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ABSTRACT

Reading curriculum generally contains instruction in two major areas, word identification and comprehension. Reading fluency, however, receives much less attention. It is too often seen more as a by-product of good instruction rather than as a central goal. This paper studies the impact of repeated reading, paired reading, and demonstration on the reading fluency of regular education students. Results suggest that integrating these strategies into the context of the regular education curriculum has a positive effect on students' reading fluency and comprehension. Practical suggestions for integrating these methods into the curriculum are given.
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CHAPTER ONE: THESIS PROPOSAL

THE PROBLEM

Too many children are not able to read grade level material fluently. Standardized test scores as well as teacher observation reflect this problem. When given the opportunity, low-achieving readers wander the room or thumb through bookshelves to avoid actually sitting down and reading books. Reading content area materials is a struggle, and many chapter books are left unfinished. Students do not read enough because they are poor readers, and they are poor readers because they do not read enough. Readers need to be given more time on task (Allington, 1983; Kelly, 1995; Mathes, Simmons, & Davis, 1992; Nathan & Stanovich, 1991), and they need to be instructed in strategies that have been tested in research (Zutell & Rasinski, 1991). Teachers must offer consistent, research-based instruction in reading fluency if students are to become better readers.

IMPORTANCE AND RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

Reading dysfluency in our nation is a serious problem. In children, it has several devastating effects. First, it detracts from their enjoyment of reading, thus causing them to be reluctant readers (Mathes, Simmons, & Davis, 1992). This naturally causes a chain of events resulting in inadequate knowledge of school curriculum and of the world in general. Second, reading dysfluency contributes to lower comprehension levels. As children put forth effort in sounding out words, they have fewer cognitive resources available to process the main message of the passage (Dahl, 1974;
LaBerge and Samuels, 1974; Mathes, Simmons, & Davis, 1992; Samuels, 1979). Moreover, brain research suggests that slow reading increases the latencies between brain components, contributing to inadequate comprehension (Breznitz, 1997). Third, dysfluent readers read less text, thus having less material to process, learn from, and appreciate (Chomsky, 1976; Mastropieri, Leinart, & Scruggs, 1999; Mathes, Simmons, & Davis, 1992). Fourth, dysfluency strongly affects self-concept, as students feel badly when they progress more slowly than their peers (Chomsky, 1976). Last, dysfluency prohibits students from seeing themselves as readers (May, 1994).

In adults, the results of being dysfluent are equally as devastating. Job opportunities are limited (Greenberg, 1996). Newspapers and magazines that shed light on governmental issues are too taxing to read thoroughly. Books that aid in healing broken relationships and others that clarify religious questions are incomprehensible. Last, reading aloud to children is a humbling exposure of failure and may therefore be avoided, thus contributing to the development of another generation of poor readers. All these missed opportunities result in a lower quality of life.

Dysfluency in reading is a nationwide problem. The 1999 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results showed that only 62% of fourth graders read at a basic reading level. Only thirty-one percent of fourth graders read at a proficient level, and a mere 7% read at an advanced level (NAEP, 1999). Unfortunately, the problem does not dissipate with age. Thirty-two percent of job applicants in 1995 revealed a reading deficiency that prohibited them from performing the jobs for which they were applying.
One can see that educators and families need to do more to develop capable readers. Of course many things such as lack of nutrition, stressful home environments, and unsupportive families are out of the teacher's control. School districts and state requirements place curricular constraints on what is taught in the classroom, leaving some teachers with less freedom to plan instruction as they would like. For a variety of reasons teachers claim they do not have time to devote to the teaching of fluency (May, 1994). Yet, a reading program that does not include a component for improving fluency is excluding a highly necessary element (Allington, 1983; Anderson, 1981; Henk, Helfedt, & Platt, 1986; Rasinski, 1989; Schreiber, 1980, 1991). Fluency is not often enough a central topic in preservice and inservice teacher development (Rasinski, 1989; Zutell & Rasinski, 1991). Students in reading programs containing a fluency component make greater gains in reading than those not in such programs (Rasinski, 1990). The following study shows that when research-tested interventions for improving fluency are part of the regular reading instruction, students do become better readers. This improvement at the school-age level will, in turn, enable children to lead richer, fuller adult lives.

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

There is some confusion regarding the definition of reading fluency. When asked to describe it, teachers offer a vast array of answers. They inaccurately characterize it as correct word recognition, quick reading, the ability to read above grade level, reading with joy, wide reading ability,
reading with confidence, good comprehension, and paying attention to punctuation (Rasinksi & Zutell, 1991). None of these descriptions, however, capture the full meaning of the word.

More accurate descriptions define fluency as “the smooth and natural oral production of text” characterized by “accuracy, quickness, and expression” (Rasinski, 1989, p. 690). Fluent reading is done “smoothly, easily, and readily” with “freedom from word identification problems” (Harris & Hodges, 1981, p. 120). When reading appears effortless, when words are put into meaningful phrases and clauses, and when reading has pitch, stress, and intonation, it is fluent (Rasinski & Zutell, 1991). Schreiber (1991, p. 158), ever the proponent of prosody, defines fluent reading as a “smooth, expressive production of text with appropriate phrasing or chunking in accordance with the syntactic structure of the material being read.”

Unfortunately, as stated earlier, the reading performance of many students cannot be described by the definitions listed above. Reasons for this are numerous. First, dysfluency may be the result of reading too much text at the frustration level. When students are asked to read materials that are too difficult, they read a fewer number of words than their more fluent peers during the same amount of time. Therefore, they make fewer responses to the text, resulting in less actual practice. Moreover, they cannot adequately apply the decoding skills they do possess. The activity becomes an unrewarding experience, and these students become less involved in other reading-related activities, as well (Nathan & Stanovich, 1991).

Second, dysfluency may be the result of the reader’s failure to
recognize and use all three cueing systems to identify unknown words. Studies show that while stronger readers draw upon the phonetic, semantic, and syntactic cueing systems, weaker readers resort to decoding alone. As a result, they often lose the intent of the passage. Unfortunately, teachers commonly do not offer the assistance needed. Allington (1980) observed that when confronted with unknown words, weak readers were told to “sound it out”—to decode—whereas strong readers were told to “use the context of the sentence.” Allington argues that this instruction only perpetuates a problem that weak readers already have. Instead, he suggests, teachers should encourage all students to use all three cueing systems—semantic, syntactic, and phonetic—to read unknown words.

Third, dysfluency may be the result of not recognizing phrases within sentences. When dysfluent readers do not recognize the phrases, they do not read them quickly—as a unit. Instead, they read them in a disconnected, word-by-word fashion. This is not surprising, say Dowhower (1987) and Scheiber (1980, 1991), as the written language lacks graphic cues for such aspects of language as phrasing, intonation, and stress. This lack of understanding about phrasing, they argue, is a chief cause for dysfluency.

Another cause of dysfluency may be the disturbing lack of reading practice both in and out of the classroom. Anderson, Wilson, and Fielding (1988) studied children’s home reading habits. They found that children in the 50th percentile in reading read at home about 4.6 minutes a day, whereas readers in the 80th percentile read at home 14.2 minutes a day. Sadly, readers in the 20th percentile read at home less than one minute a day. This translates into a few stunning statistics. Readers in the 90th
percentile read about 2.5 million words a year, while those in the 10th percentile read only about 51,000 words a year. Stated another way, the amount of material a child in the 90th percentile is exposed to in eight days is equal to that which a child in the 10th percentile is exposed to in one year.

Reading habits in the classroom need to be reexamined, as well. In general, poor readers spend less time reading text than good readers—perhaps as little as one-half the amount as good readers (Allington, 1980). In 1991, a year-long study of first graders compared high, medium, and low readers’ time on task in the classroom. High readers consistently read more words per reading session throughout the year. In October, high readers read 12.2 words during each reading session while nonreaders weren’t engaged in reading at all! In January, high readers read 51.9 words while their weaker peers read 11.5. In April, high readers read 81.4 words, and the low readers read only 31.6 (Nathan & Stanovich, 1991). Students spend entirely too much time waiting, passively watching and listening, and performing indirect reading activities (Mathes, Simmons, and Davis, 1992). Clearly, there is a correlation between amount of time on task and reading ability.

If students are to become more successful readers, educators must avoid the pitfalls mentioned above. They need to teach each child from instructional level materials. They need to help all children utilize all three cueing systems. They need to explicitly teach students to group words into phrases. They need to implement home reading programs, and they need to devote much more time to the task of reading. In essence, they need make fluency a goal of reading.
However, instructors rarely view fluency as a goal in and of itself (Allington, 1983; Rasinski, 1989). Methods texts have tended to focus on dysfluency and how to correct it rather than on fluency and how to promote it (Stayter & Allington, 1991). For too long educators have viewed slow, laborious reading as little more than an indication that more subskill instruction, such as word identification or context clues, was needed. Teachers have viewed dysfluency as an outcome of skillfulness rather than as a contributing factor to good reading (Allington, 1983; Zutell & Rasinski, 1991). Reading instruction typically includes reading-related activities intended to improve reading subskills rather than actual reading practice intended to improve fluency (Allington, 1980; Mathes, Simmons, & Davis, 1992; Nathan & Stanovich, 1991).

In the 1970's, however, researchers began studying methods that focused specifically on helping children read more quickly and smoothly without focusing on subskills. LaBerge and Samuels (1974) explored one method for improving fluency, that of using repeated reading of the same text. They noted that athletics, music, and dance have traditionally employed the use of repeating one movement until it was mastered. They argued that educators should utilize this same approach when teaching reading. Samuels' definitive research on the success of repeated reading was published in 1979. He found that when elementary children reread a single passage, their speed, word recognition, and comprehension improved.

Subsequent research has continued to suggest that repeated reading as well as other interventions improve fluency. For example, in 1979 Moyer
saw a gain of 40% to 50% over a twelve-week period during which her students practiced reading passages multiple times. O'Shea, Sindelar, and O'Shea (1987) studied the effects of repeated reading on learning disabled students in grades 5-8. Students who read passages seven times increased fluency more than those who read a passage only three times. Comprehension improved after three readings. Koskinen and Blum (1986) tried a variation of repeated reading in which students were put into partnerships. Students evaluated each other verbally and on paper. The results were positive. Layton and Koenig (1998) studied the effect of repeated reading on students with low vision. They found that error rates decreased and fluency increased in repeated passages and in new passages. In 1999, Daly, Martens, and Hamler experimented with a combination of fluency interventions—reward, repeated reading, and listening passage preview—and found that these strategies did indeed increase fluency in low-achieving readers. Rose (1984) compared silent passage preview and listener passage preview and found that—although both improved fluency—listener passage preview made the stronger impact. Daly and Martens (1994) found similar results when comparing the two methods. Thus, research strongly indicates that when certain interventions are set in place, children become more fluent readers.

A reading program is not complete if it does not have a component that directly influences reading fluency (Allington, 1983; Anderson, 1981; Rasinski, 1989, 1990; Schreiber, 1980, 1991; Zutell & Rasinski, 1991). Teaching reading comprehension strategies is not enough (Henk, Helfeldt, & Platt, 1986). Because society is no longer primarily agricultural, we no
longer depend solely on our own resources, land, and wits to survive. Instead, living in the Information Age, we must be capable of reading about medical options when faced with illness, understand state leaders' decisions that affect our families, and read material pertaining to our professions. Great quantities of literature that can positively affect our lives is available to more people than ever before in history. Therefore, educators must develop readers who can make good use of this information. Implementing strategies that improve reading fluency is not an "extra" to be squeezed into a school day when there happens to be a few unclaimed minutes. Fluency instruction cannot merely be a poem recited here and there or a bit of echo reading for fun during science one day. Fluency must be purposefully taught. Our nation's quality of life depends on it.

**STATEMENT OF PURPOSE**

The purpose of this study is to research strategies that improve reading fluency, to implement these strategies into a general education third grade classroom, and to test their effectiveness. This study:

1) Describes different interventions that research has shown to increase reading fluency.

2) Incorporates these interventions into the context of a regular education classroom.

