRA could be classified as *Weak Reading Comprehenders*. Despite the pervasiveness of all the classes within each achievement level, some classes were more common than specific levels. For example, students scoring at KRA level 1 (unsatisfactory) were much more likely to fit the *Severe* or *Moderate Global Weaknesses* classes than the others (34% and 53% respectively), while students scoring at KRA level 2 (basic) were more likely to fit the *Moderate Global Weaknesses* or *Dysfluent Readers* classes (47% and 31% respectively). KRA level 3 students, deemed “proficient” by Kansas standards, most often fit the *Dysfluent Readers* class (41%), but just as many level 3 students were split between the *Weak Language* and *Weak Reading Comprehender* classes (19% and 22% respectively). However, it

² Despite our inability to make generalizations about prevalence in the overall population of readers as noted in the Method section, we are able to make generalizations about the prevalence of skill profiles within each comprehender class. Because the variable used to stratify the sample, the KRA scores, was included as an indicator of comprehender class, the estimates of prevalence of component skill profiles within comprehender class provided here take into account the stratification of the sample. One way of understanding this is to think of each of the comprehender classes as representative of a specific population to which we can generalize our findings concerning the prevalence of component skill profile.

should be noted that more than 10% of the KRA level 2 students also fit these two profiles, demonstrating relative strength in most component skills. These results suggest that a great deal of heterogeneity in strengths and weaknesses of component reading skills exists at all three of these KRA achievement levels.

Discussion

The challenges facing the field of adolescent literacy are great and have been well documented. To date, very few interventions or programs have been found to be effective with ASRs, and, as a result, the achievement gap has not significantly narrowed, particularly for certain sub groups of learners. One of the reasons for this lack of progress in closing the achievement gap may be due to the fact that interventions and programs are not closely aligned with the comprehensive and diverse needs of adolescent struggling readers. Thus, the overarching goal of this study was to identify and bring clarity to the reading skill profiles of unique clusters of Adolescent Struggling Readers and closely examine the profile each cluster presented. With this body of knowledge, we hypothesize that literacy interventions might be crafted that are better aligned with and responsive to the needs of this population.

As described earlier and in detail, the theoretical foundation for our study was the Simple View of Reading (). While acknowledging the complexity of the reading process, The SV holds that reading comprehension is the result of skilled and efficient word level reading skills and language comprehension. Generally, we found that the SV holds for the ASRs in our study. That is, the poor comprehenders in our study presented reading skill profiles that included readers with poor word-level skills (WL) but adequate language comprehension, those with adequate word-level skills but poor language comprehension (LC), and those with both poor word-level skills and language comprehension (WL/LC). Thus, we extend the theoretical utility of the SV

for ASRs by showing that ASRs do indeed reflect readers with poor skills in word-level, language comprehension, or both areas. In our study, about 80% of our ASR sample had word-level (including fluency) and language comprehension deficits. Thus, reading development in comprehension for the majority ASRs in our sample did not occur without adequate word-level skills. This is a significant finding with implications for policy and intervention.

In order to answer the specific research question, “Do adolescents with below average comprehension exhibit differentiated profiles of component reading skills including word reading accuracy, word – level and passage – level fluency, and oral language?” and to expand upon the general comments above, we discuss in detail the unique clusters of ASRs found in the Latent Class Analysis.

Our Latent Class Analysis was conducted to bring some measure of clarity to the unique reading skill profiles and needs of ASRs. We found that there were indeed unique sub-groups of ASRs with specific instructional needs, including students with specific weakness in listening comprehension, those with specific weaknesses in reading comprehension, others who struggled with fluency, and students with moderate and severe levels of global weaknesses. By using data from a diverse sample drawn from urban schools and statistical techniques that allow for inferences to the larger population, we provided more robust evidence for claims about the heterogeneity in ASRs that can inform both policy and practice decisions.

The degree to which each of the three reading comprehension measures differentiated particular levels of readers also holds implications. None of the individual measures of reading comprehension alone provides the same precision and reliability of classification across the range of achievement as does a composite classification utilizing information from all three measures. This finding implies that future studies examining sub-groups of struggling readers

would be well advised to use multiple measures of comprehension for identifying struggling readers.

