

Northwestern College, Iowa

NWCommons

Master's Theses & Capstone Projects

Education

Fall 2021

Effective Reading Strategies to Increase Reading Fluency

Jessica DeWaard

Follow this and additional works at: https://nwcommons.nwciowa.edu/education_masters

 Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Effective Reading Strategies to Increase Reading Fluency

Jessica DeWaard

Northwestern College

December 2021

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	3
Introduction.....	4
Literature Review.....	6
What is Fluency?	6
Repeated Reading.....	8
Reader’s Theatre	12
Text Complexity	15
Phonics	17
Group Conditions	19
Future Research	21
Conclusion.....	22
References.....	24

Abstract

Research states that a student's reading fluency has a direct correlation to their reading comprehension. This literature review investigates the most effective reading strategies that increase a student's reading fluency rate. The research explores strategies such as repeated reading, Readers Theatre, text complexity, phonics instruction, and intervention group conditions. This literature review will contain peer reviewed, scholarly journals to research the most effective reading strategies to increase student's reading fluency rate. The results of the various studies utilized within this paper indicate repeated reading that incorporates scaffolded repetitive readings of a text have been highly successful.

Key words: repeated reading, fluency, Readers Theatre, reading strategies

Strategies to Increase Reading Fluency

Although many important components and processes exist in learning to read, research places reading fluency at the foundation of proficient reading (Young et al., 2015). According to automaticity theory (LaBerge & Samuels, 1974), in order for students to become proficient in reading comprehension, they must work toward automatic (fluent) word recognition.

Recognizing words automatically and effortlessly allows readers to focus on higher-order processes such as comprehension. Struggling readers are often disfluent (Rasinski & Padak, 1998); their reading is characterized by slow, labored, word-by-word reading that does not sound like normal spoken discourse. Such disfluency often requires specific, research-based corrective action and procedures. In this literature review, a variety of research based fluency interventions will be synthesized and analyzed in order to determine the efficiency and the effect on a reader's fluency.

According to the International Literacy Association (2018), fluency is defined as, “reasonably accurate reading, at an appropriate rate, with suitable expression, that leads to accurate and deep comprehension and motivation to read”. Unfortunately, reading fluently is a skill many students struggle with. According to the Nation's Report Card from 2019, of all the fourth grade students in Iowa, only 35% were at or above the national benchmark (Deeter, 2019). This report indicates a large discrepancy between where students need to be in order to be fluent readers and their current abilities. Due to the vast amount of information available, it is essential that the founded research is synthesized and analyzed to determine key points and significant findings.

As an elementary education teacher, the researcher instructs emergent readers on a daily basis. Because it is often the job of the regular education teacher to provide more intensive

instruction for students with academic difficulties (Ross & Begeny, 2014), this literature review will look into these strategies and determine which are the most effective in increasing reading fluency. Within this literature review, the information found and used comes from peer-reviewed articles retrieved from the DeWitt Library at Northwestern College. The selection process for these articles was minimized to contain only articles published in the last ten years. If the authors were considered experts in the field of reading and fluency, the publication date was disregarded. The researcher will use the findings from this literature review to influence instruction and the teaching of reading fluency.

Some of the strategies that will be addressed and researched in this literature review are as follows: repeated reading, previewing text, preteaching key words in text, the use of rhyming poetry, modeling and scaffolding instruction, choral reading, and Reader's Theatre. The goal of the literature review is to collect and analyze a variety of reading strategies to increase student fluency.

Literature Review

What is Fluency?

Fluency is one component of the reading process. “Fluency combines accuracy, automaticity, and oral reading prosody, which, taken together, facilitate the reader’s construction of meaning. It is demonstrated during oral reading through ease of word recognition, appropriate pacing, phrasing, and intonation. It is a factor in both oral and silent reading that can limit or support comprehension” (Kuhn et al., 2010). In short, fluency is one of the stepping stones to being able to make sense of what is being read. According to Guerin & Murphy (2015), “Strategic fluency describes an increased level of ability whereby the reader moves beyond surface fluency to attend to meaning while reading” (p. 551). Without fluency, emerging readers would be unable to create meaning and therefore understand the texts and information they are reading.

