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This study examined the effectiveness of repeated readings in four second-grade
classrooms in two urban elementary schools in Northwest Ohio. As determined by the
Ohio Department of Education, 75% of the students in each building must score at or
above the proficient level. For the 2008-2009 school year Building A, a school within
one of Ohio’s urban settings, had a passage rate of 65.7% and Building-B, in the same
district, had a lower passage rate of 58.1%. To evaluate the effectiveness of the 10-week
repeated reading session of poetry and prose the following research questions were
addressed: (a) What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of
narrative passages on fluency (Words Correct Per Minute) over a 10-week
intervention? (b) What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading
of narrative passages on fluency (prosody) over a 10-week intervention? (c) What is the
effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of narrative passages on
reading comprehension over a 10-week intervention? (d) What is the effect of repeated
reading of poetry on students’ attitudes toward reading as compared to the repeated
readings of narrative passages?

Mixed methods design was selected for this study due to both quantitative
and qualitative methods of data collection. The quantitative data represents the scores on
the pre- and post-tests of Words Correct Per Minute, retelling rubric, Elementary Reading
Attitude Survey, and prosody rubric. The qualitative data within the study consisted of
student questionnaires, student interviews, and teacher journals following the 10-week
repeated readings project.

Within this study, statistical significance was demonstrated in the areas of improvement
in Words Correct Per Minute, phrasing, and smoothness, making repeated readings a
viable addition to reading instruction. Additionally, the results suggested that attitudes
toward reading for poetry were more positive than attitudes toward reading of narrative
passage.
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"Fifth grade has turned into a difficult year for Jonah. He is a bright student, but he has difficulty reading. Although he can accurately sound out the words he encounters, he plods along word-by-word, often hesitating at challenging vocabulary. His oral reading shows little attention to punctuation and phrasing and it lacks expression and enthusiasm. Jonah can, however, understand material read to him. His difficulty seems to lie somewhere on the path from decoding to comprehension-in reading fluency” (Rasinski, 2004, p. 46).

The above is a common scenario given by many frustrated elementary teachers as they ask what interventions should be implemented with this type of reader.

Since the publication of the National Reading Panel (2000, p. 7), reading fluency has been brought to the forefront of reading instruction. For one to be a successful reader the reader must “process the text, the surface level of reading and comprehend the text, the deeper meaning.” To process the “surface level of the text” readers must be able to “apply alphabetic knowledge to decode unfamiliar words and to remember how to read words they have read before” (National Reading Panel, 2000). Although a single definition of reading fluency does not exist, there is consensus that fluency includes the ability to read quickly, accurately, and with expression. A study in support of this
agreement found that, “children who read quickly and accurately also tend to read with expression” (Schwanenflugel, Hamilton, Kuhn, Wisenbaker, & Stahl, 2004, p. 119).

As defined by Rasinski (2004), reading fluency refers to the reader’s ability to develop control over surface level text processing so that he or she can focus on understanding the deepest levels of meaning embedded in the text. Although the recent attention on fluency primarily focuses on speed and accuracy, the importance of prosody is overlooked. Perhaps, its subjective nature has distracted researchers from observing this component of fluency. Prosody is defined as “the extent to which reading ‘sounds’ like speaking, that is, how much it conforms to the rhythms, cadences, and flow of oral language” (Worell et al 1991, p. 212). Students who struggle with prosody may read in a word-by-word manner, overlook phrasing and punctuation as well as read with a monotone voice. Lack of prosody can result in “confusion through inappropriate or meaningless grouping of words or through inappropriate applications of expression” (Hudson, Lane, & Pullen, 2005, p. 703).

A common strategy implemented to promote fluency is repeated readings (Dowhower, 1989; Samuels, 1979). Within this approach students are expected to read the same text over and over again until fluency is achieved. According to Samuels (1979) repeated readings promote automatic word recognition skills. Moreover, research on the implementation of this method has proven to be effective (Dowhower, 1987; Hermn, 1985; Samuels, 1979; Taylor, Wade, & Yekovich).
**Introduction to the Research Problem**

This study examined the effectiveness of repeated readings in four second-grade classrooms within two, urban elementary schools in northwest Ohio. Each participating building had a second-grade classroom as treatment group one and a classroom as treatment group two. The Ohio Department of Education requires the administration of Ohio Achievement Tests within the area of reading for third grade students. As determined by the Ohio Department of Education, 75% of the students in each building must score at or above the proficient level. For the 2008-2009 school year Building A, a school within one of Ohio’s urban settings, had a passage rate of 65.7% and Building B, in the same district had a lower passage rate of 58.1%. Both buildings scored below the overall state passage rate of 77.4%. One can conclude from Building A and Building B’s scores that students are not comprehending what is being read. What does this have to do with fluency? The “theory of automatic information processing” in reading (LaBerge & Samuels, 1974) states a student reading fluently does it effortlessly and automatically, leaving energy to be used for comprehension. In other words, research has suggested poor-decoding skills may result in non-fluent reading which may result in little comprehension. After reading several scientific research articles on the effectiveness or gains with fluency through repeated readings, I hypothesized repeated readings of poetry would be a positive choice for Building A and B.
The implementation of poetry reading was chosen due to appealing content for second-grade students, such as humor, brief texts, and a variety of topics. Additionally, poems are often implemented for oral delivery which requires a reader to attend to prosody, such as punctuation, intonation and phrasing. Certainly, one would agree a reader of poetry who is not fluid would struggle with a desired positive response from others. Furthermore, being able to read brief text would help students feel confident similar to the success other researchers found through the implementation of brief texts and fluency (Rasinski, Padak, Linek, & Sturtevant, 1994). Are there other reasons supporting poetry within the classroom?