The five profiles of component skills found among below-average comprehenders demonstrate considerable heterogeneity. Although the profiles were somewhat ordinal in the severity and multiplicity of their weaknesses, the classes were not strictly parallel indicating that adolescent readers are not simply better or worse on all skills. Rather, they are distinguished also by their specific strengths and weaknesses. Only two of the classes were particularly similar with respect to relative “peaks” and “valleys” though dissimilar with respect to severity of all difficulties: those with severe global weaknesses and those with moderate global weaknesses. Other classes were distinguished from these two classes and from each other by particular skills. *Dysfluent Readers* showed weaknesses only on speeded measures (TOWRE and GORT); as shown in Figure 1, they are the most disordinal relative to the other classes in that their performance on the left four measures (the speeded measures) is essentially the same as the two lowest classes whereas their performance on the right five measures (the language & unspeeded word reading measures) is much more similar to the two higher-performing classes.. *Weak Language Comprehenders* were distinguished by average to above average performance on all component skills except listening comprehension, which was a half of a standard deviation below norms. *Weak Reading Comprehenders* demonstrated pervasive strengths, performing at or above average on all components skills.

The two lowest below-average comprehenders classes (*Readings with Severe Global Weaknesses* and *Readers with Moderate Global Weaknesses*) demonstrated relative weaknesses on tasks involving decoding of pseudo-words (word attack and phonemic decoding efficiency) compared to their performance on tasks involving sight words (letter-word identification and

sight word efficiency), suggesting that they may over-rely on knowledge of known words rather than automated decoding skill while reading. It is notable that our analyses distinguished two groups of such readers, whereas only the study by Buly and Valencia (2003) has done so previously.

The two top classes of below-average comprehenders were relatively similar, but the *Weak Reading Comprehenders* read much faster than the *Weak Language Comprehenders* (or any of the other classes). The extremely high reading rate of *Weak Reading Comprehenders* (more than two-thirds higher than national norms) suggests that what appears to be a strength may in fact be their real weakness; that is, they may be reading through text at a such a fast speed that it is not conducive to strategic comprehension. Previous studies have not found groups of such readers, who in essence show no weakness on the components identified by the Simple View of Reading, but who nevertheless struggle with reading comprehension (Gough & Tunmer, 1986; Hoover & Gough, 1990). The current study confirms theories that such readers do indeed exist (Biancarosa & Snow, 2004; Biancarosa et al., 2007).

One other take on the profiles is to look at how their vocabulary and decoding skills are associated or disassociated. Unlike prior studies (e.g., Buly & Valencia, 2003;) there was little evidence for “automatic word callers,” i.e., readers with accurate and fluent word reading skills but low vocabulary and comprehension. However, that is not to say that vocabulary levels were always commensurate with word reading skills. If you look at the right-most two indicators in Figure 1, you will see that the relative levels of reading vocabulary and word attack are strikingly different for the different classes—the *Readers with Several Global Weaknesses* have vocabulary skills that are much better than their word attack skills (by about $2/3$ *SD*), the *Readers with Moderate Global Weaknesses* and *Dysfluent Readers* have vocabulary and word attack skills that

are more or less commensurate with each other, and the top two profiles have decoding skills that are much (almost 1 *SD*) higher than their vocabulary skills.

The group of *Dysfluent Readers* is consistent with previous findings of the only other study to assess oral reading fluency as a dimension separate from word reading accuracy (Buly & Valencia, 2003; Kieffer, Biancarosa, Christodoulou, Mancilla-Martinez, & Snow, 2007; Lesaux, & Kieffer, 2008). Together, these findings suggest the fluency assessments that are so often used as curriculum-based measures in earlier grades can also provide information about grade-level reading achievement at higher grade levels (Fuchs, Fuchs, Hosp, & Jenkins, 2001).

As discussed above relative to the proportions of types of comprehenders found, the proportion of students demonstrating each below-average comprehender component skill profile (e.g., *Dysfluent Readers*, *Readers with Severe Global Weaknesses*) might have been different given a different sampling plan or operationalization of below-average comprehension; however, it is nonetheless accurate to conclude that these five distinct skill profiles exist, though at rates that may differ within the larger population. Given our sampling plan and analyses, our findings speak directly to the proportion of students demonstrating specific profiles relative to levels of performance on the stratifying measure (see Table 7). When we look at the five profiles of component skills found among below-average comprehenders, results suggest that a great deal of heterogeneity in strengths and weaknesses of component reading skills exists at each of the three lowest KRA achievement levels. Among below-average comprehenders, achieved an average score of 3 on the KRA, nearly 20 percent of these students demonstrated either severe or moderate global weaknesses, another 40 percent struggled with fluency, while the rest appeared to struggle with comprehension alone. Among students scoring a 2 on the KRA, over half showed either moderate or severe global weaknesses, and almost a third struggled on fluency

measures; very few struggled with comprehension alone. Only among those students scoring a 1 on the KRA was their anything approaching homogeneity in terms of their component reading skills; over 85 percent showed moderate or global weaknesses. Given the high number of ASRs in urban school populations, there is likely a great deal of heterogeneity in the component reading skills with which these students struggle, but greater proportions of students scoring at the lowest levels of state tests like the KRA imply greater proportions of students with profiles similar to those students in the most needy sub-groups found (i.e., *Dysfluent Readers, Readers with Severe or Moderate Global Weaknesses*).

Conclusion

While research studies during the past decade have added to our understanding of the reading profiles of struggling adolescent learners, collectively they have fallen short of providing us with sufficient information that enables researchers or practitioners from differentiating various subgroups of learners among this larger group of underachievers. In the absence of reliably defined subgroups, intervention work is adversely affected. The size of the achievement gap and the shortness of instructional time available makes it imperative that the instruction provided to these at-risk learners be exceedingly well designed and delivered. However, a prerequisite to designing effective interventions is a clear understanding of the defining characteristics of the learners who will be the target of the interventions. In the absence of these data, the probability of producing large achievement gains for the majority of struggling adolescent learners is considerably reduced. Hence, an overriding purpose of this study has been to differentiate various subgroups of struggling adolescent learners through an in-depth analysis of a carefully selected sample of ninth-grade students.

Although the current study focused on ASRs in urban schools in one state in the Midwest, the findings suggest that ASRs do indeed present clear and heterogeneous profiles of reading strengths and weaknesses. Moreover, findings indicate that passing a state English language arts test is no guarantee of adequate reading comprehension skills. Given the great deal of variability found in state tests (McCombs, Kirby, Barney, Darilek, & Magee, 2005), the findings also suggest that schools would do well to employ multiple measures of students' comprehension to identify their ASRs more reliably. Moreover, the heterogeneity found among ASRs in the current study implies the need for diagnostic assessment even after ASRs have been identified. Finally, although the current study did not examine the effects of differentiated intervention on ASRs, the significant differences in skills among those with moderate or severe global weaknesses, those who demonstrated dysfluency, and those who demonstrated no weaknesses other than in reading comprehension suggest that some amount of differentiated intervention is required. Given the large numbers of ASRs in urban schools, policy and practice needs to begin to address the varied strengths and weaknesses of this population through better identification and diagnostic systems and multiple and comprehensive intervention approaches.

Table 1.

Demographic summary of the participating students ($n=319$).

Demographic characteristic	Percent
Female	45.8%
Urban	81.5%
Free/Reduced-price Lunch	51.1%
Special Education (IEP)	9.1%
Race	
Asian	2.5%
Black	51.1%
Hispanic	15.7%
White	29.2%
Other	1.5%
Language background	
English-only at home	79.0%
ELL	5.3%

Table 2.

Goodness of Fit Statistics, Results of Bootstrapped Log-likelihood Ratio Test, and Estimates of Within-Class Correlations for Latent Class Analysis Describing Levels of Reading Comprehension Achievement ($n = 319$).

	2-Class Solution	3-Class Solution	4-Class Solution	5-Class Solution
-2LL	6010.312	5961.574	5932.512	5914.52
AIC	6036.312	5995.574	5974.513	5964.520
BIC	6085.219	6059.529	6053.516	6058.572
Entropy	0.851	0.762	0.795	0.801
Δ -2LL (Δ df = 4)	49.154***	48.738***	29.061***	17.993***
<hr/>				
Within-Class				
Correlations				
GORT with	.57	.49	.49	.41
WLPB-R				
KRAS with	.53	.41	.24	.30
WLPB-R				
KRAS with	.50	.25	.19	.19
GORT				

Table 3.

