

Bethel University

Spark

All Electronic Theses and Dissertations

2023

Repeated Readings and Their Impact on Reading Fluency

Sydney N. Olson
Bethel University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://spark.bethel.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Olson, S. N. (2023). *Repeated Readings and Their Impact on Reading Fluency* [Master's thesis, Bethel University]. Spark Repository. <https://spark.bethel.edu/etd/1037>

This Master's thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Spark. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Spark. For more information, please contact k-jagusch@bethel.edu.

REPEATED READINGS AND THEIR IMPACT ON READING FLUENCY

A MASTER'S THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF BETHEL UNIVERSITY

BY
SYDNEY N. OLSON

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF EDUCATION

DECEMBER 2023

BETHEL UNIVERSITY

REPEATED READINGS AND THEIR IMPACT ON READING FLUENCY

Sydney N. Olson

December 2023

Abstract

This thesis explores the implementation of repeated reading and its effect on fluency for students in an academic setting. Included is an explanation of repeated reading and how it can be used in a classroom setting whether in isolation or in addition to an already established reading curriculum. The research looks at repeated reading and the different components that are associated with the intervention. The components are thought of as add-ons to assist in the use of the repeated reading strategy. The research is applied through the repeated reading components. Findings show that repeated reading enhances fluency by improving student's reading rate, accuracy, and prosody. Students who participated in the repeated reading process increased their confidence, motivation and engagement in reading. Furthermore, repeated reading has been shown to help students transfer reading fluency across content areas. Repeated reading is a beneficial strategy that is quick and easy to apply within the classroom.

Table of Contents

Signature Page.....	1
Abstract.....	2
Table of Contents.....	3
Chapter I: Introduction.....	5
History of Repeated Readings.....	5
Definition of Terms.....	7
Guiding Questions.....	9
Chapter II: Literature Review.....	10
Introduction to Reviewed Literature.....	10
Fluency, Repeated Reading, and Feedback.....	10
Interventions with Reading Difficulties and Oral Reading Fluency.....	25
Repeated Readings with Secondary Students.....	39
Repeated Reading in Practice.....	48
Concluding Remarks.....	62
Chapter III: Research Application.....	63
Chapter IV: Discussion and Conclusion.....	69
Summary of Literature.....	69
Professional Application.....	73
Limitations of the Research.....	74
Implications for Future Research.....	75
Conclusion.....	76
Appendix.....	78

References.....	4
	84

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

History of Repeated Readings

Repeated reading, or the process of reading the same passage several times, has been around for decades. Starting in the 1960s and 1970s, repeated reading was used to increase oral reading fluency. It was ultimately based on the theory of automaticity. The more students can automatically decode a text, the better they can understand and comprehend what the text is saying (*WWC | Repeated Reading*, 2014). Repeated readings can be used in many ways, including improving word recognition, fluency, and comprehension. Samuels (1879) states that repeated reading is not a method for teaching beginning reading skills but to supplement an already established developmental reading program. It can be used to give students more confidence in their improving reading skills and increase their motivation to read.

Repeated reading comes from the idea of the Theory of Automaticity in Reading. Becoming an automatic reader means individuals are able to quickly and efficiently recognize and process the information being read without really having to think about it (*What Is the Theory of Automaticity in Reading?*, n.d.). Automaticity for lower-level skills like recognizing words is important because it allows for our working memory to work on more complex skills including comprehension and vocabulary. When people spend all of their cognitive energy on trying to identify words the longer they are in our working memory. This working memory may become stressed and students can have a feeling of overwhelm. When our automaticity increases our cognitive load decreases. When individuals process text at a faster pace it becomes easier to make connections between new information and prior knowledge. Overall this has a great impact on reading comprehension. “Automaticity is a prerequisite to fluency” (Houston, 2022). Fluency

contains three components: automaticity, accuracy, and prosody. Before anyone can become an automatic reader they must first work through some basics of reading.

Everybody starts off knowing nothing about reading. Slowly individuals recognize letters in the alphabet and learn the different sounds each letter can make. Students then progress into building short words as they gain more knowledge in phonemic awareness, phonics and how they work.

There are many steps that can be taken when developing automaticity. Providing students with explicit and systematic instruction will allow them to learn to use many forms of learning with phonics instruction. These forms include listening, speaking, writing, and reading. There are many components of decoding a word. It is important that instructors are accurate with each component. These structures include recognizing letters and their sounds, blending sounds together, and learning that there are irregular patterns and words. The goal is to transfer all of these skills and apply them to reading a decodable text. That is when students gain practice and develop mastery skills. This circles back to the idea of repeated reading and how it allows students to practice to the point where they become automatic readers.

The process of repeated reading is quick and easy to learn. Teachers, teacher aides, and parent volunteers can assist in the process of repeated reading. It consists of reading a short passage, usually between fifty to two hundred words, several times until a satisfactory level (determined by a school) is reached. A student would start by reading the passage to the teacher. This will allow the instructor to monitor the reading speed and if there are any errors. This information can be incorporated into a table or graph. Students will then independently practice reading the passage several times to themselves or with the assistance of audio support. The use of audio support can be beneficial when using the process of repeated reading. It allows students

to listen to themselves read and notice their mistakes. Students can also use audio supports to read alongside a narration of the passage. After practicing several times, students will read the passage with the teacher a second time. Again, the teacher will monitor the speed of the reader along with errors. This information will be added to the table and graph. Creating a graph to show student progress will allow learners to see the gains that are being made. It is a great motivating device as students see firsthand that the more they practice and participate in repeated readings, the better and more fluent readers they will become. As students improve on fluency, passages will increase in word length and difficulty. This will ensure that students are continuing to grow in word recognition, fluency, and comprehension.

Repeated reading can assist in the development of word recognition skills. To understand how this can happen, we must first understand the three levels of word recognition. The non-accurate stage is the first one. This is when students have great difficulty recognizing words no matter how much time has passed. The next level is the accuracy stage. This is where individuals are able to acknowledge words in print with accuracy, but it takes focus and requires attention. Students usually read at a slower pace and stop at unfamiliar words to sound or chunk out. Lastly, the third stage is the automatic level. This occurs when students recognize printed words automatically and without hesitation. The use of repeated reading will walk students through each of the three stages as they become familiar with new words. When students' word recognition skills are developed, reading fluency becomes established.

Definition of Terminology

There are several words and acronyms that will need to be defined so that readers are better able to understand the research conducted. There can be many different versions of the definition of repeated reading. The description that we will be referring to throughout the

research will be “a strategic approach designed to increase reading fluency and comprehension. During repeated reading, students read and re-read a selected short passage until they reach a satisfactory level of fluency” (*NYS RTI MS DP*, n.d.).

Phonemic awareness can be defined as “the ability to hear and manipulate the sounds in spoken words, and the understanding that spoken words and syllables are made up of sequences of speech sounds” (University of Oregon Center on Teaching and Learning, n.d.). This incorporates the act of segmenting (separating) sounds in isolation and then blending them together to make up a word.

Phonics instruction teaches students the relationship between written and spoken language. Students see how each letter or group of letters make up their own sound and when those letters are put together they make up a written word. Phonics instruction should be taught both systematically and explicitly. When students are able to combine letters together to build words their vocabulary expands quickly. This will allow them to recognize words when they are put together in sentences.

Individuals start to notice common words that appear quite frequently in a text. These words are called sight words and students recognize them instantly without having to sound them out. The more words people are exposed to the more words they will be able to add to their vocabulary. It is important that teachers and support staff are giving students an opportunity to increase their knowledge and learn sight words. When these initial stages of reading are taught it takes an ample amount of practice for gains to be made. “After all the only way to automatically recognize and recall words - and their meanings - is to revise them again and again, thus drilling them into a place in the brain where they will never be forgotten” (*What Is the Theory of Automaticity in Reading?*, n.d.). Since students will be participating in reading the same passage

several times, you will notice the use of the terms hot and cold reads. A cold read is when a student reads the passage aloud for the first time. They have not seen the passage before and may come across new vocabulary words. A hot read is when the student becomes familiar with the text and reads it for the last time after going through the process of repeated reading.

An element of fluency is that individuals read with prosody. This refers to the expression and phrasing of words. This includes pausing, emphasizing, and exaggerating certain words. It also refers to your tone of voice and the rhythm of which you are reading.

While students participate in repeated readings, their passages can be categorized in two different ways, transfer and nontransfer. Transfer passages are novel-based. These passages are not the exact stories that students use during a repeated reading intervention. They are used for students to transfer knowledge gained during the intervention to a new, never been seen passage. Nontransfer passages are the passages that have been used during the repeated reading strategy. Intervention conductors do not give them a new passage when scoring the words read in one minute. There is usually an overlap of words between a non-transfer and transfer passage. With this being said, as students are participating in cold reading, they should be able to recognize words based on repeated reading.

Guiding Questions

This literature review asks the question: ‘How can repeated reading be used to increase Reading Fluency?’ This thesis explains what reading fluency is, how different types of repeated reading can be used to create fluent readers in and out of the classroom, and the impact repeated readings can have on reading fluency and comprehension. Reading fluency can be used at any grade level, with the most prevalent being in upper elementary and middle school settings.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction to Reviewed Literature

The literature below was detected by exploring through research databases. These include ERIC, Academic Search Premier, and ProQuest Education Journals. The keywords that I used to organize my research include “fluency,” “repeated readings,” “comprehension,” “oral reading fluency”. I only used reviews from academic journals that had a main focus on repeated reading and fluency. The research conducted addresses a variety of grade levels and content areas.

The sections below are targeted to describe the definition, explain how to implement it, and address the outcomes affiliated with repeated reading and its impact on fluency. The research findings are designed to influence a variety of instructors and assist in the learning of all types of learners.

Fluency, Repeated Reading and Feedback

Before learning about repeated reading, it is important for you to understand what fluency is and its impact on becoming a skilled reader. The National Reading Panel identifies five subcomponents of reading. These can be identified as phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. “The panel deemed that of these five dimensions, fluency was the area least understood and most often neglected in comprehensive literacy programs, (Huang et al., 2008, p. 34). According to the National Reading Panel, fluency is defined as reading words in a smooth, accurate, and expressive manner. Huang et al. (2008, p. 34) describes fluency as “the ability to read connected text rapidly, smoothly, effortlessly, and automatically with little conscious attention to the mechanics of reading, such as decoding. Readers are able to see some overlap and commonalities between the two definitions of fluency. Text fluidity, proper expression, and constructing meaning from the text describe a fluent reader.

Huang et al. (2008), talk about two teaching strategies used to increase time spent on reading and overall fluency. These two strategies include the use of repeated reading and the provision of feedback during guided reading. The repeated reading instructional strategy got its name from the act of students participating in reading a passage many times until performance criterion goals are met. This results in reading the passage over and over again or repeatedly reading it. Repeated reading is a routine-driven, systematic approach to assist educators and students in becoming fluent readers. In order for students to become proficient and fluent readers, they must have practice reading a text. Repeated reading allows them to get the practice they need. Repeated reading can be done within the classroom and at home. It is important to encourage parents to increase the amount of time they spend reading with their child at home. This study used a home and school collaborative partnership to increase students' reading fluency. Incorporating families in this process can benefit students in many ways. It increases the amount of time students are reading, exposes them to a variety of reading materials, gives more opportunities for repetition and learning, and provides more chances for student success (Huang et al., 2008).

This study involved four students who were in a K-12 charter school. The students have previously displayed basic decoding skills, so decoding and phonemic associations were not the focus of the study being conducted. Students participated in a pre-assessment determining how many words they could read in one minute, WCPM. During this pre-assessment, students read a combined average total of 55 WCPM. Participants also were tested by the number of sight words that they could say with automaticity. Sight words can be defined as commonly used words that are memorized by sight. These words can be instantly recognized without having to take time to sound them out. "Sight word knowledge may not only contribute to fluency but

comprehension as well” (Huang et al., 2008, p. 37). During the pre-assessment, students read a combined average of 114.5 sight words. Each student was paired with a reading tutor, a high school volunteer for a ten week period. Tutors were trained and instructed to repeat the tutoring process verbatim. The explicit instructions included how to model a lesson, give appropriate feedback, practice/rehearse, give quick comprehension checks, and learn how to communicate with each other. Books and reading materials were provided by the students’ teachers and were based on individual interests and reading levels.

The process of the guided reading intervention started with having the student tutors model what appropriate fluency looks and sounds like. They do this by using accurate expression and pace in the first few pages of the book. Students will then read those same pages with prompting from the tutor. “Prompting included encouraging the use of strategies to identify words and giving the student the word read correctly if the tutee read the word for appearance incorrectly (Huang et al., 2008, p. 36). If students did make mistakes in pronouncing words, the tutor would write them down to be reviewed after the cold read. Both tutor and student worked on these missed words until memorization was reached. The process continued by having the student read the passage a second time (repeated reading), and the tutor made note of any mispronounced words, going over those specific words again. After the third read, students were asked five comprehension questions to be answered. After the session, students would bring the book home and do the same process at home. This includes having family members ask the same comprehension questions and make their own list of missed words. This process continues for ten weeks.

When looking at the results of this study all changes were in a positive direction. The participants made a combined increase of 16.5 in words read correctly in one minute, WCPM.

When they started the study, they had a combined average of 55 WCPM, and at the end, they had a combined total of 71.5 WCPM. Sight words also increased significantly during this research. Participants scored a combined average score of 114.5 sight words on the pre-assessment and 260 sight words at the end of the ten-week study. This is a total increase of 145.5 sight words. The use of repeated reading, feedback, and tutoring strategies all contributed to enhancing reading fluency. This process is easy to implement and replicate. With that being said, a variety of people can serve as tutors both in and out of school. In summary, repeated reading and feedback intervention was successful in increasing student fluency.

According to another study, Ates (2019), research has shown that giving feedback to students in relation to their performance, specifically in reading, is effective in academic and behavioral development. In this study, both skills and performance-based practices were investigated. Repeated reading was used for the skills-based practice, and computer-aided feedback practices were used for performance. The study was aimed to explore the effectiveness of a repeated reading fluency intervention with an addition of performance-based feedback on one student who has some reading difficulties. The intervention was aimed at improving reading fluency. “Reading fluency refers to the ability to read text accurately, automatically, and with appropriate prosody” (Ates, 2019, p. 163).

This study was done at a public elementary school in Turkey. The study lasted a total of 38 hours. The intervention occurred two to three days during the week. One participant was a ten-year-old student labeled as being at the frustration level in terms of word recognition. This includes an eighty-eight percent word recognition, where grade level recommends being at ninety-five percent. This student was not labeled as having any physical or mental disabilities as

well as not receiving any diagnostic and remediation support. The study took place at the students' school.

The materials used in this study included narrative passages to determine the students' reading levels. For the collection and analysis of the data being collected, computer software was used. There were both teacher and student copies of the narrative passages being used. The teacher copy included sections to input the participants word recognition automaticity and the reading miscues that may occur. These miscues include omissions (a word that is skipped or missed), additions (words that the student adds in), words read incorrectly, hesitation (if students pause or try to sound out a word for more than three seconds), and reversals (going back and fixing a skipped or mispronounced word). Teacher copies also included a section for instructors to post how many words were read correctly in one minute. All interventions were video recorded. These recordings would then be used to provide student feedback based on performance.

During the study, a running record was kept to notify students of automatic word recognition in one minute. The amount of words that were read correctly in one minute is known as WCPM. The number of miscues and associated miscue types were also recorded. If the student made a row omission or skipped a row of words, every word was considered as a reading miscue, along with keeping track of the data throughout the intervention. The teacher who is conducting this study met with one participant on certain days of the week to have one-on-one lessons. These interventions were used to check the fidelity of the intervention process.

At the start of every session, the research conductor read the student a script. The script stated, "there is a story in front of you. When I ask you to read it, you can start to read aloud. You need to read every word you meet. If you face any word you could not read, I will read it. Now,

show me your best reading,” (Ates, 2019, p. 161). The researcher would read the word if a student took longer than three seconds to say a word. That word would also be considered a miscue. In the first read through the participant read 36 words correctly in one minute with 22 reading mistakes. The passage was a total of 198 words, and it took the student five minutes to complete the entire passage. Based on this diagnostic assessment, it was considered crucial to practice the use of repeated reading and performance-based feedback.

As repeated reading was practiced, so was the use of three different kinds of performance-based feedback. All of the feedback was related to how the student was performing. One was based on the number of words read correctly. The second pertained to the reading miscues. Lastly, the third performance-based feedback was concerned with correcting student’s reading miscues. This feedback was given after the first reading and before the second reading. There was a ten to fifteen-minute break during each reading. During this break, the participant read trade books and the researcher computed the data recorded. During the feedback session, the student was able to pronounce the words that were considered miscues correctly. This process continued during the second reading attempt and beyond. Since this intervention occurred two to three times per week there were some “off” days. During these days, the participant watched the video recordings related to their reading performance and viewed the achievement charts that are being recorded.

After the 38 hours of intervention, post-measurements were made in order to see student progress. The researcher collected data to determine the students' reading levels and the number of reading errors. At the beginning of the study, the participant read 37 words correctly in one minute. At the halfway point of the study, week twenty, the student increased to forty-one WCPM. During the final evaluation, the student read a total of fifty-two words correctly. This is

a fifteen-word increase from the start of the study to the end. The number of errors or miscues that the participant had decreased from 22 (at the start) to nine (ending evaluation). The student made progress from a frustration level (88.8 percent) to an instructional level (95.5%) when it comes to word recognition. “It could be argued that giving feedback in relation to correctly read words and the reading errors after each performance and the accompanying repeated readings may have influenced HB’s (the participants initials) reading skills positively” (Ates, 2019, p. 162). The researcher noticed at the beginning of the study that most of the reading errors occurred in the form of omissions. A total of seven words were omitted. The words that were skipped were multisyllabic words or words containing three to five syllables. After corrective feedback was given to the student, the researcher noticed that the participant paid more attention to longer words. With this feedback and time to practice during the repeated reading process, the student decreased the number of errors in the form of omissions to a total of three.

Overall, the intervention has a positive effect on the one participant in terms of word recognition accuracy and word recognition automaticity. The performance-based structure of this intervention aims to improve students' reading fluency based on individual performance rather than a previously established skill. The content structure of this intervention is clear and simple. It allows most teachers or support staff to administer in either a small group or individually, like in the study above. Ates’ study shows how both repeated reading and performance-based feedback techniques are influential in improving reading fluency.

Sukhram and Monda-Amaya (2017) studied the effects of repeated reading with and without corrective feedback. Corrective feedback can be defined as, “a technique used to promote accuracy of word recognition and decoding. Feedback provides identification of correct error responses and suggestions for correcting errors” (Sukhram & Monda-Amaya, 2017, p. 97).

The participants of this study included sixty seventh-grade students across the Midwest. These students were identified as being reading at least one grade below, and may or may not have been receiving special education services (67% received services). The sixty students were placed in one of two groups: repeated reading without corrective feedback and repeated reading with corrective feedback.

During the study, participants were asked to read two passages during the initial screening. One was a narrative passage, and the other was expository. The screening was done to provide a baseline of each student's performance. The number of words correctly read in one minute were calculated, and no corrective feedback was given during the screening. After the screening was completed and students were put into one of the two groups, the study began. Each session lasted on average thirty-nine minutes.

Students who participated in the repeated reading with no corrective feedback were given a passage and asked to read it three times. Students read one narrative passage and one expository passage. If and when students make errors during any of the readings, no feedback on how to correct it was given. Errors could include mispronunciations, insertions, hesitations, omissions, and substitutions. The students in the corrective feedback group followed the same procedure as the control group; however, if they had trouble reading the passage they would receive assistance from the instructor. Corrective feedback was only given during the first and second reading, but not the third one.

Results of this study were positive for both groups as there was not a significant difference between the corrective feedback and control group. While reading the narrative text the control group had a total increase of twenty-four WCPM from the first reading to the third. The corrective feedback group had an improvement of twenty-three WCPM. In addition, the

expository reading also made positive gains. The control group's total increase was 27.6 WCPM and the corrective feedback group had an increase of 29.7 WCPM. Along with calculating the average of the participants WCPM, data was also collected based on the amount of errors. During the first read, the control group made a total of three hundred seventy-eight errors while the corrective feedback group made three hundred twenty-seven errors. This is a difference of fifty-one errors. At the end of the third read, the control group made two hundred fifty-five errors, and the corrective feedback group only made one hundred twenty-nine errors. That is a difference of one hundred twenty-six errors.

Overall, this study proved that the repeated reading strategy, whether with corrective feedback or not, was effective in improving reading fluency. Students in both groups had significant improvements in fluency from their screener to their end of the third read for both the narrative and expository texts.

Therrien's (2004) analysis states that "at least one in five students has significant difficulties with reading acquisition" (p. 252). It is theorized that these difficulties may stem from the lack of prosodic cues. Individuals who do not transfer appropriate prosody to their reading can have difficulty dividing sentences into meaningful phrases and ultimately have difficulty comprehending what they are reading. This study investigates if repeated reading is effective when it comes to the increase in fluency and comprehension.

The nontransfer (28 effect sizes) was analyzed under three different components: cued reading, corrective feedback, and the number of times the passage is repeatedly read. Before students started reading, they were cued to focus on speed and/or comprehension. During corrective feedback, participants were corrected when they mispronounced a word or when they asked for help. Students read the passage two, three, or four times.

The results were presented in a unique way. It was shown as an effect size, or ES, followed by a decimal. The decimal is based on the impact that the intervention had on the effect size or participants. A decimal between 0.00 and 0.30 had a small impact on the ES, 0.31 to 0.6 had a moderate impact, and 0.61 and higher would be considered to have a highly effective result. This means that the higher the decimal the higher the impact of the intervention. Participants of the study want the result to be of high impact. All of these results are based on the fluency-dependent variable.

The non-transfer intervention results all had a moderate or high effective impact. When students were cued to focus on speed it had a high impact on their results (ES equalled 0.72). A comprehension cue had a higher effect where the ES was 0.81. When both speed and comprehension were cued it had the highest impact of 0.94. Similar results were shown when it came to different types of feedback. Corrective feedback had an impact of 0.68 where those who did not receive feedback actually had a higher effect of 0.88. Lastly the more times that the nontransfer passage was read the higher the effect. Two times ES of 0.57, three times ES of 0.85 and four times ES of 0.95.

The transfer (27 effect sizes) was analyzed under six different components. These include the type of tutor, if there was modeling done, corrective feedback, fixed or performance criterion, if there was a comprehension component, and if the results were charted or not. Two types of tutors were tested throughout the analysis either an adult (ES equalled 1.37) or a peer (ES equalled 0.36). Modeling consisted of if the tutor read the passage prior to having the tutee read it. Both had small to moderate effects. When modeling was done the ES was 0.40 and when modeling was not done the ES was 0.30. The corrective feedback format for the transfer studies included correcting mispronunciations or commissions during or after students read. Students

were either directed to sound out the words or reread them. When corrective feedback was given ES was 0.51 and when it was not given ES was 0.46. During the nontransfer studies, the number of times the passage was read had a big impact on how students performed based on fluency. During the transfer interventions either a fixed number of readings occurred or a performance criterion was determined before students could move from one passage to another. "Performance criterion consisted of either reading until a fixed number of correct words per minute was reached or reading a passage within a predetermined time period" (Therrien, 2004, p. 256). Studies with a fixed number of readings had an ES of 0.38 and those who were a part of the performance criterion had a high ES of 1.70. The comprehension component included if comprehension questions were asked or a summary was implemented. Those studies that had a comprehension component had an ES equalled 0.39 and the studies without an ES equalled 0.33. Lastly, the studies that incorporated charting student progress had an ES of 0.57, and when charting was not included the ES of 0.40.

Overall, the nontransfer results indicated that repeated reading is an effective strategy for improving fluency. Throughout all of the non-transfer studies the mean fluency increased on a large scale as the ES of 0.83. The transfer studies also indicated that repeated reading may help students improve their fluency with new passages as the mean effect size increase was moderate, ES of 0.50. Based on the results of each component, this study analysis concluded that all repeated reading interventions should be conducted with an adult. Students should also be cued and reread the passage three or four times. Lastly, the corrective feedback component should be included since the goal is to improve overall reading fluency.

The National Reading Panel describes fluency reading as having all three components of speed, accuracy, and prosody (Ardoin et al., 2013). Reading with prosody sounds like daily

conversations. It should include appropriate pausing, phrasing, pitch, and a variation of intonation patterns. An example of good prosody would be to pause at punctuation marks and decrease your pitch at the end of declarative sentences. The purpose of this study is to examine the impact that repeated reading has on prosody and in response has an effect on reading fluency.

Ardoin et al. (2013) conducted a study that included thirty-eight third grade students and thirty-eight fourth-grade students. Each participant read the same fourth-grade expository text. This passage contained three hundred one words, but only the first one hundred fifty-four words were used in this study. The conductors of the study created a prosody rating form to provide to students. This form includes three statements that were scored using a five-point scale (never, sometimes, half of the time, most of the time, and all of the time). The three statements are, “You pause at the appropriate place when reading, such as after periods and comma.”, “Your voice fluctuated in volume when needed such as at the end of sentences”, and “The way the story was read made it more interesting.” (Ardoin et al., 2013, p. 395). The use of a computer program was incorporated into the study to visually represent the pitch and intensity of sound. Data on both WCPM and prosody was collected during this study. Prosody was assessed based on many variables such as, length of pauses after punctuation, commas, and between paragraphs.

Participants were randomly assigned to one of two groups: repeated reading and prosody or repeated reading with rate feedback. Sessions lasted about fifteen minutes and were audio recorded for later analysis. Before the first reading students were prompted to do their best reading. If students hesitated on a word for longer than three seconds the word was provided for them. The first initial read was done as a control reading as it was a cold read.

The participants in the repeated reading and prosody group were given feedback based on the prosody rating form. They were also provided with an error correction procedure. This

consisted of the examiner reading the missed word and having the student repeat it while also reading the sentence that contained the missed word. Students were then given a six-minute lesson on prosody. This included an example of what is good prosody and why it is important, and listening to a good and bad prosody reading, and identifying the sentence type based on a reader's prosody. Before each trial, participants were reminded of their scores from the first read and then prompted to read with good expression. This process was repeated for each remaining reading trial, with a total of four trials.

The participants in the repeated reading and rate feedback group were told how long it had taken them to read the passage and how many words they got incorrect. Examiners then reviewed the missed words with each student using the error correction procedure from the other group. After the initial read study, conductors played a simple game with students for six minutes. This was done to produce the same time passed from the prosody group. Similar to the previous study before each trial students were reminded of their reading times and were encouraged to beat their prior times. The error correction procedure was done after each trial.

There were many results published throughout this study. When it came to WCPM from trial one to trial four the prosody group made an increase of 4.92 and the rate feedback group made an increase of 31.99. While WCPM increased, the rate of errors decreased throughout the four trials. The prosody group made a 1.89 decrease, where the rate feedback group made a bigger decrease of 2.25. Each of the groups were also monitored on their pauses between words, after commas, after periods, and between paragraphs. The goal of this data collection was to increase the number of pauses after punctuation and decrease the number of pauses between words because that leads to better prosody. The repeated reading and prosody group's results saw a decrease of pauses between words (72), and an increase of pauses after commas (137), pauses

after periods (149), and pauses between paragraphs (62). On the other hand, the repeated reading and rate feedback group had different results. They had a decrease in all of the pause categories: Pauses between words (26), pauses after commas (95), pauses after periods (132), and pauses after periods (144).

These results are very detailed and reflective of the different components of reading fluency. They support the idea that repeated reading improves reading fluency for students. Through direction and feedback, students were able to improve their reading rate. While the prosody group made positive gains, they did not make as much progress as the feedback group. This can be attributed to the increase of pauses, which is good for prosody, but many negatively impact their WCPM. The definition of reading fluency includes speed, accuracy, and prosody. Each piece is important and, based on the results, can improve through the use of repeated reading.

Another intervention that was done based on the reading fluency component of prosody came from Dowhower (1987). There were many questions about prosodic reading that were being evaluated during this study. These questions included if there were decreases in pause intrusions, an increase in phrasal units with a decrease in inappropriate phrases, longer pauses at the end of sentences, and appropriate pitch. Repeated reading was used as the base of the study and was evaluated by calculating the words correct in one minute.

Eighteen second-grade students participated in the study, nine of them were in the unassisted control group, and the other eight were assisted or a part of the intervention process. This study lasted for seven weeks. Each participant met four to six times per week for fifteen minutes. Six stories were used in this study. These passages were four hundred words long. They were split in half as the first part would be the practice passage, and the second part was the

transfer passage. Both groups of students participated in five sequences of the repeated reading practice passage, the first practice read being the pretest and the last read of the practice passage was the posttest. This was then followed by reading the transfer passage. Both assisted and unassisted groups read the passage five times; either orally or silently. The difference between the two groups was that the assisted group listened to the passage first on tape. Prosody was measured by reviewing audio-taped samples for the students' reading. This helped to identify pausal intrusions (inappropriate pauses within words), length of phonological phrases (number of pauses between words), inappropriate phrases (phrases that were phonologically unacceptable), phrase-final lengthening (duration of sentence and subject finals), and intonation (calculated by falling pitch at the end of sentences).

After the seven weeks, the results varied for both reading fluency rate and prosody. The mean reading rate results for the assisted group increased from 35.13 WCPM to 61.63 WCPM. This is a significant increase of 26.5 words. The unassisted group also made an increase from the start of the intervention to the end. This group started at 37.89 WCPM and increased to 67.44 WCPM, this is a 29.55 word increase. It is important to note that the only difference between the two groups is that the assisted group listened to a reading of the passage during the initial read. Both groups participated in the repeated reading process five times. Prosody was recorded using the five components listed above from the pretest to the post-test. A mean number of pausal intrusions were calculated by both groups. The assisted group decreased their pausal instructions by 1.70 (2.08 to 0.38), and the unassisted group made a smaller decrease of 1.08 (1.56 to 0.48). The mean length of phonological phrases, or the number of words between pauses increased throughout both groups. The assisted group made an increase of 1.61 (1.38 to 2.99) and the unassisted group also made an increase of 1.27 (1.53 to 2.80). Inappropriate phrases were

calculated by the percentage of unnecessary phrasing. Tutors were wanting to see a decrease in the percentage, and the results showed that. The assisted group decreased by 10.46 percent, and the unassisted group decreased by only 1.12 percent. Another percentage-based result came from calculating the falling pitch at the end of sentences. The assisted group made an increase in their falling pitch from 70.83 percent to 87.50 percent. This is a 16.67 percent increase, similarly to the unassisted group, who also made an increase. This was a bigger increase of 18.53 percent (77.78 to 96.30). Lastly, the mean drop in pitch at the end of sentences was calculated from pre to post-test. Tutors were looking for an increase of the number of times students would drop their pitch at the end of sentences. The results show this increase for both groups of participants. The assisted group showed an improvement of 24.47, and the unassisted group showed a smaller increase of 8.23. With the results, we can conclude that the use of the repeated reading strategy increased student reading rate and had participants read more accurately and with more understanding. Prosodically students do not read word to word but rather flow from sentence to sentence. Repeated reading allowed students the opportunity to practice not only their reading rate but also practice word grouping and the rhythm of words.

Interventions with Reading Difficulties and Oral Reading Fluency

Hudson et al. (2020) conducted a synthesis of research on the topic of fluency interventions. Interventions consist of small groups of students who need more targeted instruction. These interventions can be conducted by teachers, support staff, or family members. This study highlights the importance of oral reading fluency as students move through the stages of reading. “Proficiency oral reading fluency is one of the main characteristics identifying children moving from stage 2 (learning to read) where the focus is on rapid decoding of words to stage 3 (reading to learn) where students begin to gain new knowledge and ideas through their

reading of increasingly complex texts from variety of different genres” (Hudson et al., 2020, p.

1). This study connects fluent reading with the ability to read with accuracy, appropriate rate, and prosody. Explicit instruction that builds fluency is needed so students can make the transition into recognizing words both accurately and quickly.

Sixteen studies were looked at in depth to understand how intervention strategies can be used to increase students' fluency. These studies ranged in participant information, details of the intervention, group size, and how long the intervention took place. Each study had a group of participants of the intervention and then a group of students who did not partake in the intervention. That group was known as the control group. An example of this includes fifty-nine second-grade students, with 52.5 percent of them being white, 28.8 percent African American, 15.3 percent Latino, and 27 of them were male. This intervention included repeated reading with multiple features. The intervention was delivered by the teacher in a one-on-one setting. The teacher would conduct three to four reads. The teacher would begin the session with a verbal cue, then the teacher times the student reading, and the student would retell the story. If the goal was met, then a new passage would be given. If the goal was not met, then the student would continue to work on the same passage. After the final read was conducted the the amount of words read in one minute would be graphed, and student progress would be praised. Although the data was given in this format for all sixteen studies, the information presented was different in many ways. Of the sixteen studies being reviewed, 1112 students participated, ranging from second grade to fifth grade. The repeated reading intervention with multiple features (features included choral reading, verbal cueing, and error correction) occurred the most often to determine the effectiveness of improving oral reading fluency.

Fourteen of the sixteen studies included a repeated reading intervention. Each of these interventions includes supplementary components or features. The following list mentions the fourteen studies and their features.

1. A peer coach was used in the format of a more capable and fluent classmate.
2. The teacher modeled fluency and prosodic reading.
3. Phrase-drill error correction was used. This included the student saying the error three times after the correct pronunciations were modeled by the instructor.
4. Error correction in the form of repeating the missed word after the instructor.
5. Performance feedback on students' prosody skills after reading.
6. Verbal cueing was used in the way of reminders. "Read this story the best you can and as quickly as you can" is an example of one type of cued reminder.
7. Goal setting was used for students to set the number of words they would read correctly in one minute (WCPM) prior to reading the passage.
8. Echo reading was used. The student was to mimic the fluency and expressiveness of the instructor.
9. Choral reading, or the idea of teacher and student reading the text together, was used.
10. Students would perform the text.
11. Students would preview the text by listening and following along with the text as it was read aloud expressively by the teacher.
12. Questions were asked after reading to promote comprehension.
13. The neurological impress method was used. This is when the teacher will read aloud slightly ahead of the student.

14. Phonics or vocabulary instruction was given while reading.

The results of these fourteen studies were grouped together according to many different features. The results were presented in a similar way as an analyzed study from above. It was shown as an effect size and a decimal. The decimal varied based on the impact that the intervention had on the effect size. Small impacted studies have a decimal between 0.00 and 0.30, 0.31 to 0.6 had a moderate impact, and 0.61 and higher were highly effective.

The seven studies where students participated with teachers one-on-one had mixed results. Four of those studies measured reading comprehension as well as fluency. These results were in the moderate to large effect sizes (0.70-1.47). Another intervention had a hybrid approach. They combined repeated reading and the Neurological Impress Method for students in grades three through five. This method had a significant increase in rate and accuracy (ES of 0.68). One intervention consisted of error correction from the teacher. This intervention lasted fourteen weeks and produced moderate results (0.53) on students' oral reading fluency. On the flipside, the intervention that included verbal cueing and error correction only produced a small effect size (0.38).

Of the other studies conducted, three of them used the one-on-one intervention strategy, but this time with a peer coach rather than a teacher. Two of those three studies were focused on working with students for ten to twelve minutes three times a week for a total of thirty-six weeks. These groups made significant progress, and both produced large effect sizes with students' oral reading fluency (1.06 and 1.12). The last study worked with students in the lowest quartile of the reading interventions. These students consisted of English Language Learners (ELL) and students who were labeled with a Learning Disability (LD). Over the fifteen weeks of this

intervention, a small effect was found with these students (0.33). This is an example of how specialized interventions do not work for all types of learners.

The last four studies were conducted by a teacher in a small group setting rather than one-on-one. Small effects were found for both oral reading fluency and reading comprehension. Two of these studies challenged the idea of trained paraprofessionals versus teachers giving the intervention. In both studies, the instructors had a quick letter-sound lesson with the small group. The instructors also provided students with error correction strategies for words that were skipped or pronounced incorrectly. Examples of these strategies included “encouraging the student to sound out the word, phoneme by phoneme, and then blend the sounds; helping the student to segment a multisyllabic word and then put the parts together” (Hudson et al., 2020, p. 18). Both studies had a more significant effect when the teacher provided the instruction rather than the trained paraprofessional (ES of 0.41 and 0.32 versus ES of 0.53).

Two of the fourteen studies had a continuous reading intervention that was examined. One was done in a small group setting, and the other was a one-on-one format. This intervention consisted of students reading continuously for the entire intervention session and then was tested on a single reading of a different text. Both studies had a moderate effect on oral reading fluency. The one-on-one study had students reading at their instructional level. The individuals in this group differed from the control group by reading the same passage repeatedly rather than reading many pages without repeating. After the study, it was found that the students who participated in the continuous reading condition outperformed the control group (ES of 0.58). The small group study practiced the continuous reading strategy by engaging in an echo or choral reading session with the teacher. The students who participated in the continuous reading intervention outperformed the control group who just listened to the reading with effect sizes of 0.58.

The goal of all sixteen studies was to explore how effective fluency interventions can be in regard to oral reading fluency. Of the sixteen studies, twelve of them “were found to produce small to large effects on the oral reading fluency of students with reading difficulties” (Hudson et al., 2020, p. 19). One of the most prominent trends in this study was the fact that close to ninety percent of the studies were of repeated reading intervention. Repeated reading is used to build students' fluency skills. This intervention is effective as it focuses on the practice of speed and ease in recognizing words that make up a text. When fluency is improved students allow for more working memory to be used on higher-order thinking that pertains to comprehension. This can include making meaning of words and phrases, noticing cause and effect relationships, and retelling the main idea and key details of a passage. According to Hudson et al. (2020) and the findings from the synthesis of research, elementary school students who have difficulty with reading fluency would benefit from one-on-one interventions facilitated by a teacher or trained paraprofessional. Repeated reading is one intervention that can assist in building oral reading fluency.

When it comes to supporting students with their reading fluency, programs may be used to supplement a fluency intervention. Vadasy and Sanders's (2008) study focuses on the fluency program called *Quick Reads*. This supplemental program is designed for students in second through sixth grade. The program provides students with reading practice so they develop word reading and fluency skills so that they can focus on comprehension. Vadasy and Sanders (2008) focused on forty fourth and fifth-grade classrooms. The students went through a screening process and qualified for the study if they demonstrated an at-risk performance on three grade-level reading passages. For fourth-grade students, this meant scoring below ninety-three WCPM and fifth-grade students' at-risk performance was if they read lower than one hundred

four WCPM. Eligible students were then assigned to dyads which included pairs of students. These dyads were then assigned the *Quick Reads* tutoring program or the control group of only classroom instruction. At the end of the study, there were fifty-four treatment students and sixty-five control students. Twenty tutors from the community were asked to join the study as instructors. These tutors have an educational background and have worked with fourth and fifth-grade students previously.

The *Quick Reads* supplemental program includes short, nonfiction passages. For this study, nine science and nine social studies passages were used. Ninety-eight percent of the words used in the *Quick Read* passages are high-frequency words or words that follow a grade-level phonics or syllable pattern. These passages are intended to be used in a whole group or small group. The usual routine includes using the *Quick Reads* passages for fifteen minutes a day for one whole semester. In that fifteen minutes, students will read the passage three times. The first read consists of the teacher activating prior knowledge and having students pick out two words that are unfamiliar. Students then read the passage aloud and make notes of key ideas. For the second reading, the teachers modeled to students what fluent reading looks like. The teacher reads the story aloud for one minute as students note one thing the author wants the reader to remember. During the third read, students are told that the goal is to read as many words as they can in one minute. Students read silently for one minute and then record how many words were read.

For this study the treatment students received the Quick Reads tutoring routine for thirty minutes per day, four days a week, for twenty weeks. These students were pulled out of the classroom based on the tutor's preference. Students who were a part of the control group did not receive any tutoring and stayed in the classroom. The tutors followed the usual routine from

above during their intervention and also added a vocabulary component to it. This vocabulary instruction was intended to introduce the vocabulary within each passage (activating background information). Each group of students participated in a pre and post assessment that included word reading accuracy, word reading efficiency, word comprehension, vocabulary, fluency rate, and passage comprehension. Word reading accuracy required students to read increasingly difficult words until they mispronounced six in a row. Word reading efficiency is similar as it asks students to read as many increasingly difficult words as they could in forty-five seconds. Vocabulary was assessed using a multiple-choice assessment. Word comprehension was assessed by using synonyms, antonyms, and analogies. The fluency rate included WCPM for three grade-level passages. Words that were omitted, substituted, or hesitated on for more than three seconds were not counted toward WCPM. Lastly, passage comprehension required students to supply a missing word in a sentence that would make the most sense.