Fluency consists of three main components: automaticity, prosody, and accuracy. According to Kuhn et al. (2010), “Automatic word recognition is central to the construct of fluency and fluency’s role in the comprehension of text” (p. 231). But what does it mean for a reader to be automatic in word recognition? Processes are considered to be automatic when they possess four properties: speed, effortlessness, autonomy, and lack of conscious awareness. As a student becomes more automatic at reading and recognizing words, their speed will increase along with it. The faster the speed, the more automatic the skill is. Effortlessness refers to “the sense of ease with which a task is performed and to the ability to carry out a second task while carrying out the first, automatic one” (Kuhn et al., 2010). If able to complete two tasks at once, one of the tasks is, by necessity, automatic. An example of this process in reading is the decoding

of words while simultaneously making sense of (comprehending) the content. If the decoding of words is not automatic, students are unable to make meaning of the text in front of them.

Along with speed and effortlessness, automaticity requires autonomy (Kuhn et al., 2010). In reading, this refers to a learner's ability to recognize words as they encounter them, whereas a disfluent reader is either unable to process the text at all or may find all of their cognitive resources preoccupied by it. The final characteristic of automaticity is a lack of conscious awareness. Disfluent readers tend to be intensely aware of the steps they need to take in order to decode the words in a text. When the skill becomes automatic, they are able to decode words without conscious effort.

The second component of fluency is the ability to read with prosody, or with appropriate expression or intonation, paired with phrasing that allows for the creation of meaning (Kuhn et al., 2010). When beginning readers read texts, they often do so in a flat, word-by-word manner that sounds more robotic than human. Prosody consists of the rise and falls of pitch, rhythm, and stress—the pausing, lengthening, and omissions surrounding certain words and phrases that are found in linguistic communication. “Prosody is the term used to describe how fluent readers use pitch, stress, and intonation to communicate the meaning of what is being read” (Guerin & Murphy, 2015). In other words, the pitch, duration, stress, and pauses used during reading help the reader or listener create meaning and understand what is being conveyed. Without prosody, students are merely decoding words, rather than comprehending.

The final component of fluency is accuracy. Accuracy refers to whether or not the words are being read correctly, and what percentage of words are being read correctly in relation to the rate at which they are being read. For example, if a student reads the word *dog* as /b/og, the student has read it incorrectly and therefore inaccurately. When all of these components

(automaticity, prosody, accuracy) are done correctly, emergent readers are able to read fluently and are then able to comprehend.

Repeated Readings

Repeated readings (RR) occurred the most frequently and were the most commonly used research strategy implemented throughout this literature review. This practice involves the repeated reading of the same passage of text until a degree of fluency is attained (Strickland et al., 2020). The repeated exposure to the words and word patterns allows students to store the information in their memory to use for other texts. In order to create fluent readers, they must have plenty of practice with words and word patterns. This approach is called repeated reading where the focus is to directly improve students' decoding fluency (Zavala & Cuevas, 2019). It was first used by S. Jay Samuels in 1979 with learning disabled beginning readers.

According to a quantitative study done by Guerin & Murphy (2015), repeated reading is also recognized as an instructional method for struggling adolescent readers. These researchers studied three sophomore aged students who had been identified as struggling readers. The three students participated in small group interventions over the course of one school year. Within their small group settings, they read chapters from a chosen story. They then read the same section of the book until fluency was attained. The repeated reading intervention resulted in an increase in fluency for two of the three students. The progress of each student was monitored through tracking the number of words read correctly in one minute. By the end of this study, two students had increased their words correct per minute (41 WCPM to 64 WCPM & 103 WCPM to 111 WCPM), however the third student decreased by over twenty words (94 WCPM to 70 WCPM). According to researchers this could be explained by the student's increase in accuracy (Guerin &

Murphy, 2015). Based on these results, the intervention was successful in increasing reading fluency.

In an analysis of previous studies, researchers Lee & Yoon (2017) studied the effects of repeated reading (RR) on reading fluency for students with reading disabilities. Within this study, a number of intervention strategies were analyzed. One method in particular is known as systematic error correction (SEC). This is a procedure in which the interventionist or instructor delivers post-reading corrections for each of the reader's reading errors. This method is often paired with repeated reading. According to the findings of Lee & Yoon, "there was no significant difference between the conditions of RR with and without SEC" (2017, p. 217). However, considering that all the studies Lee & Yoon analyzed were not conducted under the same conditions, the estimated overall average effect size for the RR effects was 1.41 with a 95% confidence interval between 0.99 and 1.41, which is a relatively large effect. This indicates that, after the RR intervention, on average, the post-WCPM of a student with a reading disability (RD) was about 1.41 standard deviations higher than the pre-WCPM before the intervention (Lee & Yoon, 2017).