Estimated Means on Reading Comprehension Measures for each Latent Class with Corresponding Standard Errors, based on Four-Class Model Describing Levels of Reading Comprehension Achievement ($n = 319$).

	<i>Struggling</i>	<i>Low Average</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Advanced</i>
	<i>Comprehenders</i>	<i>Comprehenders</i>	<i>Comprehenders</i>	<i>Comprehenders</i>
GORT (Standard	80.61	87.91	98.27	109.55
Scores)	(1.10)	(1.70)	(2.02)	(2.41)
WLPB-R	86.34	97.21	99.55	128.52
(Standard	(1.02)	(1.36)	(2.35)	(2.75)
Scores)				
KRA	1.53	2.95	4.43	4.60
(Achievement	(0.06)	(0.05)	(0.09)	(0.11)
Levels)				
Proportion of	.38	.23	.23	.16
Sample				
Classified				
n Classified	121	74	72	51

Table 4.

Goodness of Fit Statistics and Results of Bootstrapped Log-likelihood Ratio Test for Latent Class Analysis Describing Skill Profiles of Below-Average Comprehenders ($n = 195$).

	3-Class	4-Class	5-Class	6-Class
	Solution	Solution	Solution	Solution
Goodness-of-Fit				
Statistics				
-2LL	12796.534	12742.778	12674.654	12615.500
AIC	12890.534	12856.778	12808.655	12769.500
BIC	13044.365	13043.339	13.027.946	13021.521
Entropy	0.875	0.806	0.837	0.862
Δ -2LL (Δ df = 10)	121.082***	53.756***	68.124***	59.154***
Within-Class				
Correlations				
GORT Rate with GORT Accuracy	.40	.37	.37	.39
GORT Rate with SWE	.41	.44	.55	.51
PDE with WA	.51	.51	.51	.54
SWE with LWID	.22	.22	.25	.29
SWE with PDE	.46	.45	.43	.44
SWE with WA	.21	.22	.22	.24

PPVT with RV	.47	.38	.38	.30
LWID with PDE	.39	.37	.39	.43
WA with LWI	.51	.49	.50	.48

*** $p < .0001$

Draft

Table 5.

Estimated Means and Standard Errors on Component Reading Skills, Based on Four-Class Latent Class Model Describing Below-Average Comprehenders, with Areas of Relative Weakness (n=195).

	<i>Severe Global Weaknesses</i>	<i>Moderate Global Weaknesses</i>	<i>Dysfluent Readers</i>	<i>Weak Language Comprehenders</i>	<i>Weak Reading Comprehenders</i>
GORT					
Rate	71.61 (3.17)	81.78 (1.15)	84.98 (1.13)	99.64 (1.30)	112.43 (2.33)
Accuracy	65.27 (3.39)	80.36 (2.02)	84.96 (1.32)	105.38 (2.30)	106.68 (3.27)
TOWRE					
sight word efficiency	77.87 (3.54)	88.58 (1.31)	89.21 (1.20)	100.24 (1.60)	98.02 (3.09)
phonemic decoding efficiency	66.00 (2.77)	83.63 (3.20)	86.58 (1.59)	99.29 (2.33)	100.79 (2.47)
PPVT	78.74	80.06	93.76	99.71	98.82

	(2.16)	(2.45)	(1.73)	(1.64)	(3.44)
WLPB					
listening	77.80	78.15	97.30	92.55	104.47
comprehension	(2.44)	(2.60)	(3.00)	(3.60)	(4.06)
letter-word	76.97	88.73	96.07	106.38	110.45
identification	(3.51)	(1.67)	(1.57)	(1.78)	(3.02)
word attack	67.10	85.66	94.00	114.29	112.90
	(4.89)	(3.47)	(2.53)	(3.10)	(3.21)
reading vocabulary	79.44	84.48	95.59	100.27	100.11
	(1.83)	(1.84)	(2.14)	(2.33)	(2.71)
Fitted Probability of	.15	.35	.30	.11	.10
Classification					
Proportion of Below-	.14	.36	.29	.11	.10
Average Sample Classified					
N of Sample Classified	28	71	57	21	18

Table 6.

Percentage of Below-Average Comprehenders by Comprehender Class (Low Average vs. Struggling) and Component Skill Profile, with Number of Students in Parentheses (n=195).

Component Skill Profile	Comprehender Class	
	Low Average	Struggling
<i>Readers with Global Weaknesses</i>	4.1% (3)	20.7% (25)
<i>Sight Word Readers</i>	14.9% (11)	49.6% (60)
<i>Dysfluent Readers</i>	40.5% (30)	22.3% (27)
<i>Weak Language Comprehenders</i>	18.9% (14)	5.8% (7)
<i>Weak Reading Comprehenders</i>	21.6% (16)	1.7% (2)

Table 7.

Proportions of Profiles of Below-average Comprehenders by Kansas Reading Achievement

Levels ($n=195$).

Below-average Comprehender Profile						
KRA level	<i>Severe Global Weaknesses</i>	<i>Moderate Global Weaknesses</i>	<i>Dysfluent Readers</i>	<i>Weak Language Comprehenders</i>	<i>Weak Reading Comprehenders</i>	<i>Total</i>
1	18	28	6	1	0	53
2	7	32	21	6	2	68
3	3	11	30	14	16	74
Total	28	71	57	21	18	




Figure 1. Line plot with mean standard score on each component reading skill and associated 95% confidence intervals for the five profiles of below-average comprehenders, based on the five-class solution (n = 195).

Draft

References

- Adams, M.J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Adelman, C. (2006). *The toolbox revisited: Paths to degree completion from high school through college*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Allensworth, E. M., & Easton, J. Q. (2005). *The On-Track Indicator as a predictor of high school graduation*. Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research.
- Badian, N. A. (1999). Reading disability defined as a discrepancy between listening and reading comprehension: A longitudinal study of stability, gender differences, and prevalence. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 32, 138-148.
- Berman, I., & Biancarosa, G. (2005). *Reading to achieve: A governor's guide to adolescent literacy*. Washington, DC: NGA Center for Best Practices.
- Biancarosa, G., Palincsar, A. S., Deshler, D. D., & Nair, M. (2007). Adolescent literacy: Myths and realities. In D. D. Deshler, A. S. Palincsar, G. Biancarosa, & M. Nair, *Informed choices for struggling adolescent readers: A research-based guide to instructional programs and practices* (pp. 11-36). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Biancarosa, G., & Snow, C. E. (2004). *Reading next - A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy: A report from Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Block, C. C., & Pressley, M. (2002). *Comprehension instruction: Research-based practices*. New York: Guilford Press.

- Boudett, K. P., City, E. A., & Murnane, R. J., (2005). *Data wise: A step-by-step guide to using assessment results to improve teaching and learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Buly, M. R., & Valencia, S. (2003). *Meeting the needs of failing readers: Cautions and considerations for state policy*. Seattle: University of Washington, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.
- Campbell, F. A., Pungello, E. P., Miller-Johnson, S., Burchinal, M. & Ramey, C. T. (2001). The development of cognitive and academic abilities: Growth curves from an early childhood educational experiment. *Developmental Psychology*, 37, 231-242.
- Catts, H. W., Fey, M. E., Tomblin, J. B., & Zhang, X. (2002). A longitudinal investigation of reading outcomes in children with language impairments. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 45, 1142-1157.
- Catts, H. W., Hogan, T. P., & Adlof, S. M. (2005). Developmental changes in reading and reading disabilities. In H. W. Catts & A. G. Kamhi (Eds.), *The connections between language and reading disabilities* (pp. 25-40). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Chall, J.S. (1983). *Stages of Reading Development*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Christenbury, L., Bomer, R., & Smagorinsky, P. (Eds.). (2009). *Handbook of Adolescent Literacy Research*. NY: Guilford.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Council of Great City Schools. (2001). *A decade of outcomes in the nation's urban schools 1990-1999: A report on urban student achievement and course taking*. Washington DC: Council of the Great City Schools.
- Curtis, M. B. (2002). *Adolescent literacy: A synthesis of research*. Boston: Lesley College, The Center for Special Education.

- Deshler, D. D. (2006). Building a strong literacy foundation for high school excellence. In D. Clark (Ed.), *The challenge of high school reform* (pp. 20-27). Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.
- Dunn, L. M., & Dunn, L. M. (1997). *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Third Edition*. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.
- Ehri, L. C. (1997). Sight word learning in normal readers and dyslexics. In B. A. Blachman (Ed.), *Foundations of reading acquisition and dyslexia* (pp. 163-189). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ehri, L. C. (1998). Grapeheme-phoneme knowledge is essential for learning to read words in English. In J. Metsala & L. Ehri (Eds.), *Word recognition in beginning literacy* (pp. 3-40). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Foorman, B. R., Francis, D. J., Fletcher, J. M., Schatschneider, C., & Mehta, P. (1998). The role of instruction in learning to read: Preventing reading disabilities in at-risk children. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*, 37-55
- Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Hosp, M. K., & Jenkins, J. R. (2001). Oral reading fluency as an indicator of reading competence: A theoretical, empirical, and historical analysis. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 5*(3), 239-256.
- Garcia-Reid, Reid, & Peterson (2005). School engagement among Latino youth in an urban middle school context: Valuing the role of social support. *Education and Urban Society, (37) 3*, 257-275.
- Gleason, P. M., & Cain, G. G. (1997). Earnings of black and white youth and their relation to poverty (discussion Paper No. 1136-97). Madison: University of Wisconsin, Institute for Research on Poverty.

- Gough, P. B., & Tunmer, W. E. (1986). Decoding, reading, and reading disability. *Remedial and Special Education*, 7(1), 6-10.
- Harm, M. W., & Seidenberg, M. S. (1999). Phonology, reading acquisition, and dyslexia: Insights from connectionist models. *Psychological Review*, 106, 491-528.
- Hock, M. F., & Deshler, D. D. (2003). Adolescent literacy: Ensuring that no child is left behind. *Principal Leadership*, 13(4).
- Hoover, W. A., & Gough, P. B. (1990). The simple view of reading. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 2, 127-160.
- Cassidy, J., & Cassidy, D. (2009, February/March). What's hot for 2009? *International Reading Association*, 26(4), 1-9.
- Jarrett, R. L. (1997). Bringing families back in: Neighborhoods' effects on child development. In J. Brooks-Gunn, G. J. Duncan, & J. L. Aber (Eds.), *Neighborhood poverty: Vol. 2. Policy implications in studying neighborhoods* (pp. 48-64). New York: Russell Sage Foundation
- Kamil, M. L. (2003). *Adolescents and literacy: Reading for the 21st century*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Kamil, M. L., Borman, G. D., Dole, J., Kral, C. C., Salinger, T., and Torgesen, J. (2008). *Improving adolescent literacy: Effective classroom and intervention practices: A Practice Guide* (NCEE #2008-4027). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc>.
- Kansas State Department of Education. (2005). *Report card 2004-2005*. Retrieved February 12, 2007, from <http://online.ksde.org/rcard/>.
- Kansas State Department of Education. (2008). *Kansas Special Education Process Handbook*. Retrieved August 9, 2008, from <http://online.ksde.org/rcard/>.

- Kieffer, M. J., Biancarosa, G., Christodoulou, J. A., Mancilla-Martinez, J., & Snow, C. E. (April 2007). "Shades of struggle: Heterogeneity among urban adolescent struggling readers." American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Kintsch, E. (2005). Comprehension theory as a guide for the design of thoughtful questions. *Topics in Language Disorders, 25*, 51-64.
- Kintsch, W. (1998). *Comprehension: A paradigm for cognition*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Kline, T. (2005). *Psychological testing: A practical approach to design and evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Konold, T. R., Juel, C., McKinnon, M., & Deffes, R. (2003). A multivariate model of early reading acquisition. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 24*, 89-112.
- LaBerge, D., & Samuels, S. J. (1974). *Toward a theory of automatic information Processing in Reading*. *Cognitive Psychology, 6*, 293-323.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F., & Henry, N. W. (1968). *Latent structure analysis*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Leach, J. M., Scarborough, H.S., & Rescorla, L. (2003). Late-emerging reading disabilities. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*(2), 211-224.
- Lee, J., Grigg, W. S., & Donahue, P. L. (2007). *The nation's report card: Reading 2007: National assessment of educational progress at grades 4 and 8* (NCES No. 2007-496). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- Lee, C. L., Spencer, M. B., & Harpalani, V. (2003). Every shut eye ain't sleep: Studying how people live culturally. *Educational Researcher, 32*(5), 6-13.
- Lemke, M., Sen, A., Johnston, J.S., Pahlke, E., Williams, T., Kastberg, D., and Jocelyn, L.

- (2005). *Characteristics of U.S. 15-Year-Old Low Achievers in an International Context: Findings from PISA 2000* (NCES 2006-010). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Lesaux, N. K. & Kieffer, M. J. (July 2008). Qualitative differences or a question of degree? The prevalence and sources of reading comprehension difficulties among language minority learners and their classmates in urban middle schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Reading, Asheville, NC.
- Leventhal, T., Brooks-Gunn, J. (2000). *The Neighborhoods They Live in: The Effects of Neighborhood Residence on Child and Adolescent Outcomes*, By: Leventhal, Tama, Brooks-Gunn, Jeanne, Psychological Bulletin, 00332909, March 1, 2000, Vol. 126, (2).
- Leventhal, T., Graber, G. A., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2001). Adolescent transitions to young adulthood: Antecedents, correlates, and consequences of adolescent employment. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 11(3), 297-323.
- Leventhal, T. & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2003). Children and youth in neighborhood contexts. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 12, 27-31.
- Levy, F., & Murnane, R. J. (2004). *The new division of labor: How computers are creating the next job market*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Lo, Y., Mendell, N., & Rubin, D. (2001). Testing the number of components in a normal mixture. *Biometrika*, 88, 767-778.
- Lubke, G.H. & Muthén, B.O. (2005). Investigating population heterogeneity with factor mixture models. *Psychological Methods*, 10, 21-39.
- Lyon, G. R., Alexander, D., & Yaffee, S. (1997). Progress and promise in research in learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 8, 1-6.

- Magidson, J., & Vermunt, J. K. (2002). Latent class models for clustering: A comparison with K-means. *Canadian Journal of Marketing, 20*, 37–44.
- McCardle, P., & Chhabra, V. (2004). *The voice of evidence in reading research*. New York: Brookes.
- McCardle, P., Scarborough, H. S., & Catts, H. W. (2001). Predicting, explaining, and preventing reading difficulties. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 16*, 230-239.
- McCombs, J. S., Kirby, S. N., Barney, H., Darilek, H., & Magee, S. (2005). *Achieving state and national literacy goals, a long uphill road: A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- McWayne, Christine M., Fantuzzo, John W., McDermott, Paul A. (2004) Preschool Competency in Context: An Investigation of the Unique Contribution of Child Competencies to Early Academic Success. *Developmental Psychology, 40*(4), 633-645.
- Nash, J. K., & Bowen, G. L. (1999). Perceived crime and informal social control in the neighborhood as a context for adolescent behavior: A risk and resilience perspective. *Social Work Research, 23*, 171-186.
- National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). (2004). *The nation's report card: Reading 2002*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), (2005). *The nation's report card: Reading 2005*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.
http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/nrc/reading_math_2005/s0002.asp?printver.
- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel. Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction* (NIH Publication No. 00-4769). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002).

Newman, K. (1999). No shame in my game: The working poor in the inner city. New York: Knopf & the Russell Sage Foundation.

Nylund, K. L., Asparouhov, T., & Muthén, B. (2007). Deciding on the number of classes in latent class analysis and growth mixture modeling: A Monte Carlo simulation study. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, **14**, 535–569.

Perfetti, C. A., Marron, M. A., & Foltz, P. W. (1996). Sources of comprehension failure: Theoretical perspectives and case studies. In C. Cornoldi & J. Oakhill (Eds.), *Reading comprehension difficulties: Processes and intervention* (pp. 137-165). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Phelps, S (2005). Ten years of research on adolescent literacy, 1999-2004: A review. Chicago: Learning Point Associates.

Rashotte, C.A., MacPhee, K., & Torgesen, J.K. (2001). The effectiveness of a group reading instruction program with poor readers in multiple grades. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, **24**, 119–134.

Rury, J. L. (2005). Urban education in the United States: A historical reader. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Sabatini, J. P. (2002). Efficiency in word reading of adults: Ability group comparisons. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, **6**(3), 267-298.

Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W. & Earls, F. (1997, August 15). Neighborhoods and violent

- crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, 277, 918-924.
- Scammacca, N., Roberts, G., Vaughn, S., Edmonds, M., Wexler, J., Reutebuch, C. K., & Torgesen, J. K. (2007). Interventions for adolescent struggling readers: A meta-analysis with implications for practice. Portsmouth, NH: RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction.
- Share, D. L., & Stanovich, K. E. (1995). Cognitive processes in early reading development: A model of acquisition and individual differences. *Issues in Education: Contributions from Educational Psychology*, 35, 1-57.
- Shaywitz, S. E., Escobar, M. D. Shaywitz, B. A., Fletcher, J. M., & Makuch, R. (1992). Evidence that dyslexia may represent the lower tail of a distribution of reading ability. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 326, 145-150.
- Snow, C. (2002). *Reading for understanding: Toward an R & D program in reading comprehension*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Stanovich, K. E. (1988). *Children reading and the development of phonological awareness*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
- Thurlow, M. L., Sinclair, M. F., & Johnson, D. R. (2002). Students with disabilities who dropout of school: Implications for policy and practice. *Issue Brief*, 2(2), 1-7, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Center on Secondary Education and Transition.
- Tofghi, D., & Enders, C.K. (2006). Identifying the correct number of classes in a growth mixture models. In G.R. Hancock (Ed.), *Mixture Models in Latent Variable Research*. Information Age: Greenwich, CT.

- Torgesen, J. K. (1999). Assessment and instruction for phonemic awareness and word recognition skills. In H. W. Catts & A. G. Kamhi (Eds.), *Language and reading disabilities* (pp. 128-149). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Torgesen, J.K., & Hoskyn, M. (Eds.). (1999). *Assessment and instruction for phonemic awareness and word recognition skills*. Needham Heights: Allyn & Bacon.
- Torgesen, J. K., Rashotte, C. A., & Alexander, A. (2001). Principles of fluency instruction in reading: Relationships with established empirical outcomes. In M. Wolf (Ed.), *Dyslexia, fluency, and the brain* (pp. 334-355). Parkton, MD: York Press.
- Torgesen, J. K., Wagner, R. K., & Rashotte, C. A. (1999). *Test of Word Reading Efficiency*. Lake Oswego, OR: Northwest Evaluation Association.
- Torgesen, J.K., Wagner, R.K., & Rashotte, C.A. (1994). Longitudinal studies of phonological processing & reading. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 27, 276-286.
- United States Census Bureau. (2002). *2000 Census Bureau of population and housing, summary population and housing characteristics*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Congress. (2001). *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Public Law 107-110, 107th Congress*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Vellutino, F. R., Tunmer, W. E., Jaccard, J. J. & Chen, R. (2007). Components of reading ability: Multivariate evidence for a convergent skills model of reading development. *SSSR Journal*. 11(1), 3-32.
- Wechsler, D. (1991). *Wechsler intelligence scale for children* (3rd ed.). San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation.
- Wentzel, K. R. (1999). Socio-emotional processes and interpersonal relationships: Implications for understanding motivation at school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91, 76-97.

- Wiederholt, J. L., & Bryant, B. R. (2001). *GORT4: Gray Oral Reading Test*. Austin, TX: PRO-ED.
- Woodcock, R. (1991). *Woodcock Language Proficiency Battery-Revised*. Allen, TX: DLM Teaching Resources.
- Woodcock, R.W. (1997). *Woodcock Diagnostic Reading Battery: Examiner's Manual*. In R.W.Woodcock, *Woodcock Diagnostic Reading Battery*. Ithaca, IL: Riverside Publishing.
- Yang, C. (2006). Evaluating latent class analyses in qualitative phenotype identification. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 50, 1090–1104.

Draft