The results of the six components being assessed include both treatment groups and control groups. The treatment groups had an increase in all components from pre to post-assessment. The components include: word reading accuracy (increase of three), word reading efficiency (increase of three), vocabulary (increase of four), word comprehension (increase of three), fluency rate (increase of twenty), and passage comprehension (increase of three). The control group also had some improvements along with no changes. Their results are as follows: word reading accuracy (no change), word reading efficiency (increase of three), vocabulary (increase of three), word comprehension (increase of two), fluency rate (increase of seventeen), and passage comprehension (no change). With these results conclusions can be made. The treatment group outperformed the control group in all categories. Supplemental

reading fluency programs can be beneficial as a way to improve on many components of reading including vocabulary and comprehension, which in turn improve reading fluency.

A second Quick Reads study from Vadasy and Sanders (2008a) focused on a group of second and third grade students. Participants qualified if they had never been retained, had low rates of reading fluency or comprehension, and would benefit from a fluency intervention. By second and third grade fluency becomes an important topic of conversation in schools. This Quick Reads intervention was similar to the other because they used the idea of dyads. The sample group of students were made up of eighty-two students participating in the intervention (treatment group) and eighty control group students. Twenty-two tutors were used for this repeated reading intervention. Interventions for the treatment group lasted for thirty minutes a day, four days a week, for fifteen weeks. The control group only received classroom instruction.

During the intervention, the passages that were used were nonfictional and consisted of ninety-eight percent of high-frequency words. The use of these words is reflected on grade-level phonics and syllable patterns. During the repeated reading portion of the intervention, each passage was read three times. The first read consisted of the teacher activating background knowledge by having students select two words that were challenging. The second read is when the teacher models to students what fluent reading looks like. The teacher also informs students to write down one thing that the author wants the reader to remember. Lastly, the third read is when students were tested based on WCPM. The instructor would ask the students two comprehension questions at the end of the reading session. Along with the three read procedure each tutoring session consisted of six steps.

1. Letter/sound practice: Tutors took five minutes of each session to review and practice letter sounds correspondences. This activity is used to support correction strategies for word miscues as decoding skills were learned.
2. First passage reading: Students took turns reading and following along with the passage.
3. Second and third passage reading: Tutor and student would read the passage aloud together for both readings. The tutor would model what smooth, accurate, and fluent reading looks and sounds like.
4. Fourth passage reading: Students participated in a one minute read of the practiced passage and WCPM were recorded.
5. Comprehension: The student and tutor would discuss two comprehension questions.
6. Reading of new passage: Students would repeat steps one through five with a new passage. Students would get through two passages each session.

On average treatment dyads completed ninety-five passages and attended fifty sessions. This is a total of twenty-five hours of intervention time.

Fluency was the main skill target. Students read passages aloud while WCPM was calculated. If students omitted, substituted, and/or hesitated for more than three seconds and error was calculated. Results from pretest to post-test for the treatment group increased by 11.6 WCPM (77 to 88.6) whereas the control group only improved by 8.2 WCPM (78.6 to 86.8). Comprehension was also assessed at both the pre and post-test. With similar growth as fluency, the treatment group increased by 8 (84.8 to 92.8), and the control group made a smaller growth of 5.4 (87.6 to 92.9). As you can see from the results, the treatment group had bigger growth

from pre to post-test, however their scores are not that different from the control group. An explanation for this stems from the fact that the treatment group were students who would benefit from a fluency intervention, where the control group did not need as much support. These results are helpful for teachers as the academic gap is slowly closing. They also show that the treatment group participants clearly benefited from the intervention in regards to reading fluency gains.

Staudt (2009) talks about the need to combine word studies with the act of repeated reading of poetry in order to improve reading skills. Before students are able to become fluent readers they need to learn word recognition skills. The more these skills are mastered the better fluency is. To develop automaticity in reading students must be exposed to decoding strategies and be given time to practice these skills.

This study follows two fourth grade students, who are ADHD and have an auditory processing disorder, named Anne and Will. Both of these students struggle to apply the phonological skills learned and often need prompting and reminders. With that being said, repeated reading along with phonics and phonemic awareness instruction would maximize Anne and Will's chances to become fluent readers. Sound-symbol relationships for vowels, vowel pairs, and common suffix endings were reviewed. Both students practiced decoding two-syllable words. They were reminded of a strategy that splits words into syllables and how to use the six syllable types to decode words. The repeated reading practice included texts at their instructional level and the instructor gave them both corrective feedback. The advisor of the study would often model fluent reading that includes expression and prosody.

Staudt (2009) chose to use fun and easy poems to read rather than narrative or informational passages. She wanted them to hear the rhythm of the words to get a better

understanding of phrasing and expression. The poet's word choices allowed for many opportunities to work on Anne and Will's language skills. Multiple meaning words were addressed and lessons on how words can be used as different parts of speech were taught. For example the word play can sometimes work as a noun and other times as a verb. Rhyming words that can often be found in poetry can help to address orthography as they can have common spelling patterns. Each week followed the same routine. Each Monday, the instructor would introduce a new poem and record how long it took each student to read it. Then, throughout the week students got timed on the reading of the poem and got to reread poems they had previously worked on earlier in the school year. "Rereading poetry helped them hear and enjoy a more mature-sounding syntax not found in the simple books they were reading independently" (Staudt, 2009, p. 145). This study continued throughout the school year as students worked on timed repeated readings.

The results of word studies and the use of repeated reading had a positive effect on both Anne and Will as they made gains on their WCPM throughout the school year. Anne started the school year reading forty-eight WCPM and ended the school year reading eighty WCPM. That is a thirty-two word difference. Will started the year reading twenty-nine WCPM and ended the year in May with sixty-nine WCPM. That is a forty-word difference. As we can see, the use of repeated reading, poems, and intensive word studies has increased Anne and Will's reading fluency. It has also ultimately increased their interest in reading as they continue on in their education.

Repeated reading is not the only intervention when it comes to improving reading fluency. Begeny et al. (2009) mention passage previewing as another strategy. Passage previewing or PP can be students silently reading or orally reading to self before testing, or can

be listening to a skilled reader read the passage. This type of passage previewing is referred to as LPP. Another similar reading technique is a listening-only strategy (LO). This differs from LPP as LO focuses on simply listening to the reading, where LPP listens and reads along silently. This study looks to find out if repeated reading, passage previewing, or listening strategies are more beneficial to reading fluency.

The participants of this study include four second-grade students from a rural school in the Southeast. Two students were female and two were male. These students were identified by their teachers as needing additional reading instruction. All participants can read between the twenty-fifth and fiftieth percentile, which averages to be between 46 and 56.5 WCPM. The intervention was conducted during the school day in a small group setting outside of the general classroom. Trainers who were doctoral students in psychology conducted the interventions. These trainers received instruction on the procedural roles and were required to demonstrate mastery of the intervention implementation. The passages that were chosen for this experiment were at the second-grade level or slightly above. This level was selected so that materials would be at or slightly above each student's reading level. This is a common practice for reading fluency intervention studies.

The study consisted of four different conditions: control group, listening preview passage, repeated reading, and listening only. All four participants were grouped together and received the interventions at the same time. Participants received sixteen sessions total, four separate sessions for each of the four conditions. At the beginning of each session, the trainer would greet the group by saying, "Today we are going to read some stories together. When you read the stories, I want you to give your best effort! At the end of our time together today, if everybody shows that they put in their best effort and followed my directions, you can earn up to

two stars on your chart” (Begeny et al., 2009, p. 217). Students could use their stars to earn prizes. At the end of each session, the trainer would praise the group members and tell them how many stars they have earned. Groups met every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. It is important to learn about each of the four sessions.

The control group read each of the three three passages in consecutive order. These passages were not read again until the next session when they were asked to read them to determine the WCPM. This type of assessment is called a retention assessment because they are being asked to retain the information and apply it a couple of days later. The LPP (listening passage preview) group listened to the trainer read the first passage. The trainer read with good expression and pace. Students had a copy of the passage and were asked to follow along and read silently as the trainer read. The trainer would stop five to seven times throughout the passage and select a student to say the next word in the story. When the trainer was done reading the passage for a second time, the participants would leave the group and read the passage one on one with a trainer to determine WCPM. This represents an immediate assessment as students are being assessed right after the reading procedure. The same process was done for the other two passages. The repeated reading session consisted of the trainer selecting one participant from the group to lead the others in reading the first passage. This student would read the passage a bit louder as the other group members read along with a softer tone. If the group leader came across a word they did not know, the trainer would provide it for the group. A new group leader would be chosen for the second read of the same passage. When the second read was done, the participants were assessed for WCPM individually. The same process was repeated for the second and third passages. The LO (listening only) session involved only the trainer reading the

passage and students listening carefully. Each passage was read aloud twice before students participated in an immediate assessment.

The results of these sessions include the average scores across all participants of each intervention, either in regards to immediate gains or retention gains, in WCPM. The immediate gains for the control group was 62.25, the LPP group was 88.69, the repeated reading group had a total of 98.19, and the LO group had a total of 84.13 WCPM. For the retention gains the results are as follows: control group is 75 WCPM, LPP group is 92.56 WCPM, the repeated reading group has the highest WCPM at 96.69, and the LO group has a total of 83.63 WCPM. These results show that each of the intervention groups outperformed the control group. Across all of the intervention conditions, the repeated reading condition was the most effective one when it came to both immediate and retention gains. The second most effective intervention was the listening passage preview, as students were able to hear what fluent readers sound like as they followed along. With this being said, it is important that education works to implement such interventions in their classroom, particularly with students who are considered low to average readers.

Repeated Readings with Secondary Students

Valleley and Shriver (2003, p. 56) state that students' reading abilities reliably predict school success. That means that students who fall behind in reading in an elementary school setting continue to lag behind in reading when they reach secondary education. "The Center for Education Reform (1998) reported 25% of 12th grade students do not have basic reading skills" (Valleley & Shriver, 2003, p. 56). When younger students learn how to effectively read, they first focus on decoding the letter and letter sounds. As these students navigate through grade levels, the focus shifts from learning how to decode to comprehension. This is when secondary students

struggle because they lack the foundational skills and are forced to focus primarily on comprehending what they are reading. It is beneficial for secondary students to build on their fluency skills before focusing on comprehension.

Repeated reading intervention is used to increase fluency for all students. In this study, it is being used for high school students with fluency deficits. For the purpose of this study, repeated reading is defined as “the rereading of a short meaningful passage several times until a satisfactory level of fluency is reached” (Valleley & Shriver, 2003, p. 56). The satisfactory level is usually explained as a set amount of words read correctly in a specific time period. Repeated reading is beneficial for secondary students because it is simple and easy to implement in an intervention setting. This is important as secondary teachers are not usually trained in reading fluency interventions. This comes from the idea that it is not typical that high school students need support in fluency. Children seem to enjoy this reading intervention as it follows a routine where students can predict what will occur. The following study's purpose is to “examine the effectiveness of repeated readings intervention with secondary students experiencing difficulties with reading” (Valleley & Shriver, 2003, p. 57).

This study follows four high school students ranging from ninth to twelfth grade. They attend a public school in the Midwest. These participants were selected because they were reading significantly lower than their peers. To be more specific, the four students were reading thirty to fifty words correctly per minute less than the comparison group. These participants were a part of a residential treatment facility because of behavior and academic problems. The intervention was held three times a week for twenty minutes per session. The intervention lasted for a total of ten weeks. Four other students who attended the same high school and were

involved in the same residential treatment facility were labeled as the comparison group (control).

The materials that were used during this study were passages from the Timed Reading Series. These passages ranged from fourth to twelfth grade. The original goal was to start the intervention by using passages at the participant's instructional level. That level was determined by the comparison group. That group had a median WCPM of 144. However, none of the participants in the intervention group could read that many words at any grade level. Since fourth grade was the lowest grade this is where the participants started.

Valleley and Shriver (2003, p. 60), define reading fluency as the number of words read correctly in a passage during one minute. The fluency measures were gathered during the first reading of a new passage. During the baseline screening, students read three fourth-grade level passages each week. During the experiment, participants reread the same passage until they made progress on three consecutive reading fluencies. Progress includes reading one more correct word in one minute. When they showed this improvement, students would then move on to the next passage within the series. An exception to this would be if the student did not make three consecutive fluency improvements after reading the passage ten times. Students did not receive any feedback on words that they may have substituted, added, or missed. The only comments that participants did receive were if they did not get stuck on a word for longer than three seconds. In this instance, the instructor provided the word for the student. When students read the fourth-grade passages in their entirety, they moved on to fifth-grade passages.

Reinforcement was used during this study. This was done due to the fact that the participants had behavior problems. These reinforcements included points that were received when the participants exhibited appropriate behavior. These points can be used by the student for

different privileges outside of the intervention. One of the participants received immediate rewards for his participation within the study since delayed reinforcers were not motivating enough.

After the ten-week intervention, results were observed to see the effect that repeated reading can have on secondary students. It is important to note that “Reading interventions do not typically result in an immediate and dramatic change in fluency, but rather an increasing reading rate over time” (Valleley & Shriver, 2003, p. 64). Before getting into individual participant performance, it should be declared that from the baseline to throughout the intervention, students reading speed increased. For the fifth-grade reading passages, Participant One made an increase of fifteen WCPM (92 for baseline and 107 at the end of intervention), participant two had an increase of thirty-seven WCPM (64 to 101), participant three made a seventeen WCPM increase (70 to 97), and unfortunately, participant four did not make it to the end of the study due to the personal choice of stopping the intervention halfway through. The three remaining participants were also tested in a ninth-grade passage. Although they did not score higher than the comparison group, each participant had positive gains ranging from an increase of six WCPM to 20 WCPM.