The findings of Lee & Yoon contradict those from a 2020 study done by Strickland et al. Strickland et al. studied the use of repeated reading with systematic error correction for elementary students with mild intellectual disability and other comorbid disorders. Researchers implemented the repeated reading intervention with three elementary aged students. Over the course of seven weeks, the students received a daily intervention that consisted of repeatedly reading passages and following up with the SEC procedure. The students' baseline words correct per minute (WCPM) were as follows: Student A- 35 WCPM; Student B - 22 WCPM; & Student C - 47 WCPM. By the end of the seven weeks the students ended with a mean of 50.5 WCPM,

54 WCPM, and 61.7 WCPM, indicating a significant increase for all three participants (Strickland et al., 2020). However, researchers indicated future research is needed to study a larger pool of participants in order to further support or contradict their findings. I like this last sentence

In a study done by Sukhram & Monda-Amaya (2017), oral repeated reading (ORR) was studied with and without corrective feedback (CF). Corrective feedback techniques are often used with repeated reading to guide students away from practicing incorrect strategies as they read (Sukhram & Monday-Amaya, 2017). The purpose of the study was to determine the effectiveness of both methods (ORR & CF) on the fluency and comprehension of middle school struggling readers. The results indicated that the ORR group reading fluency scores increased by a total of 27.6 WCPM and the CF group increased by a total of 29.7 WCPM. Overall, no between-group differences in fluency were found over time. This indicates there is not a large enough difference between the groups for it to be considered statistically significant. The results from this study further solidify the analyses of Lee & Yoon but fail to support the findings of Strickland et al.

One form of repeated reading is known as the Fluency Development Lesson (FDL). This approach consists of various steps completed in one day to increase reading fluency. Students discuss the text, read chorally, read in small groups, and eventually read in front of an “audience”. In one study that took place over the course of twelve weeks, six elementary aged students made a gain of one year and one month in overall reading achievement and made nearly double the gain in word recognition automaticity that would normally be expected (27.6 words correct per minute versus an expected gain of 14) (Rasinski, 2017).

The effectiveness of the repeated reading intervention was further solidified in a 2015 study done by Erickson et al. This research utilized the reading program known as Read Naturally®. The Read Naturally® program consists of three comprehensive strategies: reading along with a fluent model, individual repeated readings of the same passage at the student's reading level, and progress monitoring the students' improvement. Three elementary aged students received 30 minutes of the Read Naturally® intervention everyday for six weeks. By the end of the intervention, all students had increased significantly in their WCPM for their second read. The increase averaged about 30 to 40 words for all three participants (Erickson et al., 2015).

The following year, Morgan et al. (2016) duplicated the Erickson et al. study with two third-grade students. The students in this study followed the Read Naturally® program for six weeks. By the end of this intervention both students saw a significant increase in their WCPM. For participant one, they began with a baseline mean score of 31.8 WCPM. By the end of the program, their WCPM mean increased to 63 WCPM. For participant 2, their baseline data was a mean of 18.3 and they ended with a mean score of 44 WCPM (Morgan et al., 2016). The findings from this study supports those of Morgan et al. (2016), Rasinski (2017), and Guerin & Murphy (2015).

Another method that utilizes repeated reading is referred to as Read to Impress (R2I). This method combines repeated reading with a strategy called Neurological-Impress Method (NIM). This is a method in which a tutor sits next to the reader and reads slightly ahead of them with appropriate expression, as the reader begins to "catch up" to the tutor, they will then increase their speed. The goal of this strategy is to help students read with correct prosody. The R2I method was utilized on one student who was reading fluently but in a monotone voice. After

receiving consistent repeated reading interventions for eight weeks, he increased his reading level by six levels (18 to 24) (Young et al., 2016). The impact of the new addition of R2I was “immediately apparent” as the student began to read more rapidly and with greater expression (Young et al., 2016).

One study done by Zavala & Cuevas (2019), tested the effects of repeated reading and rhyming poetry on reading fluency. Fourteen first-grade students were placed into two groups. Both groups read the same poems, however, one group was informed of the word family within the poem, and the other was not. The group then worked on activities to explore the word family further. The students who were working solely on repeated reading simply reread the poem three times. At the end of the week, both groups were asked to read a list of words that contained that word family.

After four weeks of intervention, both groups saw an increase in oral fluency. The rhyming group started with a mean score of 30 WCPM and ended with a mean score of 43.3. The repeated reading group started with a mean score of 46.6 WCPM and ended with a mean score of 57.8 WCPM (Zavala & Cuevas, 2019). The difference between groups was not large enough for the results to be statistically significant. Because there were only fourteen students involved in this study, more research is needed to determine the effectiveness of each strategy.

Readers Theatre

Many instructional procedures have emerged from the basic repeated reading form. One of those instructional procedures is known as Readers Theatre. This strategy utilizes repeated reading while incorporating practice in intonation and phrasing (Mraz et al., 2013). Using the Readers Theatre technique, the student repeatedly reads short, meaningful passages until reaching a high level of fluency. According to Mraz et al. (2013), “when implementing Readers

Theatre into the classroom, it is imperative the selected text is appropriate for the reader and that is well within their easy or slightly challenging range” (p.170).

In 2009, Young & Rasinski implemented the Readers Theatre program in a second grade classroom. The study was conducted over the course of one school year. The process consisted of a weekly cycle that repeated itself each week. On the first day, the whole class was introduced to that week’s story. Students discussed new vocabulary and participated in discussions about the text. They then followed along in their own copy as the teacher read aloud, modelling expressive reading and fluency.

On the second day, the students participated in echo reading. The teacher would read one section of the text aloud, and the students would read that same section aloud, chorally. This back and forth continued until the entire text was completed. Day three was designated for partner/paired reading. Students worked with a partner to read the entire text, alternating between sections. On the fourth day, students practiced reading their own section/role with expression and the correct intonation. The fifth and final day was designated for the performance of the text. In this particular study, students performed their Readers Theatre in front of another second grade class.

From the fall to the spring of their school year, the class average nearly doubled in WCPM. The class started with an average of 62.7 WCPM, this reading rate puts the average performance between the 50th and 75th percentiles for second grade readers.. By the end of the school year the average student reading rate was at 127.6 WCPM (an increase of nearly 65 words). This reading rate places students between the 75th and 90th percentiles (Young & Rasinski, 2009). According to Young & Rasinski (2009), “The students in this second grade class made gains in fluency that were substantially greater than what would normally have been

expected of second grade students” (p. 11). In this case, Readers Theatre had a profound positive effect on all readers and gave an opportunity for struggling readers to read confidently in front of peers.

In a 2013 study done by Mraz et al., the effectiveness of Readers Theatre was further confirmed with struggling readers in third grade. Over the course of six weeks, students participated in Readers Theatre each day for 30 minutes. After six weeks of following the same cycle used in the Young & Rasinski (2009) study, the students’ word recognition accuracy was assessed. Post-test results indicated that students’ word recognition accuracy improved dramatically (Mraz et al., 2013). Seventeen WCPM is the approximate gain to be expected for an entire year (Rasinski, 1999). All of the participants in this study scored above this benchmark with twenty-one WCPM being the smallest increase of all students. The highest increase, 64 WCPM, was 47 words above the predicted yearly gain. The class as a whole went from a class average of 55 WCPM to 93 WCPM (Mraz et al., 2013).

The findings of Mraz et al. were confirmed in a 2018 study conducted by Young & Rasinski. This study was completed over the course of two years with the first year being used as the control group. Both groups participated in a 90 minute literacy block with the only difference being 15 minutes of book box reading the first year and 15 minutes of Readers Theatre the second year. All other literacy components were the same.

The students participated in the same five-day cycle used in the Rasinski & Young 2009 study. After the students received this instruction for the entirety of the school year, their WCPM was assessed. According to the findings, the pretest to posttest increase was statistically significant. Prior to the intervention, the class average for WCPM was 62.72. By the end of the school year the class average was 127.55 WCPM. The control group began with an average of

70.32 WCPM and ended with an average of 99.36 WCPM. Although both groups saw an increase in words read correctly, effect sizes favored the experimental group indicating this group made greater progress than the comparison group (Young & Rasinski, 2018).

Text Complexity

Text difficulty was used in a study done by Stahl & Heubach (2005). In this study, first and second grade students were expected to read harder texts that produced lower oral reading accuracy levels than the typical 95% accuracy. Students were exposed to the text in a variety of ways including: listening to the teacher read it aloud, rereading the text in multiple formats, partner reading the text, and bringing the text home to read. With this level of support, students made progress in reading, making an average of 1.88 and 1.77 levels of growth in the two years the program was implemented (Stahl & Heubach, 2005).

According to Stahl & Heubach (2005), “Students were able to benefit from reading material at these lower levels of accuracy because of the higher levels of support they were given [through] the program” (p. 55). The findings from this study indicated students may increase in reading level from more difficult text, as long as support is provided.

The findings of Stahl & Heubach (2005) were supported in a 2009 study by Jones et al. Jones et al. implemented an experimental analysis of reading fluency. Over the course of 25 weeks, six elementary-age students with reading difficulties participated in a series of interventions. These interventions included an incentive strategy in which students set goals and received contingent rewards based on performance, repeated reading, Phrase Drill, and easier material. The easier material had a readability level that was one grade lower than the child’s actual grade placement. Students received each intervention for a set period of time before

moving on to the next. Data was collected at the end of each intervention to determine the effect on the children's CWPM.

After receiving the intervention using easier material, every students' CWPM decreased, with the smallest decrease being 12 words and the largest decrease being nearly 50 words (Jones et al., 2009). Researchers suggest this may be in part because the students were practicing reading at a lower level, but were then being assessed using grade level text. This supports Stahl & Heubach's (2005) findings that more difficult text has a positive effect on students' reading rather than easier text.

Stahl & Heubach's research results were contradicted in 2018 when Amendum et al. formulated a research synthesis of text difficulty and elementary students' reading fluency. After an extensive selection process, the authors chose 26 articles to synthesize and review. All studies selected included participants who were elementary-aged. The grade levels of these participants ranged from first through sixth grade. Fifteen studies examined rate as an outcome. Collectively, 73.33% (11) of the studies demonstrated, on average, that as text difficulty levels increased, students' reading rates decreased (Amendum et al., 2018). For example, students reading texts with higher levels of difficulty and fewer word recognition read significantly fewer words correct per minute.

In another study, second-grade students had improved reading rates when reading easier texts. The complexity of the text is defined as those with greater percentages of high-frequency words and/or a greater percentage of decodable words. However, four studies found no relationship between the level of text complexity and students' reading rates (Amendum et al., 2018). Based on the results from each of these studies, the effects of text complexity on reading fluency is still unclear.

Phonics

There were a number of studies that monitored the use of phonics interventions and their effects on reading fluency. In 2009, Jasmine & Schiesl utilized a word wall and word wall activities with twenty first-grade students. Over the course of four weeks, students participated in one 40-minute word wall station a week and a 20-minute whole class activity three times a week. The words used in these activities were high frequency words. Prior to the intervention, the average number of WCPM was 41.4. After four weeks of word wall instruction and activities, the mean number of WCPM was 63.7 indicating an increase of over 20 words per minute.

Pre and post-running records did indicate growth. Word wall activities might have been a factor that helped to build and strengthen high-frequency word vocabulary resulting in the increase of words read per minute. Jasmine & Schiesl (2009) state, “Results of this study suggest that word walls and word wall activities might be one strategy to help increase reading fluency” (p. 311).

In 2012, a different phonics approach was researched when Murray et al. utilized the *Road to Reading* program. This program focuses on teaching types of syllables and emphasizes letter sounds and irregularities. According to Murray et al. (2012), “Teaching the six syllable patterns in the English language provides a highly efficient way for students to decode approximately 86% of the words they encounter (p. 147). In this particular study, the program was used with one second grade student named Devan. The intervention occurred over the course of six months. Within that time, Devan was taught a variety of syllable patterns. Lessons were taught at each level until 80% mastery was reached before moving on to the next level.

Among seeing an increase in letter-sound correspondences, word recognition, and decoding, Devan also significantly increased in fluency. At the start of the intervention, Devan

was correctly reading 21 words per minute. By the end of the six month time period, Devan's WCPM had increased to 59. He averaged a gain of nearly 3 words (2.9) per minute each week. Prior to receiving the *Road to Reading* intervention, Devan was increasing by less than one (0.6) words per minute (Murray et al., 2012). This evidence indicates the program had a significant positive impact on reading fluency.

In 2019, Kjeldsen et al. released their findings from a ten year study that included 209 students from Finland. Half of these students participated in an 8-month phonological intervention in kindergarten. Over the course of their schooling, they were assessed on various skills and the results were compared. In kindergarten, the students were assessed on their phonological awareness. Prior to the intervention, the control group scored an average of 14.91 and the intervention group scored an average of 13.87 on the multiple-group path model. After receiving the intervention for 8 months, the control group scored an average of 26.41. The intervention group scored an average of 44.31 on the multiple-group path model.

In first grade, the students were assessed on their word decoding skills. The control group averaged 2.55 words read correctly. The intervention group averaged 5.23 words read correctly. By third grade, the control group accurately decoded an average of 23.50 words with the intervention group accurately decoding 30.64 words. According to Kjeldsen et al. (2019), "The intervention group outperformed the control group in both word reading and reading comprehension in grades one through nine" (p.378). This indicates early phonological intervention can have a significant impact on a student's long term ability to read and decode words. The results from this study confirm those of Murray et al. (2012).

Also in 2019, Toste et al. investigated the efficacy of a multisyllabic word reading intervention for struggling readers. In this intervention, students received small group instruction

that contained multisyllabic word reading activities. These activities included learning high frequency affixes, assembling or blending word parts, breaking or segmenting words into parts, encoding multisyllabic words, and reading text that contained multisyllabic words.

After receiving this intervention for ten weeks, the intervention group and the control group were administered posttests to determine the amount of growth. When tested on the *Big Word Reading Test*, the control group started with 62.81% mastery and ended with 66.89% mastery. The intervention group started with a score of 67.00% mastery and ended with a score of 80.29% mastery with the goal being 80% (Toste et al., 2019). These results indicate the intervention students significantly outperformed the control group. The results from this study also support the 2012 findings of Murray et al. as well as Kjeldsen et al. (2019).

Group Conditions

Starr et al. (2012) examined the effect of overall treatment duration among 38 kindergarten students. During each intervention, the students were administered the Early Reading Intervention curriculum (ERI). This is a scripted supplemental reading intervention program with a high emphasis on skills that are necessary for developing phonological awareness (Starr et al., 2012). The intervention was scheduled to last 30 minutes about three times a week. However, some students received more sessions per week than others based on their level of need.

The range of treatment duration was between 6.85 hr and 13.70 hr of instruction. Following the intervention, there were no significant differences in student outcome based on the number of intervention hours received (Starr et al., 2012).

In 2015, Ross & Begeny found different results on the effects of treatment duration. They examined the treatment intensity of an oral reading fluency intervention. The question being

answered was whether or not intervention duration and student-teacher instructional ratios impact the effectiveness of the intervention. To test this theory, Ross & Begeny (2015) created four different intervention scenarios. There were two small group interventions with one being longer (12-15 minutes) and one being shorter (6-8 minutes). The other two scenarios were both one-on-one interventions but one was a longer session (12-15 minutes) and one was shorter (6-8 minutes).

Each of the four interventions contained the same procedures and strategies: teacher modeling, repeated reading, student oral retell, student practice of misread words (phrase-drill), and a reward system to encourage desired behavior and effort. After running these interventions for approximately eight weeks, the students were assessed on their WCPM. The small group longer (SG-L) intervention had a mean score of 41.6 WCPM. The small group shorter (SG-S) intervention had a mean score of 33.0 WCPM. The one-on-one longer (1:1 L) intervention had a mean score of 40.2 WCPM, and the one-on-one shorter (1:1 S) had a mean score of 32.4 WCPM (Ross & Begeny, 2015). This indicates the longer intervention time has a greater effect on fluency than the size of the group. However, all four interventions indicated growth in the area of fluency.

Future Research

While researching for this literature review, there were some areas that were more difficult to find than others. In particular, there was not extensive research on the effects of these interventions on students who are not considered struggling readers. According to Ross & Begeny (2015), “Future studies should examine treatment intensity as it relates to students at varying levels of educational need. The students in [the] study were identified as having reading needs, but there were many students who needed targeted reading support who were not represented due to its small size” (p. 28).

The issue of sample size is one that presented itself fairly often in the research used for this literature review. Many of the studies included only a handful of students rather than a larger pool. Future research should test the effectiveness of the interventions on more students to increase the validity of the results. Zavala & Cuevas (2019) also suggested using a larger sample size in order to allow enough data to be collected on the effects of repeated reading to try to find statistically significant gains.

Another area in need of future research is the length of time the intervention should be implemented. The studies used in this literature review ranged from a few weeks to multiple years. Future research should look specifically at how long an intervention needs to be implemented in order to increase the likelihood of success. More specifically, more research needs to be conducted on how long repeated reading should be used as a reading fluency intervention. Is there a point in the intervention where students become stagnant? How often should the reading material be changed? These are questions that should be answered in future research.

Conclusion

This literature review has provided many resources and strategies to bring back to the classroom. With only 35% of fourth grade students being at or above the national benchmark (Deeter, 2019), there is clearly a need for effective interventions and strategies to help increase reading fluency. According to the findings of Guerin & Murphy (2015), Strickland et al. (2020), Rasinski (2017), Erickson et al. (2015), and Morgan et al. (2016) repeated reading has proven to be an incredibly effective strategy for increasing reading fluency in young readers.

As an elementary education teacher, the use of repeated reading in whole group and small group settings is a necessary strategy for increasing reading fluency. According to the findings of Ross & Begeny (2015), the repeated readings utilized in an intervention should occur over a longer duration of time in order to maximize the amount of growth for each student. When taking this back to the classroom, this would mean running interventions for 12-15 minutes rather than 6-8 minutes.

When selecting text for these repeated readings, it is important to choose text that is leveled appropriately for each student. According to the findings of Stahl & Heubach (2005) and Jones et al. (2009), more difficult text has a positive effect on reading fluency but only if the students are extensively supported in the reading of said text. Educators can push students to read text that is above their instructional level so long as they are providing adequate support and scaffolds to ensure students are successful.

Along with practicing repeated reading, it is also critical students receive extensive and comprehensive instruction in the area of phonics. According to the findings of Murray et al. (2012), Kjeldsen et al. (2019), and Toste et al. (2019), the explicit instruction of phonics and phonemic awareness has a positive impact on students' overall reading ability. Furthermore,

Kjeldsen et al. (2019) determined the earlier the intervention is administered in a child's schooling, the greater impact it has on their reading long term. As an early elementary education teacher, the researcher has the opportunity to intervene at a young age to help increase reading fluency down the road.

References

- Amendum, S. J., Conradi, K., & Hiebert, E. (2018). Does Text Complexity Matter in the Elementary Grades? A Research Synthesis of Text Difficulty and Elementary Students' Reading Fluency and Comprehension. *Educational Psychology Review, 30*(1), 121-151. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10648-017-9398-2>
- Begeny, J. C., Krouse, H. E., Ross, S. G., & Mitchell, R. C. (2009). Increasing Elementary-aged Students' Reading Fluency with Small-group Interventions: A Comparison of Repeated Reading, Listening Passage Preview, and Listening Only Strategies. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 18*(3), 211-228. <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.nwciowa.edu/10.1007/s10864-009-9090-9>
- Coulter, G. A., & Lambert, M. C. (2015). Access to General Education Curriculum: The Effect of Preteaching Key Words Upon Fluency and Accuracy in Expository Text. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 38*(4), 248–256. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24570113>
- Deeter, T. (2019). *NAEP state profiles*. The Nation's Report Card. Retrieved September 26, 2021, from https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/profiles/stateprofile/overview/IA?cti=PgTab_OT&chart=1&sub=MAT&sj=IA&fs=Grade&st=MN&year=2019R3&sg=Gender%3A%2BMale%2Bvs.%2BFemale&sgv=Difference&ts=Single%2BYear&sfj=NP.
- Erickson, J., Derby, K. M., McLaughlin, T. F., & Fuehrer, K. (2015). An Evaluation of Read Naturally® on Increasing Reading Fluency for Three Primary Students with Learning Disabilities. *Educational Research Quarterly, 39*(1), 3-20.

<http://ezproxy.nwciowa.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/evaluation-read-naturally®-on-increasing-reading/docview/1711213028/se-2?accountid=28306>

Guerin, A., & Murphy, B. (2015). Repeated reading as a method to improve reading fluency for struggling adolescent readers. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 58(7), 551–560.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.395>

Idler, A. M., Mercer, S. H., Starosta, L., & Bartfai, J. M. (2017). Effects of a Mindful Breathing Exercise During Reading Fluency Intervention for Students with Attentional Difficulties. *Contemporary School Psychology*, 21(4), 323-334.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40688-017-0132-3>

International Literacy Association. (2018). *Reading fluently does not mean reading fast* [Literacy leadership brief]. Newark, DE.

Jasmine, J., & Schiesl, P. (2009). The effects of word walls and word wall activities on the reading fluency of first grade students. *Reading Horizons*, 49(4), 301–314.

Jones, K. M., Wickstrom, K. F., Noltemeyer, A. L., Brown, S. M., Schuka, J. R., & Therrien, W. J. (2009). An Experimental Analysis of Reading Fluency. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, 18(1), 35-55.

<http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.nwciowa.edu/10.1007/s10864-009-9082-9>

- Kjeldsen, A.-C., Educ, L., Saarento-Zaprudin, S. K., & Niemi, P. O. (2019). Kindergarten training in phonological awareness: fluency and comprehension gains are greatest for readers at risk in grades 1 through 9. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 52(5), 366–382.
- Kuhn, M., Rasinski, T., & Zimmerman, B. (2014). Integrated Fluency Instruction: Three Approaches for Working with Struggling Readers. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 7(1), 71-81.
<http://ezproxy.nwciowa.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/integrated-fluency-instruction-three-approaches/docview/1630429549/se-2>
- Kuhn, M. R., Schwanenflugel, P. J., & Meisinger, E. B. (2010). Aligning theory and assessment of reading fluency: automaticity, prosody, and definitions of fluency. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 45(2), 230–251. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.45.2.4>
- Lee, J., & Yoon, S. Y. (2017). The effects of repeated reading on reading fluency for students with reading disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 50(2), 213–224.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219415605194>
- LaBerge, D., & Samuels, J. (1974). Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading. *Cognitive Psychology*, 6(2), 293-323.

Maki, K. E., & Adams, S. R. (2019). Evaluating the effects of repeated reading and continuous reading using a standardized dosage of words read. *Psychology in the Schools*, 56(5), 635–651. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22241>

Morgan, S. V., McLaughlin, T. F., Webe, K. P., & Bolich, B. (2016). Increasing Reading Fluency using Read Naturally® with Two Third Grade Students with Specific Learning Disabilities: A Replication of Erickson et al., 2015. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 40(1), 37-50.

<http://ezproxy.nwciowa.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/increasing-reading-fluency-using-read-naturally/docview/1818037196/se-2?accountid=28306>

6

Mraz, M., Nichols, W., Caldwell, S., Beisley, R., Sargent, S., & Rupley, W. (2013). Improving Oral Reading Fluency through Readers Theatre. *Reading Horizons*, 52(2), 163-180.

<http://ezproxy.nwciowa.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.ezproxy.nwciowa.edu/scholarly-journals/improving-oral-reading-fluency-through-readers/docview/1329187659/se-2?accountid=28306>

Rasinski, T.V. (1999). Exploring a method for estimating independent, instructional, and frustration reading rates. *Journal of Reading Psychology*, 20(1), 61-69.

Rasinski, T.V. (2017). Readers who struggle: why many struggle and a modest proposal for improving their reading. *The Reading Teacher*, 70(5), 519–524.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1533>

Rasinski, T.V., & Padak, N.D. (1998). How elementary students referred for compensatory reading instruction perform on school-based measures of word recognition, fluency, and comprehension. *Reading Psychology*, 19(2), 185-216.

Rasinski, T., Yildirim, K., & Nageldinger, J. (2011). Teaching tip: building fluency through the phrased text lesson. *Reading Teacher*, 65(4), 252–255.

Reutzel, D. R., & Juth, S. (2014). Supporting the Development of Silent Reading Fluency: An Evidence-Based Framework for the Intermediate Grades (3-6). *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 7(1), 27-45.

<http://ezproxy.nwciowa.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/supporting-development-silent-reading-fluency/docview/1630429577/se-2?accountid=28306>

Ross, S. G., & Begeny, J. C. (2015). An Examination of Treatment Intensity with an Oral Reading Fluency Intervention: Do Intervention Duration and Student-Teacher Instructional Ratios Impact Intervention Effectiveness? *Journal of Behavioral Education*, 24(1), 11-32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10864-014-9202-z>

Schlesinger, N. W., & Gray, S. (2017). The impact of multisensory instruction on learning letter names and sounds, word reading, and spelling. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 67(3), 219-258.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11881-017-0140-z>

Stahl, S.A., & Heubach, K. (2005). Fluency-oriented reading instruction. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 37(1), 25-60.

Starr, K., Gwendolyn, C., Amanda, Y., Lefki, K. (2012). Reducing reading failure for kindergarten urban students : a study of early literacy instruction,treatment quality, and treatment duration. *Remedial and Special Education*, 33(2), 89–102.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932510365359>

Strickland, W. D., Boon, R. T., & Mason, L. L. (2020). The Use of Repeated Reading with Systematic Error Correction for Elementary Students with Mild Intellectual Disability and Other Comorbid Disorders: A Systematic Replication Study. *Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities*, 32(5), 755-774.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10882-019-09718-9>

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

Toste, J. R., Capin, P., Williams, K. J., Cho, E., & Vaughn, S. (2019). Replication of an experimental study investigating the efficacy of a multisyllabic word reading intervention

with and without motivational beliefs training for struggling readers. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 52(1), 45–58.

Völlinger Vanessa A, Supanc, M., & Brunstein, J. C. (2018). Examining between-group and within-group effects of a peer-assisted reading strategies intervention. *Psychology in the Schools*, 55(5), 573–589. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22121>

Young, C., & Rasinski, T. (2009). Implementing readers theatre as an approach to classroom fluency instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 63(1), 4–13. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RT.63.1.1>

Young, C., & Rasinski, T. (2018). Readers theatre: effects on word recognition automaticity and reading prosody. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 41(3), 475–485. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12120>

Young, C., Rasinski, T., Mohr, K. A. J. (2016). Read two impress: an intervention for disfluent readers. *The Reading Teacher*, 69(6), 633–636. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1391>

Zavala, E., & Cuevas, J. (2019). Effects of Repeated Reading and Rhyming Poetry on Reading Fluency. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 6(2), 64-88. <http://dx.doi.org/10.23918/ijsses.v6i2p64>