3) Determines the effectiveness of the interventions by comparing pre-and post-intervention reading rates and pre-and post-comprehension scores.
The subjects of this study are five children in the third grade. There are four males and one female. Four are slow learners with no identified or suspected learning disability. The fourth has an identified learning disability in the area of language. Their pre-intervention reading rates range from 53 to 63 words per minute. The goal of this study is to increase their reading rate by 30% over the course of four weeks.

**DEFINITIONS OF TERMS**

**Classwide Repeated Reading**
An intervention for improving reading fluency in which students are paired and take turns being the tutor and the tutee. Each tutee reads a selected passage three times. After the first read-through, the reader makes observations about his own reading and sets some goals. After each of the following two readings, the tutor and tutee together discuss the reader's progress.

**Demonstration/Modelling**
A type of intervention for improving reading fluency in which modelling is the chief component. A wide variety of demonstration strategies exist, including reading aloud, shared reading, listening-while-reading (also known as recorded books), choral and echo reading, neurological impress, and paired reading.
**Paired Reading**-- An intervention for improving reading fluency in which students are paired and take turns being the tutor and the tutee. Students sit side-by-side while one reads and the other follows along, assisting when necessary.

**Prosody**-- The hierarchical organization of sentences into phrasal units (Schreiber, 1991).

**Reading Fluency**-- The rate and smoothness of oral reading.

**Reading Rate**-- The number of words read accurately in one minute. It is measured in words per minute (wpm).

**Repeated Reading**-- An intervention for improving reading fluency in which the reading of a passage is repeated and timed. The reader sets speed goals for a selected passage, repeating the passage until the goal is met. Progress is recorded.
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study evaluates the impact of repeated reading, paired reading, and demonstration on the reading fluency of regular education students. The study was conducted in the teacher-researcher's own third grade classroom in a middle class community of the midwest. As a result, several limitations exist. First, this study measures the effectiveness of the interventions at only one grade level. Second, the subjects come from a homogeneous, middle class community. Third, the study's multielement design makes it difficult to determine exactly which interventions are the most effective. Last, the duration of the study is merely four weeks, making it impossible to determine long-term results.
INTRODUCTION

In the last thirty years, there has been renewed interest among researchers in the teaching of reading fluency. This interest, however, has not necessarily filtered down through the educational ranks into daily classroom practice. Researchers have continually decried the fact that fluency as a curricular goal of reading instruction is all too often ignored even while studies suggest that fluency correlates highly with reading comprehension (Breznitz, 1987; Lovett, 1987; Shinn, Knutson, Good, Tilly, & Collins, 1992). Instead, fluency continues to be viewed merely as a thermometer of reading achievement and as an indication of what kind of remediation is needed (Allington, 1983; Rasinski, 1989, 1990; Reutzel & Hollingsworth, 1993; Stayter & Allington, 1991; Zutell & Rasinski, 1991).

Certain teaching practices have been shown to be highly beneficial—if not absolutely vital—for the acquisition of reading fluency. This chapter will review three of these practices. They are the use of repeated reading, paired reading, and demonstration. First, the definition and a brief history of each method will be given. Second, the effects of each method will be described. Last, possible reasons why each method is effective will be examined. The goal of this chapter is for the reader to realize fluency's importance in reading instruction and to be inspired to incorporate research-based strategies into regular education reading curriculum.
Introduction

The first of three methods to be discussed in this chapter is the method of repeated reading. Over the last thirty years, research has suggested that this method is an excellent means of improving reading rate, word recognition, comprehension, and motivation. It appears to be beneficial to all levels of readers. The following review of research on repeated reading will give a definition of the method, a brief history of its use, the effects of the method, and possible reasons for its success.

Definition of Repeated Reading

The method of repeated reading is exactly what it appears to be—repeatedly reading a passage. The reader is given a short selection (50-200 words) to reread until he can easily read it at a predetermined rate. Often each reading is graphed. Graphing is highly motivating to students, as they can visually see their progress (Dahl, 1974; Koskinen & Blum, 1984; Samuels, 1979). Most researchers suggest 100 words per minute on independent reading level material as a good target rate (Dahl, 1974; Dowhower, 1987). For norm-referenced reading rates and a method of assessing and scoring oral reading rates, see Appendix A. Speed and ease of reading are the goals of repeated reading, while word recognition accuracy is deemed less important. This is because a child's attention cannot focus on increasing rate and improving word recognition concurrently. In addition, advocates of repeated reading contend that
teachere already give too much attention to word accuracy and that this detracts from fluency and comprehension. Moreover, as rate increases during rereading, word recognition naturally improves even with no teacher intervention. Therefore, corrections are held to a minimum during repeated reading (Dahl, 1974; LaBerge & Samuels, 1974; Rasinski, 1990; Zutell and Rasinski, 1991). Repeated reading sessions last approximately 15-20 minutes (Dahl, 1974) but should be terminated when the student’s interest appears to wane.

There are a few variations of repeated reading. A student can read the same passage independently, or he can read with the support of an audio recording or of a partner. When reading with an audio recording, the student simultaneously listens to and reads aloud a passage until he can read it fluently (Chomsky, 1976; Rasinski, 1990). Chomsky recommends daily, 20 minute sessions. When reading with a partner, each student reads aloud three times and evaluates his improvement in rate, expression, and smoothness. These sessions generally last 10-15 minutes (Koskinen & Blum, 1986; Rasinski, 1990).

A Brief History of Repeated Reading

The concept of repeated reading is not new. Ancient Asian children were regularly taught to read by reading text over and over in unison with other children until they could read it fluently. Renan, in his “Life of Jesus,” believes that Christ (and thus other Jewish people of that era) was taught to read by rereading a single passage. Similarly, the 9th Century’s early handwritten primers contained the alphabet, a few columns of phonetic
patterns, and religious passages such as the Creed. Later the Ave Maria, the Benedicte, and the Gratias were added. If a child--a boy, generally--learned to read these pieces, he was well on his way to a profession in the Church--one of the few professions at the time requiring literacy. Therefore, repeatedly reading these few passages was an expedient means to becoming successfully educated. After the Reformation, early school books (now printed in greater quantity thanks to Herr Gutenberg) were manuals of church service. Again, these readers contained the alphabet and religious doctrines, which eventually developed into the primers of the 18th and 19th Centuries (Huey, 1908/1968, pp. 240-243). It seems that these primers would have been read with much repetition, as they contained passages people would be expected to recite in church services.

During the 18th and 19th Centuries, there was an emphasis on “elocution.” Elocution is the oral performance of a passage requiring an interpretive rendition. This allows listeners to understand the passage on a subjective level. Some 19th Century readers contained instruction on elocutionary principles and even printed cues to indicate appropriate intonation (Dowhower, 1987). Preparing an elocutionary piece would necessitate the rereading of a passage many times.

It is noteworthy that in the above historical cases, the method of repeated reading is most definitely not used as remedial reading instruction. Furthermore, fluency is not looked upon as a thermometer measuring knowledge of subskills. Instead, the method of repeated reading is a natural component of reading instruction, and fluency is seen as a--in fact, the--goal of instruction. While these views are historical in nature, they are,
surprisingly, the same views to which more modern researchers are strongly urging educators to resubscribe. And these more “modern” researchers began exploring the method of repeated reading much sooner than one might imagine.

**Early Research in Repeated Reading**

The method of repeated reading was researched as early as 1894. Under the direction of Professor Calkins, Miss Adelaide M. Abell of Wellesley College compared the reading rates and comprehension of forty female students. The young women read a short story. Their rates were timed. A few hours later, they were asked to rewrite the story from memory. Because this assignment was only a few hours after reading, the test was considered a measure of comprehension and not of memory. The results indicated that slow, medium, and fast readers comprehended at various levels, although the two fastest readers also comprehended at the highest rates (i.e. recalled the most from the text). Therefore, Miss Abell concluded that a fast rate does not necessarily preclude good comprehension. Furthermore, she believed that speed would be increased “by repeating and multiplying associations [with text]” (Huey, 1908/1968, p. 172).

In more current times, research in the use of repeated reading began with such educators as David LaBerge, S. Jay Samuels, Patricia Dahl, and Carol Chomsky. In 1974, Samuels and LaBerge of the University of Minnesota published a paper that sparked a good deal of curiosity in the subject of reading fluency. They proposed that automaticity is crucial to fluency and that the best way to develop it is to practice—that is, to use
repetition. They compared learning to read with learning to play a sport or a musical instrument. Developing automaticity of these skills, they pointed out, requires repeated practice of the same movements. Automaticity in reading, they argued, should be obtained no differently. For words to become automatic, they must be repeated (LaBerge and Samuels, 1974). Their theory was based on that of Dr. Edmund Huey. In his 1908 manual, *The Psychology and Pedagogy of Reading*, he wrote

Perceiving [reading] being an act, it is, like all other things that we do, performed more easily with each repetition of the act. To perceive an entirely new word or other combination of strokes requires considerable time, close attention, and is likely to be imperfectly done, just as when we attempt some new combination of movements, some new trick in the gymnasium or new “serve” at tennis. In either case, repetition progressively frees the mind from attention to details, makes facile the total act, shortens the time, and reduces the extent to which consciousness must concern itself with the process (Huey, 1908/1968, p. 104).

Influenced by Samuels' theory, Patricia Dahl studied the effects of fluency interventions on seventy-eight second graders. She was interested in developing a program for teaching high speed word recognition that would take the emphasis off decoding and place it on getting meaning from
the text, a fairly novel idea at the time. One of the interventions she researched was repeated reading. The passages used in the study were of a wide variety, including supplementary readers, library reference books, and high school and college textbooks. By the end of the training, the second graders were, amazingly, reading selections ranging from the fourth grade level to the thirteenth grade level. From this study, Dahl concluded that repeated reading significantly increased reading rate (Dahl, 1974).

Unknown to Samuels, in 1976 Carol Chomsky of Harvard University was doing her own research with repeated reading. It began when she was approached by a desperate colleague to do something for her third graders who were of normal intelligence but were reading one to two years below grade level. They had had phonics instruction and had been meeting regularly with a remedial teacher for over two years. They could read but haltingly, in word-by-word fashion, with long silences. Chomsky recognized their need for exposure to large amounts of text, and they needed support, as their own faltering attempts prohibited them from getting it. Therefore, she had them repeatedly read aloud with audio recordings until they could read the stories fluently on their own. They did this for twenty minutes each day for three months. It took four of the five children about four weeks to achieve fluency with their first books. The fifth child reached fluency with his book in only two weeks. After their initial success, fluency came much more readily. They were able to read their fourth or fifth books fluently within only one week. By the end of the three months, they each had six books they could read fluently and naturally. Their eyes shone with success as they effortlessly read to their regular classroom teacher, their principal, and to
their classmates, who applauded them (Chomsky, 1976).

The beauty of this story does not stop in the classroom, however. For not only could they fluently read six books, but they were also driven to read everything in sight. From billboards to cereal boxes, they read everything with insatiable desire. One parent summed it up in saying, “[My child] is proud of herself and not ashamed anymore” (Chomsky, 1974, p. 292).

Samuels’ definitive research was done in 1979. At the time, repeated reading was a little-known and little-researched technique. Samuels was, however, convinced that it would prove useful not only for students of low intelligence and functionally illiterate adults but also for readers who needed no more phonics instruction yet needed assistance in reading with ease. The children in his study were elementary students who had difficulty learning to read. They orally read meaningful, 50-200 word passages to the researcher, who recorded their rate and their number of errors on a graph. With each rereading, the rate increased and the number of errors decreased. Furthermore, with each new passage, there were fewer initial errors and faster initial rate. This seemed to indicate that reading improvement transferred to similar passages (Samuels, 1979).

