Secondary schools—be they middle schools or high schools—are reading-rich environments. Such settings are staffed with school professionals who themselves have succeeded in mastering a complicated reading (and writing) curriculum and moved on to similar successes at the college level. It is these teachers who are charged with educating our secondary youth. Furthermore, it is this curriculum that is expected to prepare students for an increasingly technological postschool environment, be it in a college classroom or on the job. Secondary schools provide contexts in which students must regularly read and write competently to demonstrate their literacy achievement. In any given semester, there are short stories and novels to read, comprehend, and analyze; civics and science texts whose content must be mastered; math problems that must be understood and then successfully solved; and even high-stakes tests that must be passed for advancement or graduation to take place. Middle and high school students are immersed in literacy from the opening to the closing school bell.

It is for these and other reasons that addressing the likely reading deficits of secondary students with emotional and behavioral disorders (EBD) takes on urgency in middle and high school settings. Secondary schools provide contexts in which students must regularly read and write competently to demonstrate their literacy achievement. In any given semester, there are short stories and novels to read, comprehend, and analyze; civics and science texts whose content must be mastered; math problems that must be understood and then successfully solved; and even high-stakes tests that must be passed for advancement or graduation to take place. Middle and high school students are immersed in literacy from the opening to the closing school bell.

Before focusing on such effective practices, however, we briefly describe the reading skills of secondary students with EBD, reading research designed to improve these reading skills, and a theoretical framework from which to formulate classroom and schoolwide reading intervention for students with EBD.

**Reading Characteristics**

Middle or high school teachers can expect secondary students verified with emotional disturbance—the federal disability term hereafter referred to as EBD—to have reading deficits. The research base supports this assertion. As a group, 31% to 81% of students with EBD have reading delays, with the majority of those deficits ranging from about one-half year to more than 2 years behind expected reading levels (Epstein, Nelson, Trout, & Mooney, 2005). These reading deficits are not identified in any particular group of students with EBD. For example, Nelson, Benner, Lane, and Smith (2004) found no statistically significant differences across gender or school level (i.e., elementary vs. secondary) in a cross-sectional sample of K-12 students verified with emotional disturbance and served in public school settings. Such findings, combined with other research in the area of treatment resistance (e.g., Al Otaiba & Fuchs, 2002, 2006; Nelson, Benner, & Gonzalez, 2003), have led some researchers to hypothesize that students with EBD are more resistant to generally effective reading interventions than are other groups of students, particularly in the early grades.

**Reading Research**

Today, students with reading deficits are present in a variety of educational settings. Intervention studies designed to improve secondary students’ reading performance provide promising results. An extensive review of research conducted between 1975 and 2006 yielded 10 studies similar to the comprehensive reviews completed by Epstein, Nelson, Reid, and colleagues at the University of Nebraska (e.g., Mooney, Epstein, Reid, & Nelson, 2003). Positive findings have been reported in all 10 of the relevant intervention studies. These findings indicate that secondary students with EBD are receptive to reading intervention. In the next section, we describe characteristics and outcomes from this small yet promising body of research that we analyzed for this review.

**Descriptive characteristics of studies.** The 33 predominantly male participants in the 10 studies ranged in age from 12 to 18 years, tested in the borderline to low-average IQ range, and possessed reading deficits. Intervention settings were most often restrictive, with self-contained classrooms and separate facilities predominating. No studies took place in the general education classroom. The most frequent target of intervention was either fluency development or seatwork improvement. Overall, intervention
targets included the National Reading Panel (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000), areas of phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and text comprehension. There were no studies aimed at improving the phonemic awareness skills of secondary students with EBD. Interventions were predominantly delivered in a one-to-one format and were generally short in duration. Of the 10 studies, 7 reported fewer than 20 sessions. The average length of a session was between 40 and 41 min, with a range from 7 to 120 min. In summary, intervention studies generally involved male students, targeted skill fluency, and were delivered in restrictive settings and brief in duration.

Outcomes. Again, to use a phrase we previously borrowed from noted researcher David Berliner, the glass is half-full (Mooney, Denny, & Gunter, 2004) when it comes to evaluating the effects of reading interventions targeted at middle and high school students with EBD. Interventions were placed into four different categories: teacher delivered, peer delivered, student delivered, and a combination of the three (Mooney et al., 2003). When reported data allowed, we calculated effect sizes, which are statistical measures of the magnitude of treatment effects. In the case of effect sizes, the larger the positive number, the greater the effect of the intervention. Interpretations of the magnitude of effect sizes were made according to the work of Cohen (1988): An effect size of 0.2 is considered small, an effect size of 0.5 is medium, and effect sizes of 0.8 or greater are large. Overall, the body of studies consisted of teacher-delivered, child-delivered (e.g., self-management), or combination (i.e., more than one intervention) studies. The average effect size across the seven intervention studies for which effect sizes were calculated was 1.71, which translates to a large effect of treatment. Moreover, the range of effect sizes was 0.47 to 3.0; all effect sizes were positive, and the vast majority (i.e., 24 of 32) were large in magnitude. In addition, positive findings were noted across intervention studies targeting fluency, vocabulary, and the combination of phonics and fluency. Although positive, such findings should be tempered with the knowledge that studies on students with EBD have predominantly involved single-case-study research methodologies, and generally, effect sizes are better suited for group design research. In addition, given the limited number of participants and studies, any broad-based generalizations regarding the effectiveness of the reading intervention literature for secondary students with EBD must be avoided.

Reading Theory

Nelson, Benner, and Mooney, (2008) presented learning stage (i.e., mastery and fluency oriented) instructional principles to build the reading skills of primary grade students with EBD through the lens of Ehri’s (1999, 2005) theory of word-reading development. It is important to base teaching practice on testable theory, and Ehri’s model has allowed for empirical validation efforts. The theory of word-reading development targets quick and accurate reading of individual words in isolation or text. For the secondary school teacher conceptualizing Ehri’s theory, its importance is that, as Ehri has indicated, less energy spent on word reading allows for greater energy to be devoted to text comprehension. Four interconnected phases of reading development comprise the theory: (a) the prealphabetic phase, in which students lack letter knowledge and read by memorizing their visual features or by guessing words from their context; (b) the partial alphabetic phase, in which students have an initial working knowledge of the relationship between letters (graphemes) and sounds (phonemes) and may, for example, correctly read the beginning and ending sounds in written words; (c) the full alphabetic phase, in which students demonstrate mastery of the sound-letter connections in words and are able to decode unfamiliar words as well as store sight words in memory; and (d) the consolidated alphabetic phase, in which students identify letter sequences and patterns in more complex words and see these blended units across words (Ehri, 2005).

Although Ehri’s theory is most relevant in the primary grades for the developing reader, Ehri and McCormick (1998) identified older, struggling readers in all of these stages. Secondary teachers might consider focusing on interventions targeted at students who are struggling in either the full alphabetic or consolidated alphabetic phases of development. Such an assertion is supported by the Alliance for Education’s Reading Next report (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006), which indicates that the majority of the eight million struggling secondary readers are word readers who struggle to understand text. At the full alphabetic stage, Ehri and McCormick suggest that teachers immerse students in literacy activities that include analyzing letter-sound associations in words, build fluency with onset and rime recognition by reading books that students have heard or read before, and recognize words by analogy or pattern (e.g., learning the /-ight/ in /sight/ has the same sound as the /-ight/ in /light/ or /might/). As students move through the full alphabetic phase into the consolidated alphabetic phase, Ehri and McCormick suggest continuing proficiency in analogy recognition as well as focusing effort on breaking apart multisyllabic words into separate syllables. These activities, designed to build sight word-reading abilities to automaticity, can be incorporated into the reading of continuous text in content area courses.
Practical Applications

