

1-1-2014

# Effects of Continuous and Repeated Reading on the Oral Reading Fluency of a Fifth-Grade Student with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder

Nathaniel K. Ramey

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.stritch.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Ramey, Nathaniel K., "Effects of Continuous and Repeated Reading on the Oral Reading Fluency of a Fifth-Grade Student with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder" (2014). *Master's Theses, Capstones, and Projects*. 408.  
<https://digitalcommons.stritch.edu/etd/408>

This Graduate Field Experience is brought to you for free and open access by Stritch Shares. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses, Capstones, and Projects by an authorized administrator of Stritch Shares. For more information, please contact [smbagley@stritch.edu](mailto:smbagley@stritch.edu).

IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Effects of Continuous and Repeated Reading on the Oral Reading Fluency of a Fifth-Grade  
Student with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder

By

Nathaniel K. Ramey Jr.

A Graduate Field Experience

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Masters of Arts

Urban Education

At Cardinal Stritch University

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

2014

IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

This Graduate Field Experience  
Has Been Approved for Cardinal  
Stritch University by

Dr. Linda M. Gordy

(Advisor)

April 22, 2014

(Date)

ABSTRACT

This research case study provided reading interventions that focused on increasing oral reading fluency. This case study was designed for a below-level 5<sup>th</sup> grade student attending a private, urban, Midwestern school who was identified as having Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). A pretest and posttest were administered using the Qualitative Reading Inventory 5<sup>th</sup> Edition (QRI-5) (Leslie and Caldwell 2011). The intervention was conducted over 15 sessions that lasted 35 minutes. The primary dependent variable used during this case study was the correct words read per minute (CWPM). The student increased his oral reading fluency rate as a result of this reading intervention.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval Page .....2

Abstract.....3

Table of Contents.....4

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....7

    Introduction to Child.....7

    Connection to Law and Common Core Standards.....8

    Conclusion.....9

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW .....10

    Introduction.....10

    Repeated Reading.....10

    Repeated Reading, Continuous Reading, and Interval Sprinting.....32

    Successful Fluency-Building Interventions .....38

    Conclusion .....44

CHAPTER THREE: PROCEDURES.....46

    Introduction.....46

    Description of Sample.....47

IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Setting .....48

Student Description.....48

Description of Procedures.....50

Data Collection Procedure.....52

Qualitative Reading Inventory-5 Assessment.....52

Procedure and Rationale.....53

Conclusion.....53

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS.....54

Introduction.....54

Qualitative Reading Inventory-5 Results.....55

Oral Reading Fluency.....55

Miscues.....57

Informal Assessment.....60

Anecdotal Notes.....60

Conclusion.....61

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION .....61

Introduction.....61

IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Connections to Existing Research.....62

Explanation of Results.....64

    Fluency Growth.....64

    Narrative and Expository Rationale.....66

Connections to Common Core Standards.....67

Strengths and Limitations.....68

Recommendations.....70

Conclusion.....71

References.....72

Appendix A.....78

Appendix B.....81

Appendix C.....87

## **CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION**

Reading fluency is one of the most important reading competencies for children's reading success (Rasinski, Reutzel, Chard, & Limon-Thompson, 2011). Students who struggle with reading fluency will experience more difficulties in all academic subject areas. This research case study explored the effectiveness of a reading intervention designed to improve the oral reading fluency of a fifth-grade student with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). Oral reading fluency is a person's ability to read aloud with expression and without pause or hesitation. The reading intervention focuses on improving the oral reading fluency rate of the student involved through the implementation of fluency-building strategies. The oral reading fluency rate in this study is the correct words read per minute (CWPM) by the student participant.

The following sections of this study provide a brief description of the student involved in this study. Then, an outline of federal laws that promote educational equality for students who have been identified as having a learning disability is described. Finally, this chapter connects the content presented in the intervention to the appropriate Common Core Standards (2013) to which it is aligned.

### **Introduction to the Student**

Willie (pseudonym used for confidentiality) is a student who has recently been diagnosed with ADHD (2011), according to his mother. He was identified as having a specific learning disability. Willie has attended his current urban Midwestern school since the 2012-2013 school year. He was not provided with an Individual Educational Plan because the school

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

he attends does not provide them for students, nor is it mandated to provide them. Willie is an African-American male student who recently began the fifth grade in the fall of 2013. He was ten years and four months at the time of the intervention.

Before this reading intervention, Willie's reading fluency was assessed at 3<sup>rd</sup> grade instructional on the Qualitative Reading Inventory-5 (QRI-5) (Leslie and Caldwell 2011) on September 15, 2013. According to his last report card (January 18, 2014), Willie has not made significant progress in the area of reading over the last year. Willie is a well-behave adolescent who is more attentive and cooperative during small-group or one-on-one instruction. After learning about Willie, his academic abilities, and needs, it was easy to see why he was a good candidate for this intensive reading intervention that focused on building oral reading fluency.

### **Connections to the Federal Law and Common Core Standards**

The Federal Law has established the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA, 2004), which provides special education and related services to children who have been identified as having a learning disability. All students, including Willie, who are diagnosed with a learning disability are protected under the Federal Law and are guaranteed access to a quality education. This reading intervention was created to enhance Willie's oral reading fluency. This reading intervention provided Willie with skills and strategies to become successful in the general education classrooms. During this reading intervention, I allowed Willie to receive structured and attentive reading instruction in a comfortable learning environment.

It is important to align all teaching strategies and tool with standards. Standards guarantee that students are learning required information for their current grade-level so they

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

are prepared for the next level of instruction. The focus on improving oral reading fluency rates align with Common Core Standards (2013). According to Wisconsin Common Core State Standard English Language Arts-Literacy Reading Foundation (2013) (CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RF) 5.4, all fifth grade students, like Willie, should read with sufficient accuracy and fluency to support comprehension. The purpose of this reading intervention was to improve Willie's oral reading fluency. Oral reading fluency, speed, and accuracy were heavily emphasized in the 15 sessions of this research case study. Therefore, fluency-building practices exhibited during this reading intervention are directly supported and aligned with CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RF.5.4.

### **Conclusion**

Willie, a fifth-grade student who was identified as having ADHD, participated in this research case study. This case study involved 15, 35-minute long intervention sessions that focused on improving oral reading fluency. Willie received one-on-one instruction using research-based fluency-building strategies to help improve his oral reading fluency level.

So that an effective reading intervention could be administered, a review of literature was conducted. Literature was reviewed in the area of reading interventions that focused on fluency-building strategies. Chapter Two reviews existing literature that pertains to effective reading interventions designed to improve oral reading fluency for elementary students who have been identified as having a learning disability.

## CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

In the past, the educational system has not fully embraced fluency in academic subjects other than reading. Fluency has been neglected in subjects such as math, science, and social studies (Kubina & Morrison, 2000). Because of the lack of emphasis in fluency, strengthening the reading skills of elementary students with learning disabilities has become a difficult task for educators. But changes in both research and practice are starting to occur. Reading fluency interventions are taking center stage (National Reading Panel, 2000). There are three subcategories to this chapter that discuss the positive effects of reading interventions. The first subcategory will involve a collection of research reviews containing the practices and outcomes of a fluency-building strategy called repeated reading. The second subcategory is a collection of literary reviews that involve an analysis of the repeated-reading strategy combined with continuous reading and interval sprinting fluency-building interventions. The third subcategory contains literary reviews that analyze various fluency-building strategies that have been successful among elementary students. Those strategies include Reader's Theatre, listening passage previewing, word list training and error correction. In this chapter, a review of literature uncovers best practices regarding the previously suggested reading interventions. It discusses the effects of these fluency-building interventions and how they have been successful among elementary students.

### **Repeated Reading**

Repeated-reading interventions provide an opportunity for modeling expression and fluency. During a repeated reading session, the teacher appropriately reads from a text with fluency and expression. The students then read the same words from the text (Musti-Rao,

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Hawkins, & Barkley 2009). This section will focus on the effects and strengths of repeated reading interventions.

A research study conducted by Staudt (2009) investigated if using repeated reading can improve fluency rates for below-level readers who have been diagnosed with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). The dependent variable of this study was the fluency rate. The independent variable required students to participate in repeated readings facilitated by an instructor 30 minutes every day for one school year. Repeated readings allow students to orally read a part of a reading passage immediately after an instructor has modeled how to orally read that particular section.

Hill involved two fourth grade participants, Will and Anne (pseudonyms), to help bring her theories about repeated reading to life. Anne and Will were both diagnosed with (ADHD). After three years of intense instruction in phonics and word recognition to build fluency, both Anne and Will were still reading books two grades below their grade level. Hill selected Anne and Will because she felt they would benefit the most from this study.

At the beginning of the fourth grade school year, Hill decided to give these two students an informal reading assessment, Qualitative Reading Inventory-3(Caldwell & Leslie, 2001), to find out each student's fluency rate. Each student read a third grade reading passage. The assessment outcomes revealed that Anne read the passage at 48 words per minute (wpm), and Will read the same passage at 29 words per minute. Hasbrouck and Tindal (1992) found that reading 99 wpm is the median rate for students beginning fourth grade.

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

During this study Hill provided opportunities for Will and Anne to participate in repeated readings each day. Hill used timed repeated readings, most of which were poems. The rhythm and the rhyme scheme helped to keep the students' attention. After 15 minutes of timed repeated readings, Hill would then model oral reading. This helped to show students how expressive and fluent they should sound when they read orally. Each day Hill repeated this process.

By the end of the year, Anne and Will made tremendous progress. They were both given the Qualitative Reading Inventory-3 (Caldwell & Leslie, 2001) to measure each student's progress. Anne, who previously had a fluency-rate of 48 wpm, improved to 80 wpm. Will, who previously had a fluency-rate of 29 wpm, improved to 69 wpm improving his reading speed by 138%.

This research study validates that repeated readings, small group when possible, can improve the fluency rate of a struggling fourth-grade reader who has been diagnosed with ADHD. The consistency and practice of repeated reading during this study improved the fluency rate of each target student. Repeated reading is effective when it is practiced consistently. The next study not only validates that repeated reading facilitated by a researcher can improve a student's oral reading fluency, but it also shows the effectiveness of peer-mediated repeated reading interventions.

A research study by Cartledge, Yurick, Robinson, Lo, and Evans (2006) investigated if peer-mediated repeated readings can improve fluency for urban elementary students with below-level reading scores. Peer-mediated repeated readings require students to read at least

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

one paragraph after they have heard their classmate appropriately read the same paragraph. For this study, the independent variable required students to orally reading in pairs alternating paragraphs for twenty minutes. Then, students participated in a one minute timed trial in which instructors kept track of miscues. The dependent variable was the number of total correct words read per minute.

Teachers recommended target students for this experiment. Participants consisted of twelve lower-achieving, fifth-grade, urban students. Their ages ranged from ten to twelve years of age. Four of the participants were African-American males. The other eight were African-American female.

The researchers assessed students' initial fluency levels by the standard battery reading portion of the Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement (WJ-R) (Woodcock, 1989). All students were given fourth-grade level passages to read orally for the examination. As expected, fluency levels were below grade-level for each student according to the (WJ-R) because none of the students read 180 correct words per minute.

After pretest results, four months of peer-mediated repeated readings began. For three days a week in thirty-minute sessions, two target students were taken to an isolated room and placed at a seating area about three feet across from one another. Students were assigned passages of approximately 200-250 words from a fourth or fifth-grade leveled book selected by the classroom teacher. Students read orally to each other repeating and alternating paragraphs. When miscues occurred, partners were allowed to help each other if they were able. If both students could not decode a word, the instructor would then assist with the correct

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

pronunciation of a word. Students were allowed to move to the next reading level when they reached 180 correct words read in one minute with ten or fewer errors. Correct words per minute was measured in real time and checked against an audio tape of every session. After peer-mediated repeated reading sessions were concluded, students were called out of the classroom to read for one-minute timings. The student set the timer for 1 minute, opened the book to the passage and began to read while the experimenter recorded the session with a tape-recorder for later evaluation.

Four months after the research study began, students were given the standard battery reading portion of the (WJ-R) again. On the pretest all students read between 85 and 100 correct words per minute indicating lack of speed. On the posttest, ten of the twelve target students read 180 correct words per minute indicating fluency mastery on fourth-grade level passages. Target students achieved a mean increase of 68 correct words per minute.