In describing these early studies in repeated reading, it is evident that this method increases reading rate and reduces word recognition errors. In looking at more research, other benefits become apparent. All told, the method of repeated reading seems to have four main effects. First, repeated reading increases reading rate. Second, it reduces word recognition errors. Third, it increases comprehension. Fourth, it motivates students to read.
Effects of Repeated Reading on Reading Rate

Many studies indicate that repeated reading increases reading rate. Not only did Dahl (1974), Chomsky (1976), and Samuels (1979) find this to be true, but researchers who followed them did, as well. O'Shea, Sindelar, and O'Shea (1985) used repeated reading with 30 third graders who were functioning at or above grade level but were reading an average of 117 words per minute (hereafter referred to as wpm) at the instructional level. They increased their rate to 141.7 wpm after three rereadings and to 155.3 wpm after seven rereadings. This is a gain of 17.4% after three rereadings and of 25% after seven rereadings. These findings are consistent with what Dowhower (1987) found when she used repeated reading with 17 second grade transitional readers. Again, these students had no special reading problems but were slow, word-by-word readers with adequate decoding skills. Their reading rates were all below 50 wpm on grade level material that they could read with 85% accuracy. Over a six week period, students met with the researcher for 15 minute sessions four to six times per week. Students read each passage until they could read it at 100 wpm. Before the study, these second graders has been reading at a slow rate by second grade norms of the Gilmore Reading Test (1952). Afterwards, however, they were reading at an average rate. In addition, their rate gain transferred across five passages, again indicating that this method improves reading across texts.

It is interesting to note Dowhower's conclusion that short-term rate gains were not as significant as long-term rate gains. That is to say, the gain from the initial reading of a passage early in a story to the final reading of a
later passage within the same story was insignificant. However, the gain from the initial reading of the first story to the final reading of the fifth story was significant. This suggests that rate gains transferred from one story to the next (Dowhower, 1987). This is encouraging for those who wish to use this method in regular classroom settings.

The studies of Sindelar, Monda, and O'Shea (1990) in their work with learning disabled and nondisabled second through fifth graders and of Rasinski (1990) in his study with third graders, both confirmed the positive effect of repeated reading on rate. After three readings of material at the instructional level, Sindelar, Monda, and O'Shea's learning disabled students increased their rate from 70.4 wpm to 97.7 wpm, or by 39%, and the nondisabled students increased their rate from 67.4 wpm to 93.5 wpm, or by 39%, as well. At the independent reading level, learning disabled students increased their rate from 130.5 to 154.7 wpm, or by 19%, and nondisabled students increased their rate from 121.8 to 143.5, or by 18%. It seems odd that at the independent reading level, the nondisabled students actually read more slowly than the learning disabled students, but Sindelar, Monda, and O'Shea's records indicate this to be the case. Rasinski's third graders used repeated reading for eight days. They read either independently or with the assistance of audio tapes. Those who read independently made rate gains of 25%, and those who were listening while reading made gains of 19%.

One study, however, was less supportive of repeated reading. It demonstrated that although this method successfully increased reading rate, the degree to which that rate transferred to new texts was dependent upon
the number of shared words between the texts. The less common the vocabulary between the texts, the less transfer there was of increased reading rate (Rashotte and Torgesen, 1985). However, fluency—properly defined—is more than speed. It is also smoothness, intonation, and phrase lengthening. Repeated reading offers practice that develops these aspects of fluency (Schreiber, 1980, 1991). Furthermore, because of the limited vocabulary of primary texts, much of the vocabulary at this level will transfer, thus giving students the opportunities they need to practice common phrases. Therefore, repeated reading is a worthwhile practice and should be incorporated into regular education instruction.

**Effects of Repeated Reading on Word Recognition**

Not only does the method of repeated reading increase rate, but it also reduces the number of word recognition errors made by the reader (Dahl, 1974; Dowhower, 1987; Gonzales & Elijah, 1975; O'Shea, Sindelar, & O'Shea, 1985; Perfetti & Lesgold, 1979; Rasinski, 1990; Samuels, 1979; Sindelar, Monda, O'Shea, 1990). Dowhower's second graders, in rereading five 200 word passages in five different stories until each passage could be read at 100 wpm, moved from the instructional level of performance according to Powell's (1970) criteria for reading competence to the independent level (Dowhower, 1987).

Rasinski's (1990) eight day study with third graders indicates an improvement in word accuracy for both those rereading independently and those rereading while listening. Students who read independently improved their word accuracy by 19% from the pretest to posttest. Students who
listened while reading improved their word accuracy by 25% from the pretest to posttest.

Sindelar, Monda, and O'Shea (1990), on the other hand, found that only learning disabled students showed a reduced number of errors when reading repeatedly, whereas the nondisabled students actually increased their number of errors from the first to the third readings. At the instructional level, learning disabled students reduced their errors on 200 word passages by 13%, but nondisabled students actually increased their errors by 52%. At the independent level, learning disabled students decreased their errors by 12%, but the nondisabled students again increased their errors by 33%. However, this is not as great a decline as it appears when one recognizes that the error rates increased from 2.7 to 4.1 and from 1.8 to 2.4, respectively. One might do well, however, to closely monitor the effects of repeated reading on nondisabled students so as to avoid adverse reactions. Dowhower (1987), too, found that the word recognition errors of second graders generally decreased with the use of repeated readings.

One can conclude from the above studies that word recognition errors decrease with the use of repeated reading. One advantage of practicing word recognition in this fashion is that words are learned within the context of phrases and sentences. Unlike practicing words in isolation, where learning to recognize words in context is a necessary next step, repeated reading places word recognition and application into one activity. Repeated reading is, therefore, a more authentic method of increasing word recognition.
Effects of Repeated Reading on Comprehension

Studies strongly indicate that repeated reading improves comprehension (Allington, 1983; Dahl, 1974; LaBerge & Samuels, 1974; Mathes, Simmons, & Davis, 1992; O'Shea, Sindelar, & O'Shea, 1985; Rasinski, 1990; Samuels, 1979; Stayter & Allington, 1991; Taylor, Wade & Yekovich, 1985). Stayter & Allington (1991) observed a seventh grade class prepare short dramas. Students were placed into groups to rehearse different dramas. Over the course of five days students rehearsed their scripts and critiqued each other with suggestions for expression or how a character might react in a given situation. Students' growing understanding of the characters was evident in the way they learned to speak their lines. In an interview after the performance, one student said, "You can't start understanding everything the first time" (p. 146). Another explained the development of his reading with the following words:

"The first time I read to know what the words are. Then I read to know what the words say and later as I read I thought about how to say the words...As I got to know the character better, I put more feeling in my voice" (Stayter & Allington, 1991, p. 145).

O'Shea, Sindelar, & O'Shea (1985) compared the rate and comprehension of third graders cued to read either for speed or for comprehension. Before reading, each child was told to "read as quickly and accurately as you can" or to "try to remember as much as you can" (p. 133).
Over the course of three readings, the children cued for speed had faster rates than those cued for comprehension, and those cued for comprehension had higher comprehension scores than those cued for speed. However, both groups made gains in comprehension as well as rate, indicating that repeated reading does increase comprehension.

There is some debate on the connection between repeated reading and comprehension. The question arises as to what is the cause and what is the effect (Dowhower, 1987, 1991). Does improved fluency aid in the comprehension of text or does improved comprehension aid in the development of fluency? In other words, does reading more smoothly and putting phrases together cause the reader to understand more? Or does understanding the text allow a reader to put words into phrases? Dowhower (1987, 1991) concludes that ultimately no one can be certain as to the connection between the two. At any rate, the use of repeated reading has appeared in many studies to aid in the development of comprehension.

**Effects of Repeated Reading on Motivation**

The method of repeated reading has shown the propensity to motivate young readers. Watching a line graph indicating growth in speed is exciting for a child. Feeling like a "real reader" awakens new interest in the activity. Students' own success is really all the reward they need to want to continue reading (Dahl, 1974; Koskinen & Blum, 1984; Samuels, 1979). When 12 learning disabled students ages eight to twelve were asked if they wanted to continue repeated reading after the research was over, 75% answered in the affirmative. They said that repeated reading made it easier
to get a high speed score. And this was after a month of daily, fifteen minute
sessions (Rashotte & Torgesen, 1985). Second graders happily watched a
line graph report their progress (Dahl, 1974), and seventh graders immersed
themselves in rehearsing their lines for a short drama (Stayter & Allington,
1991). Yes, repeated reading can be a fun and satisfying experience.

**Why Repeated Reading is Effective**

Research leaves little room for doubt that repeated reading positively
impacts reading fluency. There are several possible reasons for this. First,
it offers direct, immediate feedback. Research of the last decade indicates
that the brain is highly motivated by direct, immediate feedback. Whatever
just happened to someone will help the brain determine what to do next.
Without feedback, people would be unable to learn (Jensen, 1998). In
regard to reading, feedback helps a student know exactly what he needs to
do to improve. Repeated reading, with its self-and partner-analyses, timed
readings, and encouraging graphs, offers this direct feedback.

Second, repeated reading immerses the reader in meaningful text
rather than in reading-related activities, thus giving much needed practice.
As stated earlier, reading instruction typically provides an inadequate
amount of time reading actual text. McNinch, Shaffer, Campbell, & Rakes
(1998) cite that 20% of reading instruction is practicing with reading-related
activities while only 35% is actually reading text. During repeated reading,
students are truly involved in reading text, and there are few interruptions to
break the continuity. Because of this, Moyer (1982) suggests that it may be
the element of increased practice time rather than the element of repetition
that actually increases speed. This may be so, as both listening-while-reading and repeated reading effectively accelerated third graders' reading rate in Rasinski's 1990 study. When classwide repeated reading is employed, practice time is increased even more (Koskinen & Blum, 1986).

Third, this method offers time to develop prosodic awareness. Prosody is a linguistic term referring to the stress, intonation, and duration of certain words in a sentence. Single words are grouped into meaningful phrases (Screiber, 1980, 1991). Prosodic reading is characterized by "expressive, rhythmic, and melodic patterns" (Dowhower, 1991). To become a fluent reader, one must learn to "chunk" words into appropriate phrases. Readers who do not have an understanding of this are slower, word-by-word readers. Even Miss Abell of Wellesley College in 1894 identified this as a problem. In her comparative study of reading rate and comprehension, she observed the following:

Another peculiarity of the slow readers...is the reading of one word at a time, while the rapid readers grasp phrases, clauses, sometimes even sentences at a glance (Huey, p. 172).

What contributes to the difficulty of becoming a prosodic reader may be a lack of graphic symbols. Our written language has graphic symbols for sounds and for some pauses. A "th" represents the /th/ sound, and a comma indicates a slight pause. There are no such symbols, however, for the stress, intonation, and duration of certain words in sentences. This
deficiency may inhibit the development of fluent reading (Dowhower, 1991; Schreiber, 1980, 1991). Not only does this deficiency exist, but it is rarely acknowledged. Teachers tell children, “Read with expression” but are unable to inform them explicitly what they are to do (Schreiber, 1980, 1991). Repeated reading seems to develop prosody. The reader begins to make use of the syntax of the sentence to create meaning. Reading becomes more fluid. Some readers simply cannot attend to all cueing systems simultaneously, and repeated reading gives them the time they need to attend to each one (Schreiber, 1980, 1991).

Last, the method of repeated reading allows the reader to master a passage and to know the feel of “real” reading. As the text becomes more familiar, she develops an automaticity that allows her to be fluent (LaBerge & Samuels, 1974). The redundancy of the material narrows the options for response, thus enabling her to be more successful. Never limiting the number of options for response is like never offering reprieve from a bombardment. When repeating text, readers can achieve mastery. They know the feel of reading with ease.

The question remains, is repeated reading for everyone? It has been tested with learning disabled and non-disabled children, low-level readers and high-level readers, and it appears that everyone does indeed benefit. Repeated reading was helpful to those with learning disabilities (Samuels, 1979; Sindelar, Monda, & O'Shea, 1990), those of normal intelligence but low reading levels (Chomsky, 1976; Dahl, 1974; Dowhower, 1987; Rasinski, 1990), and those at or above grade level (O'Shea, Sindelar, & O'Shea, 1985; Rasinski, 1990; Sindelar, Monda, & O'Shea, 1990). Research seems
to indicate that those with learning disabilities and those of normal intelligence but low reading levels may actually improve more than those of average or above average ability. Perhaps this is because it is just these populations who have the most to gain (Mathes, Simmons, & Davis, 1992; Rashotte & Torgesen, 1985).