Berthoff (1981) suggested implementing poetry exposes students to the “power of language” as they create meaning through the reading of poetry. Hansen (2001) suggested implementing poetry within the classroom exposes students at an early age to the language of the past and to classic literature. Koch (1990) stated he was able to get his students to write poetry through the exposure of poetry while students were generating writing ideas. In other words his students were able to use poetry as springboards for their own writings.

Although the proposed site already has several interventions in place, such as, Title I services and Ohio Reads, a focus on repeated readings does not exist.
Statement of the Research Question

To evaluate the effectiveness of the 10-week repeated reading session, the following questions were addressed:

1. What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of narrative passages on fluency (Words Correct Per Minute) over a 10-week intervention?

2. What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of narrative passages on fluency (prosody) over a 10-week intervention?

3. What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of narrative passages on reading comprehension over a 10-week intervention?

4. What is the effect of repeated reading of poetry on students’ attitudes toward reading as compared to the repeated readings of narrative passages?

Operational Definitions

As defined by the National Reading Panel (2003) fluency is “reading with speed, accuracy and proper expression (prosody) without conscious attention.”

Referring specifically to this study, fluency is defined as words read correctly in a minute. Repeated readings consist of rereading a brief passage numerous times until a level of fluency is reached (Samuels, 1979). Curriculum-based measurement (CBM) is a set of standards for assessing and monitoring students’ progress in reading (Fuchs & Deno, 1991; Shinn, 1989, 1998; Tindal & Marston, 1990). Reading attitude is
defined by Cooter and Alexander (1984) as, “a system related to reading which causes
the learner to approach or avoid a reading situation.” Prosody describes the rhythmic and
tonal aspects of speech. Prosodic features are “variations in pitch (intonation), stress
patterns (syllable prominence), and duration (length of time) that contribute to expressive
specifically to this study, prosody is defined as expression and volume, phrasing,
smoothness, and pace. Change within this study is the difference between the results of
the pre-test and post-test in regards to Words Correct Per Minute, comprehension,
Elementary Reading Attitude Survey (ERAS), and prosody results.

Assumptions

Within this study it was assumed treatment one and two groups remained
independent during the ten week repeated reading process.

Limitations

Limitations within this study exist. First, my bias toward the topic of repeated
readings may have been evident within my introduction and the teachers may have
been reluctant to share their honest opinions about this process. Similarly, when
completing the Elementary Reading Attitude Survey students may have answered the
survey according to how they thought the teacher would want them to answer, rather
than their honest opinion about reading. In addition, students participating within the
study were not given a choice, meaning if their teacher decided to participate
they too would participate. Although the comparison populations appear to be closely matched, outcomes may appear more or less positive than they really are based on one population being more advantaged over the other.

**Significance of the Study**

Fluency presented by the Report of the National Reading Panel (2000) is one of five critical components of reading and has been referred to as a “neglected” aspect of reading. Although repeated readings has been evident within research, the method of repeated reading combined with poetry reading, comprehension, reading attitude, and prosody has not been investigated. If the 10-week session, including the aforementioned strategies is proven to raise Words Correct Per Minute, comprehension, reading attitude and/or prosody of second-grade students or any component of these, then similar strategies could be implemented with other students.

Investigating literature within the topic of fluency, Timothy Rasinski (2000) stated for most children, “slow reading is associated with poor comprehension and poor overall reading performance.” Moreover, research over 60 years ago suggested faster readers tend to comprehend better and are overall, more proficient readers (Carver, 1990, Pinnell et al., 1995). Thus, educators need to take the notion of disfluent reading seriously because “even with adequate comprehension, slow and labored reading will turn any school or recreational reading assignment into a ‘marathon of frustration’ for nearly any student” (Rasinski, 2000). Lastly, the most
compelling reason to focus on students becoming fluent readers is the strong correlation between reading fluency and comprehension (Allington, 1983; Johns, 1993; Samuels, 1988; Schreiber, 1980).

Furthermore, “The recent attention on fluency largely focused on the role of automaticity and accuracy and thus overlooks the importance of prosody” (Ness, 2009). For this reason, prosody was examined.

Summary

Chapter One began with the introduction of the study and continued to address the research problem, research questions, as well as; operational definitions, assumptions, limitations and significance of this study. In the following chapter a review of literature is presented.
Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

Introduction

Chapter One presented an outline of research that has been completed on the topic of fluency, comprehension, student attitudes toward reading and prosody. This study was introduced as a mixed method design.

Fluency

Fluency has been called the “neglected reading skill” (Allington, 1983) Moreover, slow, laborious reading is associated with poor comprehension and overall poor reading performance (NRP, 2003, p. 92). Although, most teachers having fluency as a reading goal for their students oftentimes find it difficult to explain fluency. (Martinez, Roser, Strecker, December 1998/January 1999). Why? According to Rasinski and Zutell (1996), past programs and materials addressing reading instruction did not include reading fluency. This may be due to fluency being associated with oral reading which was traditionally viewed as having little importance in learning to read (Gibson & Levin, 1975; Smith, 2002). More recently, the need to “be fluent as well as accurate in word identification has received more attention” (NRP, 2003, p. 83). Fluency is known to be a critical factor in overall reading ability and development (Rasinski, Padak, Linek, & Sturtevant, 1994); therefore, it’s a necessary component of all literacy programs. Not all
students have the innate ability to read fluently without instruction; therefore, the
components of fluency must be taught and practiced (Allinder, Dunse, Brunken, &
Obermiller-Krolakowski, 2001; Pinell, Pikulski, Wixson, Campbell, Gough & Beatty,
1995).

Moreover, the three components of fluency are: accuracy in word decoding,
automaticity in recognizing words, and use of prosody while reading. Why are these three
components so crucial to reading? They are considered the “gateway to comprehension”
(Rasinski, 2006, p. 704). As readers develop they make an excessive number of decoding
errors, read words in text correctly but not effortlessly, exhaust their cognitive resources
for comprehension, and are unable to implement meaningful expression when reading.
Oftentimes, such difficulties result in poor comprehension, lack of enthusiasm for reading
and a sense of failure (Rasinski, 2006); therefore, fluency is critical.

Reflecting on fluency a seminal article written by S. Jay Samuels (1979)
introduced repeated readings as an effective classroom instructional strategy. Fluency
was brought to the forefront again in 2000 within the publication of the National Reading
Panel. Although much attention has been placed on fluency since 2000, prosody has
been a neglected component (Schwanenflugel, Hamilton, Kuhn, Wisenbaker, & Stahl,
2004). This study will highlight prosody and poetry as it attempts to bring fluency to the
forefront again.
**Developing and Measuring Fluency**

As defined by the National Reading Panel (2000) fluency is “reading with speed, accuracy and proper expression (prosody) without conscious attention.” How can fluency be measured? In the past researchers have primarily focused on speed of reading (Eckert et al., 2000; Jenkins & Fuchs, 2003; Kuhn & Stahl, 2003). Speed is usually measured by Words Correct Per Minute (WCPM). A popular curriculum-based measurement is the assessment of Oral Reading Fluency (ORF). ORF focuses on rate and accuracy in fluency. To implement ORF a teacher listens to a student read aloud an unfamiliar passage for a total of one minute. At the end of the minute the teacher calculates Words Correct Per Minute by subtracting the number of errors from the total number of words read. How effective is using Words Correct Per Minute? Both theoretical and empirical research has presented information representing Words Correct Per Minute as an accurate indicator of reading competence as it pertains to comprehension. The validity and reliability of these two measures have been well established in a body of research extending over the past 25 years (Fuchs, Fuchs, Hosp, & Jenkins, 2001; Shinn, 1992). In 1992 ORF norms were presented for students in grades two through five. More specifically, each grade consisted of three sets of norms representing fall, winter, and spring, including the 25th, 50th and 75th percentiles. The development of the norms consisted of collecting data from eight geographically and demographically diverse school districts in the United States. In 2005 new ORF norms
were created by collecting data from school districts in 23 states. The new ORF norms included percentiles from the 90\textsuperscript{th} through the 10\textsuperscript{th} percentile. Due to the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 schools are faced with accountability to include benchmark goals and an increase in assessment data (Linn, 2000; McLaughlin & Thurlow, 2003).

What role does ORF in reading assessment play? Providing teachers with norms can support instructional decisions for screening, diagnosis and progress monitoring. As a note of caution, results of screening measures is a single piece of information when making educational decisions of students’ placements and referrals.

**Fluency and Intervention**

**Repeated Readings.** The emergence of the rereading method developed from the “theory of automatic information processing” in reading (LaBerge & Samuels, 1974). The automaticity theory states a student reading fluently does it effortlessly and automatically leaving attention to be used for comprehension. Considering beginning readers, their reading is characterized as frequent pauses due to the lack of decoding skills. Therefore, a beginning reader is described as spending a lot of attention on decoding and not enough focus on comprehension, resulting in little meaning.

To develop fluency many interventions, such as repeated readings, are implemented. Due to a seminal article written by S. Jay Samuels (1979) the method of
repeated readings has profoundly impacted reading instruction. Based on the automaticity theory, Samuels defined repeated readings as “a brief passage read numerous times until a level of fluency is reached” (Samuels, 1979). Within this process three levels of word recognition skills are evident. The first level is the non-accurate stage characterized by students having great difficulty recognizing words even when sufficient time is provided. The second level is referred to as the accuracy stage. Within the accuracy stage students are able to accurately recognize words; however focusing on the words is necessary, therefore; students at this stage read slowly with pauses and without expression and poor comprehension may be evident. The third level is the automatic stage. During this stage students are able to recognize words effortlessly and automatically, read with expression using an appropriate rate of speed and should be able to comprehend familiar material. Is the need for such “automaticity” limited to reading?

Automaticity can be compared to music. Let us consider a musician who must make the notes on the staff sound automatic when played on an instrument. In other words, the musician must decode the notes effortlessly to reach the fluency stage. Moreover, to reach this stage the musician must practice the text over and over again until mastery is reached. What other versions of the repeated method exist?

During the 17th century many of the books provided in schools to introduce reading consisted of familiar material such as prayers (Meyer, 1957, p. 34). The catechism (Littlefield, 1904, p. 106) was a text used by young Puritans. First, the
children were asked to memorize the catechism at home so the teacher could teach them how to read by having them read from the catechism. Furthermore, Small (1914, p. 366) indicated the Bible was also a popular text used in teaching children to read. The teacher would have the better readers orally read the same Bible passage over and over again until the poorer readers had learned the words.

Within the aforementioned versions of repeated readings, the children were introduced to familiar material in which they read the text over and over again until fluency was reached. More recent studies of repeated readings have provided interesting results.

Therrien (2004) conducted a meta-analysis to examine the following questions: “Is repeated reading effective in increasing reading fluency and comprehension? What components within a repeated reading intervention are critical to the success of the program? Do students with cognitive disabilities benefit from repeated reading?” (p. 252-259) The results indicated repeated reading improves reading comprehension of nondisabled and Learning Disabled students. The results across all studies indicated repeated reading is an effective strategy to improve fluency and comprehension for passages read over and over. Secondly, the results of the studies suggested repeated reading can improve fluency and comprehension of new passages. Within the study it was reported that students read passages three to four times. The results indicated a
significant increase when the passage was read three or four times; however, reading the
passage more than four times resulted in minimal gains in comprehension.

Past research of the repeated reading method has also proven to be beneficial in
helping students with learning difficulties, to increase their fluency (e.g., Askew, 1993;
Homan, Klesius, & Hite, 1993; Weistein & Cooke, 1992; Young, Bowers, &
MacKinnon, 1996). A reflection of this is represented within a study of 50, seventh-
grade students enrolled in three remedial reading classes in a suburban middle school. Of
the 50 students, 14 had been identified as having a disability. Students were randomly
assigned to a fluency strategy group or a non-fluency strategy group. Nine students with
disabilities were in the fluency strategy group and five students with disabilities were in
the non-fluency strategy group. Fluency strategies for the treatment group consisted of:
reading with inflection (Young et al., 1996), not adding words, pausing at periods and
commas (Resins, 1989), self-monitoring for accuracy (Howell, Fox, & Morehead, 1993),
reading at an appropriate pace, watching for word endings (Kameenui & Simmons,
1990), and tracking with a finger (Shanker & Ekwall, 1998). Over the ten weeks of
treatment the results indicated better performance for both groups on a comprehension
post-test than the pre-test. Students who used a specific oral reading strategy performed
significantly better on the CBM maze task than students who did not use oral reading
strategies. The study concluded that the use of oral reading instruction as part of a
reading program for middle school students with reading problems or learning disabilities should include fluency (Allinder, Dunse, Brunken and Krolikowksi, 2001).

Rasinski, Padak, Linek and Sturtevant (1994) also noted repeated reading helped improve reading fluency. During a six-month period, second-grade students participated in 15 minutes of repeated readings daily. The texts were of second-grade level and varied according to classroom themes. Activities included teacher modeling, discussions of how to read fluently and paired readings, individual feedback and text performances.

Beneficial within another study, Therrien and Kubina (2006) pg. 156, stated “Regardless of present reading level, repeated readings appear beneficial for students who read between a first and third grade instructional level.” Additionally, Meyer and Felton (1999) stated, “Repeated reading of connected text is the most researched method of improving fluency and should be focused on to acquire adequate fluency levels.”

A second technique implemented to support fluency, which is similar to repeated reading is repeated listening while reading texts. During this technique the reader reads the text while simultaneously listening to the same selection read fluently. Recently, a study by Rasinski (2001) examined the two approaches of repeated reading and reading while listening within a group of transitional third grade students. There were 20 subjects from elementary schools in southeastern United States. The treatment included group A which followed one cycle of pre-test, repeated reading and post-test and a second cycle of pre-test, repeated listening and post-test. Group B followed the cycle of pre-test, repeated
listening and post-test, with the second cycle representing pre-test, repeated reading and post-test. Moreover, both treatment groups participated in two cycles lasting a total of eight days. The findings of this study resulting in both repeated readings and listening-reading treatments were effective in improving fluency of third grade students and neither treatment was superior to the other regarding fluency.

Reader’s Theatre, a third fluency technique is an activity in which students repeatedly read a script to prepare for an oral reading performance. Martinez, Roser and Strecker completed a study in 1999 which resulted in oral reading fluency gains within a second-grade classroom. Millian and Rinehart (1999) also reported benefits of Reader’s Theatre with Title I students. Moreover, Keehn (2003), conducted a study of Reader’s Theatre with varying levels of reading development in second-grade. Two of the four classrooms within the study were randomly chosen to receive explicit instruction through mini-lessons and the introduction of reading strategies. The two remaining classrooms took part in Reader’s Theatre; however, they did not receive explicit reading instruction. The results of the study indicated students in both treatment groups made statistically significant growth in oral reading fluency during the nine-week session of Reader’s Theatre. In conclusion this study replicates earlier findings that Reader’s Theatre is effective for oral reading fluency.

A fourth grade teacher from North Carolina emphasized reading fluency through Reader’s Theatre. A weekly procedure consisted of randomly assigned scripts among the
students. On Monday of each week the students were assigned a script to be practiced 10 minutes nightly. On Friday of the same week the students were given a brief amount of time to rehearse with students having similar scripts. Lastly, the students performed in groups their reader’s theatre. Over a ten week period the teacher observed a “deepened interest in reading” (Rasinski & Griffith, 2004, p. 136) as well as an increase in reading with expression. After a year of implementation four Title One students experienced a 2.5 year increase within silent reading comprehension.

A study examining the relationship between fluency and comprehension was conducted with 171 students within second through tenth grade. The study implemented narrative and informational text. A retelling rubric was utilized to represent the relationship among retelling and comprehension. The results indicated 30% of fluent and struggling readers achieved high levels of reading comprehension. Thirty-six percent of the student’s scores indicated they are proficient but continue to need additional comprehension instruction. Furthermore, one-third of the strong readers struggled with grade-level comprehension. What is the explanation for these results? Many students may have been labeled strong readers due to strengths in pacing, accuracy and prosody. A second explanation considers higher order thinking skills. The struggling readers performed 28% lower on higher order comprehension when compared to the proficient comprehenders and 53% lower than advanced comprehenders.
Kuhn and Stahl (2000) reviewed an approach by Stahl, Heubauch, & Cramond (1997) titled Fluency-Oriented Reading Instruction (FORI). Developed by the National Reading Research Center and classroom teachers, FORI consisted of a redesigned basal reading lesson, independent classroom reading time and a reading program implemented at home. The redesigned basal lesson consisted of the teacher reading a story aloud with focus on comprehension. During independent reading the students were expected to read some or parts of the same story, followed by a home rereading. Day two consisted of rereading with partners and extension activities, followed again with home reading. As a result of this implementation, over a two year period, students’ reading improved approximately two grade levels.

**Prosody**

Prosody describes the rhythmic and tonal aspects of speech. Prosodic features are “variations in pitch (intonation), stress patterns (syllable prominence), and duration (length of time) that contribute to expressive reading of a text” (Allington, 1983; p. 557, Dowhower, 1991; Schreiber, 1980, 1991). In other words, a student reading with prosodic features reads in a natural, conversational tone. Prosody is a linguistic term, which describes rhythmic and tonal aspects of speech: “the music of oral language” (Dowhower, 1991; Hudson, Lane, & Pullen, 2005, pg. 712). Most teachers characterize non-prosodic readers as “choppy, use of word-by-word manner, lack of appropriate phrasing and use of monotone voice” (Hudson, Lane & Pullen, 2005). In assessing prosody,
researchers can observe students’ oral reading with attention to the following components: students’ emphasis on appropriate words, students’ tone of voice rises and falls in applying intonation, students’ inflection matches punctuation, students’ use of vocal tone to reflect characters’ emotions in reading dialogue, students’ appropriate use of pausing at phrase boundaries and punctuation (Hudson et al., 2005). Most research ignores the fluency component, prosody (Schwanenflugel, Hamilton, Kuhn, Wisenbaker, & Stahl, 2004); however, if prosody is not mastered it will be difficult for students to understand what they are reading (Kuhn, & Stahl, 2003; Rasinski, 2004). In other words, students with poor prosody read with little expression place equal emphasis on every word and have no sense of phrasing, and ignore punctuation resulting in little or no comprehension (Rasinski, 2004).

Justin (2008) conducted a longitudinal study to examine reading prosody and its impact on later reading skills. The study consisted of 92 first grade students within two high-poverty schools, two rural public schools, and one parochial school. The objectives of the research focus on the development of prosody and changes in prosody and word reading skills as they relate to the development of later reading fluency and comprehension. It was concluded word reading skills of students in first and second-grade were strong predictors of later fluency achievement. Additionally, grade one and two pauses did not predict fluency outcomes for grade three. Regarding comprehension,
first grade students having intonation similar to an adult was related to skilled comprehension in third grade.

Ness (2009) implemented using jokes for prosody instruction with a nine-year-old during a six-week period, within a university reading clinic. The nine-year-old was described as a slow and labored reader with poor prosody. This student failed to apply stress, intonation, and inflection, and used a monotone voice during oral reading. According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Oral Reading Fluency Scale, Grade 4 (U.S. Department of Education, 2002) the nine-year-old was a disfluent reader, scoring two points on a four-point scale. Emma’s intervention consisted of repeated readings of familiar texts, which included poetry and narrative texts in addition to echo and choral readings. After three unsuccessful months the student was introduced to a joke book. The researcher referred to comedians as pacing, stress of the right words, and reading in a smooth, fluid manner were apparent. After several months of using joke books the student earned a score of three on the NAEP fluency scale (U.S, Department of Education, 2002).

Poetry

Rasinski (2000) stated poetry and reading fluency is an excellent match. However, using poetry to explore language is one of the most often neglected components of the language arts curriculum (Denman, 1988; Perfect, 1999). “When poetry performance is fostered in the classroom, reading fluency is also nurtured as
students attempt to make their oral interpretations just right- and this means repeated readings, but in a very natural and purposeful way” (Rasinski, 2000, p. 148).

A study examining repeated readings of poetry was titled, “Poetry Academy.” Wilfong (2008) combined repeated readings of poetry with listening while reading, assisted reading and modeling. The participants in the Poetry Academy were 86 third grade students within a rural Midwest town. Students who scored below 65 Words Correct Per Minute were selected for the treatment group. Students within the Poetry Academy made greater gains than students in the control group on the Curriculum Based Measurement after the implementation of the program. Furthermore, significant gains were also made in the treatment group in regards to Words Correct Per Minute and word recognition specifically, students in the treatment group made gains of an average of 45.06 words per minute. Lastly, to assess comprehension a retelling rubric was implemented. During the pre-test CBM, three students in the treatment group had an “excellent” rating compared to 13 students from the control group also having an “excellent” rating on their retelling. Within the second semester, the CBM was re-administered, which resulted in 26 students from the treatment group scoring an “excellent” rating on the retelling compared to 26 students also scoring an “excellent” rating in the control group.

Stanley (2004, p. 56) stated, “Reading and performing poetry provides numerous opportunities for children to practice with pleasure the essential skills of phonemic
awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension.” Repeated readings of poetry were introduced within a second-grade classroom. Each week the teacher began by reading the poem to the class, followed by discussion of vocabulary, rhythm, punctuation and poem voice. Next, a choral reading of the poem occurred followed by independent reading of the poem. Lastly, students read the poem independently approximately five to ten minutes with their poetry fluency partner. Nightly, the students took the poem home to continue repeated readings. This entire process continued for a total of five days. Friday of each week all students had the opportunity to perform the poem for the class. The results of this process included “a boost of confidence in students who were, at the beginning of second-grade, reluctant or below grade-level oral readers” (Stanley, 2004, p. 56-57). Furthermore, growth in reading fluency and comprehension were attributed to the repeated reading of poetry process.

**Summary**

Thus far, this section introduced and defined fluency and prosody. A review of literature was conducted regarding repeated readings and fluency. Both were a major component observed in the ten week session of repeated readings. Secondly, an investigation of reading attitude is presented.

**Assessment of Attitude toward Reading**

Fishbein and Aizen (1975) defined attitude as “a learned predisposition to respond in a consistently favorable or unfavorable manner with respect to a given object.” More
specifically, Alexander and Fillers (1976, p. 6) defined reading attitude as “a system of feelings related to reading which causes the learner to approach or avoid a reading situation.” Mathewson (1994) introduced a model known as the Mathewson model in which he focused on the role of attitude as one of many factors which influence an individual’s intention to read and the results of the reading encounter are fed back to influence attitude. Moreover, Mathewson was interested with the role of attitude during reading, as well as, when learning to read. This model addressed four factors to consider when acquiring attitude. The first factor is “cornerstone concepts,” which refer to values, goals and self-concepts. Secondly, “persuasive communications” can affect readers through a “central route,” such as a teacher recommending a specific text for reading or “peripherally” meaning an individual may be drawn to a specific text due to its appearance. Other factors considered within the Mathewson model are external motivation and the emotional state of the reader.

On the other hand, the McKenna Model (1994) associated a “causal role” related to an individual’s belief system. More specifically the McKenna model includes three factors contributing to attitude: belief about the outcomes of reading, expectations of others and wanting to conform to those expectations, and outcomes to specific reading situations. The “causal role” within the McKenna model was proposed by Fishbein and Ajzen (1975; Ajzen, 1989; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980).
Furthermore, the causation proposed by Fishbein and Ajzen (1975, 1989, 1980) flowed from beliefs to attitude, to intentions, and to behaviors. Two types of beliefs presented were beliefs concerning the object itself, meaning reading and objects of a “normative nature”; for example how an individual’s peers view reading. The beliefs were than categorized as descriptive, inferential or informational beliefs. Descriptive beliefs were those drawn from personal experiences. Inferential beliefs included decisions based upon existing beliefs, such as, “if this book is interesting the next book I read may be interesting too.’ Lastly, informational beliefs refer to beliefs derived from outside sources which the individual regards as important.

An idea not included within the Fishbein and Ajzen model was introduced by Liska (1984, p. 65). His beliefs suggested that intentions alone did not cause specific behaviors to occur. In addition, he argued beliefs had “little to do with behavioral intents but instead influence behavior indirectly, through their effect on attitude.”

In 1762 Rousseau proposed “that any method of teaching reading would suffice given adequate motivation on the part of the learner” (McKenna and Kear 1990, p. 629). Smith (1988, p. 177) stated “the emotional response to reading is the primary reason most readers read and probably the primary reason most nonreaders do not read.”

Unfortunately, the current trend has emphasized reading proficiency and has neglected the important role of reading attitudes. McKenna and Kear created an instrument for classroom teachers to administer to better understand reading attitudes of students in
grades one through six. The Elementary Reading Attitude Survey (ERAS) can be given to an entire class in a brief amount of time. Creating a fun appeal to children, McKenna and Kear (1990) implemented the comic strip character Garfield. The ERAS depicts four poses of Garfield with each pose representing a range from happiest to a very upset Garfield. The use of four points was implemented due to research suggesting that children cannot discriminate more than five bits of information simultaneously (Case & Khanna, 1981; Chi, 1978; Chi & Klahr, 1975; Nitko, 1983). The items within the survey correspond to academic reading or recreational reading. Reliability and validity were documented as this instrument was administered to a sample of 18,000 students in grades one through six.

Lazarus and Callahan (2000) implemented the ERAS (McKenna & Kear, 1990) to introduce reading attitudes of students with learning disabilities as compared to their non-disabled peers. Randomly selected, 39 learning-disabled teachers from four states were identified to administer the ERAS to 522 randomly selected learning disabled students. Within the ERAS, students answered statements relating to recreational and academic reading. The results indicated an overall “happy” rating for reading within in each area; however, a decline appeared from second throughout fifth grade. There were no significant differences in recreational and academic reading for first and second-grade; however, first, second, and third grade students appeared to have higher attitudes toward recreational reading than students in grades four and five. Lastly, academic reading was
not significantly different across the grades. Upon viewing non-disabled versus disabled students’ reading attitude, a parallel existed across all grade levels. Additionally, disabled students’ attitudes regarding recreational reading were higher than the lower, non-disabled readers and mirrored the average non-disabled readers. Viewing the results for academic reading, the learning disabled students’ scores resembled the low, non-disabled readers’ scores. In summary, the students with learning disabilities in this study held attitudes similar to and more stable than their non-disabled peers.

Other studies implementing the ERAS exist. Kennedy and Halinski (1975) examined students in an accelerated academic track. The results indicated students within the accelerated track scored significantly higher on reading attitude than students in a regular track. In regards to gender and grade level differences in reading attitudes, consistently results have indicated that girl contain more positive attitudes toward reading than boys (e.g., Anderson, Tollefson, & Gilbert, 1985; Diamond & Onwueguzie, 2001; Kennedy & Hallinski, 1975; Ley & Trenthamm, 1987; Ross & Fletcher, 1989; Smith, 1990). McKenna et al. (1995) indicated that girls in grades one through six had more positive reading attitudes than boys in academic and recreational reading. Diamond and Onwuegbuzie sampled 1,968 kindergarten through fifth grade students. The results indicated girls had higher scores in reading attitudes and reading achievement. Krush et al. (1995) observed 139 males and 150 females in grades one through five. The results found significant differences in attitudes among girls and boys in grades one, three, four
and five. Less consistency exists among grade levels. Diamond and Onwuegbuzie (2001) found reading attitude declined drastically in fourth grade. McKenna et al (1995) found that attitudes toward reading also decreased as students progressed to higher grades except for high ability readers. Kush et al. (1995) indicated the difference in reading attitudes among grade levels of first through fifth grade students.

Summary

This chapter presented literature as it pertained to fluency, prosody, and comprehension and reading attitude. The literature presented provides a foundation and background for the current study by providing information on existing studies within the aforementioned fields.
Chapter Three

Methodology

This chapter will discuss the methods and procedures used to answer the research questions:

1. What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of narrative passages on fluency (Words Correct Per Minute) over a 10-week intervention?

2. What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of narrative passages on fluency (prosody) over a 10-week intervention?

3. What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of narrative passages on reading comprehension over a 10-week intervention?

4. What is the effect of repeated reading of poetry on students’ attitudes toward reading as compared to the repeated readings of narrative passages?

Data Collection

Table 1 represents quantitative and qualitative data collection and the research questions they assist in answering.
Table 1

*Research Question and Data Collection Methods*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question One: What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of narrative passages on fluency (Words Correct Per Minute) over a ten week intervention?</th>
<th>X</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question Two: What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of narrative passages on fluency (prosody) over a ten week intervention?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Three: What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of narrative passages on reading comprehension over a ten week intervention.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Four: What is the effect of repeated reading of poetry on students’ attitudes toward reading as compared to the repeated readings of narrative passages?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Design**

Mixed methods design was selected for this study due to both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection. The combination of both forms of data provided a better understanding of “Repeated Readings.” The quantitative data consists of scores on the pre- and post-tests of Words Correct Per Minute, retelling rubric, Elementary Reading Attitude Survey and prosody rubric. The qualitative data within the study included student questionnaires, student interviews and teacher journals following the ten week repeated readings study. In this study it appeared statistical data alone would not satisfy practitioners who look toward the measure of a whole student. Hearing from some of the participants themselves during the interviews, reading teacher...
journal entries and reading answers to student questionnaires allowed the examiner to look “deeper” and identify existing themes. Within this study, the strategy sequential explanatory was the best fit. Sequential explanatory “consists of first collecting quantitative data and then collecting qualitative data to help explain or elaborate on the quantitative results” (Creswell, 2003)

**Setting and Participants**

The setting of this research was two elementary K-3 buildings located in Northwest Ohio. The first elementary building (A) consisted of 239 students with a district enrollment of 3,870 students. The student population of the school was: 31.7% Black, Non-Hispanic; 13.4% multi-racial; and, 53.2% White, Non-Hispanic; 73.7% of the student population was economically disadvantaged as indicated by the Ohio Department of Education. The attendance rate for building A was 94.1% as compared to the state attendance rate of 94.3%. The school was rated as “Continuous Improvement” by the Ohio Department of Education Report Card, as a result of 65.7% having passed the third grade achievement test in literacy as compared to the state requirement of 75%. What does “Continuous Improvement” mean? The Ohio Department of Education rates the progress schools have made based on the four following measures of performance: Indicators, Performance Index, Adequate Yearly Progress and Value Added. A combination of the measures is the basis for assigning one of the following designations
to a building: Excellent with Distinction, Excellent, Effective, Continuous Improvement, Academic Watch, and Academic Emergency.

The second elementary building (B) consisted of 297 students. The student population of the school was: 31.9% Black, Non-Hispanic; 16.7% multi-racial; and, 50.5% White, Non-Hispanic. Over 69% of the students were classified as economically disadvantaged according to the Ohio Department of Education. The attendance rate for building B was 95.6% compared to the state attendance rate of 94.3%. This school was also rated as “Continuous Improvement” by the Ohio Department of Education Report Card, as a result of a 58.1% passing rate on the third grade achievement test in literacy. A study of this type which focused on the fluency and practices recommended for those who suffer from a lack of fluency such as repeated readings, was especially appropriate in such settings. The participants within this study consisted of 61 second-grade students. These second-grade students were divided into four classrooms within two urban, K-3 elementary buildings. Of the 61 students in the study, one classroom in each building was randomly selected for Treatment 1, group A and one classroom was randomly selected for Treatment 2, group A. Within building B one classroom was randomly selected for Treatment 1, group B and one classroom was randomly selected for Treatment 2, group B. Of the 61 students in the study, 24 were girls and 37 were boys.
Treatment 1 versus Treatment 2

The study was conducted over a ten week period. First, Treatment 1, groups A and B, as well as Treatment 2, groups A and B were given pre-tests to measure Words Correct Per Minute, comprehension, and prosody. The instrument used to assess comprehension was a second-grade reading passage titled “Bob and His Father” from the Eckwall and Shanker Reading Inventory (2000) see Appendix. Immediately following each oral reading passage a retelling rubric was implemented to check for comprehension. Second, a brief narrative passage (see Appendix) was implemented to assess Words Correct Per Minute. Third, a pre-test to measure prosody was administered (see Appendix). Individually, all students read a poem selected by the investigator and were assessed using the prosody rubric(see Appendix). Fourth, the examiner administered the Elementary Reading Attitude Survey (see Appendix) to one classroom at a time, during a whole group setting. All pre assessments were administered by the examiner one-on-one except the ERAS. Next, the repeated readings of poetry or narrative texts began daily for a total of ten weeks. During the last Friday of the study, the examiner audio-taped the students’ reading and implemented the multidimensional fluency scale (see Appendix). After ten weeks all groups were administered post-tests by the examiner to measure Words Correct Per Minute, comprehension and reading attitude. All post-tests were administered one-on-one except the ERAS. Additionally, a total of four students, one student randomly selected from each treatment group were selected to
participate in an interview conducted by the examiner to determine any existing themes. (See Appendix F for interview questions) Additionally, all participants were administered a survey (see Appendix), one whole class at a time by the examiner. All post assessments were administered by the examiner. The examiner collected teachers’ journals to support fidelity of the study. Lastly, data was analyzed to prove or disprove the proposed research questions.

Below is Table 2 representing the aforementioned process of Treatment 1 and Treatment 2 groups.

Table 2

_Treatment One and Treatment Two_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment 1, groups A and B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pre-Assessments (Examiner administers): reading passage from Informal Reading Inventory to assess comprehension using the retelling rubric, poem to assess prosody, Elementary Reading Attitude Survey, brief narrative text to assess Words Correct Per Minute and ERAS to assess reading attitude.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Repeated readings of poetry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher uses read aloud daily to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment 2, groups A and B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pre-Assessments (Examiner administers): reading passage from Informal Reading Inventory to assess comprehension using the retelling rubric, poem to assess prosody, Elementary Reading Attitude Survey, brief narrative text to assess Words Correct Per Minute and ERAS to assess reading attitude.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Repeated readings of narrative text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level of Text Difficulty

Research suggests in selecting materials for rereading, it is best to implement books that are just below a student’s instructional level and contain interesting topics (Hicks, 2009). Within this study narrative texts were chosen using the instructional level of students provided by the classroom teachers. Additionally, the researcher searched for narrative passages with interesting topics for second-grade students, including fiction and nonfiction. A few titles of the narrative passages were: “Tornadoes,” “Soccer,” “One Big Storm,” “Helicopters,” “Mexican Jumping Beans,” “Saving Old Red,” “Molly’s New Friend,” “Living in the Dark Zone,” “Desert Monster” and “Volcanoes.” All of the narrative passages implemented within this study, as well as poems, were one page or less in length.

What about text-level of poems? Literacy specialists often use readability graphs such as the “Fry Readability Graph” to calculate text levels. Readability calculations often require using long passages (at least 100 words) to determine sentence complexity, average word length and the like. Unfortunately, it is often difficult to determine an exact readability of a poem due to the lack of complete sentences and brief nature. To determine poems appropriate for the students within this study various text
characteristics were used to guide the selection. For example, when viewing the reading level of second-grade students, Fountas and Pinnell (2009) created a text gradient which highlights reading levels and text characteristics. The text gradient suggests typically, second-grade students enter second-grade reading at a level H and at the end of the year typically reading level M. Since this study took place toward the end of third quarter one can approximate a typical second-grade student may be reading at level J-K; therefore, the poems selected for the study highlight text characteristics of level J and K suggested by Fountas and Pinnell, 2009. Below are the text characteristics suggested by Fountas and Pinnel, 2009 for levels J/K and the criteria used in determining the selection of poems that were implemented for this study. Moreover, the poems selected contained three or more of the listed characteristics.

Table 3

*Text Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two or more syllables in words</td>
<td>Three or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of contractions</td>
<td>Three or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of compound words</td>
<td>Three or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of words containing suffixes</td>
<td>Three or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of words containing plurals</td>
<td>Three or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of words in a sentence</td>
<td>15 or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similar to narrative passages the researcher considered the interest level of second-grade students for poems. In conclusion, the researcher implemented poems with humor which were centralized around the theme “School”. A few of these poems were: “School Daze Rap,” “I Ripped My Pants at School Today,” “How to Torture Your Students,” and “Caleb’s Desk Is a Mess.” For a complete listing of poem titles refer to Appendix I.

Examining the content of the poems one would find humor in each. “Caleb’s Desk Is a Mess” includes Caleb’s teacher cleaning out his desk. The teacher finds many gross things, such as; an old ham sandwich turning green, monstrous spit wads, and a sock with a hole in it. “I Ripped My Pants at School Today” consists of a student ripping his pants going down the slide. Although everyone saw his purple underwear the student was glad he had them on. “There’s a Cobra in the Bathroom” refers to a girl insisting there is a snake in the bathroom but her teacher is reluctant to believe her. At the end of the poem the teachers is frightened due to seeing the cobra in the bathroom. This poem contains rhyming words within every other line. “School Daze Rap” also contained rhyming words; however, it had a rhythm students were able to turn into a rap. In summary, the poems varied in length, content, rhythm and rhyme.

**Timeline**

A quasi-experimental, pre-test-post-test design for this research was evident. In March of 2010 pre-tests were administered to Treatment 1, groups A and B and Treatment 2, groups A and B (all groups), followed by Treatment 1 “repeated readings of poetry” or Treatment 2 “repeated readings of narrative texts.” Lastly, post-tests were
administered to all treatment groups at the end of the study (Creswell, 2003). If the results of this study prove to be effective, the researcher would provide repeated readings of poetry to the aforementioned “Treatment 2 groups” and to the other second-grade classes not participating within the study. Beginning in March Treatment 1 and 2 groups received their intervention during the regularly scheduled language arts block to eliminate exposure to more instruction of one treatment group over the other. The pre-test of Words Correct Per Minute, retelling rubric, as well as attitude toward reading and prosody rubric took place in March of 2010. The post-tests of the aforementioned measures plus student interviews and questionnaires took place in May of 2010.

**Procedure and Training of Teachers**

The general sequence of the study was first, the principals of the two elementary schools in Northwest Ohio were contacted to discuss the possibility of conducting the study in their school. The study sites were selected due to similar demographics, lack of repeated readings and designation assigned by the Ohio Department of Education. After getting permission from the principals, a meeting was arranged with the second-grade teachers from buildings A and B to explain the study and the possibility of their classroom being randomly selected for the research. Random sampling was initiated beginning with the target population, which consisted of four second-grade classrooms within building A and building B. Each second-grade classroom within building A and B was assigned a number one through four. The first number drawn in building A and B were the Treatment 1 groups and the second number drawn in building A and B were the Treatment 2 groups. The remaining two second-grade classrooms in building A and B
did not participate in the study. The following items were shared during the initial meeting with the second-grade classroom teachers.

1. An explanation of repeated readings and the research supporting repeated readings was introduced and discussed.
2. An explanation of fluency and its role within repeated readings was explained.
3. A brief explanation of treatment 1 (repeated readings of poetry with a focus on prosody).
4. A brief explanation of treatment 2 (repeated readings of brief narrative text with a focus on accuracy and speed).
5. An explanation of how they will be notified if their classroom is randomly selected to participate.
6. An explanation of time involved for training.
7. Question and answer session.

After the initial meeting the classrooms were randomly selected for buildings A and B and the participating teachers were notified of their training date and time. The teachers of the treatment 1 classrooms were trained separately from the teachers of the treatment 2 classrooms. