

Repeated Reading

Introduction

“Fluent readers can read text with speed, accuracy, and proper expression” (National Institute of Child Health & Human Development, 2000). The word attack strategies skilled readers have available to read words (e.g., decoding, analogy, prediction, and sight) assist them in being fluent at recognizing known and unknown words (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000). As a component of fluent reading, expression is affected by fluent decoding skills (Schwanenflugel, Hamilton, Kuhn, Wisenbaker, & Stahl, 2004). The skills required for a student to read fluently make fluency a good measure of broad reading; reading fluency is correlated with comprehension (Pinnell, Pikulski, Wixson, Campbell, Gough, & Beatty, 1995; National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000), and there is evidence of a minimum level of fluency required for adequate comprehension (Burns, M. K., Tucker, J. A., Hauser, A, Thelen, R. L., Holmes, K. J., & White, K., 2002). Therefore, focusing on early literacy skills in young students so they become fluent readers will aid comprehension.

So, what can teachers implement in the classroom to support fluency? To answer the question, repeated reading is a research supported instructional practice that can be implemented by teachers to support fluency, and to a lesser extent to support comprehension. The National Reading Panel’s analysis reported that “repeated reading and other guided oral reading procedures have clearly been shown to improve fluency and overall reading achievement” (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000, Chapter 3, p. 28). As a caution, it is important to note that the number of studies meeting methodology criteria to support repeated reading as an “evidence-based” practice is limited (Chard, Ketterlin-Geller, Baker, Doabler, Apichatabutra, 2009; O’Keeffe, Slocum, Burlingame, Snyder, Bundock, 2012). In response to the limited number of empirical studies, one study (Lo, Cooke, & Starling, 2011) empirically assessed whether fluency gains during repeated reading transferred to new passages and found that fluency gains did transfer to unread passages. Also, the use of repeated reading is a specific instructional practice that is in contrast to independent and wide reading.

Review

When to Start

Fluency, as measured using curriculum-based measurements, is a complex performance resulting from combined reading skills (Fuchs, Fuchs, Hosp, & Jenkins, 2001). Regarding fluency as an instructional focus, students may not be at an instructional level to focus on fluency. Repeated reading instruction is recommended for students between a 1st and 3rd grade instructional level regardless of actual grade level (Therrien & Kubina, 2006). Initially, learning phonemic segmentation and letter knowledge skills and knowing a few preprimer words assist students with pointing to printed words as they are read, remembering how to read words in text,

locating words in text, noticing letters in text that have been altered, and learning to read new words in text (Ehri & Sweet, 1991). Prior to providing repeated reading, teachers should assess students to determine the presence of basic reading skills. Students should have basic readings skills before starting repeated reading instruction.

Components

There are various methods of implementing repeated reading instruction. All methods of repeated reading (i.e., assisted, unassisted, and prosodic modeling) appear to work with average students (Meyer & Felton, 1999) and generally improve reading rate, accuracy, and comprehension for students with learning disabilities (Chard, Vaughn, & Tyler, 2002). Successful implementation of interventions has been provided by teachers, paraprofessionals, and peer tutors (Fuchs, Fuchs, Mathes, & Simmons, 1997; Therrien & Kubina, 2006). Therrien (2004) reports that peer tutoring effectiveness is limited in comparison to adult tutors and peer tutoring should be cautioned. Furthermore, even though peer tutoring increases student reading rate, it is not sufficient to close the achievement gap between reading disabled and non-disabled students (Vaughn, S., Chard, D. J., Bryant, D. P., Coleman, M., Tyler, B., Linan-Thompson, S., & Kouzekanani, K., 2000).

Additional methods of repeated reading include tape assisted reading, modeling, read alongs, and listening while reading. The use of a model during repeated reading is better than no model (Chard, Vaughn, & Tyler, 2002) and improved rate of correctly read words on passages (Rose & Sherry, 1985). Teacher modeling was more effective than tape-assisted modeling (Chard, Vaughn, & Tyler, 2002). If tape or audio assisted reading is used, students should whisper read along (Samuels, 1997). Read along repeated reading appears to be helpful for accurate-slow beginning readers (Meyer & Felton, 1999). The use of teacher modeling with error-correction while reading increased fluency and accuracy (Chard, Vaughn, & Tyler, 2002). Both repeated reading and listening-while-reading were effective in improving student reading fluency and neither was found to be superior (Rasinski, 1990). Common approaches to providing repeated reading include the following: student-adult reading, tape-assisted reading, partner/peer reading, readers' theatre, newscaster, listening preview, choral reading, duet reading, echo reading, whisper reading, and silent reading.