Peer-mediated repeated readings were effective in this experiment conducted by Cartledge et al. (2006). Ten of twelve target students improved their fluency levels, and they reached a fluency mastery level of 180 correct words per minute on grade-level text. The next article focuses on the repeated reading intervention also. However, in this study, students were required to participate in class wide repeated readings as well as peer-mediated repeated readings.

The study conducted by Musti-Rao, Hawkins, and Barkley (2009) studied the effects of repeated reading among fourth-grade urban learners. They investigated if these repeated reading strategies can improve the reading fluency rate of fourth-grade urban learners. The

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

dependent variable used for this experiment was the students' oral reading fluency-correct words per minute (cwpm). The independent variable required target students to participate in class-wide repeated readings as well as peer-mediated repeated reading. During a class wide repeated reading session, the teacher appropriately reads one sentence from a text with fluency and expression. The students then read the same sentence. This process continued for about five minutes. Peer-mediated repeated readings require two students to sit across from each other. While sitting across from one another, students take turns reading one paragraph at a time for a period of twenty minutes.

Target students were selected based on results of screening for at-risk markers on the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS; Good & Kaminski, 2002) instrument and on the basis of teacher nominations. Results generated by this assessment suggested that all 12 target students needed intensive fluency instruction to reach the benchmarking goal for fourth grade. DIBELS indicates that 118 correct words per minute is the benchmarking goal for fourth-grade students. Twelve African-American students between the ages of nine and twelve participated in this experiment. Although the whole class received repeated-reading instruction, data were only collected on the select twelve students. Six of the twelve students had been diagnosed with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD).

At the beginning of the study, students were administered fourth-grade-level passages from the DIBELS oral reading fluency (Good and Kaminski, 2002). These data served as progress-monitoring data for students throughout the study. Initial scores from the DIBELS oral reading fluency assessment ranged from 9 to 69 correct words per minute.

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Target students participated in class-wide repeated reading sessions. Students read 120-150-word passages from a fourth-grade leveled book *Charlotte's Web* (White, 1952). The teacher selected this text because of the many characteristics demonstrated by each character. The daily goal for target fourth-grade leveled students, indicated by DIBELS, was set at 118 correct words per minute. Because fluency levels were so low, they were allowed to read second and third grade passages from DIBELS with a daily reading goal of 90 correct words per minute.

Although class-wide instruction took place every day in the classroom for 30 minutes, the 12 target students only spent 30 minutes per week practicing small group repeated readings and peer repeated readings for 17 weeks. At the beginning of each small group session, students sat across from one another and placed their reading passage from DIBELS and correction card in front of them. A correction card is a small note card students used to write down words they could not decode. Next, students took turns reading each of the passage for 10 minutes. The correction procedure used in this study was similar to the procedure used in Yurick et al.'s (2006) study. When a student incorrectly said a word, his or her partner attempted to help decode the miscue. If neither student could correctly pronounce a word, the instructor would say the word for the students and document it for further practice. At the end of the paired reading session, students recorded on their correction card the number of words they read correctly. If a student met the goal of 118 correct words per minute, he or she was given tangible rewards such as colorful pencils, erasers, or fancy notebooks.

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Data at the end of this repeated reading study showed that there was an increase in the fluency rates of all target students. Only one student was able to meet the fluency goal of 118 correct words per minute on fourth-grade practice passages from DIBELS. This student read 126 correct words per minute. Overall, the mean of the fluency rate for target students improved by 20 correct words per minute. These gains indicated promise in the repeated reading strategy for fluency improvement. In the article, Musti-Rao et al. (2009) described a study where results indicated that all students improved reading-fluency levels with the repeated-reading intervention. However, only 1 of the students reached bench mark goals for fourth-grade at the end of the study. If target students could have met more than once a week, more than one learner might have obtained the benchmarking goal of 118 correct words per minute. The results of this study do confirm that repeated reading is an effective fluency-building intervention for urban learners. Although this study revealed how effective repeated readings can be for urban elementary students, the next study investigated if continuous reading interventions are more effective than repeated reading interventions.

A research study by Cartledge, Lo, Staubitz, and Yurick (2005) investigated if repeated-reading instruction, peer and trainer-mediated, can improve the reading fluency of elementary students with emotional and behavioral disorders. Repeated reading involves students rereading a passage of text independently, with a partner, or with an instructor. The student's fluency is measured during the initial reading of a passage, after which the student practices rereading the passage independently (Samuels, 1997). The dependent variable for this study was the students' oral reading rates. The oral reading rate is the number of words per minute

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

read during the first minute of student reading. The independent variable was the repeated-reading intervention.

Classroom teachers from a Midwestern urban elementary school identified six students who were having reading difficulties. All six participants were diagnosed with emotional disturbance (ED) and two of the six students were diagnosed with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD).

Participants' fluency was assessed in a pretest. Passages on the pretest came from the Woodcock-Johnson III Test of Achievement (WJ III; Woodcock, McGrew, & Mather, 2001). On the pretest, the mean of the participants' fluency rate was 71 words per minute on a fourth-grade reading passage. Words per minute of the participants ranged from 39 to 123. Pretests were administered without the repeated-reading condition of being able to read a passage after someone has already read it out loud. Therefore, participants took the pretest under the sustained silent reading condition (SSR). The sustained silent reading condition allowed participants ten minutes to silently read a passage of 180-200 words before their oral reading rate was assessed from the same passage. The repeated-reading condition allowed students to orally read a passage of 180-200 words with a peer or instructor for ten minutes while receiving praise and decoding help from a trained examiner before their oral reading rate is assessed on that same passage.

The researcher matched students in pairs immediately prior to the interventions once the fluency rate data were complete. Reading pairs were matched according to assessment scores. Trainings began with students who showed the greatest reading deficits. Training was

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

completed over the course of three 20-minute sessions. Appropriate reading and listening skills were modeled and practiced during student training. During trainings, the researcher showed participants how to sit across from either the peer or instructor during interventions. The researcher also told and modeled how to follow along while the assigned reading passage was being read using a tracking finger. Participants were also instructed to expressively reread the passage after they heard either their instructor or peer read that same passage.

Repeated-reading interventions were given in staggers according to who needed the most assistance. This stagger was based on the pretest score from the WJ III (Woodcock, McGrew, & Mather, 2001). For example, because student 1 and student 2 scored a fluency rate of 39 and 53 words per minute, they began their repeated-reading intervention on the earliest date of October 13, 2003. These participants were able to receive 32 sessions that lasted 20 minutes. Student 3 was given 19 sessions, student 4 was given 16 sessions, and students 5 and 6 were given 12 sessions. All repeated-reading sessions were complete by March 16, 2004.

During the repeated-reading sessions, students read with partners from a passage of 180-200 words for ten minutes. While one student read, the other student followed along with his or her tracking finger. During this ten minutes, the examiner monitored the students providing praise, stickers, and help with decoding unfamiliar words. After the ten minutes of practice, the students individually read the practiced passages to the experimenter for one minute. The participants were timed and recorded. The students were given three opportunities to read a particular passage for the examiner each session. The number of words

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

read during the participant's best performance was charted in the examiner's records at the end of each session.

After the repeated-reading interventions were complete, the participants used the repeated-reading condition to read passages for a fluency posttest from the Woodcock-Johnson III Test of Achievement (WJ III; Woodcock, McGrew, & Mather, 2001). During the repeated condition, words per minute scores for all target students were higher than those from the pretest during the sustained silent reading condition. The group mean increased from 71 words per minute on the pretest to 133 words per minute on the posttest.

All of the students in the study read more fluently during the repeated-reading preparation of the posttest than they had during the sustained silent reading condition on the pretest. The results of this study support peer-mediated repeated-reading interventions as a viable option for students with emotional or behavioral disorders. The next study utilized repeated reading for fluency-building purposes; however, it compared repeated reading to another strategy called interval sprinting.

A research study by Cooke, Lo, and Starling (2011) investigated the effectiveness of repeated reading on reading fluency. These researchers wanted to know if repeated-reading practice could improve the oral reading rate of three second-grade students at-risk for reading failure. Repeated reading involves a student rereading a specific passage out loud multiple times to a teacher or peer tutor. The teacher or peer may first model expressive reading or involve the student in unison reading (Richards, 2000; Therrien & Kubina, 2006). The

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

dependent variable of this study was the oral reading rate (correct words per minute). The independent variable of this case study was the repeated-reading interventions.

This study was conducted in a Title 1 elementary school within an urban school district located in the southeast region of the United States. Three second-grade students participated in this study. These students were selected based on three criteria. First, students had to have tested out of *Early Reading Tutor* (Gibbs, Campbell, Helf, & Cooke, 2007), a decoding program addressing first-grade decoding skills. Second, students scored below the benchmark level on the second-grade DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency subtest (Good, Kaminiski, & Dill, 2002). Third, students were not involved in any oral reading interventions beyond basic reading instruction from school.

Student 1 was a 7-year-old African-American female. On the fluency pretest, she obtained 52 correct words per minute on the DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency subtest (Good, Kaminiski, & Dill, 2002). Student 2 was a 7-year-old Hispanic female. She scored 34 correct words per minute. Student 3 was an 8-year-old African-American male who read 40 correct words per minute.

Each participant received the individual repeated reading sessions from the researcher for 20 minutes each session, four times per week. Each session involved a new passage and 7 important steps. The first step was called *Preview of difficult passage words*. This is where the researcher read five preselected difficult words from the passage to the participant. The participant then independently read each of the 5 difficult words. The second step of the intervention was called *Initial timed passage reading*. In this step, the tutor instructed the

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

participant to read the provided grade-level passage for 1 minute without assistance. The tutor recorded errors on the instructor's materials as the participant read aloud. At the end of the 1-minute reading, the tutor placed a bracket after the last word read and recorded the number of correct words on the student performance graph using the green color gel ink pen. The next step was called *Performance feedback and error correction*. For this section, the tutor announced to the participant the number of words he or she read correctly. The tutor provided error correction on each of the missed words by pointing to and identifying the missed word on the passage instructing the participant to read the missed word. Step 4 is called *Error word or sight word practice*. For this step, the tutor wrote down the missed words on blank flash cards for isolated word practice. Step 5 provided unison reading. For this section, the tutor instructed the participant to read the passage aloud with her as she modeled expressive reading at a rate that was slightly faster than the participant's current reading rate but at a rate that the participant could read in unison with a tutor. Step 6 provided repeated performance cueing and feedback. In this section, the tutor cued the participant to focus on improving fluency by pointing out the number of words he or she read correctly during the initial reading on the graph and encouraging the participant to read faster with expression. The seventh and final step is called *Timed Passage Rereading*. For this final step, the tutor instructed the participant to reread the passage independently for 1 minute, recorded errors, and marked the number of correct words read per minute on the performance graph using a different color gel ink pen.

During each repeated reading intervention, the three second-grade participants took a fluency pretest and posttest from the DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency subtest. Student 1 received

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

repeated reading intervention on 24 passages. She scored an average of 77.67 correct words per minute on the initial timed readings and 101.88 correct words per minute on the post readings. Student 2 practiced repeated reading on 19 passages and received a mean score of 72.95 correct words per minute on the initial timed readings and 85.68 correct words per minute on the post readings. Student 3 received repeated reading interventions on only seven passages. He scored an average of 82.86 correct words per minute on the initial readings and an average of 109.43 correct words per minute on the post readings. All three participants improved between initial and post readings with an increased score of 24.21 correct words per minute for student 1, 12.74 for student 2, and 26.57 for student 3.

Results showed that this repeated reading program combining several research-based components (i.e., repeated readings, preview of difficult words, unison reading, error correction, and performance cueing and feedback) improved fluency for three second grade below-level readers. After participating in this repeated reading program, all three participants increased their oral reading rates and speed of fluency progress. The individual interventions allowed all participants to obtain independence on grade-level reading passages within the time frame of 20-minute reading interventions according to the oral reading fluency rates recorded. The next research summary also investigated the fluency growth of fourth and fifth-grade students with repeated reading, but the researchers provided Quick Reads during the interventions that involved reading passages containing information science and social science subjects.

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

A research study by Vadasy and Sanders (2008) investigated if the *Quick Reads* program could improve the fluency rate of fourth and fifth-grade struggling readers. The *Quick Reads* program provided a repeated reading procedure with short non-fiction texts written on grade-appropriate science and social science topics. The simplicity of the repeated reading procedure and the engaging nature of the *Quick Read* passages make the program well suited for use by researchers. The repeated reading procedure involves reading a short passage aloud several times. The instructor often provides corrections. The students read a passage a prescribed number of times until the student reaches a certain reading rate goal (Weinstein and Cooke, 1992). The dependent variable for this study was the number of words read correctly per minute (WCPM) by the student. The independent variable was the repeated reading procedure administered with the *Quick Reads* program.

In the fall academic year of 2008, 40 fourth-grade and fifth-grade teachers in 12 public elementary schools in a large northwestern city were asked to refer students with adequate word reading skills and low fluency rates. Students were considered eligible for participation of this reading intervention if they demonstrated at-risk performance on reading passages from the Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) subtest of the *Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literary Skills* (DIBELS; Good and Kaminski, 2002). Fourth-grade at-risk performance was defined as scoring below 93 WCPM on fourth-grade passages. Fifth-grade at-risk performance was defined as scoring below 104 WCPM on fifth-grade passages. The final number of student participants for this fluency intervention was 54 treatment students and 65 control students.

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

When students became eligible for this fluency intervention, they were immediately grouped in pairs. After they were grouped in pairs, they were randomly assigned to one of two conditions: treatment, which used *Quick Reads* for repeated reading tutoring or control. Students in the control group did not receive tutoring; they only received classroom instruction. Treatment Students received *Quick Reads* tutoring in pairs for 30 minutes per day, 4 days per week, for 20 weeks. Students assigned to the control group received regular classroom instruction while treatment students received tutoring.

During the *Quick Reads* intervention, researchers administered nonfiction passages for grade levels 4 and 5. Each grade level included nine science topics and 9 social studies topics chosen on the basis of national and state standards for science and social science. All passages were read three times. For the first read the teacher activated background knowledge about the topics and asked students to find two words that were challenging. Students then read the passages aloud while writing notes or key phrases. During the second read, the teacher read aloud for the students while they followed along, setting a model for fluent reading. For the third read, the researcher told students that their goal was to read as much of the passage as they could in 1 minute. The student then read aloud for 1 minute while the researcher recorded the number of words per minute.

All students were pretested and post-tested. Fluency rate was assessed using students' mean WCPM on two grade-level passages drawn from DIBELS ORF benchmarks. Specifically, the fourth graders had to read the following passages at pretest: "Water Cycle," and "Land at the Top of the World"; and at posttest: "The Youngest Rider," and "She Reached for the Stars."

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

The fifth grader read the following DIBELS ORF Grade 5 passages at pretest: "Something's Missing," and "Mount Rainier"; and at posttest: "Help is on the Way," and "Mount Everest." Students read each passage aloud while the tester recorded errors. Treatment students scored a mean fluency rate of 64 WCPM on the pretest and a mean fluency rate of 84 WCPM on the posttest. From the pretest to the posttest treatment students improved their fluency rate by 20 words. Control students scored a mean fluency rate of 65 WCPM on the pretest and a mean fluency rate of 82 WCPM on the posttest. From pretest to posttest control students improved their mean fluency rate by 17 words.

The aim of this study was to evaluate the use of the *Quick Reads* fluency program for fourth and fifth-grade students whose fluency rate was below grade level. This article by Vadasy and Sanders (2008) does validate that the *Quick Reads* program does improve oral reading fluency for struggling fourth and fifth-grade readers. However, at posttest, there were no significant differences in fluency growth between control students and treatment students. This means that the *Quick Reads* program is effective for struggling readers in small groups and whole-class settings. The next article discussed a repeated reading intervention administered in Turkey, but this intervention also included performance-based feedback.

This article by Ates (2013) explored the effects of repeated reading fluency interventions with performance based feedback on a student with reading difficulty. Repeated readings require that the student orally read a passage several times during each session. For each successive reading, the student tries to increase the number of words read per minute (Samuels, 1979). During this intervention, two kinds of performance feedback were provided to

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

the student. The first type of performance feedback was concerned with the number of words read correctly. The second type was concerned with reading miscues. All feedback was related to the student's performance (Konold, Miller, and Konold, 2004). The dependent variables of this study were the number of words read correctly per minute and the number of errors per minute. The independent variable of this study was the repeated reading interventions with performance based feedback. In this study, errors included miscues such as omissions, word additions, reading incorrectly, hesitations, and word reversals.

The research took place in a public elementary school in Turkey's Ankara Province with a student with reading difficulty. For ethical consideration, the student's name was labeled as HB. HB was 10 years old. HB was selected by school staff to receive the reading intervention because he was at frustration level in terms of word recognition accuracy and oral reading fluency. In determining the student's reading level before and after the intervention, narrative passages were used. These passages were selected from the Turkish Language Arts textbooks published by different publishing companies.

The research began in the second week of March. This intervention lasted 38 hours. The intervention took place two or three days during the week in a silent room. At the beginning of every session, the researcher presented student with a passage to read. While HB orally read the passages, the researcher recorded the number of words read correctly per minute and the number of miscues made by HB. Following the HB's readings, he was given breaks changing from 10 to 15 minutes. During the breaks given, the researcher computed the number of words HB read correctly in one minute and counted the number of his miscues. While breaks occurred, the researcher also asked HB to pronounce the words he read wrong.

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

The repeated reading activities followed the performance feedback process from the oral reading at the beginning of the intervention. After the repeated reading activities, HB was asked to read the same reading passage orally. The documentation from the first oral reading session was repeated in the second. Following the second reading session, HB was informed about the number of words he read correctly and the number of miscues that he made.

During the first reading intervention, HB read a passage that had 198 words. He read 37 words correctly in 1 minute and recorded 22 errors. For HB's final oral reading evaluation, he read a passage that contained 200 words. For HB's final oral reading evaluation, he read 52 words correctly in 1 minute and recorded 9 errors. HB improved the number of words he read correctly in 1 minute by 15 words. He also decreased his number of reading errors by 13 words.

For this study, a performance based skill development program was applied in order to remove reading problems for a student who has fluency problems. The authors wanted to know if repeated reading combined with performance feedback could improve the oral reading fluency of a struggling reader. After this intervention, a positive change was observed in HB's reading skills in terms of word recognition accuracy and word recognition automaticity. The results from this research case study demonstrated that both repeated reading and performance-based feedback techniques are influential in terms of improving oral reading skills. The next research review also summarized a repeated reading intervention, but the this study did not use performance-based feedback. The next study discussed a reading intervention combined with a systematic error correction process.

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

This research article by Alber-Morgan, Ramp, Anderson, and Martin (2007) examined the effects of repeated reading combined with systematic error correction on the reading fluency of 4 middle school students receiving treatment for their behavior problems. Repeated readings require that the student orally read a passage several times during each session. For each successive reading, the student tries to increase the number of words read per minute (Samuels, 1979). During systematic error correction, the student reads a passage for five minutes. For every miscue, the teacher provided the correct word, the student repeated the word, and the student reread the sentence that included the word (Alber-Morgan et al., 2007). The dependent variables of this study were the number of words read correctly per minute and the number of errors per minute. The independent variable of this study was the independent variable that included repeated reading combined with systematic error correction.

The participating students were three boys and one girl. The students' ages were 12 to 15. They attended a self-contained day treatment classroom located in a Mississippi public middle school. Theo and Brian (pseudonyms) were sixth graders with emotional and behavior disorders, and Kelly and Andrew (pseudonyms) were seventh graders with learning disabilities. The special education teacher nominated these four students to participate in this study because they demonstrated substantial deficiencies in reading performance. Data were collected for one hour a day between 10:00 a.m. and 11:00 p.m. in students' self-contained classroom 3 days each week over the course of 11 weeks.

All reading interventions included repeated readings combined with systematic error correction. For each session, the researcher presented grade level reading passages from the

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

MacMillan McGraw-Hill basal reading series (Pearson et al., 1991). While the researcher presented passages to the students, he prompted them to read the story. While the student read, the researcher recorded each word as correct or incorrect. Each time the student produced a reading error, the following error correction procedure was used: The researcher read the word correctly, and prompted the student to read the word. Upon completion of reading the passage, the researcher reviewed each reading error by pointing to the word and saying, "What is this word?" If the student responded correctly, the researcher would move on to the next word until all reading errors were said correctly. After this procedure, the student was timed to see how many words he or she could read in one minute. After the 1-minute timed reading, the researcher counted the number of words read correctly and reported that number to the student. The researcher also counted the number of reading errors. A word was counted as an error if it was stated incorrectly, omitted, miscued, or not stated within 3 seconds.

The data paths showed a similar pattern for three of the four students. For Theo, Kelly, and Andrew, there was immediate increase in their reading rates with an ascending trend throughout the repeated reading interventions. Brian's data path, however, did not show immediate increase in reading rate, but eventually began to increase the number of correct words read per minutes throughout the remainder of the intervention. The mean of the reading rates for all four students increased from 95.6 correct words read per minute to 133.7 correct words read per minute. During repeated readings, Theo and Andrew showed immediate decrease in errors (mean errors, 1.3 to 2.2). Brian also showed immediate decrease

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

in errors. Kelly showed initial increase in errors and continued for the first five sessions.

However, the first five sessions were followed by low and stable error rates (mean errors= 3.6).

This study examined the effectiveness of repeated readings with systematic error correction on reading fluency of middle school students with severe behavior problems. A positive relationship was demonstrated for repeated readings on correct words read and errors made per minute. The data patterns for all four students indicate that repeated readings combined with systematic error correction had a significant effect on increased reading fluency.

In this section, the previously discussed repeated reading interventions improved the oral reading fluency for all participants. In research studies conducted by Staudt (2009), Musti-Rao, Hawkins, and Barkley (2009), Cartledge, Yurick, and Cooke, Lo, and Starling (2011), all participants were able to improve their oral reading fluency rates, which is the correct words read per minute. These research articles focused on repeated reading interventions that were facilitated by teachers only, and they validated that small group repeated reading interventions does improve the fluency of elementary students. In case study articles conducted by Cartledge, Lo, Staubitz, and Yurick (2005) and Robinson, Lo, and Evans (2006), participants also improved their oral reading fluency rates, but the reading interventions from these case studies were facilitated by instructors and other students. These studies validated that students can improve reading fluency while participating in a repeated reading intervention that does not include an adult trainer. In case study articles conducted by Vadasy and Sanders (2008), Ates (2013), and Alber-Morgan, Ramp, Anderson, and Martin, (2007), fluency improvement was obtained by all students. These research studies used error correction and student feedback

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

combined with repeated reading interventions, and the articles discussed how providing feedback to students individually assisted during the repeated reading process. This subcategory validated that repeated reading interventions can improve fluency among elementary students and elementary students with learning disabilities.

### **Repeated Reading, Continuous Reading, and Interval Sprinting**

This subcategory analyzes research on a combination of three fluency-building strategies. Those strategies include a combination of repeated reading and continuous reading and a combination of repeated reading and interval sprinting. The research in this section will illustrate how effective the previously suggested reading interventions can be when elementary students are consistently engaged with these strategies. This section also analyzes which of these fluency-building strategies are most effective.

A research study conducted by O'Connor (2007) evaluated two methods that can improve the fluency of struggling readers. The researcher wanted to know if repeated-reading practices are more effective than continuous reading practices when trying to improve a student's fluency rate. Repeated reading requires a student to orally read a group of words from a text immediately after an instructor or peer has correctly read that same group of words. Students orally read for a required amount of time while an instructor keeps track of miscues during continuous reading practice. The independent variable was the intervention that included repeated reading or continuous reading. The dependent variable was the fluency rate.

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Researchers screened students in eight classrooms (four classes each in the second and fourth grade) to identify 6 students per class who met eligibility criteria for struggling readers. To meet these criteria, second graders had to have read between 12 and 45 words per minute (wpm) on grade level passages, and fourth graders between 20 and 80 wpm. The criteria were established to ensure that selected students could read enough words to benefit from read-aloud practices. Target students from four classes (two second-grade classes and two fourth-grade classes) were assigned to repeated-reading practices, and selected students from the remaining four classes participated in continuous reading interventions.

Target students completed a pretest and a posttest to assess the dependent variable. Examiners used the Gray Oral Reading Test, Fourth Edition (Wiederholt & Bryant, 2001) to assess students' fluency rate. Because it is possible that students will read faster if they know they will not be held accountable for comprehension (O'Shea et al., 1985), the researchers of this study measured fluency rates of comprehension passages without asking questions. Target students selected for repeated-reading interventions scored a combined fluency rate of 58 words per minute on the pretest. Students selected for continuous-reading interventions scored a combined fluency rate of 59 words per minute on the pretest.

The six struggling readers per class were put into groups of threes based on their fluency scores on the Gray Oral Reading Tests, Fourth Edition (GORT4). Students in each trio were randomly assigned to one read-aloud practice (repeated reading or continuous reading). The growth in reading rate of all 6 target students per class was monitored weekly. Target students selected for continuous reading interventions read aloud to a trained adult listener for 15

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

minutes 3 times weekly for 14 weeks. During continuous reading interventions, students read all grade-leveled passages from the GORT4. When miscues occurred, adult examiners were there to write down the miscues and review them with students after the examination.

Students who participated in repeated-reading interventions also met 15 minutes out of a day, three times a week for 14 weeks. In these interventions, students followed and listened to adult examiners read one paragraph at a time. After the examiners were finished reading that particular paragraph, target students orally read that same paragraph mimicking the examiner's fluency and expression.

Students in all four groups improved in overall levels of performance during the 14 weeks of the study. When students selected for continuous-reading interventions were given their posttest, they scored an average fluency rate of 83 words per minute. Their fluency rate improved 24 words per minute from the pretest score. When target students selected for repeated-reading practices took their posttest, they scored an average fluency rate of 84 words per minute. Students participating in repeated-reading practices improved their average fluency rate 26 words per minute from the pretest score. Target students in repeated reading and continuous reading experiments showed greater fluency growth than students who were not selected to participate in this study. Students from the classrooms of target students not selected in this study only improved their average fluency rate by 5 words from pretest to posttest. Although students receiving the intervention outperformed other students, no significant differences were found between students who practiced repeated or continuous reading on measure of reading rate.

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

This article does validate that repeated reading and continuous reading practice does improve the reading fluency of struggling second and fourth grade readers. It also confirms that there is no significant difference between the fluency improvement of repeated reading and continuous reading practice. According to this study, second and fourth-grade below grade-leveled readers may experience similar growth in their fluency rates by using a repeated-reading or continuous-reading method of practice. The next research case study also compared the effects two reading interventions. Similar to the study by O'Connor (2007), it examined repeated reading, but the next study compared repeated reading to a reading intervention called interval sprinting.

A study conducted by Kostewicz and Kubina (2010) compared two fluency-building strategies called repeated reading and interval sprinting for three participants with or at-risk for reading deficits. This research study investigated which fluency-building condition can help an elementary student who receives extra oral reading tutoring achieve the fluency criterion of 200 or more correct words per minute. During a repeated reading condition, a student reads the same passage until meeting a pre-set criterion of words per minute while receiving feedback and error correction (Meyer & Felton, 1999). Interval sprinting with reading involves two main steps. First, a practitioner determines a reading passage for practice and equally divides the passage into a specified number of words based on the length of time per interval (i.e., number of seconds). Second, students will spend their time sprinting (i.e., reading aloud) from each of the starting points across the passage (Therrien & Kubina, 2007). The dependent variable for this study was the correct words read per minute. The independent variable for this study was the repeated reading and interval sprinting interventions.

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Two ten-year old males and one eight-year male participated in this study. Both ten-year old students received special education services and had individualized educational plans stating that they needed additional reading support. The eight-year old participant did not receive special education services. Due to difficulties with reading, he received reading assistance from Title 1, a tutoring program that provides additional educational help for elementary students. The researcher recruited all participants through community referrals from faculty in a special education program. This study took place during summer vacation. Therefore, all sessions occurred in each participant's home. The experimenter conducted all sessions and met with each participant every available weekday during the course of the study. Each session lasted approximately ten to twenty minutes. All readings came from Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (Good & Kaminski, 2007).

During the interval sprinting interventions, the researcher asked the participants to read from six specific points within the passage. The specific starting points of each sprint passage came from dividing the first 204 words of a passage into six equal parts. The researcher then provided the participants with copies of the passage and told them that they would read aloud from six different parts of the passage for ten seconds twice and to read as fast as they were able. After setting the timer for ten seconds, the researcher had the participant start reading the first of six equal sections in the passage while recording correct words read, highlighting miscues, and marking the final word read. Once the participant completed two readings for any passage, the researcher prompted him to start reading from the beginning of the next passage. The above procedure was repeated for each ten-second reading. After the second timing of the third and sixth passage, the researcher provided verbal feedback and error

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

correction over the previous timed readings. Verbal feedback consisted of explaining the number of correct words read per sprint passage. For error correction, every word mispronounced, omitted, substituted, or skipped was showed to the participant and read for him. Following the verbal feedback and error correction over the final six sprints, the experimenter had the participant read from the start of the overall passage for a one-minute test.

To start the repeated reading condition, the experimenter provided the participant with an unmarked copy of the passage. The participant then read the passage twice as fast as he could. The participant was given one minute to read each passage. While the participant read, the examiner recorded the number of correct words and errors on a separate copy of the passage. Then, the researcher provided verbal feedback discussing correct words read and performed error correction identical to the error correction discussed in the interval sprinting condition of this study. After verbal feedback and error correction, the participant had to complete a one-minute test reading of the passage.

On average, each participant had 22.6 minutes of reading practice for both conditions (i.e., two minutes per condition, two conditions per session, ranging from 9-13 sessions for an average of 11.3 sessions). During the repeated reading condition, the participants read an average of 169 (range 151-203) correct words per minute. The participants read an average of 186 (range 169-215) correct words per minute during the interval sprinting condition. Participants read an average of 17 more words correctly in the interval sprinting condition in an identical amount of reading time.

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

This study compared repeated reading with interval sprinting. The research question asked which of the two fluency-building procedures facilitated attainment of the fluency criterion of 200 or more correct words. The data suggest little difference between the methods as participants met the criterion under both procedures an equal number of times. However, on average the interval sprinting condition did produce a higher mean of 186 correct words read per minute. These data suggest that the interval sprinting condition can cause a participant to read more correct words per minute than repeated reading during a facilitated study.

This section examined and compared three effective reading interventions. The study by O'Connor (2007) validated that continuous reading and repeated reading interventions do improve the reading fluency of struggling fourth-grade readers. It also confirmed that there is no significant difference between the fluency improvement of repeated reading and continuous reading practice. The research study conducted by Kostewicz and Kubina (2010) provided data that suggested there was minor difference between repeated reading and interval sprinting interventions as participants met fluency goals using both practices. This subcategory proved that fluency growth will follow all of the previously suggested reading interventions.

### **Successful Fluency-Building Interventions**

The final subcategory of this chapter analyzes three commonly used reading interventions. Those interventions are Reader's Theatre, which involves students performing passages from texts, listening passage preview, which requires students to listen to experienced

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

and expressive readers, word list training, and error correction. Error correction allows students to see and review the mistakes they made during oral reading interventions. This section will provide the effects of these fluency-building interventions among elementary students.

A research case study conducted by Corcoran and Davis (2005) investigated if the Readers' Theatre Fluency Program could improve the reading fluency of 12 students with learning disabilities in the second and third grade. Readers' theatre is an example of a strategy that uses several instruction forms to improve fluency, including repeated readings. It uses modeling, guidance, and independent student practice, while students rehearse a play, speech, poem, or other appropriate text. Students rehearse their readings until they are able to perform them fluently and with expression for an audience (Corcoran & Davis, 2005). The dependent variable for this study was the number of words read correctly per minute in a grade-level passage. The independent variable was the readers' theatre interventions.

Participants in this study were 12 students from a self-contained second and third grade. The classroom was in a public school in a Central Florida town with a population of approximately 20,000. Four out of the twelve students received speech services twice a week. Three were considered emotionally handicapped, eight were classified as Learning Disabled with four of those eight having Attention Deficit Disorder.

Students were placed into three readers' theatre groups of four based upon their oral fluency scores from the fluency pretest. Each group consisted of one female and three males. One group was given plays that were on a higher reading level as it fit their instructional

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

reading levels. The other two groups were given the same plays each week, written on their reading levels.

Readers' theater always took place during the morning with students rotating from independent work to readers' theatre group meeting with the researcher. Each play was practiced on average for two weeks or six sessions before being performed for a kindergarten class with an average of 30 minutes being spent on each reader's theater session. Each group performed three different plays during this eight-week period.

For training, each group met with the researcher for several mini lessons. In the lessons, students imitated the researcher reading aloud while comparing and contrasting fluent and non-fluent reading. The mechanics and scripts were discussed thoroughly by the researcher. After the trainings, the following procedures were followed during the interventions: On the first day of the week, groups read the script silently to themselves, then aloud with their group. The researcher assigned each student a role and provided that every child get an opportunity to have one small and one large role within the eight week period. On the second day the researcher modeled selected parts using expression in reading the scripts. Students then imitated this form of reading while practicing the script three times out loud paying close attention to projecting their voices and adding emotion. On the third day the researcher would read the script aloud with the individual group as a whole three times before having the group practice reading independently. Then, the researcher would work with one student at a time from the group to practice echo reading of that student's part. Echo reading is when a teacher reads fluently and with emotion for the student and the student mimics the way the teacher

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

says the lines (Corcoran & Davis, 2005). On the fourth day, the students continued to practice and rotate with echo reading while the researcher provided feedback. Readers' theaters performances were videotaped. Video release forms were obtained and permission to record the performance was given by the parent or guardian.

At the end of the Readers' Theatre intervention, all participants read a passage similar to the pretest from a grade-level reading book. The number of words read correctly per minute increased overall as a class by an additional seventeen words. Increases individually ranged from the lowest of three words more per minute to the highest increase of 41 additional words read correctly.

The data from this study suggested that the students with special education needs did benefit from the readers' theater program. The fluency scores revealed an increase in the number of words correctly read per minute in fluency tests. If these students increased their number of words correctly read by a quartile or more in an eight-week period, one can only imagine the gains of a year-long program. Although the next study did not require students to do any performing, it does emphasize and introduce fluency-building interventions that involve repeated reading, listening passage previewing, and phase-drill error correction. The next research study combined several fluency-building strategies into one intervention just like the reader's theatre program.

This study conducted by Begeny and Martens (2006) investigated if several fluency-building strategies combined into one intervention could improve the reading fluency of third-grade students in a group setting. Those strategies included repeated reading, listening

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

passage previewing, and phase-drill error correction. Repeated reading requires students to reread a short passage several times until it can be read at an appropriate fluency level (O'Shea, Sindelar, & O'Shea, 1987). Listening passage previewing requires the student to listen to a more skilled reader read a particular passage while following along silently (Rose, 1984). Phase-drill error correction requires students to read text from a passage repeatedly; however, in the phase-drill procedure students read a particular phrase containing a word previously read incorrectly (Daly, Martens, Dool, & Hintze 1998). The dependent variable of this study was the words read correctly per minute. The independent variable was the fluency-building interventions.

Participants included twelve third-grade students from four different classrooms located in one urban school in the Northeast. Teachers identified selected students as students who needed additional reading assistance. All intervention procedures were conducted in a classroom in the participants' school that was free from noise and distractions. Each instructional session lasted approximately 15-20 minutes, and the entire study lasted about nine weeks for one group and eleven weeks for the other group.

During the intervention, students received a fluency-based training routine on eleven different passages developed from the Silver Burdett, and Ginn (Pearson et al., 1989) reading series. Selection of words for word-list training was consistent for each group and included difficult words from the students' passages. During word-list training, one to three students were removed from the small group to work one-on-one with a researcher for the phase-drill error correction component. This phase required each student to practice the words he or she

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

read incorrectly during the passage readings. Once all students completed the word-list training and phase-drill components, the trainer implemented the listening passage preview component of the intervention.

During the listening passage preview component, the instructor read a passage at approximately 130 words per minute while students in the group read along silently on their own copies. Students were also asked to point to the words in the passage to demonstrate they were following along. Repeated reading followed the listening passage preview procedure. For repeated reading, students were paired and took turns reading the passage to each other, with the nonreader following along and helping the reader with any words he or she did not know. After completing the entire intervention program, the researcher administered the Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement, Third Edition (Woodcock, McGrew, & Mather, 2001) to each student.

Participants read an average of 53.2 correct words per minute on third-grade passages at pretest and an average of 67.3 correct words per minute on these same passages at posttest. For second-grade passages, participants read an average of 70.1 correct words per minute on the pretest and 86.3 correct words per minute on the posttest. On first-grade passages, students read an average of 75.2 correct words per minute on the pretest and an average of 93 correct words per minute on the posttest.

Findings of this study indicated that this group-based reading fluency intervention improved students' oral reading fluency of trained passages. This finding is consistent with current research from this study demonstrating that procedures such as repeated reading,

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

listening passage previewing, word-list training, and phase-drill error correction can improve students' oral reading fluency. This study also suggests that these interventions can also be effective when combined for use with small groups of three or more students.

This section included research case studies that presented and analyzed successful fluency-building reading interventions. The research study by Begeny and Martens (2006) promoted a program called Reader's Theatre. This program allowed students to improve fluency by performing passages from texts. The data from this study suggested that the participants did benefit from this intervention as their oral reading fluency rate increased significantly given the time provided. In the study conducted by Corcoran and Davis (2005), reading interventions involving listening passage preview, word list training and error correction were discussed as it pertained to small groups. This data from this study did suggest that these interventions were successful, and oral reading fluency rates did increase for the participants in these small-group settings.

### **Conclusion**

This chapter was organized in three sections. The first section analyzed repeated reading interventions only. In research studies conducted by Staudt (2009), Musti-Rao, Hawkins, and Barkley (2009), Cartledge, Yurick, and Cooke, Lo, and Starling (2011), researchers investigated if repeated reading interventions facilitated by teachers only could improve the fluency rate of elementary students. The research studies validated that small group repeated reading interventions facilitated by a researcher does improve the fluency of elementary students. In case study articles conducted by Cartledge, Lo, Staubitz, and Yurick (2005) and

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Robinson, Lo, and Evans (2006), participants improved their oral reading fluency rates, but the reading interventions from these case studies were facilitated by instructors and other students. These studies validated that students can improve reading fluency while participating in a repeated reading intervention that does not include an adult trainer. In case study articles conducted by Vadasy and Sanders (2008), Ates (2013), and Alber-Morgan, Ramp, Anderson, and Martin, (2007), fluency improvement was obtained by all students. These research studies used error correction and student feedback combined with repeated reading interventions, and the articles discussed how providing feedback to students individually assisted fluency growth during the repeated reading process.

The second section researched repeated reading interventions combined with continuous reading and interval sprinting interventions. The study by O'Connor (2007) validated that continuous reading and repeated reading interventions do improve the reading fluency of struggling fourth-grade readers. It also confirmed that there is no significant difference between the fluency improvement of repeated reading and continuous reading practice. The research study conducted by Kostewicz and Kubina (2010) provided data that suggested there was minor difference between repeated reading and interval sprinting interventions as participants met fluency goals using both practices.

The third section analyzed various fluency-building interventions. Those interventions were reader's theater, listening passage previewing, error correction, word list training. The research study by Begeny and Martens (2006) promoted a program called Reader's Theatre. This program allowed students to improve fluency by performing passages from texts. In the

study conducted by Corcoran and Davis (2005), reading interventions involving listening passage preview, word list training and error correction were discussed. Personal attention and instruction from error correction and word-list training assisted students' fluency growth. This chapter was written to emphasize the importance and effects of the suggested fluency-building strategies for elementary students. These reading interventions provided a direct way to support struggling elementary readers individually and in small-group settings. Almost twenty-five years ago, Allington (1983) suggested that building oral reading fluency helps create effective and efficient readers. Methods that build fluency should meet the same effective and efficient criteria.

The data presented in this chapter suggested that all fluency-building strategies practiced in each reading intervention can lead to the attainment of oral reading fluency in children with or at-risk for reading disabilities. I planned to reach fluency success as I began my research with a fourth-grade student. I conducted two fluency-building strategies mentioned in this chapter into one reading intervention. Those interventions are repeated reading and continuous reading.

### **CHAPTER THREE: PROCEDURES**

This chapter details the procedures used with the target student in a fluency-building intervention that included repeated reading and continuous reading strategies. There are three sections in this chapter. The first section is a description of the sample; it also includes the setting and a description of the student involved in the interventions. The second section of this chapter includes detailed descriptions of daily procedures and a rationale for the strategies used throughout the fluency-building interventions. As I stated previously, I used

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

two fluency-building strategies in this intervention that focused on improving a student's correct number of words read per minute. Every intervention began with repeated reading. Repeated reading involves a student rereading a specific passage out loud multiple times to a teacher or peer tutor. The teacher or peer may first model expressive reading or involve the student in unison reading (Richards, 2000; Therrien and Kubina, 2006). Following repeated reading, the participant participated in continuous reading. During a continuous reading intervention, students orally read for a required amount of time while an instructor keeps track of miscues (O'Connor, White, & Swanson, 2007). After both fluency-building strategies are complete, I reviewed with the participant their *Performance feedback and error correction*. For this section of the intervention, I announced the number of words he read correctly. I also provided error correction on each of the missed words by pointing to and identifying the missed word on the passage instructing the participant to read the incorrectly pronounced word. The last section of this chapter includes an explanation of data collection, a description of pre and posttests given, as well as a review of miscue charts taken from the reading interventions.

### **Description of Sample**

This section includes two parts. First, the setting of the case study is described. Following the description of the setting, the participant involved in the intervention is described, and his academic background related to this study is discussed.

### **Setting**

This case study took place in a choice school in an urban Midwest City during the winter months of the school year. Willie (pseudonym), the student participant, has been enrolled at this choice school for two years. This urban learning environment does not have a traditional curriculum. It has a unique curriculum based on outcomes aligned with Common Core Standards students are required to obtain by the end of each academic school year. This choice school assesses reading fluency and comprehension with tools selected by the instructor. All assessment tools are permitted as long as they align with Wisconsin Common Core Standards. Oral reading fluency is instructed through process that involves three steps. The first step includes modeling by the instructor while students follow along. Then, a whole-class repeated reading session is conducted followed by students reading individually. Each step of this instruction process lasts 10 minutes.

The sessions took place in a large classroom after the regular school day ended. The student and I were the only people in the large classroom, but after-school programs, club meetings, and other teachers remained in the school while the interventions were in session.

### **Student Description**

This case study involved one African-American male student who attended a private choice school in an urban Midwest City. This student was in the fifth grade during this case study. In an effort to retain confidentiality, the student will be referred to as "Willie". Willie

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

has received tutoring in reading and comprehension from Catapult learning for the last two years. Catapult Learning is a government funded tutorial program that focuses on assisting students with academic needs. Willie receives tutoring twice a week for 45 minutes a session. Earlier in the school year during oral reading instruction, Willie had difficulty following along with modeling and repeated reading. He looked out the window and put his head down during the oral reading instruction process on many days. According to Willie's Mother at the beginning of the 2012 school year, he was diagnosed with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD).

Willie is a compliant student. In the classroom setting, he follows classroom rules and regulations most of the time. During a classroom observation on October 13, 2013, I observed Willie asking some meaningful questions during instruction. I also noticed Willie being easily distracted by other students and noises in the classroom while working on an independent academic assignment. Instead of working diligently on the assigned task, Willie gave his attention to disruptive students and allowed himself to engage in social conversation during class time. I observed Willie at the reading corner of the classroom on a couple of occasions. He read some grade-level books with little fluency, and he had difficulty reading words with four and five syllables. He held meaningful conversations with peers during social hours such as lunch and recess. During observations, Willie learned best through small-group instruction, and it allowed him to participate in academic discussions without worrying about what other students said about him.

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

The next section describes the procedures used during the reading interventions. The strategies incorporated in this intervention in the order that they occurred will be described as well.

### **Description of Procedures**

After learning about Willie's academic skills, abilities and needs, *The Quality Reading Inventory-5* (Caldwell & Leslie, 2010) was selected to assess Willie's oral reading fluency rate on the pre- and posttest for this case study. Interventions that included repeated reading, continuous reading, and post intervention discussions were utilized to increase Willie's oral reading fluency rate. Willie participated in repeated reading and continuous reading interventions three times a week for five weeks. There were 15 total sessions which lasted 35 minutes. This section details the daily procedures used throughout the case study.

This case study had four significant parts. Because the dependent variable of this case study is the participant's oral reading fluency rate (correct words read per minute), I began my research on the first day with a pretest identifying Willie's current oral reading fluency rate using the Qualitative Reading Inventory-5 (Caldwell & Leslie, 2010). Willie's oral reading fluency rate was assessed on third and fourth grade levels. He was assessed while reading expository and narrative passages to detect any similarities or differences between the two genres as he read. I wanted to determine if Willie could find more success with oral reading improvement in one genre than the other.

On the second day of this case study, I began teaching Willie how to participate during the repeated and continuous reading interventions. During the intervention instruction, I

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

explained the repeated reading strategy and guided him for the first fifteen minutes. I read a complete sentence from a grade-level text by Macmillan/McGraw-Hill (Flood, Hasbrouk, Hoffman, Lapp, and Lubcker, 2005). While I read the sentence, I told Willie to follow along using his tracking finger. After I completed reading the selected sentence, I instructed him to read the same exact sentence with the same expression. After ten minutes of training for the repeated reading intervention, Willie participated completely. Next, I modeled the continuous reading strategy. Then, I explained to Willie that during the continuous reading interventions, he will orally read for 15 minutes while I record miscues on a data sheet. (The miscue data sheets are included in Appendix B and C.)

On the third day of this case study, the repeated and continuous reading interventions began and continued for the next thirteen sessions. For the first 15 minutes of every session, repeated reading was conducted. For the second 15 minutes of every session, continuous reading was conducted. While Willie participated in continuous reading, I recorded miscues on a data sheet. After every session, I briefly shared with Willie minor feedback consisting of progress that I noticed and the correct pronunciation of words with which he struggled with.

At the end of the 15 sessions, Willie was given a posttest that once again assessed his oral reading fluency rate. For Willie's assessment, he read narrative and expository passages from the Qualitative Reading Inventory-5 (Caldwell & Leslie, 2010). The passages he read were third and fourth-grade level; however, the passages were not the same passages from the pretest. (Assessment passages are included in Appendix B and C.)

The next section provides an explanation and justification of the data collected and the procedures for the data collection. Formal and Informal assessments are described in detail. This section is followed by the conclusion of this chapter.

### **Data Collection Procedures**

Data were collected throughout the 15 days of this case study. This section includes descriptions of formal and informal assessments used to measure the dependent variable. The *Qualitative Reading Inventory 5<sup>th</sup> Edition* (QRI-5) (Caldwell & Leslie, 2010) was administered before the reading intervention and immediately after the reading intervention was complete. The QRI-5 was administered to determine Willie's oral reading fluency rate (correct words read per minute). Anecdotal notes were recorded during each session of this case study. The anecdotal notes included words that were pronounced incorrectly and words that were ignored or skipped over. This section is divided in two sections. The first section describes procedures from the QRI-5. The second section explains the procedures and rationale for the recorded anecdotal notes.

### **Qualitative Reading Inventory Assessment**

*Qualitative Reading Inventory 5<sup>th</sup> Edition* (QRI-5)(Leslie and Caldwell, 2011) was used as the pre- and posttest assessment. The QRI-5 is an informal reading inventory that measures word identification skills, fluency, and reading comprehension. For the purpose of this research study, only fluency subtests were administered.

## **Procedures and Rationale**

Informal assessments allowed progress to be monitored throughout the intervention. Fluency data from third and fourth-grade reading passages in the QRI-5 were collected during the pre- and posttest for this study. Narrative and expository passages were selected to assess the fluency rate and number of miscues on the pre- and posttest. Anecdotal notes and miscues were collected during the repeated reading and continuous reading sessions of this intervention. The student's fluency rate (correct number of words read) and number of miscues were recorded on data sheets. Miscues were recorded when the student omitted words, inserted words, read words incorrectly, or could not read a word.

All anecdotal notes can be found in Appendix A. Data sheets, the student's miscues and fluency rates on pre- and posttest can be found in Appendix B. The anecdotal notes contain the daily plan for each session, observations, as well as concerns or changes warranted from the observation. This informal data were valuable as each observation led to concerns or a need for change.

## **Conclusion**

This chapter detailed the procedures established and used with the target student to increase his fluency rate and decrease the amount of miscues made while reading. Repeated reading, continuous reading, and brief pronunciation review at the end of each session were all employed as strategies used during this intervention. First, the setting of this case study and the student description was discussed and described. Next, descriptions of all procedures used

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

in the intervention were shared. The explanation of data collection was shared last and included descriptions of formal assessments used during this intervention.

In the next chapter, Chapter 4: Results, data and assessment results will be presented. Results from the QRI-5 will be presented and discussed as well as informal data documented during repeated reading and continuous reading interventions. This information will reflect the progress made throughout this case study. Data will reveal if the repeated reading and continuous reading interventions were effective in improving the fluency rate of a struggling reader in the fourth-grade with ADHD.

### **CHAPTER 4: RESULTS**

The purpose of this study was to determine if a reading intervention that included repeated reading and continuous reading could improve the oral reading fluency of a fifth grader with ADHD. In this chapter, data from this case study will be presented and analyzed. This chapter has two sections. In the first section, data from the Qualitative Reading Inventory-5<sup>th</sup> Edition (QRI-5) (Caldwell & Leslie, 2010) pre- and posttests are presented and discussed. The student's oral reading fluency rate (correct words read per minute) was determined on the pre- and posttest of this study. This section also includes the number of miscues the student made during his pre- and posttests from the QRI-5. The second section includes the discussion and presentation of informal data. The informal data include observations and concerns collected on the anecdotal notes. All data are discussed in detail. In both sections, the data are displayed, discussed, and then the findings are shared.

## Qualitative Reading Inventory-5 Results

### Oral Reading Fluency

Data from this research case study were collected through a QRI-5 pre- and posttest. The QRI-5 is an informal reading assessment that consists of word identification, oral reading fluency, and reading comprehension. For the purpose of my study data were only collected in the subtests of oral reading fluency. This case study only focused on improving the correct words read per minute (CWPM) of a below-level fifth-grade student with ADHD. The QRI-5 subtests for oral reading fluency were administered to the student during session 1 and session 15 of this research case study.

At the beginning of the 2013-2014 school year, Willie's CWPM was assessed at instructional level for third grade according to his reading teacher (September 18, 2013). Because of Willie's assessment level, I began the case study pretest with level 3 of the QRI-5 oral reading subtests. Willie was required to read narrative and expository passages. On level 3 of QRI-5 narrative reading passage, Willie read 90 CWPM. On level 3 of QRI-5 expository reading passage, Willie's oral reading fluency rate was 101 CWPM. Because his fluency rates for both genres on level three of the QRI-5 were determined as instructional, I administered a pretest assessing his oral reading fluency rate on level 4 passages. On level 4 of QRI-5 narrative reading passage, Willie read 68 CWPM. On level 4 of QRI-5 expository reading passage, Willie's oral reading fluency rate was 77 CWPM. Because the results of Willie's fluency rate on level 4 passages were close to frustration level, I did not proceed to level 5 with pretesting for this case study.

**Table 1***Qualitative Reading Inventory 5<sup>th</sup> Edition Oral Reading Subtest*

	Pretests			
	3 <sup>rd</sup> Test Level Narrative	3 <sup>rd</sup> Test Level Expository	4 <sup>th</sup> Test Level Narrative	4 <sup>th</sup> Test Level Expository
CWPM	90	101	68	77

After 13 sessions of continuous and repeated reading interventions, I administered the posttest for this case study. During the posttest, Willie was not required to read the same passages he read on the pretest. I administered different level 3 and 4 reading passages from the QRI-5. He read narrative and expository passages on the posttest as he did on the pretest. Willie's oral reading fluency rate improved on every passage of the posttest. On level 3 of QRI-5 narrative reading passage, Willie read 120 CWPM. On level 4 of QRI-5 narrative reading passage, Willie's oral reading fluency rate was assessed at 95 CWPM. On level 3 of QRI-5 expository reading passage, Willie read 108 CWPM. On level 4 of QRI-5 expository reading passage, Willie's oral reading fluency rate was assessed at 92 CWPM.

**Table 2***Qualitative Reading Inventory 5<sup>th</sup> Edition Oral Reading Subtest*

	Post Tests			
	3 <sup>rd</sup> Test Level Narrative	3 <sup>rd</sup> Test Level Expository	4 <sup>th</sup> Test Level Narrative	4 <sup>th</sup> Test Level Expository
CWPM	120	108	95	92

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

From pretest to posttest on level 3 of the QRI-5 narrative passage, Willie's CWPM improved by 30 words. On the level 3 expository passage, Willie's CWPM improved by 7 words. On the level 4 narrative passages, Willie's CWPM improved by 27 words from pretest to posttest. On the level 4 expository passage, Willie's CWPM improved by 15 words. This reading intervention including continuous and repeated reading did improve the oral reading fluency rate of Willie, a struggling reader in the fifth grade with ADHD.

Willie was required to read expository and narrative texts during this intervention to determine if there were any significant differences as he read narrative and expository passages. On the pretest, Willie read the expository passages significantly better than the narrative passages. Coincidentally, Willie read 11 more CWPM on expository passages on levels 3 and 4 of the pretest. However, on the posttest of this case study, Willie's CWPM on the narrative passages were higher than his CWPM on the expository passages. From pretest to posttest, his improvements on narrative passages were significantly greater than his improvement on expository passages. He improved an average of 28 CWPM on levels 3 and 4 narrative passages. Willie improved an average of 11 CWPM on levels 3 and 4 expository passages. There was a significant difference between the two texts in regards to the improvement of Willie.

### **Miscues**

While Willie orally read assigned text on pretest and posttest, I recorded the number of reading errors he made. Reading errors consisted of the following miscues: insertions, omissions, words read incorrectly, and words Willie could not read. On the level 3 pretest,

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Willie recorded a total of 10 errors while reading the narrative text. He recorded a total of 11 errors while reading the level 3 expository text. On the level 4 pretest, Willie recorded a total of 11 errors while reading the narrative text. He recorded a total of 12 errors while reading the level 4 expository test.

**Table 3**

*Qualitative Reading Inventory 5<sup>th</sup> Edition Oral Reading Miscues*

	Pretests				Total
	Omissions	Insertions	Words Read Incorrectly	Could Not Read	
Narrative 3 <sup>rd</sup>	1	3	6	0	10
Expository 3 <sup>rd</sup>	0	5	5	1	11
Narrative 4 <sup>th</sup>	2	2	7	0	11
Expository 4 <sup>th</sup>	2	0	10	0	12

As Willie became more acclimated with the repeated and continuous reading interventions, his confidence began to grow as an oral reader. As the sessions proceeded, I noticed that reading miscues such as omissions, insertions, and reading words incorrectly started to decrease significantly. From session 2 of this reading intervention to session 11, Willie's total miscues recorded decreased by 11.

**Table 4***Macmillan/McGraw-Hill Reading Series Oral Reading Miscues*

	Omissions	Insertions	Words Read Incorrectly	Could Not Read	Total
Session 2	4	3	6	3	16
Session 5	3	2	5	3	13
Session 8	1	3	2	1	7
Session 11	1	1	3	0	5

The results from Willie's posttest reading miscues showed a decrease in reading miscues from pretest to posttest during this case study. On level 3 posttest, Willie recorded 4 miscues while reading the narrative text. Willie recorded 3 miscues on posttest while reading the level 3 expository text. On level 4 posttest, he recorded a total of 6 miscues while reading the narrative text. Willie recorded 6 miscues on posttest while reading the level 4 expository text. From pretest to posttest on level 3 narrative texts, his total miscues decreased by 6. From pretest to posttest on level 3 expository texts, Willie's total miscues decreased by 8. From pretest to posttest on level 4 narrative texts, his total miscues decreased by 5. From pretest to posttest on level 4 expository texts, Willie's total number of miscues decreased by 6. There were no significant differences between narrative and expository texts in regards to the decreased number of miscues.

**Table 5**

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

### *Qualitative Reading Inventory 5<sup>th</sup> Edition Oral Reading Miscues*

	Post Tests				Total
	Omissions	Insertions	Words Read Incorrectly	Could Not Read	
Narrative 3 <sup>rd</sup>	1	2	1	0	4
Expository 3 <sup>rd</sup>	1	1	1	0	3
Narrative 4 <sup>th</sup>	1	3	2	0	6
Expository 4 <sup>th</sup>	0	3	3	0	6

### **Informal Assessment Data**

This section presents data collected informally throughout this research case study. This information helped guide this case study and provided documentation of Willie's oral reading progress. Informal data will be presented and discussed on the anecdotal notes from this case study.

### **Anecdotal Notes**

Anecdotal notes were collected as data throughout the intervention. All anecdotal notes are found in Appendix A. The anecdotal notes include specific observations from each session, as well as concerns in the progress or process of this repeated and continuous reading intervention. In session three of this case study, I noticed Willie repeating words and phrases on a regular basis. I knew this would affect his oral reading fluency rate. For session four, I suggested to Willie that he use a tracking finger while reading the required text. A tracking finger is usually the index finger, and it points to the words as they are read so the reader can keep track of where they are at all times. When Willie began to use his tracking finger while reading, he repeated words and phrases less. During session six, I noticed Willie's confidence

beginning to increase. He was excited about reading with fluency, and he was excited to receive personal attention from me.

### **Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of a continuous and repeated reading intervention on a fifth-grade student with ADHD. In this chapter, results and data collected throughout this case study were described and discussed. First the pre- and posttest data from the QRI-5 were discussed and displayed. Displayed data included the CWPM of the student. Informal data was also discussed during this chapter. The number of miscues recorded on pre- and posttest was shared and discussed throughout the second session of this study as well as the anecdotal notes.

Chapter 5: Conclusion will follow. This chapter will include connections to existing research, connections to common core standards, and a synthesis of results and data that have been collected. Strengths and limitations of this study will be discussed along with recommendations for the student involved in this study.

### **CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION**

This research case study evaluated the effect of continuous and repeated reading on the oral reading fluency of a fifth-grade student with ADHD. The data collection process spanned over 15 intervention sessions. Chapter Four displayed and discussed fluency progress and miscue analysis that were collected through a pre- and posttest from the Qualitative Reading

Inventory 5<sup>th</sup> Edition (QRI-5) (Leslie and Caldwell, 2011) assessment. Chapter Four also displayed and explained anecdotal notes which highlighted the concerns and observations from each session of this case study. This chapter is divided into five sections. First, results from this research case study are connected and compared with existing and previous research. Next, results are explained further and conclusions are drawn from all data. From there, connections are made between this research case study and Common Core Standards. Next, strengths and limitations of this case study are examined. The last section of this case study includes future recommendations for the student involved in this case study.

### **Connections to Existing Research**

Connections from this case study are made to current research, which were presented in Chapter Two: Review of Literature. In this section, the current case study and presented research are examined for similarities and differences.

This research case study was designed to improve the oral reading fluency rate of one fifth grade student with ADHD. Results from this case study suggest that the continuous and repeated reading interventions were successful in improving the oral reading fluency rate of this one student. Ates (2013) also designed a study to improve the oral reading fluency of one student using repeated reading interventions. The student examined in this case study was also a fifth grader who did not read at grade level. Similar to my case study, the research conducted by Ates (2013) was driven by a pre- and posttest. On pre- and posttests, both case studies used oral reading fluency rates and recorded miscues as dependent variables. Results from both case studies revealed similar progress even though the study by Ates (2013) only provided

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

repeated reading interventions, whereas my study included repeated and continuous reading interventions. HB, the student participant from the study conducted by Ates (2013), increased his oral reading fluency rate by 15 CWPM and decreased his reading miscues by 13 from pretest to posttest. Willie, the student participant in the research case study conducted by me, increased his oral fluency rate by 15 CWPM on expository passages and by 27 CWPM on narrative passages. Willie decreased his reading miscues by 6 miscues on the expository texts and by 5 miscues on narrative texts.

In a research case study conducted by O'Connor (2007), he wanted to know if repeated reading practices are more effective than continuous reading practices when trying to improve the fluency rate of struggling fourth-grade readers. Similar to the case study I conducted, O'Connor (2007) utilized continuous and repeated reading strategies in his reading interventions. However, students were separated in two groups, and either a group participated in continuous reading interventions or repeated reading interventions. As stated previously, this case study conducted by me combined continuous reading with repeated reading during its reading interventions to determine if both fluency-building strategies together could create a significant improvement on the fluency rate of one fifth-grade student. O'Connor (2007) wanted to determine which fluency-building strategy caused more increase to the fluency rate of fourth-grade students.

Fluency-building strategies used to improve the fluency rate of a fifth-grade student with ADHD were supported by research. This research case study also confirmed the effectiveness and validity of the previously described research based on Willie's increased oral

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

reading fluency rate reflected through data provided in Chapter Four. The following section explains and discusses the results of this study.

### **Explanation of Results**

This section discusses and explains data presented in Chapter Four. First, the findings and results from this reading intervention presented in Chapter Four are explained. Next, rationale is provided for narrative and expository fluency growth.

### **Explanations for Fluency Growth**

The QRI-5 results presented in Chapter Four show that Willie made progress in the area of oral reading fluency from pretest to posttest. Results from posttest assessment also reveal that Willie's number of miscues on third and fourth-grade reading passages decreased. The success from this research case study derived from effective fluency-building strategies, consistency within this case study, and personal attention given to Willie.

During repeated reading interventions, Willie received expressive modeling which allowed him to hear what fluency should sound like. Repeated reading also allowed Willie to become acclimated to unfamiliar vocabulary words because he heard me read them aloud. At the end of each session during this case study, I provided performance feedback to Willie informing him of the miscues. During performance feedback, Willie and I also corrected words he could not say by saying them correctly out loud. Research has demonstrated that providing information or feedback to students in relationship to their performance is effective in terms of academic or behavioral development (Conte & Hintze, 2000).

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

The consistency and structure provide during this research case study provided Willie with effective modeling and oral reading practice. As I stated previously, there were 15 sessions during this research case study. Sessions were administered three times weekly. Because the continuous and repeated reading sessions were administered continuously and so close together over the period of one month, Willie adapted to the learning environment that was provided for him. The more Willie read and participated in the reading interventions, the more confident he became as an oral reader. The consistency of the continuous and repeated reading sessions along with the personal attention Willie received made success and fluency growth the only option for him during this research case study.

A reason for the success and fluency growth obtained by Willie during this case study was the personal attention he received from me during the sessions. Because Willie has been diagnosed with ADHD, it is difficult for him to participate to the best of his ability during whole-class instruction. I am a well-liked educational leader in the learning environment in which this research case study was held. Willie was elated to spend that time with me after class during the reading interventions. The excitement and exuberance displayed by Willie when hearing about his oral reading progress aligned with the results presented in Chapter Four. The functional relationship demonstrated between examiners and students support previous research that repeated reading is an effective intervention for students with severe behavior problems (Scott & Shearer-Lingo, 2002).

### **Narrative and Expository Rationale**

Willie was required to read expository and narrative texts during the pre- and posttest of this study to determine if there were any significant differences as he read narrative and expository passages. On the level 4 narrative passages, Willie's CWPM improved by 27 words from pretest to posttest. On the level 4 expository passage, Willie's CWPM improved by 15 words. These results showed that there was a difference in fluency growth between narrative and expository passages.

One reason for the higher CWPM improvement on narrative passages is the story selection from Macmillan/McGraw-Hill (Flood, Hasbrouk, Hoffman, Lapp, and Lubcker, 2005) reading stories during this reading intervention. Of the thirteen stories used during continuous and repeated reading interventions, nine of them were narrative stories. The extra narrative reading practice may have affected the greater fluency growth on narrative passages during this case study.

On the pretest, Willie read the expository passages significantly better than the narrative passages. Coincidentally, Willie read 11 more CWPM on expository passages than narrative passages on levels 3 and 4 of the pretest. The higher CWPM on the expository pretests did not leave as much room for growth as the narrative pretest results. It is possible that Willie's improvement on expository passages could not match the improvement on narrative passages because of higher pretest results on expository passages.

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

The practices and results of this research case study were supported through existing research as well as the Common Core Standards. The following section connects the purpose of this study to the Common Core Standard to which it was aligned.

### **Connections to Common Core Standards**

The focus of this research case study research case study was to improve Willie's oral reading fluency rate. The number of words read correctly per minute by Willie represents his oral reading fluency rate. The focus on improving oral reading fluency rates align with Common Core Standards (2013). According to Wisconsin Common Core State Standard English Language Arts-Literacy Reading Foundation (2013) (CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RF) 5.4, all fifth grade students, like Willie, should read with sufficient accuracy and fluency to support comprehension. The purpose of the previously discussed continuous and repeated reading interventions during this case study was to improve Willie's oral reading fluency. Oral reading fluency, speed, and accuracy were heavily emphasized in the 15 sessions of this research case study. Therefore, fluency-building practices exhibited during this reading intervention directly supported and aligned with CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RF.5.4. During continuous reading sessions, Willie's oral reading was observed and discussed with him so that he could see what miscues he made. This strategy not only improved Willie's fluency and speed, it also decreased his reading miscues. Although comprehension strategies were not discussed or supported in this case study, I strongly believe that because Willie's fluency improved, his comprehension did as well. Non-fluent readers who struggle with word recognition fail to comprehend various types of text.

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Their lack of fluency also causes them to have little motivation to read (Chard, Vaughn, & Tyler, 2002).

Willie's progress toward the previously discussed standards was measured through formal assessments. These data were presented in Chapter Four. Connections have been made between existing research and Common Core Standards (2013) in the previous section. The following section highlights the strengths of this case study along with the limitations. Specific examples of strengths and limitations are included in this section to shape future fluency-building interventions.

### **Strengths and Limitations**

Through an understanding of Willie's skills, abilities, and behaviors, along with information from his mother and my observations, this intervention was focused around the Willie's needs in oral reading fluency. Various factors impacted this case study. Strengths and weaknesses of this case study are discussed in this section.

A strength of this case study was the environment in which each fluency-building session was held. The case study occurred in a large classroom with no other people involved. The environment was distraction free, and it allowed Willie to remain focused on continuous and repeated reading throughout the duration of each session. Another strength of this case study was the one-on-one attention that Willie received during this case study. The opportunity for me to provide Willie with one-on-one attention allowed me to be a catalyst for establishing reading practices in his life. Because Willie enjoyed spending time with me, his examiner, during the reading interventions, he accepted and received every aspect of this

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

research case study willingly. The more time Willie and I spent together during this case study, the more comfortable he became during oral reading. As Willie grew comfortable reading aloud, his confidence grew as well which contributed to the fluency growth presented on the results of this case study. One-on-one attention and facilitation of this case study drew and kept Willie's attention during continuous and repeated reading interventions. This might not have been the case during whole-class instruction.

While this case study has strengths for demonstrating the effectiveness of increasing oral reading fluency, there were considerable limitations within the scope of this study. Because this fluency-building intervention was administered to one student by one examiner, progress and fluency growth was achieved. Similar progress may not have been accomplished if this research case study was administered to a small group of students or a whole class. Another limitation of this case study focuses on its length. The intervention occurred over 15 sessions. The sessions spanned five weeks in length. If this intervention were longer, there would have been more improvement in the oral reading fluency rate of Willie. I could have possibly incorporated some fifth-grade passages in this research case study.

This case study focused on improving the oral reading fluency of one student through continuous and repeated reading interventions. Perhaps this case study may have been more beneficial if I would have incorporated comprehension as a measurement tool. However, this research case study was effective because the oral reading fluency of the student did improve significantly. Recommendations for Willie are presented and discussed in the following section.

### **Recommendations**

As Willie enters the sixth grade in the fall, he will have to develop a consistent routine that allows him to practice reading orally as well as reading unfamiliar vocabulary. According to CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RF.5.4 (2013), all students who have been promoted to the sixth grade should be able to read with sufficient accuracy and fluency to support comprehension. This Common Core Standard also suggests that Willie should incorporate some form of comprehension in his oral reading routine as well.

I recommend that Willie establish a routine of reading aloud for a minimum of 25 minutes every night. It would be beneficial for Willie to read aloud for a parent in those 25 minutes. Reading orally for a parent creates an opportunity for important events and details to be recalled and discussed after oral reading is complete. Reading for a parent also creates discussions about unfamiliar vocabulary words within text. Implementing this routine will assist with strengthening oral reading fluency and comprehension.

Because of Willie's new-found respect for oral reading, I would recommend that Willie not be placed in a classroom setting of more than 15 students. Drawing and keeping Willie's attention is the key to his continual reading progress. Because Willie has been diagnosed with ADHD, I believe he will continue to improve in the area of oral reading if he can dwell in a learning environment that minimizes distractions.

## **Conclusion**

This research case study validated that a continuous and repeated reading intervention could improve the oral reading fluency of one student with ADHD. The effectiveness of this case study was first supported through the integration of existing research to the strategies chosen for this research case study. The strategies and purpose of this case study were then connected to Common Core Standards (2013), which validated the importance of this case study and supported the direction of learning and growth that took place during this case study. Next, the results and reasons for success in this case study were explained. Following the explanation of positive data, strengths and limitations of this case study were discussed. Finally, recommendations for Willie's future reading success were shared. Continuous reading, repeated reading, and performance feedback did contribute to the growth of oral reading fluency Willie achieved over the length of this case study.

### References

- Alber-Morgan, S. R., Ramp, E. M., Anderson, L. L., & Martin, CM. (2007). Effects of repeated readings, error correction, and performance feedback on the fluency and comprehension of middle school students with behavior problems. *The Journal of Special Education, 41*(1), 17-30.
- Allington, R. L. (1983). Fluency: The neglected reading goal. *The Reading Teacher, 36*, 556-561.
- Ates, S., (2013). The effect of repeated reading exercises with performance-based feedback on fluent reading skills. *Reading Improvement, 4*, 158-165.
- Begeny, J. C., & Martens, B. K. (2006). Assisting low-performing readers with a group-based reading fluency intervention. *School Psychology Review, 35*, 183-195.
- Caldwell, J. S., & Leslie, L. (2001). *Qualitative reading inventory-3*. New York, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Chard, D. J., Vaughn, S., & Tyler, B. (2002). A synthesis of research on effective interventions for building reading fluency with elementary students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 35*, 386-407.

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Conte, K.C., & Hintze, J. M. (2000). The effects of performance feedback and goal setting on oral reading fluency within curriculum-based measurement. *Diagnostique*, 25, 85-98.

Corcoran, C. A., & Davis, A. D. (2005). The study of the effects of readers' theatre on second and third grade special education students' fluency growth. *Reading Improvement*, 42(2), 105-111.

Daly, E. J., Martens, B. K., Dool, E. J., & Hintze, J. M. (1998). Using brief functional analysis to select interventions for oral reading. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 35, 386-406.

Flood, J., Hasbrouck, J. E., Hoffman, J. V., Lapp, D., Lubcker, D., & Paris, S. (2005). *Macmillan/McGraw-Hill Reading*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gibbs, S. L., Campbell, M., Helf, S., & Cooke, C. L. (2007). *Early Reading Tutor*. Columbus, OH: SRA/McGraw-Hill.

Good, R. H., & Kaminski, R. A. (Eds.) (2002). *Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Eugene, OR: Institute for the Development of Educational Achievement.

Good, R. H., & Kaminski, R. A. (2007). *Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy*

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

*Skills* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Eugene, OR: Institute for the development of educational Achievement.

Hasbrouck, J.E., & Tindal, G. (1992). Curriculum-based oral reading fluency norms for students in grades 2 through 5. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 24*(3), 41-44.

Konold, K.E., Miller, S.P., Konold, K.B. (2004). Using teacher feedback to enhance student learning. *TEACHING Exceptional Children, 36*, 64-69.

Kostewicz, D.E., & Kubina, R.M. (2010). A comparison of two reading fluency methods: Repeated reading to a fluency criterion and interval sprinting. *Reading Improvement, 47*, 43-63.

Kubina, R. M., & Morrison, R. S. (2000). Fluency in education. *Behavior and Social Issues, 10*, 83-99.

Lo, Y., Cooke, N. L., & Starling, A. L. (2011). Using a repeated reading program to improve generalization of oral reading fluency. *Education & Treatment of Children, 34*(1), 115-140.

Meyer, M. S., & Felton, R. H. (1999). Repeated reading to enhance fluency: Old approaches and new directions. *Annals of Dyslexia, 49*, 283-306.

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Musti-Rao, S., Hawkins, R. O., & Barkley, E. (2009). Effects of repeated readings on the oral reading fluency of urban fourth-grade learners: Implications for practice. *Preventing School Failure, 54*(1), 12-23.

National Reading Panel (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

O'Connor, R.E., White, A., & Lee Swanson, H.H. (2007). Repeated reading versus continuous reading: Influences on reading fluency and comprehension. *Exceptional Children, 74*(1), 31-46.

O'Shea, L., Sindelar, P., & O'Shea, D. (1985). The effects of repeated readings and attentional cues on reading fluency and comprehension. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 17*, 129-142.

Pearson, P. D. (1991). *World of reading: A new Day*. Needham, MA; Silver Burdett & Ginn.

Pearson, P. D., Johnson, D. D., Clymer, T., Indrisano, R., Venezky, R. L., Baumann, J. F., Hiebert, E., & Toth, M. (1989). *Silver, Burdett, and Ginn*. Needham, MA: Silver, Burdett, and Ginn, Inc.

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Rasinski, T.V., Reutzel, D.R., Chard, D., & Limon-Thompson, S. (2011). Reading fluency. In M. L. Kamil, P. D. Pearson, E. B. Moje, & P. P. Afflerbach (Eds.). *Handbook of reading research* (V. IV, pp. 286-319). New York: Rutledge.

Richards, M. (2000). Be a good detective: Solve the case of oral reading fluency. *The Reading Teacher*, 53, 534-539.

Rose, T. L. (1984). The effects of two prepractice procedures on oral reading. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 17, 544-548.

Samuels, S.J. (1979). The method of repeated reading. *The Reading Teacher*. 32, 403-408.

Scott, T. M., & Shearer-Lingo, A. (2002). The effects of reading fluency instruction on the academic and behavioral success of middle school students in a self-contained EBD classroom. *Preventing School Failure*, 46, 167-174.

Staubitz, J. E., Cartledge, G., Yurick, AL., & Lo, Y. (2005). Repeated reading for students with emotional or behavioral disorders: Peer- and trainer mediated instruction. *Behavioral Disorders*, 31, S164.

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

## IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

- Therrien, W. J., & Kubina, R. M. (2006). Developing reading fluency with repeated reading. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 41*(3), 156-160.
- Therrien, W. J. & Kubina, R. M. (2007). The importance of context in repeated reading. *Reading Improvement, 44*, 179-188.
- Vadasy, P.F., & Sanders, E.A. (2008). Benefits of repeated reading intervention for low-achieving fourth- and fifth-grade students. *Remedial and Special Education, 29*(4), 235–249.
- Weinstein, G., & Cooke, N. L. (1992). The effects of two repeated reading interventions on generalization of fluency. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 15*, 21-28.
- Wiederholt, J., & Bryant, B. (2001). *Gray Oral Reading Tests*, Fourth Edition. Austin, TX: PRO-ED.
- White, E. B. (1952). *Charlotte's Web*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Woodcock, R. W., McGrew, K. S., & Mather, N. (2001). *Woodcock-Johnson III Tests of Achievement*. Itasca, IL: Riverside Publishing.
- Yurick, A. L., Robinson, P. D., Cartledge, G., Lo, Y., & Evans, T. L. (2006). *Using peer-mediated repeated readings as a fluency building activity for urban learners*. *Educational and Treatment of Children, 29*, 469-506.

**APPENDIX A**

**Anecdotal Notes and Observations**

<b>SESSION</b>	<b>INSTRUCTIONAL PLAN</b>	<b>SPECIFIC OBSERVATIONS FROM LESSON</b>	<b>CONCERNS/CHANGES WARRANTED</b>
1	QRI-5 Assessments (pretest)	Participant reached instructional level on 3 <sup>rd</sup> and 4 <sup>th</sup> grade reading passages. Participant had more success while reading expository passages.	The students repeated phrases a lot.
2	Repeated reading and continuous reading training	The student caught on quickly to the repeated reading process.	The student will need a water break between repeated reading and continuous reading.
3	Repeated and continuous reading intervention	The student is very willing to participate.	The student will start following the words with a tracking finger while he reads to decrease the amount of times he repeats phrases.
4	Repeated and continuous reading intervention	The student is not repeating words or phrases as much while he reads.	The student did not imitate expressive reading during repeated reading.
5	Repeated and continuous reading intervention	Fluency is becoming evident during repeated reading sessions.	Too much time was spent while attacking an unfamiliar word. He was told to attack for 3 seconds and then move on.

IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

6	Repeated and continuous reading intervention	The student was excited about the progress of fluency he is displaying during the continuous reading session.	The student inserted articles such as <i>the</i> and <i>a</i> during continuous reading. He was reminded to keep using his tracking finger while reading.
7	Repeated and continuous reading intervention	The student wanted to research more about the main character from the nonfiction reading story.	I shifted the student's excitement and energy toward meeting fluency goals.
8	Repeated and continuous reading intervention	The student did not want to receive any help decoding any of the words.	The student skipped 2 and 3 letter words four times. The student was reminded to read every word.
9	Repeated and continuous reading intervention	Confidence of the student is improving when approaching difficult phrases.	None
10	Repeated and continuous reading intervention	The student inappropriately inserted the word <i>the</i> three times during continuous reading.	I am concerned about the student inserting words. I encouraged the student to take his time and only read words that he sees.
11	Repeated and continuous reading intervention	The student inserted the word <i>and</i> two times to the text during continuous reading	The student is still inserting small words during continuous reading.
12	Repeated and continuous reading intervention	The student did not make one miscue during continuous reading that could cause him not to understand the text. The student remembered to use his tracking finger	None

IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

		while reading.	
13	Repeated and continuous reading intervention	The student did not use a tracking finger while reading and he did not repeat phrases during continuous reading.	I was concerned when the student did not use his tracking finger during continuous reading. He did well without it.
14	Repeated and continuous reading intervention	The student attempted to read with expression more during continuous reading.	The student was required to read with expression as I did during repeated reading.

15 QRI-5 assessments (posttest) From pretest to posttest the student improved Cwpm for narrative and Expository passages.



IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Text Word	Omission	Insertion	Could Not Read	Read Incorrectly	Corrected
promotion				x	
meant				x	x
Jose				x	
Didn't				x	x
present				x	
suddenly	x				
especially				x	
and		x			
the		x			
the		x			

Total Errors	1	3		6	
--------------	---	---	--	---	--

IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Date: January 15, 2014

Level: 3<sup>rd</sup>

Text: Qualitative Reading Inventory-5

Story: Where Do People Live?

Genre: Expository

Number of Total Miscues (Total Accuracy) \_\_\_\_\_ 11 \_\_\_\_\_

Total Accuracy	0-7 miscues	_____ Independent
	8-32 miscues	__X__ Instructional
	33+ miscues	_____ Frustration

Correct Words per Minute (CWPM)

$(279 - \underline{11} \text{ errors}) \times 60 = \underline{16,080} / \underline{159} \text{ seconds} = \text{CWPM}$

CWPM \_\_\_\_\_ 101 \_\_\_\_\_

IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Text Word	Omission	Insertion	Could Not Read	Read Incorrectly	Corrected
suburbs				x	
raise				x	
the		x			
depends				x	x
they		x			
they		x			
in			x		
quieter				x	
theatres				x	x
in		x			

rise

x

Total Errors		5	1	5	
--------------	--	---	---	---	--

IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Date: January 15, 2014

Level: 4<sup>th</sup>

Text: Qualitative Reading Inventory-5

Story: Amelia Earhart

Genre: Narrative

Number of Total Miscues (Total Accuracy) \_\_\_\_\_11\_\_\_\_\_

Total Accuracy	0-7 miscues	_____ Independent
	8-32 miscues	___x___ Instructional
	33+ miscues	_____ Frustration

Correct Words per Minute (CWPM)

$(263 - \underline{11} \text{ errors}) \times 60 = \underline{15,120} / \underline{220} \text{ seconds} = \text{CWPM}$

CWPM 68

IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Text Word	Omission	Insertion	Could Not Read	Read Incorrectly	Corrected
adventure				x	
pioneer				x	
Ireland				x	
mechanical				x	x
Pacific				x	
the		x			
and		x			
they				x	x
computers				x	x
as	x				

and x

Total Errors	2	2		7	
--------------	---	---	--	---	--



IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Text Word	Omission	Insertion	Could Not Read	Read Incorrectly	Corrected
heavier				x	x
weighed				x	
valve				x	
canals				x	x
railroad				x	x
an	x				
and	x				
a				x	x
with				x	x
locomotive				x	

Advertised

x

x

thumb

x

Total Errors	2			10	
--------------	---	--	--	----	--

IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Date: March 5, 2014

Level: 3<sup>rd</sup>

Text: QRI-5

Story: The Trip to the Zoo

Genre: Narrative

Number of Total Miscues \_\_\_\_\_4\_\_\_\_\_

Total Accuracy	0-7 miscues	__x__ Independent
	8-32 miscues	___ Instructional
	33+ miscues	___ Frustration

Correct Words per Minute (CWPM)

$(312 - \underline{4} \text{ errors}) \times 60 = \underline{18,480} / \underline{153} \text{ seconds} = \text{CWPM}$

CWPM \_\_\_\_\_120\_\_\_\_\_

IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Text Word	Omission	Insertion	Could Not Read	Read Incorrectly	Corrected
that		x			
with	x				
what				x	x
up		x			x

Total Errors	1	2		1	
--------------	---	---	--	---	--

IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Date: March 5, 2014  
Level: 3<sup>rd</sup>  
Text: QRI-5  
Story: Wool: From Sheep to You  
Genre: Expository

Number of Total Miscues \_\_\_\_\_3\_\_\_\_\_

Total Accuracy	0-7 miscues	__x__ Independent
	8-32 miscues	___ Instructional
	33+ miscues	___ Frustration

Correct Words per Minute (CWPM)

$$(221 - \underline{3} \text{ errors}) \times 60 = \underline{13,080} / \underline{121} \text{ seconds} = \text{CWPM}$$

CWPM 108

IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Text Word	Omission	Insertion	Could Not Read	Read Incorrectly	Corrected
woven				x	
then	x				
do		x			x

Total Errors	1	1		1	
--------------	---	---	--	---	--

IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Date: March 6, 2014

Level: 4<sup>th</sup>

Text: QRI-5

Story: Johnny Appleseed

Genre: Narrative

Number of Total Miscues \_\_\_\_\_6\_\_\_\_\_

Total Accuracy	0-7 miscues	__x__ Independent
	8-32 miscues	____ Instructional
	33+ miscues	____ Frustration

Correct Words per Minute (CWPM)

$(308 - \underline{6} \text{ errors}) \times 60 = \underline{18,120} / \underline{190} \text{ seconds} = \text{CWPM}$

CWPM 95

IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Text Word	Omission	Insertion	Could Not Read	Read Incorrectly	Corrected
he		x			x
not		x			x
who				x	x
gathered				x	x
be		x			
that	x				

Total Errors	1	3		2	
--------------	---	---	--	---	--

IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Date: March 6, 2014

Level: 4<sup>th</sup>

Text: QRI-5

Story: Busy Beaver

Genre: Expository

Number of Total Miscues \_\_\_\_\_6\_\_\_\_\_

Total Accuracy	0-7 miscues	__x__ Independent
	8-32 miscues	___ Instructional
	33+ miscues	___ Frustration

Correct Words per Minute (CWPM)

$(281 - \underline{6} \text{ errors}) \times 60 = \underline{16,500} / \underline{179} \text{ seconds} = \text{CWPM}$

CWPM \_\_\_\_\_92\_\_\_\_\_

IMPROVING ORAL READING FLUENCY

Text Word	Omission	Insertion	Could Not Read	Read Incorrectly	Corrected
is		x			x
pack				x	
it		x			x
be		x			x
floods				x	
middle				x	x

Total Errors		3		3	
--------------	--	---	--	---	--