Since reading can be found in just about every content area, it is important to transfer the idea of fluency to other areas. This can include social studies, science, English, and mathematics. The three participants and the comparison group were asked to read generalization passages. These passages were either from students' Social Studies or English textbooks. From the pre to post passage, the three participants increased their reading fluency by six to seventeen WCPM. This is a different result than the comparison group, where they made minimal gains or decreased their WCPM. This shows that even though the repeated reading intervention passages

were at a fourth and fifth-grade level, the participants were still able to read more fluently when asked to read a higher leveled text. It can seem probable that average secondary readers would not make improvements on their WCPM since fluency is no longer a focus at this age level. This may give us an explanation on why the comparison group did not make as much of an increase as the participants.

This study's primary goal was to see how repeated reading can help struggling readers increase their fluency strategies. Ten additional hours, three weekly sessions of twenty minutes, of repeated reading allowed each participant to experience an increase in reading fluency. As stated above, reading interventions are known to increase students reading rate over time rather than have an immediate effect. The results of this study support this idea as, “Each of the participants also showed slow but steady increasing trends during the repeated reading intervention” (Valleley & Shriver, 2003, p. 71). With that being said, repeated reading is a simple and reasonable intervention for secondary students who have reading setbacks.

In recent years, the increase in online learning has taken off. The COVID-19 pandemic had teachers transitioning from in-person learning to online instruction. Romig and Jetton (2023) talk about how repeated reading can be a reading intervention delivered synchronously online with struggling readers. According to the National Reading Panel (2000), fluency is one of the five pillars of reading. When individuals become fluent in reading, they are able to spend more time focusing on other reading elements like comprehension. In this study, Re-Read-Adapt and Answer-Comprehend (RAAC) was used as a specific repeated reading intervention. This program incorporates error correction and feedback, repeatedly reading until a criterion is met, and prompts for fluency and comprehension. This intervention also uses a question generation component to support reading comprehension.

Online learning can become difficult, especially when reading is involved. The lack of student participation and engagement is one difficulty. Another one involves the problem of poor audio connections. Since reading requires the ability to hear and manipulate sounds, students who have bad connections can struggle with the key pieces of learning to read. It can also become problematic for students to follow along with the text. Another issue stems from error corrections. In order for this to happen, teachers must share their screen with students and highlight mistakes throughout the passage. The question being asked during this study includes if the use of repeated reading and RAAC will increase student WCPM on nontransfer passages.

Three students were included in this study. One was in fourth grade, and the other two were in sixth grade. The study was conducted online via an application called Zoom. All sessions were one-on-one, with the tutor leading the student. All tutors were trained on how to model, provide feedback, and collect data. Tutors were asked to note the WCPM by calculating the total number of words read and subtracting out the reading errors. “In the RAAC intervention, students repeatedly read passages and received feedback on reading, including error correction, after each read (Romig & Jetton, 2023, p. 5). Passages being used included narratives that included a wide range of topics.

The study followed a specific format to ensure that all participants were getting the same instruction. This procedure started with a baseline. During this phase tutors modeled what fluent reading looks and sounds like. Then, they prompted students to read each passage one at a time. Each student participated in three baseline readings. Throughout the intervention phase tutors modeled fluent reading of the passages and then the students read the same passage at least two times. After each reading, the tutor would provide feedback by highlighting any reading errors the student made. The student was asked to repeat the corrected words. After feedback was given

the student would read the same passage again. If students met the grade-level fluency on any of the reading the tutor would move to the next passage within the same grade level. If students read the same passage four times and did not reach grade level fluency, then the tutor moved on to the next passage in the same grade level. If students met the fluency goal on three consecutive passages, then the tutor moved on to the next grade-level passages. On the flip side, if students failed to meet the fluency level goal on three consecutive passages then the tutor would decrease the grade level. This would repeat for ten sessions.

The results for the RAAC intervention show that each of the three students consistently improved on their WCPM. This means that on each of the repeated reading passages, students' scores increased from the previous reading of the same passage. Student one completed six passages with four repeated readings in each session. This is a total of twenty-four readings. Of these twenty-four readings, on six times did the students' WCPM not increase from the previous reading. This student also increased from the baseline, below the fiftieth percentile, to one session being over the seventy-fifth percentile. Student two had three such instances and increased from the baseline, below the twenty-fifth percentile, to one session being over the ninetieth percentile. Student three had five of these cases, which increased from the baseline, around the tenth percentile, to consistently being at the fiftieth percentile. Overall, seventy-five percent or more of the time, fluency increased with each repeated reading for all participants. This indicates that the RAAC intervention can successfully be conducted online. They have similar results to what is expected of repeated reading interventions in a traditional classroom setting.

Chang (2013) conducted a study based on the effects of the repeated reading strategy and foreign language students. These students are labeled as L2 in the study. This represents that

English is the second language they are learning. L2 readers often read at a careful pace and search for the definitions of unfamiliar words. This leads to a slower reading pace, and the more these students use this type of reading a habit starts to form. According to Chang (2013), reading fluency is composed of automaticity in word recognition, accuracy in decoding familiar and unfamiliar words and reading at a quick pace. When there is a lack of ability to decode the words that make up a text, comprehension becomes harder. There are high correlations between reading fluency and comprehension. With this comes the importance of practicing fluency so that comprehension follows.

Repeated reading is an intervention that can be used to assist this learning. This strategy can be done orally or silently, and with or without modeling. Repeated reading with the assistance of modeling tends to be more effective than without. “Rereading helped students with reading difficulties break out of word-by-word reading to read larger chunks of meaningful phrases” (Chang, 2013, p. 129). For the effectiveness of this study, the question of if students who receive repeated reading instruction can read faster than those who do not receive this instruction will be answered. Another focus of this study was to examine whether students could use the improved reading rate and transfer it to an unpracticed passage.

Twenty-six college-aged students from Taiwan participated in this study. All of these students have received English instruction for seven years previously. During the study they were part of a once-a-week, three-hour-long English course. Before the study started a Vocabulary test was administered to see how many high frequency words the participants know. The test indicated that the participants might know one thousand seven hundred thirty-two words. This allowed the researchers to select appropriate text. A control group participated in this study. This group participated in the one minute reads and answered the comprehension questions however

did not receive repeated reading instruction. Each passage being used was approximately three hundred words long. Each passage was followed by five multiple choice comprehension questions. There were thirty-one passages being used in the study. Passage 1 through 3 were used during the pre-test, passages four through twenty-nine were used during the intervention as practice, and the last two passages were used for the post-test. Each participant in the repeated reading intervention read the passages five times, where the non-treatment members only read them once.

Since this study consisted of college aged students, a lot of the procedure was put on the student to conduct. For example, students timed their own reads by using their own cell phones. They were also able to record the time it took them to complete each of the passages. This is helpful because the instructor is not having to complete each and every step. Two passages were read each week as the study lasted for thirteen weeks. The repeated reading treatment group read each passage five times and then answered five comprehension questions. These questions were first answered at the end of the first read and then a second time after the fifth read. The control group read each passage only once and answered the comprehension questions afterward. The last week of the study students read the last two passages and an average WCPM was calculated.

The results of the study show that the students who participated in the repeated reading interventions improved their reading rate more than the students who read only once. More importantly, the effects of the study can be transferred to an unpracticed passage of the same difficulty. The repeated reading group improved from the pretest one to the posttest one by forty-seven words (103 to 150 WCPM) and pretest two to posttest two by forty-five words (100 to 145). In comparison, the control group only had a thirteen WCPM improvement (107 to 120) and a seven WCPM increase (102 to 109). Comprehension significantly increased for the

repeated reading group as well. Pretest and posttest one had ten comprehension questions and on average, the treatment group increased by 1.89 where the control group increased by only 0.52. Pretest and posttest two had a total of nineteen questions. The treatment group increased by 3.23, and the control group experienced a small increase of 0.69. You can see that the treatment group's use of repeated readings has supported their comprehension. This is an enhancement of nineteen and seventeen percent. Overall with repeated reading, students not only read faster but also improved on their comprehension. Reviewing the initial questions that were asked before the study occurred, it can be concluded that not only did repeated reading increase students reading rate, it also helped participants transfer their knowledge to a new unpracticed reading passage.

Repeated Reading in Practice

Repeated reading has been defined as reading a passage until grade-level criterion is met. This could be two, three, or four times. Ardoin et al. (2009) evaluates if doubling the amount of repeated readings would lead to greater gains. In place of having a pre-established amount of WCPM in order to move on, this study focuses on the amount of rereading is done. The study established that a normal amount of repeated reading is three.

The participants of this study were four boys who received their education at a residential facility for troubled youth. The students consisted of Shane, a fourth grader, Seth, a fifth grader, Roland a second grader, and James who was also in the second grade. The intervention was conducted daily. A baseline was administered to determine each participant's instructional level. This consisted of reading three passages (cold reads) and WCPM were averaged out. Shane and Roland were placed at a first-grade level, James was at a second grade level, and Seth received third-grade reading materials. Once instructional levels were determined, thirteen random

passages were selected based on each student's reading level. For the following three days students read the thirteen passages for one minute each without error correction. Students' WCPM were calculated to match each passage according to their difficulty level. When this was done one passage was assigned to a condition.

The two interventions differed only in whether students read a passage three or six times. Other components of the intervention included the passage being read to the student, the student reading either three or six opportunities to read the passage aloud for two minutes, and after each reading the student was told how many words he read correctly in the first minutes and incorrectly in the second minute, and error correction at the end of each passage. Even though students practiced the rereading process for two minutes only the first minute was assessed for WCPM. Tokens were awarded to participants each time they exceeded their WCPM on each passage. Tokens were used to encourage engagement and participation in the study. Tokens could be turned in for tangible items like pencils and erasers.

No matter if students reread each passage three or six times, there were gains on their WCPM. However, doubling the number of reading opportunities resulted in greater fluency gains. For example, Shane made growth from his pre-reading to three reads (43.2 WCPM) and from his pre-read to six reads (60 WCPM). You will see similar results for the other three participants (Seth 23.45 and 42.4 WCPM growth, Roland 30.84 and 38.51 WCPM growth and James 47.17 and 60.5 WCPM growth). On average the four participants increased by 14.21 WCPM from three to six reads. Overall the repeated reading intervention helps to increase the rate and accuracy of reading fluency whether you read it three or six times. However, these results show that the more times you re-read the passage the more words you are able to read in one minute.

Repeated reading has been used to improve reading fluency and comprehension for many years. This intervention has been used for short-term results throughout several weeks or even for the length of a school year. Gellert (2014) explores the idea of repeated reading and if it can predict reading development over time. Does repeated reading have long term effects on reading development? Or is it just an in the moment/short term solution? When students participate in the repeated reading strategies, they are able to build up their understanding of the text during the first or second reading. Students are able to learn new words and word combinations. This new learning allows students to speed up their reading, ultimately making WCPM improvements, as well as comprehension gains.

In order to find out if repeated reading can increase reading development over time this study followed third-grade students at the beginning of the school year and then the same group of students nine months later as they entered into fourth grade. A total of eighty-one students, fifty girls and thirty-one boys, participated in this study. Participants read the same text aloud once in third grade and then again in fourth grade. The text was ninety-eight words long and consisted of a narrative genre. At the beginning of the read, no instructions were given and there was only general encouragement provided. The instructor calculated reading fluency based on each student's WCPM. Text comprehension was also measured in the study. Students read one long text, about nine hundred words, and then were asked thirty-three multiple choice questions and eleven yes or no questions. The participants were given twenty-five minutes to complete both the reading and answer the questions. Repeated reading was assessed in this study by taking part in reading a seventy-eight-word narrative three consecutive times (story A). Students were instructed that at the end of the third read, they would retell the story to the examiner. Then, about one week later students read a different text (story B). This narrative was one hundred five

words. The examiner told the students to read the story three consecutive times as quickly as possible. The examiner also showed the student a stopwatch and told them they would be timed on their speed. During both stories A and B, the instructor never assisted the student.

Results for this study included all three measures from above. In regards to the reading fluency from third to fourth grade, students on average, made a 17.45 WCPM growth. Students also made great progress in reading comprehension as the average number of questions answered correctly went from 31.6 to 36.84. This is a growth of 5.24. When it comes to the repeated reading intervention that was used only in the third grade, both text A and B had a WCPM increase. As a reminder, text A incorporated the use of retelling after the three reads. The examiner recorded the WCPM after each of the three readings. On average, students increased their WCPM by 39.2 words. (first read was 104.66 and the second read was 143.86). Text B was a longer read, and students were told to read as quickly as they could. During this read there was a WCPM increase of 48.84 words (first read equalled 117.08 and the second read equalled 165.92).

The results from the tests done in third grade indicate that repeated reading can contribute to reading development over time. It can be predicted that the repeated reading process can help students build up their understanding of the text as a whole and they can use this understanding as a basis for speeding up their reading. This build up of understanding allows for students to have stronger potential for developing long term fluency compared to their peers that do not have the opportunity to build their understanding. Based on the results it can be stated that repeated reading does have an effect on reading development over time.

Oral reading fluency can become more prevalent in the upper elementary grade levels as there is a transition from a learning to read stage to the reading to learn stage. Since this is a big

shift for students, it is important that there is explicit instruction in reading fluency. “One way to help transition struggling readers to becoming fluent readers is to provide them with numerous opportunities to practice reading text at their instructional level” (Musti-Rao et al., 2009, p. 13). The purpose of this study is to determine the effectiveness of peer-mediated repeated reading with fourth grade students. Students were measured weekly on unpracticed passages to determine if gains in WCPM occurred. The reason why unpracticed passages were used is to see if the act of repeated reading would transfer to unfamiliar readings.

Twelve African American students participated in this study. They were a part of a fourth grade classroom of thirty-two students. The entire class participated in repeated reading but only the twelve students were monitored. The classroom teacher volunteered to conduct the repeated reading intervention within her classroom. This teacher has had thirty-five years of experience teaching both elementary and middle school. The repeated reading intervention took place during the students' silent reading time three days a week. Students were assessed on their reading fluency by calculating their WCPM.

Peer-mediated repeated reading was a process taught to the twelve students in groups of four. This was done in a staggered manner resulting in three tiers of students. Before the intervention started there were two training sessions for students to attend. This training consisted of an overview of the entire process, modeling of each of the roles (listener and reader), and student practice of the study with feedback. After students participated in the training, they started the intervention. Every student was assigned a 120-150 word passage from the book *Charlotte's Web*. Based on the baseline reading, three students were below a fourth-grade reading level and read different passages that were at their reading level. Each student had a repeated reading folder that included the reading passage including the word count,

a good tutor card, a correction card, and a reading log. The good tutor card was a reinforcement component for students to follow good tutoring behavior. Students would get a stamp when they displayed this behavior. The reading log was used to record the date and their WCPM at the end of each session. During each session, students took turns reading each paragraph of the passage for ten minutes. At the end of this time, students read the passage for one minute and then recorded their WCPM in their reading log. The reading goal was one hundred eighteen WCPM and if students met or exceeded this goal on the third day they would receive a tangible reward. This could be a key chain or a gen pen. Only one student reached or exceeded the benchmark, scoring one hundred twenty-six WCPM. Since groups of students were staggered, some groups ran for seventeen weeks, some for twelve, and the last group ran for six weeks. Weekly sessions ran for thirty minutes.

The introduction of repeated reading for this group of students had a positive effect. All students showed an increase in their fluency rates (WCPM). On average, the twelve students made a 13.7 word increase from the baseline to the intervention (45.8 to 59.5). With that being said, none of the students met the end-of-the-year benchmark for fourth grade. This can possibly be attributed to the amount of time spent on the repeated reading intervention which in turn decreased the amount of time spent on grade-level reading. Despite this, results from this study show that repeated reading promotes an increase in reading fluency for struggling readers. Providing students with multiple exposures to print, repeated reading can address speed, accuracy, and prosody, all components of reading fluency.

The use of the repeated reading procedure is to apply what they have learned to fluently read a transfer passage or a new passage that has not been practiced. This transfer of understanding will help support students when reading unfamiliar texts both academically and

for leisure. The repeated reading intervention can also include other components in addition to the act of re-reading passages. Some examples of these include error correction, modeling, performance cueing, and feedback. Another component that is not seen all of the time is the act of previewing and practicing isolated words. Error correction is used by the instructor, correcting any missed words the student had during the reading. The instructor will correctly say the word and have the student repeat it within a phrase or sentence. This helps readers improve their response accuracy for future readings. Modeling is usually supported by the instructor or tutor. They model how to read at a natural reading rate along with using prosody. These are essential characteristics of reading fluency. The act of cueing students refers to telling students to focus on their fluency. Instructors can say, “read as fast as you can,” before students start to read. Graphing students' performance helps instructors prompt students to read more words the next time. “In fact, performance cueing and graphing have been associated with increases in oral reading fluency for students with and without disabilities” (Lo et al., 2011, pp. 118–119). Previewing words in isolation is different from error correction as instructors choose specific words from the passage that may cause difficulties and teach them to students before they start to read. This helps prevent student errors and hesitations that may get in the way of a student's reading fluency. Lo et al. (2011) study looks to evaluate the use of a repeated reading intervention package and how it affects oral reading fluency on the independent (above 95% word recognition) level and grade level transfer passages.

This study was conducted in a Title One elementary school in the Southeast region of the United States. All of the assessment and intervention sessions took place in a small group room different from the participants core classroom. Three second-grade students were chosen to participate in this study. They were chosen because they had essential decoding skills, they

scored below the benchmark for a second-grade assessment, and their trend line of an eight-week progress monitoring period predicted that they would not attain the benchmark level by the end of second grade with just core reading instruction alone. The reading passages that were chosen to be used in this study consisted of forty short passages. These passages ranged from ninety-one words to one hundred twenty-three words at the first-grade level and one hundred five to one hundred forty-seven at the second-grade level. First-grade passages were used for intervention and assessment, where the second-grade passages were only used for assessments. There were also preview word lists that had five words from each passage that were anticipated to be difficult to decode, and flashcards to be used for incorrect word practice and the practice of high frequency sight words. Each student had a performance graph to visually show their progress throughout the twenty session intervention.

This study had the three participants take part in their general classroom's core reading instruction program for ninety minutes. During this instructional time students learned decoding skills, vocabulary, reading fluency, with emphasis on comprehension, and language arts content. Students also used decodable books throughout the core instruction to exercise the decoding skills being taught. When the whole group lesson was done the three participants received individualized repeated reading instruction from the tutor. Each session lasted approximately fifteen to twenty minutes four times a week. It introduced a new passage and followed an eight step procedure.

1. Initial performance cuing and feedback: The instructor showed the participant their progress on each individual performance graph and encouraged them to beat their previous WCPM.

2. Preview of difficult passage words: The tutor read the title of the passage and then previewed the five preselected difficult words associated with that passage. They would model the word and have the participant independently read each of the five words.
3. Initial timed passage reading: This is when participants read the first-grade passage for one minute. There was no assistance from the instructor.
4. Performance feedback and error correction: The tutor would inform the participant how many words they read correctly during the timed read. They would then provide error correction on words that were mispronounced by pointing at it and then telling them the correct way to say it. Participants were asked to repeat the word and then read a three word phrase that contained the missed word.
5. Error word or sight word practice: Tutors wrote down the missed words on the flashcards for isolated practice. There would be a total of five words practiced during this time. If the student did not miss five words then words from the high frequency sight word pile would be incorporated.
6. Unison reading: The tutor and participant read the passage aloud while the tutor modeled expression and fluency.
7. Repeated performance cueing and feedback: Tutor cued the participant to focus on improving their WCPM by showing them the number of words they read at the initial reading. The instruction also encouraged the student to read faster and with expression.

8. Timed passage rereading: The participant read the passage independently for one minute, graphing the WCPM on their performance graph.

The tutor would repeat steps four, five, seven, and eight for a third and fourth time. After the fourth read, the tutor would examine the progress made. If the participant made three consecutive improvements, then the session is over for the day, and the second-grade transfer passage was read. If they did not make three consecutive improvements then a fifth read was done before the transfer passage.

The results from this study vary from the first-grade passages to the second-grade ones. Student one scored an average of 77.67 WCPM on the initial timed read. She made an increase after each of the following reads, the second read was 101.88, the third read was 104.88, fourth read was 106.46. This student read the passage a fifth time 19 of the 24 times. During this fifth read, she averaged 109.7 WCPM. The second student scored 72.95 WCPM on the initial read, 85.86 (second read), 90.05 (third read), 94.16 (fourth read), and 100.58 (fifth read, which was 12 of the 19 times). The third student participated in seven passages, and five of them required a fifth reading. He scored 82.86 WCPM for the initial reading passage and then 109.43 (second read), 109.57 (third read), 111.43 (fourth read), and 114.20 (fifth read). Every student who was included in this study made growth throughout each read. This largest growth was between the first and second reading (24.21 for student one, 12.74 for student two, and 26.57 for student three). With the practice of the repeated reading procedure, each of the three participants increased their WCPM for the second grade transfer passage from baseline to after the implementation of the eight repeated reading steps. Student one made an increase of 8.96 words (62 to 70.96), student two made an improvement of 17.13 words, and student three had growth of 23.29 words.

The study was conducted to explore the repeated reading intervention with multiple additional components and its effect on three second-grade students and grade-level transfer passages. The results show that the repeated reading process brought the participant closer to the grade level benchmark criterion. However, it is hard to tell what one or combination of components contributed to this outcome. With that being said it can be concluded that repeated reading and the eight-step process of this study is helpful for the transfer of knowledge to new passages. This benefits students as they are more likely to focus on interpreting the meaning from the text because they are no longer spending their time decoding it.

Sweeney et al. (2003) believe that there is a universal recognition that fluency is important. However, little is done to develop this important skill in the classroom. It should be emphasized that regular assessment of reading fluency is important to ensure that students are making adequate progress. If students do not express growth, then remediate instruction should be given. "Fluent readers become experts because they are more proficient at incorporating complex skills, assimilating large amounts of content, understanding knowledge structures, and problem representation (Sweeney et al., 2003, p. 3). When fluency is taught within the classroom students are able to gain the skills necessary to become fluent readers. Repeated reading is one procedure that builds fluency components. This strategy improves the reading skills of students who are showing reading difficulties while also extending those who already have adequate skills. This study's purpose is to see the effectiveness of repeated reading techniques for students who are academically at risk. This intervention will also incorporate daily goal setting and the use of chart collections.

Thirty-nine fourth-grade students from Sioux City, Iowa, participated in this study for approximately five weeks. Each intervention lasted for forty-five minutes and were completed by

eight university tutors within the participants' classroom. These students worked in groups of one to four students. The tutors used the repeated reading strategy along with using daily goal setting and a retelling procedure. Students would recall all of the information and details they could remember from the reading passage.

The general intervention process consisted of the use of three reading passages ranging from one hundred fifty words to two hundred twenty. These reading passages were used during the initial assessment process to determine instructional reading level. Tutors then chose passages that would challenge the students but also improve their oral reading fluency. The instructional goal for this study was to have students read between one hundred eighty words to two hundred ten. Goal setting was used to encourage students to improve from their previous WCPM score. Before completing the timed reading, students were asked what their previous best score was and then asked what their new reading goal was. Tutors were instructing students to choose a reasonable goal. Students must have a minimum goal of one more WCPM. After students participated in the one-minute reads, tutors would review, record, and chart their best reading score of the day. If students achieved their goal, then they received a tangible reward like stickers. The repeated reading procedure started with the tutor reviewing the passage. This instruction included correcting any prior errors and coaching students on possible difficulties throughout the reading passage. Students would then read the passage aloud while WCPM was being analyzed. Students were told to read as fast as they could, and if they did not know a word to skip it and move on. Students often requested another attempt at their repeated reading score in order to increase it. When time allowed, students could try for a higher WCPM score. Only students' best score was counted, recorded, and charted. At the end of each intervention session, students would choose a new goal for the next session.

Results from the study show that students have made substantial progress when it comes to oral reading fluency. Many of the students doubled their performance every single week. The data collected also shows that the error correction procedures that were done were successful as well. The instructional goal of reading between one hundred eighty words to two hundred ten WCPM was reached by many of the students on not just one passage but often on two passages during the five weeks. Generally, participants made a two WCPM increase throughout each session. Some made as much as a ten WCPM increase whereas most students made improvements between three and six words during the repeated reading procedure. It cannot be said exactly what was the sole reason for these reading increases, whether it be the repeated reading process or the goal setting. We can conclude that both were important components of the intervention and reading improvements were made.

Rasinski (1990) talks about the inclusion of listening-while-reading during repeated reading. This includes the use of listening to the passage as students are reading. This can be done in the form of teacher modeling or the use of audio recordings. This allows the repeated reading strategy to be done in small groups, on a one-on-one basis, or while students are working independently. This helps students develop word recognition skills to the point where they are able to become automatic readers. The purpose of Rasinski's study was to observe the differences that occur with repeated reading and repeated listening when it comes to fluency.

This study focuses on twenty third-grade students. These students were paired together based on their reading abilities identified by the classroom teacher. Pairs of students represented high, average, and low reading abilities. Pairs were classified as Partner 1 and Partner 2. The passages used during the repeated reading process were from a fourth grade level text and were around one hundred words. These passages were used to create somewhat of a challenge with the

students. The intervention consisted of two separate treatment cycles as both partners received both treatments. These interventions lasted four days. On the first day both partners read one of the two fourth grade level passages that were selected by the instructor. Word speed and accuracy were calculated as this served as the student's pretest. On the second and third days, Partner 1 read the day one passage aloud to a teacher while Partner 2 listened to the teacher read the same passage aloud fluently. This group of students was instructed to follow along with the teacher. Day four consisted of a post test. This is when students read the same passage from the previous days to see a growth in reading speed and accuracy. The second treatment cycle was done the same as the first; however, Partner one and two switched interventions (either repeated reading or repeated listening). The second passage was used during this cycle. It is important to note that even though two groups of students were made during this study students worked individually with the instructor during the treatment cycles.

The results of this study occurred in two different ways, reading speed (how many seconds it took to read the passage) and reading accuracy (word errors per passage). Increases were made in both areas by both treatment groups. There also was no significant difference between the repeated reading and repeated listening. For reading speed, the repeated reading group made an average 18.95 second decrease from pre to post-test (75.05 to 56.10) and the listening while reading group made a 13.30 second decrease (70.45 to 57.15). Word errors per passage also decreased from pre to post-test for both treatment groups. Repeated reading made an average decrease of 1.85 word errors (5.90 to 4.05) and the listening-while-reading group made a 2.05 decrease (6.10 to 4.05). These results show us that both repeated reading and repeated listening was effective in improving reading fluency for third-grade students. Both intervention methods were successful in regard to general proficiency in reading.

Concluding Remarks

Becoming a fluent reader is important not only in a language arts setting but in other content areas as well. Fluency is a critical skill that is taught to students in the early stage of elementary school. When fluency is mastered, students increase their automaticity and are able to focus on what they are reading rather than how to read it. Students develop automaticity when explicit and systematic instruction is given in regards to phonics instruction. When students are able to recognize letters along with letter-sounds and then blend those two concepts together they are able to decode words. Decoding words allows individuals to expand their vocabulary and ultimately be able to read sentences, passages, short stories and then novels. When students are able to practice these skills they become masters at it. Repeated reading is a strategy that is used so students can practice becoming fluent readers.

Repeated reading is used to improve word recognition, fluency and comprehension. It is a supplemental method that can be used with pre-established reading programs. Repeated reading is a quick and easy to learn process that teachers, paraprofessionals, and parents can use to support individual students. The process of repeated reading consists of reading short passages until a predetermined satisfactory level is reached. There are many different ways that repeated reading can be used within a classroom, small group, or one-on-one. Some of the different components include providing constructive feedback, charting growth being made, teacher modeling fluency, strategies to decode big words, setting goals, and reward charts. No matter what additional structures are implemented within the repeated reading strategy the goal of fluency does not change. The research reviewed above shows how each of these components add to the idea of how repeated reading is used to increase reading fluency.

CHAPTER III: APPLICATION OF THE RESEARCH

In order to apply the research of repeated reading and all of the components it entails, resources were created. This includes charts, tips and tricks, action steps, and blank templates to be filled out. Both students and instructors are able to use these resources in a handful of different ways. It is important to note that these are pieces that can be added to an existing repeated reading intervention. All of the resources created are intended to be used as they are, however some of them require students to alter or add information. All of these application materials add importance to the actions taken in order to increase reading fluency.

Phonics and phonemic awareness instruction is an essential prerequisite for reading fluency. When this instruction is combined with repeated reading it allows students to maximize their chances of becoming fluent readers. The act of practicing decoding multisyllabic words is an important part of learning how to decode a specific text. Staudt (2009), Chang (2013), and Gellert (2014) talk about the importance of decoding words before practicing reading independently. Learning about vowels, vowel pairs, common suffixes, and sound-symbol relationships are one way that students can become more successful at decoding a text. Participating in the act of repeated reading gives students the opportunity to repeatedly read larger chunks of meaningful text.

With this in mind, Appendix A was created. This resource is intended for students to use as a bookmark. It shows six action steps that students can take to help break apart words that many seem long and difficult. These words usually have multiple syllables. Each step walks through how students can break apart this long word into smaller chunks and then blend those chunks together to make the word. It is important to note that it is required of students to know what a prefix, suffix, and short/long vowels are. These are important steps of decoding

multisyllabic words. Teaching and modeling of how individuals can use this bookmark will be a helpful connection for students to make. The use of this resource should be reminded to students throughout the school year. Students should keep this bookmark in the book they are reading so they are able to independently use it.

Rewards for students encourage them to improve their reading rate each time they read. These rewards can be given in the form of tokens, points, a stamp or stickers. Ardoin et al. (2009), Begeny et al. (2009), Musti-Rao et al. (2009), and Valleley and Shriver (2003), research shows examples of rewards on students' progress throughout repeated reading interventions. These studies reinforced students' positive gains and encouraged them to continue to practice for growth to occur. The goal of using a reward system is that students will be so used to the supported progress that they will gain more confidence in themselves. When students gain confidence, they are more likely to be successful in what they do. They are also more likely to want to do better on their own rather than for a reward.

Appendix B is a reward chart application that is intended for students to use to track their increase in words correct in one minute. This application allows students to take responsibility for their own learning and record growth in reading fluency. The directions at the top of the page are easy to follow and remind students of what they should be tracking. The sixteen circles or improvements, is a goal that is not easy to obtain and challenges students to make adequate progress day after day. This reward chart should be implemented throughout the school year when repeated reading is being used. When rewards are used students feel encouraged to improve their reading fluency skills.

Allowing students to set their own goals for reading gives them ownership of their work. They are able to gain more confidence when they reach each of their goals being made (Hudson

et al., 2020; Sweeney et al., 2003). Setting goals for words correct in one minute gives students a visual representation of what improvement looks like. It is important that instructors are prompting students on how to make reasonable and attainable goals. This means that goals are not taking a step backward as well as being unrealistic. Students should be encouraged to create their own goals rather than relying on the teacher to make their goals. When students set goals for themselves, they are more likely to follow through and reach them.

Appendix C was created for students to set weekly goals in regards to words correct in one minute. This resource is intended for students to use daily when participating in the repeated reading process. The reading goal form is easy to follow and fill out. This allows students to be more independent throughout the day. The Appendix C resource has many different important columns to fill out. This includes the name of the passage, how many WCPM during the first read, the goal for WCPM, and then how many repeated reading attempts were taken in order to reach the goal that was made. The bottom portion of the weekly reading goals sheet is to be filled out at the end of the week. This section is for students to reflect on the progress they made throughout the school week. The question of, “What did you do to reach this goal?” encourages students to think critically about how they are becoming fluent readers. It also allows individuals to reflect on how goal decisions are being made. Students may ask themselves several questions throughout the goal-setting process. These could include: Why am I making this goal? How will I reach the goal that I set for myself? If I do not reach my goal, what can I do to ensure that next time I will reach it? Those who use this resource will see firsthand the impact that goal setting can have on accomplishing the ultimate goal of becoming fluent and proficient in reading.

Creating a progress monitoring chart will allow students to see their growth and progress throughout the repeated reading process. This is a great way to motivate students to continue to

improve their reading skills (Lo et al., 2011; Therrien & Kubina, 2006). The idea of hot and cold reads were mentioned during the literature review. A cold read is when a student reads the passage aloud for the first time. This differs from a hot read, as that is when the student becomes familiar with the text after reading it several times. During the repeated reading process a cold read is usually the first time a new passage is introduced to the student and a hot read is when that same passage is read for the last time. Tracking both a cold and hot read is a visual representation of a student's progress. This progress monitoring tool can be used for students to make goals or as part of a reward system. It can be used on its own as well.

Appendix D shows the progress monitoring chart that students can use independently or with the assistance of instructors to graph their WCPM for both cold and hot reads. The resource created is intended for students to use after reading their fluency passage for the first time and then for the last time. The dates along the top of the chart are for students to hold themselves accountable for taking part in the repeated reading process. At the bottom of the chart, you will see columns that alternate between cold (in blue) and hot (in red). Each group of cold and hot reads should be the same passage. Words correct in one minute are along the left side of the chart. They are organized in intervals of ten, starting at zero and ending at two hundred. All passages being read should be between these two amounts. When students are finished with their first cold read, they should write the date in the correct column, locate the number of words they read, and then create a bar graph up to that number. Cold reads should be marked in blue ink. After students have participated in the repeated reading process they will read the passage for the last time. Students will then repeat the same steps for creating a hot read bar graph in red ink. Creating the bar graphs in blue and red colors allows students to see their progress not only between the same passages but also across the entire chart. Cold reads should increase

throughout the school year as well as the progress being made for hot reads. This progress monitoring tool is a quick, easy, and motivating addition to the repeated reading practice.

Providing constructive or performance-based feedback gives students an opportunity to hear how they are doing as well as learn how they can improve. Students can then apply that new learning right away in the format of repeated reading. Ardoin et al. (2013), Ates (2019), Huang et al. (2008), and Sukhram and Monda-Amaya (2017) research demonstrate the importance of providing feedback to students as they are working on improving their reading fluency. This feedback can be done in the form of informing students of correct or error responses and then suggestions on how they can correct these errors. This promotes the accuracy of word recognition as well as tips on how to decode difficult words. It is important to learn how to give feedback after students read rather than during. This allows instructors to go more in-depth in their feedback, and students can practice instantly. Feedback can be given on mispronunciations of words, hesitations, omissions, substitutions, or insertions. When feedback is given students are able to broaden their vocabularies as well as increase their reading fluency.

Appendix E is a visual intended for instructor use and can be posted within a teacher's teaching space. This resource contains five tips and reminders about how to provide feedback during a repeated reading intervention. This includes different types of feedback, the idea of prompting, as well as some information on what research says about feedback when it comes to reading fluency. This visual is a great reminder of what teachers can do to help their students become better readers.

Many studies from the literature review state that repeated reading instruction should be systematic and repetitive in order for it to be effective (Dowhower, 1987; Rasinski, 1990; Romig & Jetton, 2023; Vadasy & Sanders, 2008; Vadasy & Sanders, 2008a). Providing students with

explicit and systematic instruction will allow them to learn to use many forms of learning. These forms include listening, speaking, writing, and reading. With that being said another teacher resource comes from Appendix F. This visual includes seven steps for implementing the repeated reading strategy within the classroom. Instructors who are just beginning the repeated reading intervention can use this as a starting guide. Those who have already implemented the repeated reading process can use this resource as a reminder of what each step of the process looks like. Each step is in a specific order, starting with how to introduce what repeated reading is and ending with how to wrap up each session. This resource includes the use of teacher modeling and the act of providing feedback on word corrections. Both of these are additions to the repeated reading process and can be thought of as optional. However they are added to the visual because they are important pieces of a successful intervention. When Appendix F is used regularly, the steps will become a routine within the classroom. This is one of the goals of implementing repeated reading strategies.

Both teachers and students need to feel supported while participating in a repeated reading intervention. This support can come in the form of charts, templates, tips and tricks, and action steps. When additional resources are available, they can be used to extend teaching and learning. These extensions include improving word recognition, fluency, and comprehension, which are all important components of reading fluency. They can be used to give students confidence in their reading skills and increase their motivation to read.

CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Summary of Literature

In conclusion, this review used research to define fluency and repeated reading, how repeated reading can assist students in developing fluency skills, and the different components of repeated reading. The research from the literature review is summarized here.

Huang et al. (2008, p. 34) describe fluency as “the ability to read connected text rapidly, smoothly, effortlessly, and automatically with little conscious attention to the mechanics of reading, such as decoding. When fluency is established individuals spend less time focusing on decoding each and every word and more time understanding what they are reading. This helps aid students with the comprehension piece of fluency. There are three components of fluency: automaticity, accuracy, and prosody. Fluency is established when all three components work together as one.

Repeated reading is one instructional strategy that instructors can implement within the classroom to improve students' reading fluency skills. Samuels (1879) states that repeated reading is not a method for teaching beginning reading skills but to supplement an already established developmental reading program. Automaticity is the main component that is focused on when repeated reading is used. Repeated reading is a quick and easy to learn process. The basic routine of a repeated reading strategy includes a student reading a passage to their teacher. This allows the instructor to monitor the reading speed and if there are any errors. Words correct in one minute are calculated for students first read. Students will then independently practice reading the passage several times to themselves or with the assistance of audio support. After practicing several times, students will read the passage with the teacher a second time. Again, the teacher will monitor the speed of the reader along with errors. Tracking student data will ensure

that students are continuing to grow in word recognition, fluency, and comprehension. When students participate in the repeated reading process, they get practice recognizing letters, their sounds, blending these sounds together, and then learning that there are irregular patterns and words. Transferring these skills and applying them to a decodable text is the goal in repeated reading. It is at this time that students gain practice and develop mastery skills.

Within the repeated reading intervention, there are multiple components that can be implemented to the instruction. Giving feedback to students in relation to their performance, specifically in reading, is effective in academic and behavioral development (Ates, 2019). When feedback is provided to students based on their reading performance, it allows them to broaden their vocabulary, understand word recognition skills, and decode difficult texts. Feedback can be given in many different ways. It can be given based on students miscues, students' reading performance, including prosody, and corrections on miscues. Giving students feedback allows them to pay more attention to longer words as well as decrease the number of errors made while reading. Giving feedback in the form of prompting is another instructional strategy that instructors can use to improve students' fluency. Huang et al., 2008, used prompting to remind students of word identifying strategies and by giving the student correct wording if students missed or read the word incorrectly. Another form of feedback is corrective feedback. Corrective feedback can be defined as, "a technique used to promote accuracy of word recognition and decoding. Feedback provides identification of correct error responses and suggestions for correcting errors" (Sukhram & Monda-Amaya, 2017, p. 97). This type of feedback is especially useful because it teaches students how they can correct their mistakes rather than just giving them the words. The strategies that they learn during corrective feedback is something that they can transfer to other content areas and reading passages. The National Reading Panel describes

fluency reading as having all three components of speed, accuracy, and prosody (Ardoin et al., 2013). Therrien's (2004) study focused on instructors giving feedback to students on their prosody skills. This includes an example of what is good prosody and why it is important and listening to a good and bad prosody reading. This type of feedback allows students to incorporate all components of reading fluency rather than just reading speed.

Another component of the repeated reading intervention is graphing the progress being made for each student. Creating a graph to show student progress will allow learners to see the improvements being made. It is a great motivating tool as students see firsthand that the more they practice reading, the more fluent they become (Therrien & Kubina, 2006). Graphing can be done by the teacher, student, or both. When graphing, it is important to note how many words are read correctly in one minute. Other graphs could include the number of errors including, mispronunciations, hesitations, omissions, substitutions, and deletions. Both of these graphs are impactful for reflecting on students reading fluency progress. Both feedback and graphing reading performance are important components of reading fluency. "In fact, performance cueing and graphing have been associated with increases in oral reading fluency for students with and without disabilities" (Lo et al., 2011, pp. 118–119).

Goal setting is another important component to implement within repeated reading. It encourages students to improve from their previous reading scores (Hudson et al., 2020). This, on your own practice, allows individuals to learn different life skills. This includes building confidence, creating attainable goals, using action steps to reach their goals, and increasing motivation to read. Goal setting done by students gives them the opportunity to practice these skills. When students create goals they are more likely to follow through and reach them (Sweeney et al., 2003).

Students may struggle with fluency when they come across words that they are unfamiliar with. Teaching students the skills necessary to break apart these words and sound them out is a critical component to reading success (Staudt, 2009; Chang, 2013). Decoding words is something that all students can improve on. When students come across words they do not know they tend to skip them, slow their reading to sound out, or substitute them for similar words. When this happens reading fluency is hindered. Coaching students on decoding strategies is important so they can feel success rather than defeat. These skills can then be practiced before students move to independent reading (Gellert, 2014).

Another component that can be implemented to the success of the repeated reading process is the use of a reward system. A reward system gives students an opportunity to showcase their knowledge and in return receive small tokens. These tokens can be small like erasers, mechanical pencils, and gel pens (Ardoin et al., 2009; Valleley and Shriver, 2003). Rewards can reinforce students' positive gains and motivate them to continue to practice and see growth. Using a reward system allows students to be proud of their progress and gain more confidence in themselves (Begeny et al., 2009; Musti-Rao et al. 2009). They will eventually thrive off of the joy they get from the improvements and not need a tangible reward.

Lastly, the repeated reading process is systematic and structured (Romig & Jetton, 2023; Vadasy & Sanders, 2008). This means that the process can be taught the same way by many different individuals. This can include tutors, teachers, paraprofessionals, and/or parents (Dowhower, 1987). The repeated reading intervention is most effective when it is structured and repetitive. Providing students with explicit and systematic instruction will allow students to learn in different forms. These include listening, speaking, writing, and reading (Rasinski, 1990; Vadasy & Sanders, 2008a). When these components are implemented in the classroom students

feel supported, motivated, and gain the confidence necessary to become fluent and automatic readers.

Professional Application

Reading fluency is an important topic as reading is required all over the world. You use it in everyday life as you read street signs, menus, news articles, magazines, and directions.

Reading words is one thing, but becoming an automatic and fluent reader allows individuals to spend more time comprehending what they are reading and less time decoding the words. When this happens, people find that reading is a natural process rather than a tough and tedious task.

Reading is taught very early on in elementary school. This begins with individuals recognizing letters in the alphabet and then learning the different sounds each letter can make. We progress to building short words as they gain more knowledge in phonemic awareness, phonics, and how they work. When students are able to combine letters together to build words, their vocabulary expands quickly. This will allow them to recognize words when they are put together in sentences. Sentences then become paragraphs, and paragraphs become passages, stories, and novels. It is important that teachers give students an opportunity to increase their reading skills. Repeated reading is one of those opportunities. When students participate in the repeated reading process, they are more likely to gain vocabulary knowledge, recognize word/letter relationships, and become automatic readers.

It is important for students to learn these fluency skills early on in their education because as students get older the task demand gets more difficult. When students have basic reading fluency skills, they are better able to transfer those skills to longer, more advanced texts. They are also able to spend more time comprehending the text. Comprehension can come in the form of problem and solution, cause and effect, summarizing/retelling, inferences/predictions, and

main idea with key details. When fluency is established individuals are able to transfer their reading skills to other content areas rather than just language arts. These content areas include social studies (history or civics), science, and mathematics. These content areas are found in the secondary level of the education system. It is at this level that fluency is already expected and not explicitly being taught. This only highlights the importance of learning all of the tools necessary to become fluent readers in the early stages of elementary school. The transfer of fluency knowledge is critical to the application of skills in all areas both inside and outside of the classroom. This includes real-life situations in everyday life.

Limitations of the Research

The research for the literature review was narrowed down by focusing on how repeated reading had an effect on fluency and the components that are associated with fluency (accuracy, rate, and prosody). With this in mind, the amount of research that I found on this topic was abundant, especially when it came to different content areas and grade levels. Because of the plethora of research found, it was further narrowed down by only using research that included repeated reading as the intervention. Research including repeated reading with the addition of other fluency interventions were not included in the literature review. This allowed for a true depiction of how repeated reading has an affect on fluency for students of all ages in the literature review, and the ways that repeated reading can be applied within the classroom.

The focus of the repeated reading process was done because it is of great relevance to my current teaching position. I currently teach fifth grade in a public school that has a predetermined reading curriculum established. The use of repeated readings is additional support that can be added quickly and effectively within any content area. I have been teaching fifth grade for four years and see firsthand the effects that reading fluency can have on students. With this being

said, the research of repeated reading allowed me to learn how I can implement this strategy in my classroom so that students can feel successful, confident, and motivated to learn.

Implementing the repeated reading procedure has its own restraints and limitations. One of the biggest restrictions is that it can be a timely intervention. This includes how much time it can take for teachers to conduct one-minute reads for all of their students. This is especially problematic when repeated reading is done within the classroom during the school day. With practice, training, and professional development limitations can be addressed. This includes implementing support staff, the use of paired reading, and only providing the intervention to small groups of students rather than the whole class.

Implications for Future Research

Future research is needed on the implementation of repeated reading, specifically in secondary classrooms within the United States. There are very few studies of repeated reading interventions done past elementary education. Current research shows that repeated reading is done primarily in elementary settings because that is when fluency is most prevalent. When students move past elementary school, they are expected to have fluency mastered and spend most of their time developing advanced comprehension skills. Because of this, fluency is not the focus even when students show a need for it. There are many opportunities where researchers can look at the impact that repeated reading can have on students who are at the secondary level. There is also a need for more repeated reading resources that secondary students can use. This can include passages at their reading level, ways that students can implement the intervention on their own, rather than relying on their teacher, and goals that students can strive for. More professional development can be provided for teachers on how they can implement repeated reading strategies on their own or alongside the district-provided curriculum.

Conclusion

The question of: 'How can repeated reading be used to increase Reading Fluency?' has been studied and reviewed. There are several things that can be considered based on the findings. Repeated reading has a positive effect on fluency. Throughout the repeated reading process, students take part in reading the same passage many times. This is done to increase students' academic performance by adding to their vocabulary, reading rate, accuracy, and prosody or expression. It also expands students' mindsets by increasing their confidence, motivation, and beliefs in becoming skilled readers. With these successes in mind, teachers can see firsthand the positive impact that repeated reading can have on students and their fluency.

Appendix A

Bookmark

How to Break a Part Difficult Words Bookmark

- 1.Circle the prefixes
- 2.Circle the suffixes
- 3.Underline the vowels
- 4.Say the parts of the word
- 5.Say the whole word
- 6.Make it a real word



Appendix B

Tracking Chart



Repeated Reading Tracking Chart



Name: _____

Goal: Use this chart to track growth and progress.

Directions: Every time you improve on your words correct in one minute place a sticker on this chart.

Appendix C

Student Goal Chart

Name:

Week of:

WEEKLY READING GOALS



Day	Title of Passage	Words Correct on First Read	Goal for Words Correct	How many attempts until goal was reached?
Monday				
Tuesday				
Wednesday				
Thursday				
Friday				

How many times this week did you reach your goal? What did you do to reach each goal?

Appendix D

Progress Monitoring Chart

WCPM	Date:	Date:	Date:	Date:	Date:	Date:	Date:	Date:	Date:	Date:
200										
190										
180										
170										
160										
150										
140										
130										
120										
110										
100										
90										
80										
70										
60										
50										
40										
30										
20										
10										
TYPE	Cold	Hot	Cold	Hot	Cold	Hot	Cold	Hot	Cold	Hot

Appendix E

Feedback Prompts

REPEATED READING FEEDBACK

1 Corrective Feedback

This type of feedback is to assist students when they have trouble reading.



2 Types of Feedback

Feedback can be given on mispronunciations, hesitations, omissions, substitutions, and insertions.



3 Performance- Based Feedback

Before students repeat the reading process they are informed about their prior performance.



4 Prompting

Prompting can include encouraging the use of word identification strategies and correcting words that are misspoken.



5 Research shows...

Research shows that the use of feedback during repeated reading are influential in improving reading skills.



Appendix F

Steps for Implementation

STEPS FOR IMPLEMENTATION

**1****INTRODUCE REPEATED READING**

"Today you are going to read a passage three times. The goal is to improve each time you read."

2**MODEL FOR STUDENTS**

"You are going to listen to me read the passage. Follow along and listen to how fluently I read."

3**STUDENTS START THE REPEATED READING PROCESS**

Students start to read the passage on their own.

4**CORRECT ERRORS**

Teacher will correct errors with the students when they complete the first read. Have students repeat the word correctly before moving on.

5**PRAISE STUDENTS**

Provide students with comments on how they can improve in their speed, accuracy, and expression.

6**HAVE STUDENTS RE-READ**

Repeat steps 3-5 until students have read the passage a total of three times.

7**END AND ADJUST FOR NEXT TIME**

The session ends and materials are adjusted for next time. This could include lowering or raising the reading material

References

- Ates, S. (2019). The effect of repeated reading exercises with performance-based feedback on fluent reading skills. *Reading Improvement, 56*(1), 36–43.
- Ardoin, S. P., Morena, L. S., Binder, K. S., & Foster, T. E. (2013). Examining the impact of feedback and repeated readings on oral reading fluency: Let's not forget prosody. *School Psychology Quarterly, 28*(4), 391–404. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000027>
- Ardoin, S. P., Williams, J., Klubnik, C., & McCall, M. W. (2009). Three versus six rereadings of practice passages. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 42*(2), 375–380. <https://doi.org/10.1901/jaba.2009.42-375>
- Begeny, J. C., Krouse, H. E., Ross, S. G., & Mitchell, R. C. (2009). Increasing elementary-aged students' reading fluency with small-group interventions: A comparison of repeated reading, listening passage preview, and listening only strategies. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 18*(3), 211–228. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10864-009-9090-9>
- Chang, A. C. (2013, October 1). *Improving reading rates and comprehension through timed repeated reading*. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/66864>
- Dowhower, S. L. (1987). Effects of repeated reading on second-grade transitional readers' fluency and comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly, 22*(4), 389. <https://doi.org/10.2307/747699>
- Gellert, A. S. (2014). Does repeated reading predict reading development over time? A study of children from Grade 3 to 4. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 55*(4), 303–310. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sjop.12132>
- Houston, S. (2022, October 18). *Developing automaticity in reading*. Phonics Hero. <https://phonicshero.com/automaticity-in-reading/>

- Huang, L., Nelson, R., & Nelson, D. F. (2008). Increasing reading fluency through student-directed repeated reading and feedback. *The California School Psychologist, 13*(1), 33–40. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf03340940>
- Hudson, A. K., Koh, P. W., Moore, K. A., & Binks-Cantrell, E. (2020). Fluency interventions for elementary students with reading difficulties: A synthesis of research from 2000–2019. *Education Sciences, 10*(3), 52. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10030052>
- Kostewicz, D. E. (2012). Implementing systematic practice to build reading fluency via repeated readings. *New England Reading Association Journal, 47*(2), 17. <https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1P3-2618506501/implementing-systematic-practice-to-build-reading>
- Lo, Y., Cooke, N. L., & Starling, A. L. P. (2011). Using a repeated reading program to improve generalization of oral reading fluency. *Education and Treatment of Children, 34*(1), 115–140. <https://doi.org/10.1353/etc.2011.0007>
- Lock, R. H., & Welsch, R. G. (2006). Increase oral reading fluency. *Intervention in School and Clinic. https://doi.org/10.1177/10534512060410030901*
- Musti-Rao, S., Hawkins, R. O., & Barkley, E. A. (2009). Effects of repeated readings on the oral reading fluency of urban fourth-grade students: Implications for practice. *Preventing School Failure, 54*(1), 12–23. <https://doi.org/10.3200/psfl.54.1.12-23>
- NYS RTI MS DP. (n.d.). <https://nysrti.org/>
- Rasinski, T. V. (1990). Effects of repeated reading and listening-while-reading on reading fluency. *Journal of Educational Research, 83*(3), 147–151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1990.10885946>

Repeated reading. (n.d.). Strategies.

<https://strategiesforspecialinterventions.weebly.com/repeated-reading.html>

Romig, J. E., & Jetton, A. (2023). Effects of a repeated reading intervention delivered online to upper elementary students. *Journal of Special Education Technology*.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/01626434231184879>

Samuels, S. J. (1879). The method of repeated readings. *The Reading Teacher*. Retrieved September 19, 2023, from

[https://communityreading.org/documents/Samuels\(1979\)reprint_Repeated_Reading.pdf](https://communityreading.org/documents/Samuels(1979)reprint_Repeated_Reading.pdf)

Staudt, D. H. (2009). Intensive word study and repeated reading improves reading skills for two students with learning disabilities. *The Reading Teacher*, 63(2), 142–151.

<https://doi.org/10.1598/rt.63.2.5>

Sukhram, D. P., & Monda-Amaya, L. E. (2017). The effects of oral repeated reading with and without corrective feedback on middle school struggling readers. *British Journal of Special Education*, 44(1), 95–111. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8578.12162>

Sweeney, W. J., Ring, M. M., Malanga, P., & Lambert, M. C. (2003). Using curriculum-based assessment and repeated practice instructional procedures combined with daily goal setting to improve elementary students oral reading fluency: A Preservice Teacher Training Approach*. *Journal of Precision Teaching and Celeration*, 19(1), 2–19.

Therrien, W. J. (2004). Fluency and comprehension gains as a result of repeated reading. *Remedial and Special Education*, 25(4), 252–261.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/07419325040250040801>

Therrien, W. J., & Kubina, R. M. (2006). Developing reading fluency with repeated reading.

Intervention in School and Clinic, 41(3), 156–160.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/10534512060410030501>

University of Oregon Center on Teaching and Learning. (n.d.). *Phonemic Awareness: Concepts and research*.

http://reading.uoregon.edu/big_ideas/pa/pa_what.php#:~:text=Phonemic%20Awareness%203A%20The%20ability%20to,language%20at%20the%20phoneme%20level.

Vadasy, P. F., & Sanders, E. A. (2008a). Repeated reading intervention: Outcomes and interactions with readers' skills and classroom instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 100*(2), 272–290. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.100.2.272>

Vadasy, P. F., & Sanders, E. A. (2008b). Benefits of repeated reading intervention for low-achieving fourth- and fifth-grade students. *Remedial and Special Education, 29*(4), 235–249. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932507312013>

Valleley, R. J., & Shriver, M. D. (2003). An examination of the effects of repeated readings with secondary students. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 12*(1), 55–76. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1022322422324>

What is the Theory of Automaticity in Reading? (n.d.).

https://www.teach-nology.com/themes/lang_arts/reading/auto.html

WWC | *Repeated Reading*. (2014, May). U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, What Works Clearinghouse. Retrieved September 17, 2023, from <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/EvidenceSnapshot/576>

Young, C., Valadez, C. M., & Gandara, C. (2016). Using performance methods to enhance students' reading fluency. *Journal of Educational Research, 109*(6), 624–630.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2015.1016599>