We have summarized the research on reading interventions for secondary students with EBD and placed the likely academic needs of this population of students in a theoretical context. Now, we turn our attention to practical suggestions for teachers who are preparing to teach students with EBD and their classmates. In suggesting ways to improve the reading skills of secondary students with EBD, we are mindful that each teacher faces different circumstances, and these differing circumstances require varying responses. In some cases, there may be schoolwide behavioral support systems in place that allow for a host of preplanned responses to behavioral incidents. In other instances, the teacher is on his or her own in responding to student behavior. Moreover, across general and special education classrooms, there are different curricular and content expectations at both the district and state levels. We are also mindful of the confluence of common sense and emerging research (e.g., Lane, Wehby, Robertson, & Rogers, 2007) that suggests different groups of secondary school students (including the many students within those groups) respond differently to school-based actions, such as reinforcement of appropriate behavior or suspension for behavior deemed dangerous or unacceptable. Given these circumstances, we offer three suggestions for improving the reading skill deficits of secondary students with EBD. These three practical applications are (a) using standard protocol interventions such as Corrective Reading, (b) incorporating progress monitoring into vocabulary instruction, and (c) teaching students to use reading comprehension strategies. The use of standard protocol interventions, such as Corrective Reading, is likely to take place in the special education classroom. The use of progress monitoring, with vocabulary instruction and comprehension strategy instruction, can be applied across special and general education settings.

Standard Protocol Intervention: Corrective Reading

Direct instruction reading programs are supported by research (for further details, see reviews by Adams & Engelmann, 1996, and White, 1988). One such reading program, Corrective Reading (Engelmann, Hanner, & Johnson, 2002), has shown great promise with students with EBD who experience reading difficulties. Professionals (e.g., general and special education teachers, paraprofessionals) and nonprofessionals (e.g., cross-age tutors) have successfully implemented the Corrective Reading program (Marchand-Martella, Martella, & Przychodzin-Havis, 2005). The collective results of 21 peer-reviewed investigations demonstrate that students who received Corrective Reading significantly outperformed comparison groups on standardized and curriculum-based reading measures, measures of social adjustment, and attendance (e.g., Benner, in press; Benner, Kinder, Beaudoin, Stein, & Hirschmann, 2005; Lloyd, Cullinan, Heins, & Epstein, 1980; Marchand-Martella, Martella, Orlol, & Ebey, 2000). For example, Benner and colleagues (2005) found significant improvements for students in Grades 3 to 8 who received Corrective Reading Decoding Level B1 \((n = 28)\) versus those in a comparison condition \((n = 23)\) on measures of beginning reading skills. In addition, a large percentage of students in the experimental group who experienced low or below average reading skills at pretest performed in the average range at posttest. A follow-up investigation revealed, with the exception of performance on one curriculum-based measure of oral reading fluency, that students with EBD were significantly more responsive to Corrective Reading than their counterparts with learning disabilities on standardized and curriculum-based measures of basic reading skills (Benner, in press). We now provide an overview of the Corrective Reading program through a description of materials, instructional format, and key things to remember when implementing the Corrective Reading program.

Overview. Corrective Reading is a supplemental intervention program designed for students in Grades 3 to 12 who are reading 1 or more years below grade level. Corrective Reading includes two major strands: decoding and comprehension. Both Corrective Reading decoding and comprehension strands have three levels devoted to half-year (i.e., 65 lessons) implementation (Levels A, B1, and B2) and one level devoted to full-year (i.e., 120 lessons) implementation (Level C). The three essential instructional goals of the decoding strand are to develop decoding, word reading, and fluency skills and concepts. The two essential instructional goals of the comprehension strand are to develop vocabulary and comprehension skills and concepts. These programs can be implemented with the whole class or in small groups (three to eight students) and are intended to be implemented by teachers.

Materials. There are teacher and student materials and a placement test associated with Corrective Reading. Teacher materials for each level of the decoding and comprehension strands include a spiral-bound Presentation Book, Series Guide, Teacher Guide (which contains reproducible placement tests and sample lessons), Blackline Masters of Additional Practice Exercises, Sunshine State Standards/Benchmarks Checklist, Standardized Test Format Booklets, and Mastery Test Packages. Student materials for each level of the decoding and comprehension strands include a hardcover Student Decoding Textbook and Student Comprehension Textbook,
respectively. The workbooks include practice and review activities to reinforce the skills and concepts taught in the lessons. Other materials include a separate workbook answer key, nonconsumable student book, and consumable workbook. In addition to the program materials, teachers use stopwatches, dry-erase boards and markers, pencils, and folders to track the progress of students. Regarding placement tests, the Corrective Reading decoding and comprehension instruments provide a starting point for lessons. The placement tests are available for free online at http://www.sraonline.com/. The tests take 3 to 5 min to complete per student.

**Instructional format.** A typical Corrective Reading decoding lesson is structured as follows. There are four parts to each lesson: word attack skills (10 min), group reading (15–20 min), individual reading checkouts (10 min), and workbook exercises (10 min). A typical lesson begins with the word attack portion.

In word attack, students practice pronouncing words, identifying the sounds and sound combinations, and reading isolated words composed of sounds and sound combinations. Word attack is followed by group reading. In this part, students take turns reading aloud from their student book. Students not reading follow along. Group reading is followed by individual reading checkouts. During this activity, assigned pairs of students read two passages. The first passage is from the lesson that the group just read, and the second is from the preceding lesson. Each member of the pair reads first the passage from the current story and then the passage from the preceding lesson. Workbook exercises close out the lesson.

**Key items to remember.** There are several important items to consider when delivering a standard protocol intervention such as Corrective Reading. The most important item is delivering the standard protocol intervention program with fidelity, or as it is intended to be delivered. It is critical for teachers to use error correction procedures, reteach when students have not mastered content, pace lessons appropriately, provide specific and immediate feedback, complete all parts of the lesson, and follow the lesson script. We recommend teachers not only self-evaluate fidelity when using a standard protocol intervention but also seek several opportunities to receive fidelity observations by experts with the program, such as well-trained literacy coaches. It is also critical that students with EBD receive enough “dosage,” or amount of intervention per week. The dosage of scientifically based reading instruction should be 40 min per day for 4 or 5 days per week. The intervention should continue until the student meets grade-level reading benchmarks. Such dosage is very imperative for increasing the reading abilities of a student with EBD and reading difficulties. Finally, we strongly encourage the use of in-program, curriculum-based assessments of student mastery and fluency. Although these measures should not replace progress monitoring using curriculum-based measurement, such measures motivate students with EBD through daily goal setting and monitoring. Moreover, such measures provide important data for instructional decisions, such as reteaching a lesson or task if student has not mastered it. In short, using a scientifically based intervention does not guarantee responsiveness. Responsiveness comes from applying these programs with fidelity, sufficient dosage, and using in-program measures of mastery and fluency. Teachers who deliver standard protocol reading interventions, with at least 90% fidelity, are more apt to see significantly higher gains on standardized reading measures compared with teachers who do not implement to this standard.

**Progress Monitoring During Content Instruction**

Progress monitoring is defined as a scientifically based practice designed to assess academic performance and evaluate instructional effectiveness (see the National Center on Student Progress Monitoring Web site, www.studentprogressmonitoring.org). Progress monitoring works because teachers are able to (a) assess a student’s current level of performance, (b) set measurable goals based on research indicating what performance level predicts future success, (c) measure a student’s academic performance in critical skill areas regularly, (d) determine whether the student is on track to meet established measurable goals, and (e) change instructional strategies quickly if data indicate that the present instruction is not having the desired effect (Nelson et al., 2008).

Although progress monitoring is most associated with the elementary school grades, it is also being used by middle and high school teachers to assess present performance and growth in reading and writing skills and content knowledge. One example of a secondary tool is vocabulary matching, which is a curriculum-based measurement device that can be used to evaluate the effects of classroom instruction for all students in social studies, science, and other content-focused classes (e.g., Espin, Shin, & Busch, 2005). Because textbooks are integral to secondary school instruction and vocabulary terms are featured components of secondary texts and critical to content learning, connecting ongoing assessment to vocabulary instruction allows teachers to determine if students are learning content. This can be particularly important for teachers of students with EBD whose vocabulary knowledge is likely to be delayed.

In developing vocabulary-matching probes, teachers can use textbook features, such as the glossary, to assist them. In
developing a series of equivalent probes (possibly two per week for the academic year), teachers need to create a spreadsheet of glossary terms in alphabetical order in one column and brief definitions (15 words or fewer) in a second column. From that spreadsheet, teachers randomly select 20 terms and 22 definitions per vocabulary-matching probe. Once the probes are developed (see Figure 1 for an example of a probe we developed for an introductory course in exceptionality for preservice teachers), teachers then administer the probes to students on an ongoing basis. Students have 5 min to read the terms and match the definitions to the terms. Each probe score consists of the number of correct responses. Because the terms in each probe are randomly drawn from the entire series of vocabulary terms in a course, teachers can monitor student performance and the effectiveness of instruction by the measured number of correctly identified terms.

Measures such as vocabulary matching provide teachers with a clear way to communicate findings to students, parents, and teachers. For example, Benner has developed a readily downloadable Excel program (http://www.tacoma.washington.edu/education/docs/BAM_ILXls) that can be used both to monitor progress and to facilitate school-home communication. For example, a teacher can enter a student’s name and grade, the type of probe being administered, goal or aim lines, the dates of periodic progress monitoring, and the progress-monitoring data (see Figure 2). In addition, teachers can track when instructional or aim line changes are made.

**Comprehension Strategy Instruction**

Teachers assign text reading assignments to communicate knowledge. Therefore, the primary goal of reading is to understand the written word. In understanding text, good readers engage in numerous cognitive strategies such as asking questions, visualizing, and summarizing while they read (Pressley & Wharton-McDonald, 1997). Such strategies can be explicitly taught to struggling readers, either in large-class or small-group settings. Secondary teachers can develop students’ use of multiple strategies as part of content instruction. One example of a multiple-strategy instruction intervention is Collaborative Strategic Reading (Klingner, Vaughn, Dimino, Schumm, & Bryant, 2001).

Collaborative Strategic Reading is designed to facilitate reading comprehension for students with reading disabilities using expository reading materials. Collaborative Strategic Reading infuses explicit prereading, during-reading, and postreading strategy instruction. Before reading, students brainstorm what they already know and predict what they will learn. During reading, students monitor their comprehension and apply one or more fix-up strategies from a menu, “Click and Clunk”, to help them figure out unknown words and comprehension breakdowns. In addition, students “Get the Gist” by identifying the most important ideas about the topic they read. After reading, students “Wrap-Up” by generating questions and review what they have learned. Students record this information on a Learning Log, which provides a graphic organizer of the students’ written account of their learning.

Collaborative Strategic Reading consists of 17 scripted lessons based on three phases of scaffolded instruction: teacher modeling, teacher assisting, and student independent practice. Initially, the Collaborative Strategic Reading strategies are presented to the whole class by the teacher using modeling and think-alouds. After students have developed proficiency using the strategies, they are divided into collaborative groups in which each student is assigned a defined role to implement the strategies using the existing expository classroom reading materials.

Collaborative Strategic Reading has demonstrated effectiveness in improving the reading comprehension skills of students with and without disabilities (Bryant et al., 2000; Klingner & Vaughn, 1996; Klingner, Vaughn, Arguelles, Hughes, & Leftwich, 2004; Klingner, Vaughn, & Schumm, 1998). It is used in both large- and small-group settings as well as in different class environments. Beckers and Mooney (2007) conducted a recent study of secondary students identified with reading disabilities and behavioral concerns who were all considered to be at risk for dropping out of school. Collaborative Strategic Reading was implemented in a study skills classroom using reading materials from the content area. This study yielded positive results on formal and informal measures of reading comprehension skills as well as a measure of students’ self-reported social-emotional competence.

**Summary**

Secondary school students with EBD should demonstrate the same amount of reading success as their peers. Improving reading outcomes is one of the cornerstones of the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act–No Child Left Behind legislation (US Department of Education, Office of the Undersecretary, 2002). However, not leaving students with EBD behind will likely require a fundamental shift from a reactive and compliance-driven system to a proactive and results-driven system (President’s Commission on Excellence in Special Education, 2002). Teachers of students with EBD should use a proactive response to intervention system to increase responsiveness to reading instruction. Such a system includes progress monitoring with technically adequate assessments, determining response to intervention, ensuring that scientifically based intervention is
## Example of a Vocabulary-Matching Probe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>accommodation</td>
<td>Study that follows one subject or group of subjects over an extended period of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>ataxia</td>
<td>After learning how to perform a new skill, one should work to develop fluency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>auditory canal</td>
<td>Adjustment to the eye for seeing distances into clear focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>autistic disorder</td>
<td>Review of the relationship between a student’s misconduct and his disability by the IEP team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>cystic fibrosis</td>
<td>Excessive, unrealistic worries, fears, tension that lasts six months or more; can include other symptoms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>diplegia</td>
<td>Poor sense of balance and body position and lack of coordination of the voluntary muscles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>generalized anxiety disorder</td>
<td>Pervasive developmental disorder marked by impairment of social interaction, impaired communication, and repetitive behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>individualized transition plan</td>
<td>Paralysis that affects the legs more often than the arms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>longitudinal study</td>
<td>Related to viral infections; common over age 6; 30% die; survivors show neurological damage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>manifestation determination</td>
<td>Specifies desired post-school outcomes in four areas, providing instruction to help students attain outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>mnemonic strategies</td>
<td>Combination of skills enabling a person to engage in goal-directed, self-regulated, autonomous behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>osteogenesis imperfecta</td>
<td>Identifies children likely to have a disability before being necessarily referred for more assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>practice stage of learning</td>
<td>Bones do not grow normally and break easily; sometimes called brittle bones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>refraction</td>
<td>Memory-enhancing strategies such as acronyms, acrostics, keywords, and peg words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Reye’s syndrome</td>
<td>Fluency disorder of speaking marked by rapid-fire repetitions of consonant or vowel sounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>screening</td>
<td>A descriptive statistic that shows the average amount of variability among a set of scores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>self-determination</td>
<td>Study of the rules that govern how language is used in a communication context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>standard deviation</td>
<td>The system of rules governing the meaningful arrangement of words in a language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>stuttering</td>
<td>Inherited disorder causing dysfunction of the pancreas, salivary, and sweat glands with no cure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>syntax</td>
<td>Specifies an if-then relationship between performance of specified behaviors and access to a reward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bending or deflection of light rays from straight paths as they pass from mediums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slightly amplifies and transports sound waves from the outer ear to the middle ear.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
delivered with fidelity and with sufficient dosage, and determining the intensity of the support that a student needs to be responsive to reading instruction.

We have offered practical suggestions for teachers that can be applied across all school settings to assist in developing the most comprehensive and responsive program for the secondary student with EBD. In the general education classroom at the core curricular level, comprehension strategy instruction using Collaborative Strategic Reading can facilitate the practical use of cognitive reading strategies in an appropriate setting and with relevant content for all students, not just those with EBD. The use of progress-monitoring tools, such as vocabulary-matching probes, can also be implemented for all students in the general education classroom. Students are directly involved in data collection activities (e.g., Gunter, Hummel, Denny, & Mooney, 2006). At the supplemental levels of instruction, Collaborative Strategic Reading and progress monitoring can also be used as part of small-group or individualized instruction. Standard protocol programs, such as Corrective Reading, are also well suited for greater intensity instruction. Moreover, use of comprehensive reading instruction programs, such as Corrective Reading, is congruent with the theory-based suggestions of Ehri and McCormick (1998s) and the empirical evidence in the area of EBD (i.e., Strong, Wehby, Falk, & Lane, 2004). Although it makes sense for teachers of secondary students with EBD to expect reading delays, it also makes sense for teachers to believe they can foster this population’s reading skills and increase content knowledge.
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