PAIRED READING AS A METHOD TO IMPROVE READING FLUENCY

Introduction

The second of three methods to be discussed in this chapter is the method of paired reading. Research indicates that paired reading has highly positive effects on reading fluency, motivation to read, and attitude toward school and peers. Moreover, it appears to be beneficial to all levels of readers (Koskinen & Blum, 1986; Mathes & Fuchs, 1993; Rasinski, 1990; Rekrut, 1994; Utley, Mortsweet, & Greenwood, 1997). The following review of paired reading will give a definition of the method, a brief history of its use, the effects of the method, and possible reasons for its success.

Definition of Paired Reading

Paired reading is a strategy in which students take turns tutoring one another. The partnerships may be self-chosen or teacher-selected. The activity may be highly structured requiring repeated reading or some other task, or it may be straight-forward, sustained reading. In paired repeated reading, the first student reads a short passage aloud and analyzes his
reading. After reading the same passage two more times, the reader and the tutor discuss together how the reading got better. Then students reverse roles. This procedure lasts a total of 10-15 minutes (Koskinen & Blum, 1986). In sustained paired reading, partners take turns acting as tutors and tutees, but nothing is repeated. Instead, students read straight through the text, stopping only for assistance or to perform certain mandated tasks. In Peabody Classwide Peer Tutoring (CWPT) students have two mandatory tasks to perform while reading. One is to summarize each paragraph by "shrinking" it into ten words or less. The other is to engage in a prediction relay by taking turns predicting what will happen next in the selection. Peabody CWPT sessions last about thirty-five minutes and are implemented about three times a week. These strategies are reported to develop fluency and comprehension skills (Mathes, Fuchs, Fuchs, Henley, & Sanders, 1994).

Paired reading is an effective strategy turning the disadvantage of high student--teacher ratios in typical classrooms into the advantage of helpful one-on-one tutoring opportunities.

A Brief History of Paired Reading

Paired reading is as old as instruction itself. Older siblings have taught younger ones, and children have taught their friends. It appears to have first been systematized in England in the early 1800s. Independently of one another, two men developed methods of peer tutoring. Andrew Bell was an Anglican clergyman, and Joseph Lancaster was a Quaker schoolmaster. Lancaster's was the method that became more widely recognized. He prepared older and abler students with detailed instructions
so they could teach younger ones. His idea was founded on the belief that children learn most effectively from one another (Rekrut, 1994).

In varying degrees of structure, peer tutoring was utilized in the one-room schoolhouses of the 19th and early 20th Centuries. It was re instituted in the 1970s, when the country was suffering a teacher shortage that resulted in large classes. This made it expedient to utilize peer tutoring. In the 1980s, school systems were experiencing limited budgets, again making peer tutoring a viable instructional method. Amazingly, peer tutoring was found to be more cost-effective than computer-aided instruction, reduced class size, increased instructional time, or adult tutoring. Cross-age tutoring in particular was found to be nearly four times as cost effective as reduced class size and increased instructional time (Levin, Glass, & Meister, 1984). This movement toward peer and cross-age tutoring created a need for research to determine the effectiveness of various tutoring structures.

At the University of Kansas, Dalquadri, Greenwood, Whorton, Carta, and Hall made up a team of researchers working on the Juniper Gardens Children’s Project. Out of this project came a method known as “Classwide Peer Tutoring” (hereafter referred to as CWPT). This method was designed to increase academic achievement of low performing students in urban schools. Because half the class was reading simultaneously to the other half, who were acting as tutors, CWPT offered students a much greater length of time to read than the common practice of “round robin” reading (in which students take turns reading while others listen) (Delquadri, Greenwood, Whorton, Carta, & Hall, 1986). Mathes, Fuchs, and Fuchs of George Peabody College of Vanderbilt University extended CWPT to
include some specific comprehension strategies, including prediction relay and paragraph shrinking. This method is known as Peabody CWPT or Peabody Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies (Peabody PALS) in reading for the upper elementary grades. First-Grade Pals was later developed as a downward extension of the Peabody PALS (Mathes, Howard, Allen, & Fuchs, 1998).

Regardless of whether Peabody PALS or the original CWPT is used or if students are rereading or sustaining their reading, the effectiveness of paired reading cannot be discounted. The benefits range from improved reading fluency to better attitudes toward peers and school (Koskinen & Blum, 1986; Mathes & Fuchs, 1993; Rasinski, 1990; Rekrut, 1994; Utley, et al., 1997).

**Effects of Paired Reading**

Paired reading has continually demonstrated positive results. It is both academically and socially beneficial. Academically, students in paired reading programs demonstrate improved reading rates, comprehension, and word recognition (Koskinen & Blum, 1986; Mathes & Fuchs, 1993; Mathes, et al., 1994). Socially, students develop empathy for their peers as they focus on someone else's needs rather than their own. They feel cared about by others and less alone in the academic world, which can be particularly intimidating to low achieving students. Attitudes about themselves, academics, and school greatly improve (Utley, et al., 1997). Paired reading is also motivating and enjoyable (Raskinski, 1990).
Why Paired Reading is Effective

There are several possible reasons for paired reading's success. First, it increases individual instruction time. Instead of one teacher futilely attempting to offer one-on-one instruction to each of the twenty-some students in the room, half the class is offering one-on-one instruction as the other half reads. This results in greater quantities of and more immediate feedback (Heibert, 1980; Mathes & Fuchs, 1993; Utley, et al., 1997). The brain needs this feedback to make the required changes for improvement (Jensen, 1998). In addition, this personal attention offers students the emotional support they need. Children who lack friends find security in being assigned to someone whose presence contributes to their success.

Second, paired reading increases time spent reading meaningful text. When half of a class is reading simultaneously for 10-15 minutes with the other half following suit during the next 10-15 minutes, each student is reading much more text than students who take turns reading in the "round robin" fashion. Students are not passively listening. They are not looking around the room or out the window. They are not bored because someone is reading too slowly or frustrated because someone is reading too quickly. Everyone is engaged--tutees and tutors alike (Heibert, 1980; Mathes, et al., 1994; Utley, et al., 1997).

Third, paired reading offers readers models of fluent reading. In paired reading, better readers can be paired with lower ones. The last thing struggling readers need is to listen to models of dysfluent reading. Their ears need to be exposed to proper pronunciation, phrasing, and intonation. Their eyes to be trained to move more quickly across text (Mathes,
Simmons, & Davis, 1992; Schreiber, 1980). The modelling they receive from their better reading partner is precisely what they need.

Last, paired reading promotes a helping and cooperative classroom atmosphere. As students tutor each other, they are essentially serving one another, thereby developing empathy. They learn to consider how they can help those less able than themselves. Students are not left to flounder while the teacher attempts to meet many students' needs. Instead, each is personally encouraged and knows he is part of a caring community that insists upon his success (Heibert, 1980; Mathes, et al., 1994).

Studies show that practically everyone benefits from paired reading. Elementary as well as secondary students can tutor one another effectively (Rekrut, 1994). Learning disabled who are mainstreamed, low achieving nondisabled, and average readers all outperform their peers in non-classwide peer tutoring programs (Mathes, et al., 1994). The only reservation researchers seem to have is using this method in self-contained resource rooms. It appears that when the each child in a pair is learning disabled, the success rate is not as high as when only one is learning disabled. Moreover, Mathes & Fuchs (1993) recommends that learning disabled students use the method of sustained paired reading rather than repeated paired reading. Overall, the method of paired reading has solid documentation suggesting that it is a highly beneficial strategy improving reading fluency. It seems that Joseph Lancaster of 19th Century England was right. Children do learn best from their peers.
DEMONSTRATION AS A METHOD TO IMPROVE READING FLUENCY

Introduction

The last of three methods to be discussed in this chapter is the method of demonstration. Demonstration, or modeling, exists in a wide variety of forms, all offering the slow reader a model of fluent reading. Research over the last thirty years indicates that this method in all its forms has a positive effect on reading fluency (Carbo, 1978; Chomsky, 1976; Daly & Martens, 1994; Heckleman, 1969; Henk, Helfeldt, & Platt, 1986; McCurdy, 1990; Rasinski, 1990; Rose, 1984; Smith, 1979). The following review of the different types of demonstration will give definitions of each form, a brief history of its use, the effects of the method, and possible reasons for its success.

Definition of Demonstration

Demonstration can also be called modeling. In this method the reader listens to a fluent, oral rendition of text before, after, or during reading. When demonstration is done before reading, it serves as a prompt for improved fluency. When it is done after reading, it serves as direct feedback (Skinner, Logan, & Robinson, 1997). Forms of demonstration that occur before reading include echo reading, in which students echo phrases and sentences first read orally by an adult, and listening passage preview (LPP), in which students read longer passages to which they have been pre-exposed by a fluent reader. One variation of this method, silent passage previewing (SPP), is a form of repeated reading. Forms of demonstration
that occur after reading include modelling of text to show students proper phrasing and modelling of individual words to correct unknown words.

Forms of demonstration that take place during reading may all be categorized as "listening-while-reading" strategies. The first, "taped books," is also known as the "read-along method," "tape-recorded assistance," and "audio-taped assistance." When using this method, the student listens to a tape recording to achieve fluency. He may read and listen repeatedly until he is fluent, or he may listen and read a single time to a longer book. Sessions last approximately 20 minutes (Carbo, 1978, 1995, 1996; Chomsky, 1976; Mathes, Simmons, & Davis, 1992; Rasinski, 1990).

A second listening-while-reading method is the Neurological Impress Method (hereafter referred to as NIM). During NIM, the student and a mature reader sit side-by-side orally reading the same text. The mature reader sits slightly behind the student, reading gently into his right ear at a slightly faster rate than the student and pointing to the text. When the student is able, he takes over pointing to the text with his own finger, and the instructor's voice fades a bit, gradually allowing the reader to take over more of the reading task as well (Heckleman, 1969).

A third method of listening-while-reading is the shared reading experience. In shared reading, the teacher reads aloud such things as big books, paragraphs composed by the class, or poems on an overhead. Students read with the teacher as she points to the words. It is important in shared reading that everyone read from the same text and that it be a relaxing, enjoyable activity (Carbo, 1995, 1996; Rasinski, 1988).
Another form of listening-while-reading is choral reading. The students and teacher read text simultaneously with no repetition. This is often done with poems, literature, and reading materials across the curriculum (Carbo, 1995, 1996; Kelly, 1995).

Last, in echo reading the teacher reads a phrase, sentence, or short passage, modelling good phrasing and expression. Students repeat after her, copying her fluent example. As in choral reading, echo reading can be done with poems, literature, and reading materials across the curriculum (Carbo, 1995, 1996; Henk, Helfeldt, & Platt, 1986; Huey, 1908/1968; Kelly, 1995).

While the above methods of demonstration are all explicit types of modelling, the following two methods are more implicit in nature. These are reading aloud and paired reading. Reading aloud is an indirect way of helping students develop vocabulary and acquire a sense of phrasing and expression. This results in better fluency when reading independently (McCurdy, Cundari, & Lentz, 1990). Paired reading, although treated as a separate fluency intervention earlier in this paper, can also be viewed as a form of demonstration and so will be mentioned here briefly. As students read in pairs, the listener receives from his partner implicit modelling in phrasing and word identification (Greenwood, et al., 1987).

A Brief History of Demonstration

Demonstration has been a strategy for teaching reading ever since mankind began using the written word. During feudal times, it was the habit of apprentices to learn their trades by watching skilled craftsmen and by
working along beside them. It is likely that people of that time learned to read in the same way. The literate person probably modeled for the new reader as he followed along. The two may very easily have read together until the beginner was well on his way to success much in the way students read with adults using NIM or choral reading today. In modern times we continue to acquire many skills using this same apprentice-master relationship, and acquiring the skill of reading should be no different.

It was during the 1960s when demonstration was systemized into a formal reading strategy. Heckelman (1969) devised a method he called the Neurological Impress Method (NIM). In NIM, the reader reads a passage aloud as the teacher sits slightly behind her, reading into her right ear. The teacher or student follows along in the text by pointing to the words. In this manner, the activity is visual, auditory, and tactile all at once, making many "neurological impressions." In 1976 Carol Chomsky came to the aid of a colleague who had several third graders of normal intelligence reading one to two years below grade level. Recognizing that these slow readers were responding to less text than their faster reading peers, she recorded short books for them to read and listen to simultaneously. Naturally at first they had difficulty keeping pace with the recording, but with repeated listenings, they ultimately succeeded in becoming fluent. Research since then has continued to suggest positive results for the method of taped books (Carbo 1978; Conte & Humphreys, 1989; Gose, 1987; Hoskisson, 1975; Hoskisson & Krohm, 1974).
Effects of Demonstration

The various forms of demonstration appear to have positive effects on reading fluency. The following studies suggest that demonstration increases reading rate and decreases word recognition errors. Conte & Humphreys (1989) compared the effects of repeated reading using tapes and repeated reading without using tapes on 35 nine to thirteen year olds in Alberta, Canada. Only the repeated reading with tapes condition brought significant improvement in fluent reading. These findings, however, are inconsistent when compared to results of similar research. For example, Rasinski (1990) also compared the use of unassisted repeated reading to assisted repeated reading when used with third graders. His conclusion was that both conditions were similarly effective in improving speed and word recognition.

Studies investigating the effects of listening passage preview (hereafter referred to as LPP) suggest similar effects on reading fluency. In 1979, Smith studied the effects of LPP on elementary learning disabled students. The teacher read the first page of basal reader stories aloud before students read them on their own. All students decreased their error rates and improved their reading rates after the modelling intervention. Rose (1984) compared LPP to SPP (silent passage preview) and found LPP to be superior in reducing error rates and increasing reading rates. The study of Daly and Martens (1994) also compared these two methods and produced similar results.

Skinner, Cooper, & Cole (1997) compared faster to slower modelling rates to determine which was more effective in increasing the learner's reading rate. One modelling rate was reduced to 50 wpm and the other was
maintained at a normal adult rate of 114-216 wpm. Although the students in the slower modelling treatment did increase their speed, this difference was not statistically significant. However, the fewer number of errors made under the slow modelling treatment was statistically significant.

Demonstration not only improves fluency, but it also contributes to the development of the enjoyment of reading. Choral and echo reading can be fun activities. LPP and taped books empower students to be successful in reading new texts, thereby making the reading experience more pleasurable. During NIM, students receive individual attention, making them feel valuable. Last, shared reading and reading aloud are delightful experiences that build a strong sense of community within the classroom.

**Why Demonstration is Effective**

There are several possibilities why demonstration is effective. First, by definition, demonstration offers a model of fluent reading. This is far more helpful to the dysfluent reader than listening to bad examples of slow, word-by-word reading, which happens all too often (Kelly, 1995; Schrieber, 1980; Smith, 1979). Instead, the model demonstrates to the reader exactly what he has to do to be successful. The model articulates accurate pronunciations, expression, intonation, and good phrasing (Carbo, 1978; Mathes, Simmons, & Davis, 1992; Schreiber, 1980, 1991). Particularly in the cases of taped books and NIM, the modelling is constant. This cannot be emphasized enough, for this is extremely beneficial to the dysfluent reader.

Second, the NIM and taped books forms of demonstration maximize the time reading meaningful text. As the student reads with a recording of a
text or with a more mature reader, he is on task—something poor readers often are not when left to read alone. The recording keeps him attuned to the passage, thus increasing his actual number of responses to the written word (Chomsky, 1976; Rasinski, 1990). In many reading programs, poor readers have far too few opportunities to respond to text. That is to say, they come into contact with and sound out fewer words than their more fluent peers. This problem exists because they are slow readers and is compounded when their teacher utilizes the “round robin” reading method (Allington, 1980, 1983; Anderson, 1981; Kelly, 1995; Smith, 1979). Taped books and NIM force slower readers to have more responses to text.

Third, with the exception of NIM, all of these types of demonstration allow teachers to impact many students at once. Choral and echo reading can be enjoyable, whole-class activities requiring no individual attention yet helping the students who particularly need it. LPP demonstrates fluent reading to everyone (Carbo, 1995, 1996). Taped books in particular allows the teacher to impact many students simultaneously. This method enables dysfluent readers to have the constant aid of the teacher without the teacher actually being present. The teacher is free to work with other students and attend to various matters that would constantly interrupt the flow of the reading if she were to attempt to devote a significant amount of time to one child. In essence, the recording is a surrogate teacher (Rasinski, 1990).

Last, demonstration activities are successful because they are motivating to students. They are enjoyable, and they show that the teacher is concerned about reading fluency. When elementary students know what is expected of them, they generally are agreeable to doing it. As students
repeatedly read with the aid of a tape recorder, their own improvement is motivating to them. They also enjoy the independence they are given as they go off to a corner and read “on their own.” They feel that they are taking command of their own reading growth as they work independently (Rasinski, 1990).

While it seems that most students benefit from demonstration, certain forms need to be used correctly to reap positive results. Researchers caution that taped books needs to be used carefully with beginning readers. One study showed that beginning readers made no better gains in fluency than the control group because they were merely listening (and not reading) as they looked at the pictures (Reitsma, 1998). Second, books must be recorded at the proper rate. If the recording is too fast for the reader, the method has insignificant results. The speed should challenge the reader but not frustrate him into passively listening (Carbo, 1978; Greenwood, Dalquadri, & Hall, 1984; Skinner, Adamson, Woodward, Jackson, Atchison, & Mims, 1993; Skinner & Shapiro, 1989). Last, because taped books is intended to develop fluency (e.g. speed, expression, and intonation) rather than develop reading subskills, it is best used with readers who have adequate phonics skills but are still slow, word-by-word readers. When taped books is done correctly with a suitable population, it has a positive effect on reading fluency.

CONCLUSION

It is evident that the methods of repeated reading, paired reading, and demonstration have powerful effects on reading fluency. Research suggests
that repeated reading increases reading rate, decreases word recognition errors, and improves comprehension (Dahl, 1974; Dowhower, 1987; Rasinski, 1990; Samuels, 1979). These benefits are very likely the results of more immediate feedback to the brain, (Jensen, 1998), more practice in reading meaningful text (Koskinen & Blum, 1986; Moyer, 1982), more time to develop prosodic awareness (Dowhower, 1991; Schreiber, 1980, 1991), and more time to develop automaticity, or mastery, of the text (LaBerge and Samuels, 1974). Repeated reading activities are motivating to students because they can actually see their progress during their practice (Samuels, 1979; Rasinski, 1989).

Like repeated reading, paired reading also seems to increase reading rate, decrease word recognition errors, and improve comprehension (Koskinen & Blum, 1986; Mathes & Fuchs, 1993; Mathes, et al., 1994). Moreover, paired reading helps students develop empathy and improves student attitudes about themselves, academics, and school (Utley, et al., 1997). These benefits are very possibly the results of more one-on-one instruction time (Heibert, 1980; Mathes & Fuchs, 1993; Utley, et al., 1997), more immediate feedback to the brain (Jensen, 1998), more time reading meaningful text (Heibert, 1980; Mathes, et al., 1994; Utley, et al., 1997), the presence of more fluent models (Scheiber, 1980, 1991; Mathes, Simmons, & Davis, 1992), and a cooperative classroom atmosphere (Heibert, 1980; Mathes, et al., 1994). Students enjoy paired reading, for it offers them a certain amount of independence as well as social interaction (Rasinski, 1990; Utley, et al., 1997).
Last, research indicates that demonstration in its various forms improves reading rate and word recognition (Chomsky, 1976; Daly & Martens, 1994; Heckleman, 1969; Rasinski, 1980; Rose, 1984; Skinner, et al., 1993; Skinner, et al., 1997; Skinner & Shapiro, 1989; Smith, 1979) as well as prosody (Dowhower, 1991; Schreiber, 1980, 1991). For the most part, these benefits are the result of the fluent modelling inherent in any form of demonstration (Carbo, M., 1978, 1995, 1996; Mathes, Simmons, & Davis, 1992; Rose, 1984; Schreiber, 1980, 1991). A second probable cause for these benefits is the increased time reading meaningful text, as in the taped books and NIM methods. This, in turn, increases the number of responses to the written word (Chomsky, 1976; Rasinski, 1990). These methods of demonstration are motivating as students see their improvement (Rasinski, 1990) and enjoy literature with others (Carbo, 1995, 1996).

The purpose of the following study is to determine the impact of repeated reading, paired reading, and demonstration on reading fluency when incorporating these methods into the regular educational classroom. The goal is to increase the reading rates of five target students by 30% over a four week period.
CHAPTER THREE: THESIS REPORT

Introduction

Across the nation, many students are reading below grade level. They are taught to identify cause and effect relationships, find the story elements, and sequence the main events. They are taught to survey informational text before reading, form questions and make predictions, locate the answers to those questions and check the accuracy of their predictions, and to think about the author's purpose. They are not, however, instructed in how to read smoothly, quickly, or with good expression, and they are not specifically taught to "chunk" phrases. As a result, many cannot read fluently when reading aloud, and comprehension suffers. This inadequacy contributes to avoidance of and dislike for reading. This, in turn, translates into lack of interest in education, negative attitudes toward school, poor self-concept, and, ultimately, limited job opportunities and a more narrow understanding of the world.

There are methods, however, that greatly contribute to students' ability to read fluently. Three of these methods are repeated reading, paired reading, and listening-while-reading. Studies show that these interventions have positive results when used in formal testing situations. To test the effectiveness of these methods in a regular educational classroom setting, the present observational study was conducted. Although the teacher-researcher worked individually with five students, many of the methods were performed with the entire class.

This chapter is a description of an observational study conducted in a third grade regular education classroom. First, the subjects, setting,
materials, and procedures will be described. Second, the data will be analyzed. Last, the implications of the study will be discussed.

**Subjects**

The teacher-researcher chose five students—four boys and one girl—from her third grade classroom to participate in this study. They were chosen because of their average intelligence and low reading ability. All students were below grade level in comprehension and had slow reading rates, and one was identified with a reading disability. None had significant attentional or behavioral problems. All were nine years old. The names of these participants have been changed to protect their identity.

One of these participants, Cory, demonstrated good effort and responsibility in performing schoolwork and had strong parental support. Throughout the schoolyear he dutifully read the required 15 minutes of home reading each night. He was the most word-by-word reader of the five students and was not particularly strong in any subject. Cory was a friendly boy who got along well with others and was respectful in class.

On the surface, Erin appeared to “have it all together.” She dressed for school very nicely, seemed confident, was articulate in stating her thoughts, and had a good deal of common sense. Because of this, it was a surprise to her teacher that she was low in comprehension and fluency, a fact which became evident early in the schoolyear. It was obvious, too, that she was very uncomfortable with her inadequate reading ability. Her eyes revealed her insecurity when asked to read aloud, even though this was usually done privately with the teacher or in paired reading situations.
Reading was not the only subject in which she struggled. She was ranked with the weakest students in most academic areas. She tended to work slowly, gaze around the room, and be one of the last done with assignments. It was not certain if her mild inattention was an avoidance technique or was an independent issue causing slow performance. Probably because of her strongly-supportive mother, Erin regularly performed her nightly home reading.

Nate’s second grade teacher recommended that he be retained. His parents, however, opposed the idea. Not surprisingly, in third grade he continued to struggle, although he did not significantly lag behind the others. Like Cory and Erin, he was conscientious in reading at home. Nate was a happy, friendly boy who enjoyed school and loved sustained silent reading time, although he often chose to read informational books with less text and more pictures.

Wade, a quieter student, was not regular in his nightly reading or his homework, although he seemed to enjoy sustained silent reading in school. Reading, spelling, and writing were a terrible struggle for him, and math was his strength. Wade was a nice boy and had a good attitude toward school but lacked motivation.

Dan was the only student identified with a learning disability. Reading grade level content material was an excruciating experience for him, and the entire class seemed to understand that Dan “couldn’t read.” When left on his own during sustained silent reading time each day, Dan would look at informational picture books or peruse the book shelves. He rarely did his nightly reading. Fortunately, this year Dan was spending one
hour each day with the resource room teacher, and he seemed to be making some progress with her.

Clearly, these five students were ideal candidates for more instruction in reading fluency. The purpose of this study was to investigate how repeated reading, paired reading, and demonstration would improve these students' reading fluency. The goal was to increase their reading rates by 30% over a four week period by using these methods.

Setting

This study was conducted in a suburban public elementary school in a midwestern middle class community. The teacher-researcher worked with the subjects in their traditional third grade classroom as well as in the carpeted hallway just outside the room. Generally, the remainder of the class was relatively quiet and engaged in sustained silent reading while the subjects worked individually with the investigator or with a high school student assistant. Sometimes the methods were incorporated into whole class instruction. At such times, the entire class gathered in the group area, worked at their desks, or read with their partners around the room, causing a low hum of voices, but relatively few unnecessary distractions.

Materials

Reading selections for this study were passages of various chapter books and science curriculum, students' own writing, and poetry. The chapter books used were Encyclopedia Brown, Boy Detective, by Arnold Sobel, The Boxcar Children, by Gertrude Warner, and the Little House
books by Laura Ingalls Wilder. These were chosen because they were the books being used for reading instruction at the time of the study. Other chapter books used were those chosen by students to read during their personal sustained silent reading time. An Addison Wesley science book represented expository, content area books. Poetry, students' own journal writing, and, in Dan's case, picture books with a tape recorder, were other materials used in this study.

**Procedures**

Three procedures were used to establish baseline data. First, the five subjects read three different passages from third grade reading material. These reading rates were averaged to determine the baseline reading rates, noted in words per minute (wpm). Next, the students were tested on the reading comprehension section of the Houghton-Mifflin (1989) reading test. From this their baseline comprehension levels were determined. Last, the remainder of the class read a single 100 word passage from which their pre-intervention reading rates were determined. These were used to rank the students by speed and then make matches for paired reading. See Appendix B for a sample of teacher notes from a 100 word passage.

The teacher-researcher wanted as many students as possible to benefit from the four-week emphasis on fluency. Therefore, five procedures were incorporated into the regular education curriculum. First, repeated reading was used in conjunction with journal writing time. Four times each week, students wrote for approximately eight minutes in their journals. Then they were told to "read over what you wrote so you are ready to read to your
partner.” They were given a minute or so to do this, after which they took turns reading orally to someone sitting nearby. Next, volunteers in small groups stood in the front of the room to read aloud to everyone. Typically one-quarter to one-half of the class participated in this third reading. Often as students waited their turn to read, they silently reread their paragraphs again. Hence, students read their own writing at least two and as much as four times, four days each week.

Second, poetry was used as a means of getting students to repeatedly read text. Poetry was read (and reread) an average of three times each week. Sometimes students read with partners and other times the entire class read together. These sessions lasted about ten minutes each. Furthermore, students were instructed to begin reading silently as each piece of poetry was initially handed to them, thus preparing them to successfully read the piece aloud with the teacher or a partner.

Third, classwide paired reading was used four times a week. Although students had commonly read in pairs throughout the year, now they were paired very specifically in dyads of stronger and weaker readers. By having each child read a 100 word passage, the teacher-researcher determined students’ reading rates. She then ranked them in order from the fastest to the slowest reader and paired the fastest with the middle, the next fastest with the one just below the middle, and so on. This ensured that no partnership would have two weak readers. Care was taken to create pairs who would feel comfortable working together. This was possible because in several instances students read at similar rates, allowing for variations in the dyads. For variety, students occasionally read with someone of their own
choosing. They either read in a sustained manner or read repeatedly. When reading repeatedly, students filled out forms evaluating themselves after one reading and again after three or four readings. See Appendix C for a sample of a student self-evaluation form and a blank form for duplication. This procedure lasted approximately 10-15 minutes. When reading in a sustained manner, students took turns acting as tutor and tutee for at least 10 minutes and sometimes as much as 30 minutes. As was mentioned above, the students were already used to reading in pairs. However, during this study the teacher-researcher taught mini-lessons on the different ways to tutor the reader when he came to an unknown word. One mini-lesson taught how to help the reader sound out words. Another taught how to ask the reader, "What word would make sense?" The last taught how to ask the reader, "What kind of a word is it?" Thus, the students were taught the three cueing systems and how to help the tutee use all three to determine unknown words.

Fourth, the teacher-researcher explicitly demonstrated fluent reading in a variety of ways. One way she demonstrated was by using listening passage preview (LPP). Students silently read with her as she read the first portion of a chapter, and they later reread the chapter from the beginning with their partners. She also demonstrated fluent reading of a sentence written on the board, telling students to notice which words were stressed, which were "chunked" together into phrases, and which were spoken slowly and separately. Discussion about their observations and then copying her example followed the demonstration. Other times she demonstrated by having the children echo phrases and sentences after her. Last, when
reading poetry aloud, she often told students to note her expression, phrases, and intonation before they discussed what they heard. These tasks were done to heighten students’ awareness of phrasing, intonation, and expression.

The procedures described thus far were implemented with the entire class. The five target subjects also received individual attention. Based on their personal needs and what appeared to be helpful to each one, different strategies were applied. Cory, Erin, Nate, and Wade used the method of repeated reading. While the whole class was engaged in sustained silent reading, the teacher-researcher met with each of these students individually. Sometimes they came to her desk, and other times she moved to wherever in the room they had located themselves. Preparing 100 word passages ahead of time or counting out how many words were read in one minute proved too cumbersome an activity. Therefore, the repeated reading strategy was simplified by having each student read from whatever book in which he was currently involved. He read a chosen passage repeatedly. The teacher-researcher timed and recorded the speed of each reading so the student was aware of his improvement and could be encouraged by it. For a sample of teacher notes, see Appendix D. Another way the teacher-researcher determined improvement was by having the student reread a passage for one minute durations. As he read, she made marks signifying each word read correctly and noted word recognition errors. Students could easily see their progress in the amount of text read in one minute and in the number of word recognition errors made. For a sample of these teacher notes, see Appendix E. It should be stressed that the marks for each word
read cannot be translated into wpm, as wpm are calculated differently. When figuring wpm, not real words but six letters and/or spaces equate one word. Therefore, the actual correct wpm was not measured at this time. Instruction in phrase “chunking” was also given during these sessions.

Dan, at the beginning of the study, was resolved to finish a book that he had been reading even though it was at his frustration level. Heckleman's Neurological Impress Method (1969), a listening-while-reading strategy, seemed the most expedient method to scaffold his slow, word-by-word reading. He read with a high school assistant in the hallway for the four 20 minute sessions it required to complete the book. It was about that time that Dan informed the teacher of his family's intention to move out of state within two weeks. With this turn of events, it seemed crucial that Dan be successful in reading some picture books he personally owned and would be taking with him. Therefore, the taped books method was used next. His picture books were recorded, and he listened to the recordings twice a day in 20 minute sessions. This was more than the single daily sessions Chomsky (1976) recommends, but the teacher-researcher wanted to increase his reading time as much as possible before his departure. He used repeated taped books until he could read each book fluently. Dan used this method for nine 20-minute sessions.

Data Collection

Several types of data were collected and analyzed during this study. The first data collected were the pre-intervention reading rates of the five target students. Students read three passages—one from a science book
and two from chapter books. These three rates were averaged to determine the students’ baseline reading rates. In addition, the teacher-researcher took one reading from the remainder of the class to determine their baseline rates. Although they were not originally part of the study and did not receive individual intervention, she wanted to determine how their rates would be affected by the whole-class implementation of the methods. Furthermore, these rates were needed to rank the students and assign reading partners.

The next data collected were from the private rereading sessions with the teacher-researcher. When repeated readings of passages were timed, the speeds were recorded, and when repeated one minute timings were used, the amount of text covered during each reading was recorded. These records were merely used to motivate the children and to determine how rereading was affecting fluency. The actual wpm during these sessions was not tabulated and is therefore not part of the final results. See Appendix D and Appendix E for samples of teacher notes.

The last data collected were the post-intervention reading rates of all the students. These rates were obtained by having the entire class read two passages from the same books from which the five target students read to establish baseline data. These were 100-word passages that had not been read at all during the study, so they had not been practiced. They were of the same readability as the passages used to establish baseline rates.

Data collection from the taped books method used with Dan included his reading rate and the number of word recognition errors made before and after rereading each book. Word recognition errors included mispronunciations, substitutions, omissions, insertions, and refusals. They
did not include self-corrections and minor (1-2 second) hesitations. Because he was absent for two days before he moved and because he left two days before he originally planned, there was no time to obtain overall post-intervention rates. Therefore, the data are limited to Dan’s reading rates and miscues for the particular books he practiced reading.

Results

Table 1 contains a comparison of the mean pre-and post-intervention reading rates of Cory, Erin, Nate, and Wade. Their gain in wpm ranged from 8 to 22 words, or 16-42%. Their average gain was 17 wpm, or 30%.

Table 1-- Mean Pre-and Post-Intervention Reading Rates of Target Students Measured in Words Per Minute (WPM).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Intervention</th>
<th>Post-Intervention</th>
<th>Gain in WPM</th>
<th>%Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the 30% increase in reading rate desired by the teacher-researcher was met by two of the students, with another coming quite close. One, however, lagged seriously behind. Moreover, upon analysis of the entire class, 10 of the 21 students made significant changes in reading rate. Their gains ranged from 13 to 40 wpm, or 22-48%. Average gains of this larger group were 25 wpm, or 33%. These scores are listed on Table 2.
Table 2-- Pre-and Post-Intervention Reading Rates of Ten Students Measured in Words Per Minute (WPM).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #</th>
<th>Pre-Intervention</th>
<th>Post-Intervention</th>
<th>Gain in WPM</th>
<th>%Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student #1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #4</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #8</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student #10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the rest of the class, six students made no significant growth, two lowered their rates slightly, and three had less significant growth of 8-15 wpm, or 13-15%.

Comprehension scores were taken before and after the intervention to determine if increased rate would affect comprehension. Results indicate that there was growth in comprehension as well as rate during this four week study. See Table 3 for pre-and post-intervention comprehension rates.
Table 3-- Pre-and Post-Intervention Comprehension Scores as Indicated by the Houghton-Mifflin Reading Test, 1989.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Test Level</th>
<th>Pre-Intervention</th>
<th>Post-Intervention</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>3rd grade</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th grade</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>3rd grade</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th grade</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate</td>
<td>3rd grade</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th grade</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade</td>
<td>3rd grade</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th grade</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As stated previously, Dan was the only student utilizing the taped books method. He showed gains after three readings of each book. See Table 4 for the changes in his speed after three 20-minute taped books sessions with each book.
Table 4— Changes of One Student in Rate and Word Recognition Errors Before and After Three Taped Books Sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture book #1</th>
<th>speed</th>
<th># of errors</th>
<th>Before Taped Books Sessions</th>
<th>After Three 20-Minute Taped Books Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>speed 5:00 minutes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:18 minutes 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture Book #2</td>
<td>speed 6:00 minutes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>2:50 minutes 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture Book #3</td>
<td>speed 9:15 minutes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>7:15 minutes 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, Dan's post-intervention fluency was impeccable for Picture Books #1 and #2. The stress, phrase lengthening, and intonation were highly expressive. He would have benefitted from more time on Picture Book #3 to develop this same level of fluency, but even with just three readings, he made no word recognition errors. There remained 16 slight (1-2 second) hesitations and/or self-corrections, but nothing to be counted as errors. Unfortunately, because Dan moved away before this study was complete, there was no time to determine how this gain in fluency transferred to new texts.
Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate how classroom applications of repeated reading, paired reading, and demonstration affected students' reading rate and comprehension over a four week period. This study was based primarily on Samuels' (1979) work in repeated reading, Greenwood's, et al. (1987) work in peer tutoring, Chomsky's (1976) and Rasinski's (1990) work in listening-while-reading (taped books), Schreiber's (1980, 1991) theories regarding prosody, and Carbo's (1995, 1996) continuum of demonstration methods. It seems that there is very little previous research measuring the impact of these reading strategies under normal classroom conditions. While these researchers studied the methods in controlled, clinical settings, this study placed the methods in a less-controlled, more natural setting of a regular education classroom. Results indicate that when the methods of repeated reading, paired reading, and demonstration are placed within the classroom setting, they continue to have positive effects on reading fluency and comprehension.

The major findings of this study are that a) the combination of repeated reading, paired reading, and demonstration has a positive effect on reading fluency, that b) taped books alone has a positive effect on reading fluency, and that c) instruction in reading fluency appears to have a positive effect on comprehension.

The first finding, that the combination of repeated reading, paired reading, and demonstration has a positive effect on reading fluency, is consistent with previous research in the areas of repeated reading (Dahl, 1974; Dowhower, 1987; Gonzales & Elijah, 1975; Samuels, 1979), peer
tutoring (Dalquadri, et. al., 1986; Greenwood, et al., 1987; Koskinen & Blum, 1986; Mathes, et al., 1994), and demonstration (Daly & Martens, 1994). Rasinski's (1990) study comparing repeated reading and listening-while-reading (taped books) indicated a 25% and 19% increase in reading rate, respectively, over an eight day period. While the present study was four weeks in duration, the study was not as controlled as Rasinski's study. Therefore, the 33% average increase seen in 10 of the 21 students over four weeks, and the 30% average increase seen in the four target students, seems comparable to Rasinski's results. This finding also supports results from Daly and Marten's study (1994) comparing silent passage preview, listening passage preview, and taped words. They found that listening passage preview resulted in the most gains in reading fluency. The teacher-researcher's use of LPP in this study may likewise have been a cause for the increased fluency.

The second finding, that taped books alone has a positive effect on reading fluency, is also consistent with previous research (Chomsky, 1976; Rasinski, 1990). Like Chomsky's third graders who repeatedly read with recordings of picture books and like Rasinski's second graders who used repeated listening-while-reading, Dan, too, improved his reading fluency using this strategy. Furthermore, these results support Carbo's (1995, 1996) theories on the usefulness of this demonstration method.

The third finding, that instruction in fluency appears to have a positive effect on comprehension, is consistent with previous research, as well. The second graders in Dowhower's (1974) study who were instructed in repeated reading increased their comprehension. O'Shea, Sindelar, &
O'Shea (1985) found that whether students were cued to read quickly or cued to remember as much as they could, they all tended to remember more after several readings. Furthermore, the consistency of the subjects' improvement or lack thereof in both fluency and comprehension may indicate a relationship between these two components of reading. Specifically, Nate improved in neither fluency nor comprehension while the others improved in both of these reading components. It is difficult to know if this consistency is a result of a connection between comprehension and fluency or if Nate's dual failure was simply the result of a low-achieving student. Incidentally, Nate was the student recommended for retention.

The results of this study appear even more favorable when compared to rate gain under typical instruction. Typical instruction leads to a weekly rate increase of two wpm (Daly & Martens, 1994). This translates into eight wpm in four weeks. The target students in this study increased their reading rates by 22, 13, 8, and 19 wpm, and the 10 students with significant improvement increased their reading rates by an average of 25 wpm. Therefore, on the average, the students impacted by the interventions improved their rates three times as much as they would have under typical instruction. Nate's rate gain, however, was only eight wpm, what would have been expected under typical instructional conditions.

The limitations of this study leave a number of questions to be answered. Most importantly, the multielement design makes it impossible to determine exactly which factors truly contributed to the improvement in reading rate. Was it the repeated reading of poetry and journal entries? Was it the paired reading? Was it the explicit demonstrations in fluency?
Was it an increased amount of time reading meaningful text? Or could it simply be the new awareness of speed as a criteria for reading success? Further research isolating these factors in a classroom setting is needed to determine which method(s) was the most responsible for these findings.

A second question arises. How much improvement will be seen over a longer period of time? This study was only four weeks, yet nearly half the class made significant gains. Will those gains continue at their current rate over the next four weeks, or was there an immediate gain simply due to an increased awareness of speed which cannot be obtained again over a longer period of time? Will the remainder of the class see better gains over a longer period of time? To find the answers to these questions, the teacher-researcher intends to continue the same methods for the remaining eight weeks of the school year. She will retest after four weeks and then again after eight, comparing the degree of gain in each portion of time.

Third, this study seems to be fairly unique in that it was done under normal classroom conditions rather than in a clinical setting. While this makes the results valuable to a degree, it does not establish statistical evidence of improvement in reading fluency. More measurable research of a similar nature needs to be done to statistically substantiate the findings of this study.

Last, this study was limited to a third grade classroom in a homogeneous socio-economic community. What would be the effects of implementing these strategies into primary and secondary grades or into more heterogeneous socio-economic communities? More research of a similar nature but under these varying conditions should to be undertaken.
to determine the latitude of the success of these interventions.

Student reaction to these methods was highly positive. They thoroughly enjoyed reading their journal entries to friends and then again to the class. In fact, on two occasions when the teacher-researcher forgot to tell the students to quietly read their entries to themselves before reading to a partner, the students quickly reminded her that they had skipped a step. In addition, when asked if they thought reading their work silently and then to a partner helped them read better in front of the class, the consensus was in the affirmative. Students also enjoyed reading the poetry. Favorite poems were heard being chanted and rechanted happily across the room. Students loved peer reading. When it came time for this activity, they took up their books excitedly and eagerly found a corner in which to nestle with their friend. During this activity they were attentive to their task (with only minor incidents of off-task behavior) and were not frustrated with students reading too quickly or too slowly. They enjoyed tutoring one another. These methods also developed positive self-concepts. It was obvious that Dan, in particular, enjoyed a new confidence, as indicated by the broad smile on his face, the quickness of his step, and the proud poise of this head.

From the teacher-researcher’s perspective, using these methods made a lot of sense. She felt that she had a much greater knowledge of individual student performance as a result of daily, anecdotal information and from ranking the entire class based on the number of words they read per minute. As she read with students and listened to their tape-recorded readings, she learned exactly how well each child was reading. She also discovered the expediency of having students read into a tape recorder
rather than read individually with her. At a later time she analyzed the reading. This was a much more efficient way to obtain the desired information than trying to meet with each child personally during the school day. Moreover, students seemed to enjoy the independence of reading alone into the recorder.

From this study come several implications for classroom instruction. First, teachers must give students more opportunities to reread text. Options for this include having students read directions silently before having someone read them aloud, reading poetry again and again, setting up a listening station, or working with individual students during silent sustained reading. Second, teachers must increase the time students are actually reading meaningful text. One way to do this is to set up a system of classwide paired reading. Pairs may be assigned or self-chosen. If they are self-chosen, the teacher should monitor if certain children are being left out. If so, then perhaps she should assign them herself after all. Third, teachers must make demonstration of fluent reading an integral part of reading instruction. This can be done explicitly by identifying the phrases within sentences written on a board or implicitly by making reading aloud a priority of the school day. It can also be done by setting up a listening station containing fluent renditions of books on tape and incorporating listening passage preview into daily lessons. For other suggestions on how to use repeated reading, paired reading, and demonstration in the classroom, see Appendix F, Appendix G, and Appendix H.

Some words of caution are necessary for anyone who might replicate portions of this study. First, when recording books/passages for taped
books, one must not read too fast. The recording must be slow enough so that listeners can actually read the words aloud as they listen. If students are merely listening, their reading may not improve. Students should be monitored for boredom, as well. If they are becoming bored with the repetition, the length or frequency of the sessions should be decreased. Second, each intervention should be monitored for its degree of success. In Erin's case, for example, private repeated reading did not seem to help. Her speed and word recognition errors would haphazardly improve and decline while rereading one passage. Therefore, other interventions—perhaps taped books—will be attempted with her in the future. Third, when assigning pairs for paired reading, care should be taken that everyone is matched with someone with whom they will feel comfortable. Paired reading could be a miserable experience for someone poorly matched and possibly have adverse effects. If these cautions are carefully heeded, the implementations of these methods will be a rewarding experience.

Dissemination of Data

The teacher-researcher intends to disseminate this data in two ways. First, she will speak at Grand Valley State University's Student Scholarship Day in April, 2000. The presentation will focus on the results of her study and implications for classroom instruction. Second, she intends to present her findings at the Michigan Reading Association Conference in March, 2001. This presentation will be a longer version of the former and will include data collected throughout the remainder of the school year, which is after the formal completion of this study.
Conclusion

This study suggests that when repeated reading, paired reading, and demonstration are implemented into a regular educational classroom they have a positive effect on reading fluency. Furthermore, this study demonstrates that these strategies can help create a positive classroom atmosphere and develop healthy self-concepts in students.

This study has been an incredible source of inspiration for the teacher-researcher. As a result of the literature she reviewed and the findings of her own study, she is planning a third grade poetry and readers’ theater night. Not only will this be a delightful way to implement the strategies meaningfully, but it will also be a pleasant way to celebrate reading progress made by the children this year.

One image in particular confirms the importance of fluency instruction. Dan had been reading aloud to the teacher-researcher in the back of the classroom, but after a time she quietly slipped away to monitor the class as they lined up for gym. As the last student left the room, she looked back. There was Dan, alone at the table, intently finishing the book he had been reading aloud. The world was forgotten, and the book was everything. At that moment he was no longer the easily-distracted reader, perusing the bookshelves to avoid actual reading, quickly shutting a book and stuffing it into his desk with the least excuse, known to all as the “nonreader.” Instead, he was the successful student, delighting in the sound of his own voice moving smoothly and swiftly over the words, relishing the ease with which he was accomplishing his task, beginning to claim a new identity. Yes, indeed...fluency must have a central place in reading instruction.
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Books Read by Participants


Norm-Referenced Reading Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*[^n] = number of median scores from percentile tables of districts (maximum possible = 8).
**[^WCPM] = words correct per minute.
***[^SD] = the average standard deviation of scores from fall, winter and spring for each grade level.

Copyright 1992 by Council for Exceptional Children. All rights reserved.
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Figure 1

Curriculum-Based Measurement Procedures for Assessing and Scoring Oral Reading Fluency

Say to the student: "When I say 'start,' begin reading aloud at the top of this page. Read across the page (demonstrate by pointing). Try to read each word. If you come to a word you don't know, I'll tell it to you. Be sure to do your best reading. Are there any questions?"

Say, "Start."

Follow along on your copy of the story, marking the words that are read incorrectly. If a student stops or struggles with a word for 3 seconds, tell the student the word and mark it as incorrect. Place a vertical line after the last word read and thank the student.

The following guidelines determine which words are to be counted as correct:

1. Words read correctly. Words read correctly are those words that are pronounced correctly, given the reading context.
   a. The word "read" must be pronounced "reed" when presented in the context of "He will read the book," not as "red."
   b. Repetitions are not counted as incorrect.
   c. Self-corrections within 3 seconds are counted as correctly read words.

2. Words read incorrectly. The following types of errors are counted: (a) mispronunciations, (b) substitutions, and (c) omissions. Further, words not read within 3 seconds are counted as errors.
   a. Mispronunciations are words that are misread: dog for dig.
   b. Substitutions are words that are substituted for the stimulus word; this is often inferred by a one-to-one correspondence between word orders: dog for cat.
   c. Omissions are words skipped or not read; if a student skips an entire line, each word is counted as an error.

3. 3-second rule. If a student is struggling to pronounce a word or hesitates for 3 seconds, the student is told the word, and it is counted as an error.

Appendix B

Sample of Teacher Notes From a 100 Word Passage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #1</th>
<th>Miscues</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>wpm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓✓✓✓✓✓</td>
<td>1:40</td>
<td>74 wpm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student #2</th>
<th>Miscues</th>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>wpm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓✓</td>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>92 wpm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formula for figuring wpm

\[
\frac{100 - \text{# of miscues}}{\text{Student's time in sec.}} \times \frac{60 \text{sec}}{1 \text{min.}} = \text{wpm}
\]
Peer Reading Observation Sheet

My name: [Johnny]  My peer's name: [Tyler]

Date: 3-17-2000

Read the passage once.

Describe your reading. Use words like choppy, smooth, fast, slow, full of expression, lacks expression, ran sentences together, etc.

Lacks of expression (Choppy)

Now read the same passage again until your reading gets better.

Discuss with your partner how your reading improved. Use words like faster, smoother, better expression, paused at periods, didn't run sentences together, less-choppy, etc.

Faster  Less choppy
Peer Reading Observation Sheet

My name ____________________ My peer's name ____________________

Date ____________________

Read the passage once.

Describe your reading. Use words like choppy, smooth, fast, slow, full of expression, lacks expression, ran sentences together, etc.

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Now read the same passage again until your reading gets better.

Discuss with your partner how your reading improved. Use words like faster, smoother, better expression, paused at periods, didn't run sentences together, less-choppy, etc.

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
Appendix D
Sample of Teacher Notes During the Rereading of a Short Passage

3/10

Title, p. 4, paragraph 2

1st time = 30 sec.

2nd time = 27 sec.

3rd time = 25 sec.

4th time = 21 sec. very fluent.
Appendix E

Sample of Teacher Notes During a One Minute Reading

3/9

1st reading

biggest
ex/sec

English

channel

inky

\( \frac{57}{3} \)

\( \text{squad} \)

\( \text{couldn't} \)

\( \approx 55 \text{ words} \)

2nd reading

midnight

In-2

channel

inky

\( \text{bud-2} \)

buddies

\( \approx 71 \text{ words} \)

3rd reading

midnight

could/se

\( \text{couldn't} \)

buddies

Infantry

\( \approx 85 \text{ words} \)

Key:
- tallies = words read correctly
- words = miscues
- sc = self-correct
- o = omitted word
Appendix F

Classroom Applications of Repeated Reading

Taped Books

Older students record short books for younger students to read. Before recording, students practice reading the book a few times to attain the desired level of fluency (Rasinski, 1988).

Classwide Repeated Reading

This variation of repeated reading allows all students to be engaged in the activity simultaneously. Students are assigned a reading partner, with whom they take turns reading and listening. While the first student reads the same passage three times, the other follows along in the text. Together they analyze the reading, commenting on what is good about it and what could be improved. When one reader has achieved the desired level of fluency, students reverse roles (Koskinen & Blum, 1986). This strategy can be used with basal or literature-based reading programs.

Silent Reading Before Reading Aloud to the Class

Before reading aloud to the class, students are read the passage to themselves or to a partner first. Studies show improvement in fluency between first and second readings of text (Dahl, 1974; Rasinski, 1990). This is highly beneficial to student performance as well as to self-concept.
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Cross-age Tutoring

Older students who are low-level readers read with younger students. This gives them practice reading materials at their independent reading level. Also, as they help the younger child read, they become more aware of reading cues that they themselves need to watch more closely (Rasinski, 1988).

Reader's Theatre and Plays

Students rehearse and perform for an audience. This is a practical, meaningful, and fun use of repeated reading (Clark, 1995; Kelly, 1995; Martinez, Roser, & Strecker, 1999; Rasinski, 1989).

Games

Students play games that require students to read short texts. For example, in Monopoly, players draw cards they must read (Rasinski, 1988).

Songs

Children sing songs pertaining to the curriculum, seasons, or holidays. They happily sing their favorites again and again (Rasinski, 1988).
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**Shared Book Experience**

Big books are reread chorally or individually. When everyone is exposed to the same book at the same time, individual children’s enthusiasm spreads throughout the group, thus heightening other’s interest in the topic and in reading in general (Rasinski, 1988).

**Storytelling**

Children practice reading a story until they can retell it in their own words to an audience. Naturally, many rereadings are required to be successful storytellers (Rasinski, 1988).

**Poetry Reading**

Durham (1997), Perfect (1999), and Rasinski (1988) all suggest that poetry begs to be repeated, thus giving children the practice they need to become fluent. Individual pages of poetry are passed out, read silently while all students are receiving their copies, read together, and kept in student folders for frequent rereadings. Students may also memorize poetry and perform it for peers, other classes, or parents at a “Poetry and Drama” night. The poems are enjoyed again and again, read by partners, in groups, or chorally as a class.
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**Echo Reading**

The teacher reads a sentence or two, modelling fluent reading. The class or a small group then chorally reads the same words, copying her intonation, stress, and expression, thereby developing more prosodic reading (Anderson, 1981; Chomsky, 1995, 1996; Kelly, 1995).

**Reading Directions Silently Before They are Read Aloud**

As papers are passed out, students silently read through directions before another student or the teacher reads them aloud. Not only does this provide students with rereading opportunities, but it also teaches them to be self-reliant learners. When given the chance to comprehend what they are to do before someone tells them, students learn that they don't always need someone else to interpret information for them.
Appendix G

Classroom Applications of Paired Reading

Paired Reading During Reading Instruction

After large-group reading instruction, students read with partners at a self-chosen place in the room. As pairs read, the teacher moves from student to student taking notes on reading performance. Taking notes impresses upon the students the value of this activity, which results in more on-task behavior, and it also enables the teacher to obtain the information needed to make further instructional decisions. Because pairs will finish reading at different times, follow-up activities must be explained prior to the reading.

Paired Reading Across the Curriculum

Students read short mathematics texts and passages in science and social studies with a partner before they are read aloud by a competent reader.

Paired Reading of Directions

With a partner, students read directions to assignments and then put the directions into their own words with their partner before someone is called upon to read aloud.
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Classroom Applications of Demonstration

The following strategies are listed in order from High Teacher Involvement/Low Student Independence to Low Teacher Involvement/High Student Independence. While some methods, for obvious reasons, should be implemented as good general practices, others should be implemented based on the needs of individual students. Students ought be placed in the most independent situation possible (Carbo, 1995, 1996).

**Reading Aloud**

Fiction, non-fiction, biographies, poetry, rhymes, and a wide variety of other types of literature are read aloud to the entire class. When selecting materials, it is important to keep in mind that students' listening vocabularies are greater than their reading vocabulary and that listening leads to further acquisition of word knowledge (Carbo, 1995, 1996).

**Shared Reading**

Big books, paragraphs composed by the students, or poems on an overhead or chart paper are read together as a class. Students follow or read along as the teacher reads aloud and points to the words. It is important in shared reading that everyone read from the same text and that it be an enjoyable and relaxing experience (Carbo, 1995, 1996).
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Explicit Teaching of Phrasing

Discussion about “chunking” words into phrases, stressing individual words, and using proper voice intonation is based on a sentence or two written where all students can see it. Volunteers take turns reading the sentence aloud to the class in an attempt to read it fluently. This activity should have a playful air and be fast-paced.

Neurological Impress Method

Students with their fluent tutors read in quiet corners about the room, in the hallway, or in other locations during sustained silent reading time. This method is easily implemented using parent or high school volunteers (Heckleman, 1969).

Recorded Books

Students’ own picture books are recorded and practiced before they are read to younger siblings at home, younger students in the school, or preschoolers of parent volunteers. Passages from chapter books being read in class are recorded and practiced during part or all of the sustained silent reading time. Books pertaining to classroom themes can be recorded and placed in a listening station through which students rotate during science or social studies activities (Chomsky, 1976).
Echo Reading

When reading a poem, science book, piece of literature, or other text, the teacher reads a phrase, sentence, or short passage, modelling good phrasing and expression. Students repeat, copying the phrasing and expression (Carbo, 1995, 1996; Kelly, 1995).

Choral Reading

Students and teacher read text simultaneously with no repetition. No prior modelling is given. This can be done with poems, literature, and reading materials across the curriculum (Carbo, 1995, 1996; Kelly, 1995).

Paired Reading

Students read in assigned or self-chosen pairs during instruction in reading, poetry reading, or content area reading (Delquadri, et al., 1986; Koskinen & Blum, 1986).
April 19, 2000

Stephanie Anna Gerdes
514 Crescent St. NE
Grand Rapids, MI 49503

Dear Stephanie:

Your proposed project entitled Using Repeated Reading, Paired Reading, and Demonstration to Increase Fluency in Regular Education Students has been reviewed. It has been approved as a study which is exempt from the regulations by section 46.101 of the Federal Register 46(16):8336, January 26, 1981.

Sincerely,

[Name Redacted]
Paul A. Huizenga, Chair
Human Research Review Committee
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Permission to Conduct the Study

March 3, 2000

Dear Mr. Vermuelen,

I am currently taking a course at Grand Valley State University in which I am studying research-based strategies shown to improve reading fluency. Although I am implementing most of the strategies (paired reading, modelling, and rereading) with the whole class, I would like to focus on five children individually until March 31 and document the effectiveness of these methods. In working with the children, I will:

a) have them reread passages privately with me.
b) have them read along with a taped recording of chapters from our literature books.

These strategies are for the purpose of improving fluency— that is, speed, expression, phrasing, and intonation. It is hoped that comprehension, typically a by-product of improved fluency, will improve as well.

This information will assist me in planning my reading lessons, as it will measure the effectiveness of using these methods with my students. If you like, I would be happy to share with you what I learn from the completed study.

If you have any questions about the students’ rights in this study, you may contact the Chair of Grand Valley’s Human Research Review Committee, Paul Huizenga, at 616-895-2472.

Thank-you! Have a great day!

Sincerely,

Miss Stephanie Gerdes

I give my permission for this study on reading fluency to proceed as described above.

Signed  Date 3/15/00
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Permission to Conduct the Study

March 3, 2000

Dear Parents,

I am currently taking a course at Grand Valley State University in which I am studying research-based strategies shown to improve reading fluency. Although I am implementing most of the strategies (paired reading, modelling, and rereading) with the whole class, I would like to focus on five children individually until March 31 and document the effectiveness of these methods. In working with your child, I will:

a) have your child reread passages privately with me.
b) have your child read along with a taped recording of chapters from our literature books.

Both of these strategies are for the purpose of improving fluency—that is, speed, expression, phrasing, and intonation. Better comprehension, by the way, is typically a by-product of improved fluency.

This information will assist me in knowing what methods are helpful for improving the reading fluency of your child and others. I will share with you what I learn and make some recommendations about methods you might like to try at home. Don’t worry—they are painless! They are also simple and highly motivating, as students really can see their improvement!

Participation in this research is voluntary. If you are willing for your child to participate, I would greatly appreciate it, and your child cannot help but benefit from the individual attention. Please sign and return this letter to me. No information passed on to others will identify your child. If you have any questions about your rights, you may contact the Chair of Grand Valley’s Human Research Review Committee, Paul Huizenga, at 616-895-2472.

Thank-you! Have a great day!

Sincerely,

Miss Gerdes

I give permission for my child, ________________________________, to participate in this study.

Signed ________________________________ Date ____________________________
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Copyright Permission

April 17, 2000
Dear Jane,

I am currently enrolled in the Grand Valley State University (GVSU), Advanced Studies in Education Program, and I am writing a thesis for the completion of my Masters' Degree in Education. My thesis is titled "Using Repeated Reading, Paired Reading, and Demonstration to Develop Fluency in Regular Education Classrooms." May I receive permission to include in the appendices a copy of the following item?


More specifically, I wish to use the chart on curriculum-based norms in oral reading fluency on page 42 as well as Figure 1, procedures for assessing and scoring oral reading fluency, as found on page 43.

The inclusion of your copyrighted material will not restrict your re-publication of the material in any other form. Please advise if you wish a specific copyright notice to be included on each page. My thesis will be cataloged in the GVSU library and will be available to other students and colleges for circulation.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Anna Gerdes

Dear Stephanie,

Permission is granted. Please be sure to give full credit to The Council for Exceptional Children.

Best wishes,

Jane Uffelman
Copyright Administrator
NAME: Stephanie Anna Gerdes       MAJOR: Reading/Language Arts

TITLE: The Effects of Repeated Reading, Paired Reading, and Demonstration on Reading Fluency

PAPER TYPE: Thesis       SEM/YR COMPLETED: Spring, 2000

SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE OF APPROVAL:

________________________________________

ERIC DESCRIPTORS:
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READING RATE          PARTNER READING      ECHO READING
READING SPEED         PEER TUTORING        CHORAL READING
REPEATED READING      DEMONSTRATION

CLASSWIDE PEER TUTORING

ABSTRACT: This study evaluates the impact of repeated reading, paired reading, and demonstration on the reading fluency of regular education students. Results suggest that integrating these strategies into the context of the regular education curriculum has a positive effect on students' reading fluency and comprehension. Practical suggestions for integrating these methods into classroom activities are provided.