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ABSTRACT

Reading is a lifelong skill that is used in many other subject areas. When students aren’t meeting the academic standards set before them in reading, often times, reading interventions take place. Repeated reading is an intervention that targets improving students’ oral reading fluency. This study took place during a second grade classroom’s reading intervention time. The study included four students from my class that were reading below a second grade reading level. I worked one-on-one with these students to conduct the intervention. The purpose of the study was to determine the effectiveness of the intervention of repeated reading in relation to reading fluency and comprehension. The research question that guided this study was, “How does the targeted fluency intervention of repeated reading impact second grade readers in fluency and comprehension?” I conducted timed running record assessments three times per week, along with multiple choice comprehension question assessments to determine students’ progress. Data was analyzed to determine if the intervention had a positive effect in student’s oral reading fluency and comprehension. It was determined that the repeated reading intervention did have a positive effect on students’ oral reading fluency, and was inconclusive if it did have a positive effect on students’ comprehension. All four students who participated in the study improved their words per minute score when analyzed using pre and post assessment data.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Reading is an essential skill that is used in all aspects of life, and in order to be successful in other subject areas, one often needs to be able to read. “An individual’s reading skill is often considered a critical factor for success in schools because it influences access to numerous features of instruction and to the general education curriculum” (Park et al., 2015, p. 1188). Not only is reading so important for children to learn, and at an early age, often times literacy gaps exist before children even enter school. Katzir et al. (2013) pointed out that an important issue exists when they said, “One of the biggest challenges our education system faces is literacy development” (p. 61). Because of these gaps and challenges with literacy development, often times, reading interventions are needed for students who are behind where they need to be. There are many interventions which target specific reading skills. Choosing one which fits students’ needs is important. The intervention of repeated reading specifically targets reading fluency. However, studies have shown repeated reading can also impact reading comprehension. Because of this, the goal of my action research was to implement the repeated reading intervention strategy and see the impacts on students’ oral reading fluency and comprehension. Repeated reading involves students reading a text or part of a text for a predetermined length of time or for as many times as needed to reach a predetermined performance goal, focusing on reading speed and accuracy (Padeliadu, 2021).

Brief Literature Review

If students are struggling to gain the necessary reading skills needed, reading interventions are sometimes needed. Begeny et al. (2009) stated, “It is often the job of the regular education teacher to provide more intensive instruction for students with academic difficulties”
Successful reading interventions involve frequent opportunities for students to respond, contingencies for reading responses, error correction procedures, progress feedback to students, and instruction of new skills (VanAuken et al., 2002). Reading fluency is an important component of reading. Fluency is referred to as being able to perform a skill rapidly and with proficiency. Accuracy is an important component here as well, which can be improved with teacher modeling, prompting, and error correction (VanAuken et al., 2002). Conducting guided reading groups is a popular form of reading intervention that focuses on many of the specific reading components (e.g., comprehension, fluency, phonics). Repeated reading interventions are another popular form of reading interventions, but these types of interventions focus more specifically on oral reading fluency. However, numerous amounts of studies have shown the positive impacts that repeated reading interventions have on comprehension as well. If fluency improves and students have the ability to decode words, they can then focus on comprehension.

Bennett et al. (2017) stated,

It is difficult for a reader to comprehend if he/she is focusing his/her attention of decoding individual words, for this reason, readers need to acquire decoding automaticity, the ability to decode effortlessly, which is usually calculated through timed oral reading assessments. (p. 147)

Once the reader has improved their decoding and fluency skills, they can focus more of their attention on the meaning of the text, and improve their comprehension skills. Therefore, conducting fluency interventions to improve reading rate and automaticity can then benefit comprehension, even though the reader isn’t specifically working on that skill.

Repeated reading is a fluency intervention that has been utilized for decades. This specific intervention involves having a teacher time how long it takes a student to read a book or
passage multiple times (VanAuken et al., 2002). Miscues and errors are also recorded. The purpose of this intervention is to increase students’ oral reading fluency (ORF). ORF is calculated by using timed reading assessments for usually one minute in length, and calculating the words per minute read correctly (Bennett et al., 2017). There is some controversy as to what level of text should be selected for students reading passages for repeated reading interventions. “Readability levels of instructional texts plays an important role in reading fluency interventions. However, there is a lack of agreement among researchers about which level is the most effective for reading fluency instruction” (Padeliadu, et al., 2021, p. 50). The varying levels of text could be at a student’s independent, instructional, or frustrated level of reading. Most research analyzed for this study points to choosing leveled text that is at the student’s instructional level, which is usually predetermined based off of a reading benchmark assessment. The overall description of repeated reading instruction is readers practicing reading a passage to a teacher, at an appropriate instructional level, until a predetermined level of fluency is attained (Elhoweris, 2017).

**Statement of the Problem**

The research problem was measuring the growth in oral reading fluency and comprehension of students that were reading below grade level when using a reading intervention system of repeated readings. Within my elementary school as a whole and within my own second grade classroom it was noted that many students were performing below grade level in the area of oral reading fluency. Because of this issue, I decided to implement the reading intervention of repeated reading to improve students’ overall fluency, and possibly comprehension abilities.