Repeated reading interventions were noted to last between 10-20 minutes and implemented three-five times a week; some interventions did not exclusively focus on fluency (Therrien & Kubina, 2006; Meyer & Felton, 1999). Short passages of 50-200 words were used for repeated reading practice; fluent readers progress to longer passages (Samuels, 1997). Therrien and Kubina (2006) suggest that passages be read by students in one to two minutes. Passage accuracy levels varied between 85 and 100 percent accuracy. Lower accuracy passages had more effect on accuracy, specifically passages at an instruction level of 96 through 98 percent accuracy (Chard, Vaughn, & Tyler, 2002). Mastery level text of 99 through 100 percent accuracy had greater

effect on reading rate (Chard, Vaughn, & Tyler, 2002). Poor readers need text that they can read accurately; Meyer and Felton (1999) suggest that text passage accuracy does not fall below 90 percent.

Before reading, it may be beneficial to cue students to the purpose of the reading; this provides the students the opportunity to adapt to such focuses as improving rate, accuracy, expression, and comprehension (Meyer & Felton, 1999; Therrien, 2004). Meyer and Felton (1999) suggest reading strategies should be considered based on student characteristics. Single word or phrase training before reading improves rate and accuracy while reading text contacting those words (Meyer & Felton, 1999). During reading instruction, repeated reading improves fluency with more readings (Chard, Vaughn, & Tyler, 2002; Therrien, 2004). Completing four readings of a passage appears consistent with research intervention treatments (Meyer & Felton, 1999). For comprehension, reading a passage more than three-four times does not appear necessary; there were limited gains between the third and fourth readings (Therrien, 2004). When finishing the repeated readings, using a fixed criteria, such as words correct per minute or accuracy, was more effective than fixed number of readings (Chard, Vaughn, & Tyler, 2002; Therrien, 2004). Also, charting student progress as a part of the intervention had higher fluency, but it may result in lower comprehension gains (Therrien, 2004). Additionally, charting may be motivational as a visual proof of progress (Samuels, 1997, Meyer & Felton, 1999).

Error-Correction

Standard error-correction should be provided during readings (Therrien, 2004; Therrien & Kubina, 2006). Error-correction should be positive and heavy emphasis on accuracy should be avoided since it may lead to students becoming fearful of making errors (Samuels, 1997). When evaluating error correction procedures, all forms of error correction were more effective at increasing the number of words read correctly during context reading than no error-correction. Word supply is the least effective; sentence repetition, end of passage review, and word meaning are more effective than word supply; the most effective experimental treatment is the drill technique (Jenkins & Larson, 1979). Additionally, self-monitoring and error-correction practice with feedback and reinforcement decreased errors and improved accuracy with poor readers; results are maintained after interventions (Kolić-Vehovec, 2002). The pencil tap technique is a commonly used technique for assessing a student's error-correction skills, and may be used during an intervention to increase self-monitoring and self-correction errors.

Academic Gains

Repeated reading improves fluency and comprehension for both non-disabled and disabled students on previously reread and potentially for new material (Therrien, 2004). Rate, accuracy, and comprehension gains

with both practiced and unpracticed passages were made with repeated reading (Dowhower, 1987). Transfer of repeated reading skill depends on the number of shared words (Rashotte & Torgesen, 1985). Practice across a series of passages was more effective than with only a single passage (Dowhower, 1987). Additionally, repeated reading instruction improved prosodic reading of reread passages and new passages that were similar to practiced passages; prosodic reading improved greater with read along practice, but independent practice still improved prosodic reading (Dowhower, 1987). Word decoding speed is a key to prosodic reading, and prosodic reading may only have minimal effect on comprehension (Schwanenflugel, Hamilton, Kuhn, Wisenbaker, & Stahl, 2004).

Progress Monitoring

As an important skill, fluency should be monitored to determine the effectiveness of instruction, and transfer passages should be used to determine the transfer of skills to unread passages (Lo, Cooke, & Starling, 2011). Fluency can be quickly measured using curriculum-based measurements-reading (CBM-R). Typically a CBM-R provides educators with a student's reading rate and accuracy. The measurement is designed to broadly measure reading skills at a selected level with standardized administration and scoring procedures (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2002); fluent reading is not a single skill but the result of combined reading skills, and it is measured as a complex performance (Fuchs, Fuchs, Hosp, & Jenkins, 2001). CBMs have been demonstrated effective for the use of establishing growth standards for readers (Deno, Fuchs, Marston, & Shin, 2001). A student's score can be used as an indicator of the student's overall reading performance compared to peers or benchmark targets and should be used in conjunction to other assessments to make critical instruction decisions (Ardoin & Christ, 2009). Reading progress can be monitored over time by administering several CBM-R probes to a specific student over a period of time. In addition, using passages controlled for difficulty and providing multiple probes over time reduces the standard error of measurement (Hintze & Christ, 2004).

Main Reviews

Developing Reading Fluency with Repeated Reading by Therrien and Kubina, 2006

- Repeated Reading is recommended for students reading between a 1st grade and 3rd grade instructional level regardless of the student's grade
- Interventions have been successfully implemented by teachers, paraprofessionals, and peer tutors
- Intervention: 10-20 minutes, 3-5 times a week
- Essential components
 - Passage is read to a competent tutor
 - Corrective feedback should be provided
 - Passage is read until performance criteria is met
- Supplies
 - Instructional level passages (85-95% accuracy)
 - Passages can be read by students in 1 to 2 minutes
 - Timer/stopwatch
 - Data tracking sheet

Fluency and Comprehension Gains as a Result of Repeated Reading: A meta-analysis by Therrien, 2004

- Repeated reading improves both fluency and comprehension for both non-disabled and disabled students for previously reread and potentially new material
- The more repeated readings of a passage improved fluency and non-transfer comprehension (studies used 4, 3, and 2 readings)
- Teacher conducted interventions had higher fluency and comprehension results than peer conducted interventions
- Fixed performance criteria (rate or time) was more effective than fixed number of readings
- Charting student progress as a part of intervention had higher fluency, but may result in lower comprehension
- Reading a passage more than 3-4 times to improve comprehension doesn't appear necessary, there were only limited gains between 3rd and 4th readings
- Corrective feedback should be added to passage readings
- It may be beneficial to cue students to adapt to the goal of the reading, such as improving rate, accuracy, expression, and comprehension

A synthesis of Research on Effective Interventions for Building Reading Fluency with Elementary Students with Learning Disabilities by Chard, Vaughn, and Tyler, 2002

- Generally, repeated reading is associated with improvements in reading rate, accuracy, and comprehension
- Mastery level text improved fluency
- Instructional level text (96-98% accuracy) (50-100wcpm) was used to improve accuracy
- The more repeated readings of a passage improve fluency (studies used 7, 3, and 1 readings)
- Repeated reading with a model was better than no model
- Teacher modeling was better than tape-assisted modeling
- Teacher modeling and error-corrections while reading increased fluency and accuracy
- Fixed rate criteria was more effective than individual improvement criteria for increasing passage difficulty

Repeated Reading to Enhance Fluency: Old approaches and new directions by Meyer and Felton, 1999

- Repeated reading improves rate, accuracy, comprehension, and expression
- Single word or phrase training improved rate and accuracy of text containing those words
- Repeatedly reading a passage 4 times appears consistent with research
- Intervention: 15 minutes daily (may not exclusively focus on fluency)
- All types of repeated reading appear to work with average students
- Read along repeated reading appears to be helpful for beginning readers that are accurate but slow
- Poor readers need text that can be read accurately
- Transfer of fluency to new passages may be affected by the number of shared words
- Transfer of fluency to easy stories might be a result of shared content
- Suggestions
 - Charting should be used as an incentive
 - Repeated reading strategies should be considered based on student characteristics
 - Material should be at no less than 90-95% accuracy

The method of repeated Readings by Samuels, 1997

- Rereading short passages (50-200 words) of meaningful text, longer passages are used for more fluent readers
- Emphasis on rate rather than accuracy, so students aren't fearful of errors
- If tape/audio assisted reading is used, students should whisper read along
- Graphs provide visual proof of progress and is motivating
- Students become excited to make gains in fluency

Additional Reviews

An Examination of Group-Based Treatment Packages for Increasing Elementary-Aged Students' Reading Fluency by Begen and Silber, 2006

- Group-based reading fluency interventions appear to be a viable alternative to one-on-one interventions reading fluency

Becoming a Fluent Reader: Reading Skill and Prosodic Features in the Oral Reading of Young Readers by Schwanenflugel, Hamilton, Kuhn, Wisenbaker, and Stahl, 2004

- Word decoding speed is a key to prosodic reading
- Prosodic reading may only have minimal effect on comprehension

Fluency and Comprehension Interventions for Third-Grade Students by Vaughn, S., Chard, D. J., Bryant, D. P., Coleman, M., Tyler, B., Linan-Thompson, S., & Kouzekanani, K., 2000

- Partner reading improved reading rate and words read per minute for low- to average-achieving students
- Rate gains made by students with learning disabilities were insufficient to close the achievement gap

Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies: Making Classrooms More Responsive to Diversity by Fuchs, Fuchs, Mathes, and Simmons, 1997

- Students in Peer Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS) demonstrated greater reading progress for words correctly read, questions answered correctly, and correct maze passage word choices.

Fingerpoint-Reading of Memorized Text: What Enables Beginners to Process the Print? by Ehri and Sweet, 1991

- Knowing a few preprimer words was important in learning to read new words in text
- Phonemic segmentation was important for learning to point to printed words at the same time as they were spoken and for remembering how to read individual words in text
- Letter knowledge was important for noticing that letters in text had been altered and for locating words in text

Effects of Repeated Reading and Listening-while-Reading on Reading Fluency by Rasinski, 1990

- Both repeated reading and listening-while-reading were effective in improving student reading fluency, neither method was found to be superior

Effects of Repeated Reading on Second-Grade Transitional Readers' Fluency and Comprehension by Dowhower, 1987

- Repeated reading was found to result in rate, accuracy, and comprehension gains with both practiced and unpracticed passages
- Repeated reading instruction improved prosodic reading of reread passages and new passages that were similar to practiced passages
- Repeated reading across a series of passages was more effective than with only a single passage
- Prosodic reading improved greater with reading along practice, but independent practice still improve prosodic reading

Repeated Reading and Reading Fluency in Learning Disabled Children by Rashotte and Torgesen, 1985

- Repeated reading skill transfer depends on the amount of shared words
- If stories have few shared words, repeated reading is not more effective than wide reading

Relative Effects of Two Previewing Procedures on LD Adolescents' Oral Reading Performance by Rose and Sherry, 1984

- Listening preview of text improves rate of correctly reading words on passages

Evaluating Error-Correction Procedures for Oral Reading by Jenkins and Larson, 1979

- All forms of error-correction were more effective than no correction on context reading. Treatments were more effective.
 - Word supply (control)
 - Sentence repetition (treatment)
 - End of passage review (treatment)
 - Word meaning (treatment)
 - Drill (treatment)-most effective

References

- Ardoin, S. P., & Christ, T. J. (2009). Curriculum-Based Measurement of Oral Reading: Standard errors associate with progress monitoring outcomes from DIBELS, AIMSweb, and an experimental passage set. *School Psychology Review, 38*(2), 266-283.
- Burns, M.K., Tucker, J.A., Hauser, A., Thelen, R.L., Holmes, K.L., & White, K. (2002). Minimum reading fluency rate necessary for comprehension: A potential criterion for curriculum-based assessments. *Assessment for Effective Intervention, 28*(1), 1-7.
- Begeny, J. C., & Silber, J. M. (2006). An examination of group-based treatment packages for increasing elementary-aged students' reading fluency. *Psychology in the Schools, 43*(2), 183-195.
- Chard, D. J., Ketterlin-Geller, L. R., Baker, S. K., Doabler, C., & Apichatabutra, C. (2009). Repeated reading interventions for students with learning disabilities: Status of the evidence. *Council for Exceptional Children, 75*(3), 263-281.
- Chard, D. J., Vaughn, S., & Tyler, B. (2002). A synthesis of research on effective interventions for building reading fluency with elementary students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 35*(5) 386-406.
- Deno, S. L., Fuchs, L. S., Marston, D. & Shin, J. (2001). Using curriculum-based measurement to establish growth standards for students with learning disabilities. *School Psychology Review, 30*(4), 507-524.
- Dowhower, S. L. (1987). Effects of repeated reading on second-grade transitional readers' fluency and comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly, 22*(4), 389-406.
- Ehri, L. C., & Sweet, J. (1991). Fingerprint-reading of memorized text: What enables beginners to process print?. *Reading Research Quarterly, 26*(4), 442-462.
- Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., Mathes, P. G., & Simmons D. C. (1997). Peer-assisted learning strategies: Making more responsive diversity. *American Educational Research Journal, 34*(1), 174-206.

- Fuchs, L.S. & Fuchs, D. (2002). Curriculum-based measurement: Describing competence, enhancing outcomes, evaluating treatment effects, and identifying treatment nonresponders. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 77(2), 64-84.
- Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Hosp, M. K., & Jenkins, J. R. (2001). Oral reading fluency as an indicator of reading competence: A theoretical, empirical, and historical analysis. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 5(3), 239-256.
- Hintze, J.M. & Christ T. (2004). An Examination of variability as a function of passage variance in CBM progress monitoring. *School Psychology Review*, 33(2), 204-217.
- Jenkins, J. R., & Larson, K. (1979). Evaluating error-correction procedures for oral reading. *The Journal of Special Education*, 12(2), 145-156.
- Kolić-Vehovec, S. (2002). Effects of self-monitoring training on reading accuracy and fluency of poor readers. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 17(2), 129-138.
- 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.
- Meyer, M. S., & Felton, R. H. (1999). Repeated reading to enhance fluency: Old approaches and new directions. *The International Dyslexia Association*, 49, 283-306.
- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). Report of the National Reading Panel. *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction* (NIH Publication No. 00-4769). Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- O'keeffe, B. V., Slocum, T. A., Burlingame, C., Snyder, K., & Bundock, K. (2012). Comparing results of systematic reviews: Parallel reviews of research on repeated reading. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 35(2), 333-366.

- Pinnell, G. S., Pikulski, J. J., Wixson, K. K., Campbell, J. R., Gough, P. B., & Beatty, A. S. (1995). *Listening to children read aloud*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED395292.pdf>
- Rashotte, C. A., & Torgesen, J. K. (1985) Repeated reading and reading fluency in learning disabled children. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 20(2), 180-188.
- Rasinski, T. V. (1990). Effects of repeated reading and listening-while-reading on reading fluency. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 83(3), 147-150.
- Rose, T. L., & Sherry, L. (1984). Relative effects of two previewing procedures on LD adolescents' oral reading performance. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 7(1), 39-44.
- Samuels, S. J. (1997). The method of repeated reading. *The Reading Teacher*, 50(5), 376-381.
- Schwanenflugel, P. J., Hamilton, A. M., Kuhn, M. R., Wisenbaker, J. M., & Stahl, S. A. (2004). Becoming a fluent reader: Reading skill and prosodic features in the oral reading of young readers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96(1), 119-129.
- Therrien, W. J. (2004). Fluency and comprehension gains as a result of repeated reading: A meta-analysis. *Remedial and Special Education*, 25(4), 252-261.
- Therrien, W. J. & Kubina, R. M., (2006). Developing reading fluency with repeated reading. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 41(3), 156-160.
- Vaughn, S., Chard, D. J., Bryant, D. P., Coleman, M., Tyler, B., Linan-Thompson, S., & Kouzekanani, K. (2000). Fluency and Comprehension Interventions for Third-Grade Students. *Remedial and Special Education*, 21(6), 325-335.