Repeated reading interventions were utilized during my classroom reading intervention time. During this time, students were participating in reading stations; read to self, listen to
reading, word work, or working with the teacher in guided reading groups or conducting various reading interventions per the individual student’s needs.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to see the impacts the intervention of repeated readings had on students’ oral reading fluency and comprehension. I understood the importance of reading as not only an academic skill, but a life skill that is used in many areas. At the time of the study, I was a second grade teacher who knows the importance of developing early literacy skills and the importance of intervening early on if there is a deficiency in the ability to read. Prior research showed that providing a reading fluency intervention like repeated reading helped students build accuracy and fluency skills, which then allowed their reading to focus more on comprehending of text instead of decoding of words, which improved overall reading comprehension and fluency abilities (Begeny et al., 2009; Elhoweris, 2017; VanAuken et al., 2002).

**Research Question(s)**

The central research question was: How does the targeted fluency intervention of repeated reading impact second grade readers in fluency and comprehension?

**Definition of Variables**

The following are the variables of the study:

Variable A: The independent variable in the study was the reading intervention of repeated reading, followed by answering comprehension questions. This repeated reading intervention was conducted three times a week for ten to fifteen minutes at a time.

Variable B: The dependent variable in the study was the progress the students participating in the study were making in their reading fluency and comprehension. This was
measured using timed reading passages and tracking student’s words per minute reading assessments and comprehension questions that go along with these reading passages.

**Significance of the Study**

Reading is a lifelong skill that is needed in order to be successful in other academic areas. Reading fluency and comprehension are two key areas that play an important aspect in students being successful readers. Researchers have noted that children are significantly falling behind in meeting grade level reading expectations, and with the COVID-19 pandemic, this problem has not resolved. With students learning in hybrid learning models or doing distance learning, the problem has actually gotten worse. To improve this problem with reading, students often participate in reading interventions to help them improve their reading skills. Learning to read more fluently can benefit comprehension, and help students be more successful in school and in their daily lives as well. The purpose of this study was to provide successful reading intervention tools to help students build their reading fluency and comprehension.

**Research Ethics**

*Permission and IRB Approval*

In order to conduct this study, I sought out approval from MSUM’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) to ensure the ethical conduct of research involving human subjects (Mills & Gay, 2019). Likewise, authorization to conduct this study has been approved by the school district where the research project will be take place (see Appendices A and B).

*Informed Consent*

Protection of human subjects participating in research was assured. Participant minors were informed of the purpose of the study via the Method of Assent (see Appendix C) that I read to participants before the beginning of the study. Participants were aware that this study was
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classified as part of my master degree program and that it benefitted my teaching practice.

Informed consent means that the parents of participants have been fully informed of the purpose
and procedures of the study for which consent is sought and that parents understand and agree, in
writing, to their child participating in the study (Rothstein & Johnson, 2014). Confidentiality was
protected through the use of pseudonyms (e.g., Student A) without the utilization of any
identifying information. The choice to participate or withdraw at any time was outlined both
verbally and in writing.

Limitations

A potential limitation of this research study was the sample size. Through this study I
tracked the impact of the repeated reading fluency intervention of four students in my second
grade class. The low sample size was due to the fact that reading intervention time is very limited
in the classroom, and there are many students needing specific reading interventions. A second
limitation was the amount of time I had to work with the students. In a classroom full of 17-21
kids, there is not a lot of time to provide every student with the specific interventions that they
may need. A final limitation to this study would be the COVID-19 pandemic that we are in, and
students or staff missing school due to quarantines.

Conclusions

In this chapter, I described how reading is an essential life skill. However, many students
fall below grade level academic standards and need interventions in order to get their reading
skills where they need to be. Choosing a reading intervention that is right for each student is
essential to meet their needs. The intervention of repeated reading focuses on improving
students’ oral reading fluency. The goal of this study was to show the impacts of the repeated
reading intervention on students’ oral reading fluency and comprehension. In the next chapter, I
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will discuss the literature that has been found related to reading interventions, specifically looking at the intervention of repeated reading.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Reading is an essential skill that is important in other subject areas as well. Fluency is just one of the important components of reading. During the 2020–2021 school year, the elementary school where I teach had six sections of second graders. I taught one of these six sections and had discussions with the other teachers about the topic of reading fluency. All six teachers reported low reading fluency scores in their students. Every trimester (fall, winter, and spring) students are assessed on their fluency using the Curriculum-Based Measurement for Reading (CBMreading) assessment tool. For this assessment, students read three reading passages for one minute each, and the average score from those three passages is taken for their words per minute (WPM) fluency score. Many literature pieces have been carefully reviewed and reflected upon in order to determine the definition of reading fluency, relations to other levels of reading, and various reading interventions that target reading fluency. Scholarly researchers, authors, and educators have defined fluency and the importance it has in other areas of reading as well, specifically in reading comprehension. Fluency is one of the five pillars of reading along with phonics, phonemic awareness, comprehension, and vocabulary (Begeny et al., 2009).

There are many types of interventions that target improving reading fluency. Some of the known and well-studied interventions include repeated readings, video self-modeling, small group instruction, reader’s theaters, and listening while reading (Elhoweris, 2017; Wu & Gadke, 2017). Implementing a reading fluency intervention and analyzing the outcome bridges the gap between fluent and non-fluent readers. In the past, I have used the Benchmark Literacy reading curriculum which incorporates reader’s theaters and small group reading instruction. There is
also a phonics and writing curriculum that are a part of this as well. Even with these curriculums and interventions, students are still lacking in fluency.

Throughout the research process, I found many scholarly articles that defined reading fluency and the importance of it. Much research was conducted using the keywords oral reading fluency and reading interventions to find how best to intervene and service students who were struggling with reading fluency. Within the research, most studies incorporated more than one intervention at a time, so finding which specific intervention yielded the best results was somewhat unclear.

**Body of the Review**

**Context**

Being able to read is a key foundational skill that spills over into other educational subject areas (Ates, 2019). Reading fluency is dependent on the exposure to reading and on a student’s motivation to read (Leloup, 2021). Reading fluency, as defined by The National Reading Panel, is accurate, rapid, and expressive reading (as cited in Ari, 2011). In further detail, that means reading at a reasonable rate with little miscues and expression that sounds like spoken language (Swain, et al., n.d.). A student’s reading fluency is usually measured by a WPM score. The student will read a selected passage for one minute, and the teacher will mark any errors that are made. The errors are then subtracted from the WPM read. There is usually a target WPM score for each quarter or trimester throughout the school year (Hawkins et al., 2015). If a student scores below the targeted WPM score, they may need some form of intervention to help them increase their reading fluency. The next step would be to choose the targeted reading intervention. My Personal Learning Community (PLC) of second grade teachers has set target
WPM scores for each trimester. In the fall the score is 74 WPM, in the winter the score is 87 WPM, and in the spring the score is 106 WPM.

**Fluency as a Strand of Comprehension**

Poor reading achievement, specifically in the areas of reading comprehension, was noted throughout many scholarly articles. Efforts have been made to develop effective interventions which target decoding and fluency, but less attention has been made to improving children’s reading comprehension (Jiang & Logan, 2019). Many researchers have noted the impact that fluency interventions also have on comprehension (Nevo et al., 2020; Swain & Conley, 2017; Trainin et al., 2016). The National Reading Panel identified fluency as a crucial aspect of reading development that led to successful reading comprehension (as cited in Trainin et al., 2016). It was noted that students who read with understanding at an early age gain access to a broader range of educational opportunities, making early reading comprehension critical (Solari et al., 2018). Multiple sources stated that oral reading fluency, which is often defined as text reading rate and text reading prosody, as being a contributing factor in reading comprehension outcomes in addition to decoding efficiency and language comprehension. “As word reading processes become automatic, cognitive resources are proposed to become available for comprehension purposes” (Veenendaal et al., 2015, p. 214).

A study conducted by Neddenriep et al. (2011) found that targeted fluency intervention did in fact have an impact on students’ reading fluency rates as well as their comprehension capabilities. Many researchers noted this same phenomenon. The targeted fluency intervention used in this study was repeated reading with performance feedback and error correction. There is an abundant amount of research that supports this idea of fluency interventions impacting comprehension. “Oral reading fluency and reading comprehension are interconnected in young
readers” (Nevo et al., 2020, p. 1947). Because of this relationship between reading fluency interventions and their impact on not only fluency but comprehension as well, teachers should determine the needs of their students, to determine what intervention is right for them.

**Fluency Intervention of Repeated Reading**

Researcher Mehigan (2020) discussed an increase in fluency rates being achieved through practice and repetition. The fluency intervention of repeated reading does this exact thing. Although there are different methods in implementing repeated reading strategies and some have been proven to be more effective than others, there is not a one size fits all procedure. With repeated reading interventions, students repeatedly read a passage either for one minute or until a predetermined fluency criterion is reached (Hawkins et al., 2011). Working one on one with students, or two on one with students yields best results. Researchers noted that often times three to four readings of that same passage is often needed to see positive effects. When selecting a book or passage to use for a repeated reading intervention, it is important to note that it should be a book or passage that is at the student’s reading level. As the student reads, the teacher makes note of errors the student has as they read, and the student repeatedly reads this book or passage, having the goal of making less errors each time.

Professor Elhoweris (2017) reported positive feedback on repeated readings to impact students reading fluency. She defined repeated readings as, “learners practice reading one passage at an appropriate instructional level until some predetermined level of fluency is attained” (p. 38). This fluency intervention dates back to 1974, developed by Dahl and Samuels. This reading intervention was found to be beneficial for students with and without learning disabilities.
It was noted that within my research, many reading interventions were being implemented with more than one intervention taking place at a time. Researchers Wu and Gadke (2017) conducted a study on reading interventions by comparing the targeted fluency interventions of repeated readings and video self-modeling. Repeated reading was used in order to repeatedly expose the reader to the same text in order to allow the reader to gradually increase accuracy. Video self-modeling (VSM), includes the participant watching videos of themselves that have been edited to consist of desirable behaviors that are the target for intervention. Results proved that repeated reading was an intervention that had more effect than VSM, however, the most improvement in reading fluency was noted when both interventions were combined (Wu & Gadke, 2017).

Multiple studies conducting research on repeated reading interventions were in agreement that repeated readings, did in fact produce positive gains in students reading fluency and comprehension (Barber et al., 2018; Therrien & Hughes, 2008). By focusing specifically on the fluency to start, reading with less errors, and doing this for a repeated amount of time, eventually the students were overcoming fluency struggles, and allowing themselves to then focus on comprehension next.

**Theoretical Framework**

The theory that is centered around reading fluency is automaticity. Automaticity and how it relates to fluency is broken down into four properties; speed, effortlessness, autonomy, and lack of conscious awareness (Kuhn et al., 2010). These four properties are believed to be central to the construct of fluency and the relation to comprehension of text. It is noted that automaticity occurs on many levels, and connects to comprehension in multiple ways (Kuhn et al., 2010). Automaticity is often measured by timing students and listening to them read a passage or book.
and marking their miscues or errors. With the targeted reading intervention of repeated reading, these four properties of automaticity are worked on. Prosody is a second crucial aspect of reading fluency, which is centered around the idea of students reading with appropriate expression or intonation (Kuhn et al., 2010). In other words, this is getting students to read like they would talk in their everyday speech. This theory is something that is not as often measured with the intervention of repeated reading.

**Research Question**

The research was being driven by my interest in teaching reading, and wanting to find an effective reading fluency intervention to help readers who may be performing below grade level standards. Because of this, I developed a question to help guide my research. The question is: How does the targeted fluency intervention of repeated reading impact second grade readers in fluency and comprehension?

**Conclusions**

This chapter reviewed the literature that supports the importance of reading fluency and reading comprehension. The literature highlighted strategies that are utilized for targeted fluency interventions to increase students’ ability to read fluently and comprehend. Research suggests that fluency interventions have positive impacts on both of these reading components. The most widely used intervention that achieved the best results was the intervention of repeated readings. In my action research, my goal was to determine if the reading intervention of repeated readings had a positive impact on second graders reading fluency and reading comprehension. The next chapter will go into great detail about the method for which this action research was conducted.
CHAPTER 3
METHODS

Introduction

Reading is an essential skill for children to learn at an early age. It is an important component of all students’ educational success. Research shows that if students are not making the adequate progress needed to be successful in their reading skills, early intervention is key to success. “The primary grades provide a critical window of opportunity in which early intervention differentially accelerates reading growth compared to later intervention for children with early reading risk” (Little et al., 2012, p. 190). Many studies have shown success with small group or one-on-one reading interventions. Fluency and comprehension are two of the main components of reading, along with phonemic awareness, phonics, and vocabulary. A large body of research supports the concept that fluency is related to reading comprehension. “Reading fluency serves as a bridge, connecting word recognition to reading comprehension, mostly during the early elementary grades” (Padeliadu et al., 2021, p. 51).

For this research study, I chose a quantitative quasi-experimental research design. With this type of research design, some subjects are exposed to a form of treatment (Gopalan et al., 2020). The subjects here are the students, and the treatment is the intervention of repeated reading. This study examines the reading intervention of repeated reading. Repeated reading is an intervention which focuses on increasing students’ oral reading fluency by repeatedly reading passages until a predetermined WPM score is reached. This study measured the impact this reading intervention had on students’ fluency and comprehension.

Research Question

How does the targeted fluency intervention of repeated reading impact second grade readers in fluency and comprehension?
Research Design

This study was conducted using a quantitative approach with an experimental design. “Experimental quantitative research requires students to be randomly assigned to a control group or an experimental group and involves manipulation of the independent variables in order to control group assignments” (Mills, 2018, p. 133). This was the best choice for this study because the researcher implemented a repeated reading intervention with students in order to see the effects this had on their fluency and comprehension scores. When using the experimental research design, researchers are looking for a cause-and-effect relationship (Mitchell, 2015). With this study, I was looking for the effects of the repeated reading intervention. To begin conducting the study, a baseline Curriculum-Based Measurement for Reading (CBMreading) assessment was given to see students’ starting words per minute scores before interventions began. Then, weekly interventions were conducted, and progress was monitored using running record benchmark assessments, timing students’ words per minute scores. Also, a five question multiple choice comprehension assessment was given once students had read the reading passage three times or reached mastery of 74 words per minute. A sample of these is included in Appendix D.

Setting

This study took place in a second grade classroom, at an elementary school where it is a preschool to fourth grade building. The school was located in North Central Minnesota, in a small rural town of around 3,000 people. Within the local area there are many lakes, factories, and farmers. The town has a lot of outdoor charm since it is located around many lakes. There is a strong sense of community, with schools and sports bringing people together.
The district in which this elementary school is located has around 1,800 students enrolled, with approximately 600 of them being at the elementary school. At the elementary school, the breakdown by race/ethnicity was 80% White, 9.9% Hispanic, 2.2% Black, 2% American Indian, 0.7% Asian, 0.2% Pacific Islander, and 4.9% two or more races. Five point nine percent of the population were English Language Learners, and 43% of the population is on free or reduced lunch. Over 18% of the elementary school students were receiving special education services.

**Participants**

There were four second grade students that participated in this study. All four of them were in my general education classroom. The students ranged in age from seven to eight years old. One of the students was female and three were male. Three of the students participating in the study were Caucasian, and one was American Indian. All of the students participating in the study were reading below a second grade reading level. However, none of the students participating in the study were receiving other services outside of the classroom for reading interventions. One of the students participating in the study had a split parent household, therefore, they lived in two separate houses throughout the week. The other three students lived in a two parent household. One of the students participating in the study received free or reduced lunch.

**Sampling**

The four students participating in the study were from my second grade classroom. These students were selected to participate in the study because they scored below the benchmark of 74 wpm on the CBMreading assessment, and were reading below a second grade reading level. This is a purposive sample. Purposive sampling is when subjects are chosen based
on a certain quality of the participant. It is not a random sample (Etikan et al, 2015). For this study, it was important that I chose students who were not yet reading at a second grade reading level, in order to show an adequate amount of progress that students were making in their fluency and comprehension.

**Instrumentation**

A running record was used as the instrument for the data collection. As the student read aloud a reading passage to me, I timed them reading for one minute, and marked any errors they made while reading. A check mark was placed above the word if the student read it correctly, and if the word was skipped or read incorrectly, I circled the word, and wrote the word the student read instead above this. Once the one minute time was up, if the student had not finished the passage, they continued to read. However, the teacher no longer timed the reading or marked miscues. After the passage was finished, I would calculate the student’s WPM score, subtracting any errors from the total amount of words read in a minute. The student would read the passage three times, or until 74 words per minute was scored. After this, the student would then answer five multiple choice comprehension questions about the passage that they repeatedly read. When students had completed the assessment, I scored the comprehension assessment. The reading passage, running record assessment form, and comprehension assessment were all found on the Reading A-Z website(readinga-z.com). The amount of time it took to complete the assessments varied with each student. It usually took around ten minutes to complete a passage, reading it three times, and answering the multiple choice questions. A sample of a running record form, reading passage, and comprehension assessment is included in Appendix D.
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Data Collection

A CBM reading assessment was given to students the first week of the study to determine baseline WPM reading levels. Each time the repeated reading intervention was implemented, a running record assessment was conducted, marking students’ errors and timing their reading for one minute. After reading the assigned passage three times or until the predetermined number of 74 words per minute was reached, the student then answered a five question multiple choice answer comprehension assessment on the passage they repeatedly read. WPM scores and comprehension scores were recorded each time the intervention took place.

Data Analysis

Running record assessments were given three times a week, each time the intervention took place, as well as comprehension assessments. This data was tracked using a table. The table indicated the date, reading passage number, the words per minute score, and the comprehension score. Student’s scores were recorded on the table three times a week. The table was analyzed to determine if students were making progress towards meeting the goal of 74 words per minute at a second grade reading level. Results were also then graphed to show trends in students reading fluency and comprehension data.

Research Question and System Alignment

Table 3.1 provides a description of the alignment between the study research question and the methods used in this study to ensure that all variables of study have been accounted for adequately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1. Research Question Alignment
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ1</th>
<th>DV: Reading progress made in fluency and comprehension.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV:</td>
<td>The reading intervention of repeated reading.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Experimenta l Research Design**

Running Record Assessment and comprehension quiz questions.

All students were assessed weekly using the same reading passages and questions from the same site of Reading A-Z.

The techniques used were formative and summative assessment in the form of running records and multiple choice questions.

Four second grade students that were scoring below a 74 wpm score.

**Procedures**

The procedure for this study lasted for six weeks total, with the first and last week being used to get pre and post data. To begin, I conducted a CBM reading assessment to get baseline data for all four students’ fluency and words per minute score. Each student was assessed one-on-one by the researcher to get this score. Students read three second grade level passages aloud, and I recorded their miscues and timed them for one minute. Their errors were subtracted from their WPM read. The average of these three scores was then taken to get a baseline WPM score. After this, the students met with me three times per week for ten minutes at a time. This occurred during the classroom reading intervention time. During this intervention time, I met with the four students participating in this study one-on-one. All four students were given a reading passage at their instructional reading level, which was pre-selected by me, and students were asked to read the passage aloud as I completed a running record assessment. A new passage was given, each time the intervention took place. Errors were marked on the running record assessment sheet,
circling words read incorrectly, and writing the student’s response above the word. They also were timed reading for one minute using a stopwatch. After one minute, I no longer timed or marked miscues, but the student did finish reading the passage. After completion of the reading passage, I calculated the students WPM score by subtracting their number of errors from their WPM score. If their score was below 74 WPM, I asked the student to reread the passage. Again a running record was completed and the students WPM score was calculated. If the score was still below 74 WPM, the student read the passage a third time as I assessed them using a running record. After completion of reading the passage three times or reaching a score of 74 WPM, a five question multiple choice question comprehension assessment was given to each student. On their own, students read and circled their best guess on the assessment. There were choices a,b, and c to choose from for each of the five questions. This process was completed three times per week, during each repeated reading intervention time. After each intervention time, I scored the assessments and recorded them onto a table to track student progress over the six week period. At the end of the six weeks, I plotted the data onto a graph to analyze student growth.

**Ethical Considerations**

Before this study was conducted, permission was received from the school district, the participants, and the parents or guardians of the participants. Participants and their families were given detailed information about the study, as well as made aware of any risks that might have been associated with the study. Confidentiality was ensured for the participants by eliminating names, and incorporating the use of pseudonyms (e.g., Student A). Participants and their families were informed that they could withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or questions asked.
Conclusions

Reading is an essential life skill, which is why I felt examining the effects of a reading intervention was important to help my students be the most successful in their reading. The chapter explained the action research process of implementing the reading intervention of repeated reading. Chapter four will examine the results of the action research.
CHAPTER 4
DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This study was conducted to investigate if the reading intervention of repeated reading had an effect on student’s oral reading fluency and comprehension. I chose this specific reading intervention because students in the second grade at my school of employment have had lower than average oral reading fluency scores, and after extensive research, it was decided that the intervention of repeated reading was something that may benefit the students.

Data Collection

A baseline CBMreading assessment was given to get student’s starting oral reading fluency score. Then, for four weeks, I met with the participants of this study one-on-one to conduct the repeated reading intervention. During the intervention, each participant read aloud a reading passage to the researcher that was at their instructional reading level, and I timed the participant reading for one minute and conducted a running record assessment to mark errors. After reading the passage I subtracted the errors from the amount of words per minute read, to determine an oral reading fluency score. A goal was set of 74 words per minute, and if the participant scored less than that, they reread the passage for a second time, completing these same steps. This continued for a third time if the goal of 74 words per minute was not reached. After the participant had read the passage for three times, or meeting their goal of 74 words per minute, they then answered five multiple choice comprehension questions about the passage that they read. I then scored this assessment, and documented data into a table to track student progress. After the four weeks of intervention, I gave the same CBMreading assessment to the participants that was given at the start of the research study to determine post intervention data and evaluate student growth and progress.
Results

*RQ: How does the targeted fluency intervention of repeated reading impact second grade readers in fluency and comprehension?*

Table 4.1 shows Student A’s data from the repeated reading intervention. This student had a baseline score of 38 words per minute, and a post intervention score of 69 words per minute when assessed using the CBMreading tool. This is an increase in 31 WPM. The graph shows how each time the student read a passage, their WPM score did increase. Sometimes the student only needed to read the passage two times to reach the WPM score of 74 which was the original goal set for second grade readers in the first trimester of school.

Table 4.1

*Bar Graph Data of Student A from Repeated Reading Intervention*

![Bar Graph of Student A's Data](chart.png)

Table 4.2 shows Student B’s data from the repeated reading intervention. The student had a baseline score of 33 words per minute, and a post intervention score of 56 words per minute
when assessed using the CMBreading tool. The graph shows that each time the student read a passage, their WPM score did increase. Sometimes the student only needed to read the passage twice in order to reach the WPM goal of 74. One thing you will notice with Student B in comparison to students A, C, and D, are there is less data on the graph due to less interventions being conducted because of student absences. However, even due to a shortened intervention time, Student B still improved their WPM score by 23 WPM.

Table 4.2

*Bar Graph Data of Student B from Repeated Reading Intervention*

Table 4.3 shows Student C’s data from the repeated reading intervention. The student had a baseline score of 48 words per minute, and a post intervention score of 68 words per minute when assessed using the CBMreading tool. The graph shows that each time the student read a passage, their WPM score did increase. On several days the intervention was conducted, the student only needed to read the passage twice in order to achieve the 74 WPM goal set for trimester one. In addition to this, on day seven of the repeated reading intervention the student
achieved the goal of 74 on their first reading attempt. Overall the student increased their WPM score by 20 words throughout the intervention process.

Table 4.3

*Bar Graph Data of Student C from Repeated Reading Intervention*

Table 4.4 shows Student D’s data from the repeated reading intervention. This student had a baseline score of 22 words per minute, and a post intervention score of 31 words per minute when assessed using the CBMreading tool. This is an increase in 9 WPM. The graph shows how each time the student read a passage, their WPM score did increase. Student D had the lowest fluency score of all four students, and made the least gains, however, each time he did read a passage, his WPM score did increase.

Table 4.4

*Bar Graph Data of Student D from Repeated Reading Intervention*
Table 4.5 shows comprehension assessment results from the four weeks the repeated reading intervention was conducted for all four students participating in the research study. I found the average of the three comprehension scores each week for each student, and this is what the graph displays. Student A started with a 70% average score for reading comprehension, but declined to 67% comprehension by week four. Student B started with an 86% average comprehension score, and increased to a 100% average comprehension score by their last week of interventions. Student C started with an average of 46% comprehension, and increased to a 73% comprehension by week four. Lastly, Student D started with a 73% average comprehension score, and finished the intervention process with an 87% comprehension score. This data shows that three out of four participants in this study increased their comprehension scores. However, as the graph displays, only one student had a steady incline, and others scores were increasing and decreasing throughout the intervention process.

Table 4.5

Comprehension Scores from Repeated Reading Intervention
Data Analysis.

The results of this action research project were what I was hoping would happen, students would improve their oral reading fluency scores. All four students that participated in the research study did improve their ORF score from the baseline data to the post intervention data. Some improved more than others, but they all did improve. It was evident that each time I conducted the repeated reading intervention, the student’s WPM scores improved each time they read the same passage. The literature that I found on the reading intervention of repeated reading also found that it did improve students’ ORF. Multiple studies conducting research on repeated reading interventions were in agreement that repeated readings, did in fact produce positive gains in students reading fluency and comprehension (Barber et al., 2018; Therrien & Hughes, 2008). Another study conducted by Professor Elhoweris (2017) reported positive feedback on repeated readings to impact students reading fluency.
Along with ORF, I was also studying to see if the repeated reading intervention had an impact on second grade reader’s comprehension. Many researchers have noted the impact that fluency interventions also have on comprehension (Trainin et al., 2016; Swain & Conley, 2017; Nevo et al., 2020). The National Reading Panel identified fluency as a crucial aspect of reading development that led to successful reading comprehension (as cited in Trainin et al., 2016). In analysis of the action research project data on comprehension, it was noted that two of the four participants had comprehension scores above the 80 percent target goal of second grade readers. However, I did not have baseline data on comprehension to see if this score was improved because of the intervention of repeated reading, along with the comprehension questions asked each day the intervention was conducted. The baseline assessment given was the CBMreading assessment which only tracks students WPM read, and does not include any comprehension questions. So I would either have to use a different baseline assessment data tool which included some form of comprehension, or use a different assessment to administer along with the CBMreading assessment tool to get baseline data on comprehension as well. The instrumentation used to track student progress throughout the repeated reading intervention was a running record, which was an adequate tool to use. This tool was able to help track student errors and determine the participants WPM score during each intervention.

One problem I encountered during my research study was the absence of student B. Because of the Covid-19 pandemic, this student was quarantined for ten days. This happened in the middle of the research study. I worked with the student for one week before this happened, and then was able to continue working with the student upon his return for an additional one and a half weeks. In total, the participant missed a week and a half of the intervention, and did not receive a consistent repeated reading intervention like the other three participants. This could
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have effected this student’s data scores, however, the data does still show that this student made gains in their ORF, even with the interruption.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The results of my action research project is relative only to my classroom setting and the participants that I worked with. This is a limitation to this study. To further my research and understanding of how repeated reading impacts readers, I would further research how frequently the intervention needs to be conducted, as well as for what duration of time to be the most successful. I conducted my study for a total of six weeks, but only four of those weeks was actively doing the repeated reading intervention, and the other two weeks was used for pre and post assessment data collection. I also would conduct more research on the relationship between repeated reading and comprehension, and a specific instrument to be used to intertwine reading fluency with repeated reading, and comprehension with the reading passage students are reading. For my research project, I did not collect pre or post assessment data with reading comprehension, so a different research question could include just information on reading fluency, instead of adding in the comprehension piece. However, during my research I did find other studies that focused on reading fluency and comprehension, but there were sometimes two different interventions done to reveal the impact of reading fluency and comprehension.

**Conclusions**

The intervention of repeated reading was an effective tool to use to help second grade readers improve their oral reading fluency. The results of the study show that the more opportunities students have to reread a passage, the better opportunity for them to increase their reading fluency. Because students are exposed to the passage more than once, they have the opportunity to improve their word decoding, therefore, being able to read the passage more
fluently. It is still unclear if the intervention of repeated reading has an impact on second grade reader’s comprehension. A different assessment tool would be needed to obtain baseline and post intervention comprehension data.

This research study revealed that when students are presented with the opportunity to reread a reading passage more than one time, they have the opportunity to correct some decoding mistakes they may have made the first time they read the passage. By improving their decoding mistakes, they are then able to focus on reading at a quicker pace, and are also able to focus more on the meaning of the text, versus how to decode certain unknown words. I also found that the intervention of repeated reading seemed to allow students time to build their reading confidence, and achieve goals set for themselves. The students who participated in this study knew they were aiming to get that 74 WPM score. When they achieved this score during the intervention, I was able to see the excitement and sense of accomplishment on the student’s faces. Even if the students did not achieve the 74 WPM score, but increased their WPM score by even a few words, they were proud of themselves. I would hear the participants make comments like, “I improved by 15 words!” Another comment heard was, “Wow, I got a lot more words that time!” As not only the researcher but the classroom teacher as well, it was very encouraging to hear comments from students like this, and feel a sense of success from the intervention taking place.

In the final chapter, I will outline my action plan for using this intervention in my daily teaching, and how I will share the information gathered from this study with others.
CHAPTER 5
IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

Within my classroom and within the elementary school where I teach, oral reading fluency has been something students have continued to struggle with. The purpose of this research study was to see if a repeated reading intervention had an impact on second grade reader’s fluency and comprehension. Throughout the action research process I was able to see the positive effect the intervention was having on students, as each time the reading intervention was conducted, students were reading more words per minute. After analyzing the data of the study, it was determined that each of the four students participating in the research study did improve their oral reading fluency. This was based on using a pre and post assessment. However, it was unclear if student’s reading comprehension was improved with the repeated reading intervention.

Action Plan

Through my action research, I have learned how important reading is, not only in school but in life. Fluency is a key component of reading, and the intervention of repeated reading allows students the opportunity to improve their reading fluency by giving them time to practice rereading a passage or a book, and correct their reading miscues along the way. The intervention also allowed my students to build confidence and feel successful at improving their WPM scores as they read.

The information I learned through my action research project will directly impact my teaching because I have already continued to conduct this repeated reading intervention within my reading time with the four students who participated in this study from the beginning. As the school year progresses, and my four students who I am working with continue to make gains, I also hope to implement the repeated reading intervention with a new group of students in my
classroom who are not meeting oral reading fluency goals set for them. I believe in this reading intervention, and the positive effect it has had on my students, not only for improving their oral reading fluency, but also for improving their reading confidence. If I had more time to conduct the repeated reading intervention with my entire class, one-on-one, I would. However, time doesn’t allow that.

The information and knowledge I learned through research and work with my students has helped me have a better understanding of the importance of reading fluency, and an intervention that can be conducted to help students who are struggling with oral reading fluency. The knowledge I have gained can now be shared with my co-workers and parents of students who may be struggling with reading fluency. The intervention of repeated reading is something that parents could easily conduct at home as well. When students are given the opportunity to improve their oral reading fluency by rereading a text and correcting their miscues, they are able to focus more on reading fluently and comprehending what they are reading. Success with the repeated reading intervention and improving oral reading fluency is evident when students improve their WPM scores, but also when their reading fluency improvement can be noted in their everyday reading practice.

Plan for Sharing

I will share her results of this action research project with my second grade teaching team, as well as other teachers at the school where I teach. I will also share results of this study with the school literacy coach. The results of the research study will be shared with the four second grade student’s parents who participated in this action research project. I also hope to share these results and the specific reading intervention with parents of other students who are
struggling in reading fluency. This is a possible intervention parents could try at home to improve their child’s reading fluency.
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APPENDIX D

Reading a-z
Benchmark Passage Running Record
Fruit From My Garden

Student’s Name __________________________ Date ____________ Word Count: 116
Have the student read out loud as you record. Assessed by ______________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>word count</th>
<th>E = errors</th>
<th>S-C = self-correction</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>S-C</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>S-C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M = meaning</td>
<td>S = structure</td>
<td>V = visual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I walk into the garden to see</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>how my plants have grown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>My plants have dark, green leaves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>and pretty red fruit that I like to eat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>I start to pick some fruit from the plants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>I gently squeeze and poke the fruit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>to see what is ready to pick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>After I pick for a while, I look into my bag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>There is so much fruit inside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>My hands go into the bag as if</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>they have a mind of their own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>They pick up that yummy red fruit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>that I want to taste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>I cannot wait to get inside to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>wash it and eat it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>I eat a strawberry right there</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>in the garden.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Yum!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WCPM: ___________ Error Rate: ___________ Accuracy Rate: ___________ Self-Correction Rate: ___________

© Learning A-Z. All rights reserved.
Fruit From My Garden

I walk into the garden to see how my plants have grown. My plants have dark, green leaves and pretty red fruit that I like to eat. I start to pick some fruit from the plants. I gently squeeze and poke the fruit to see what is ready to pick. After I pick for a while, I look into my bag. There is so much fruit inside. My hands go into the bag as if they have a mind of their own. They pick up that yummy red fruit that I want to taste. I cannot wait to get inside to wash it and eat it. I eat a strawberry right there in the garden. Yum!
The Impact of Repeated Reading Interventions on Second Grade Readers

Fruit From My Garden

Name ___________________________ Date ________________

1. What is the boy growing?
   A) strawberries
   B) flowers
   C) green beans

2. How does the boy know if the fruit is ready to pick?
   A) He smells it.
   B) He feels it.
   C) He tastes it.

3. Why does the boy carry a bag?
   A) to hold his tools
   B) to hold the seeds
   C) to hold the fruit

4. What word tells the reader that the boy likes the way strawberries taste?
   A) pretty
   B) gently
   C) yummy

5. What is a garden?
   A) a place to grow plants
   B) a place to buy fruit
   C) a place to pick out a bag
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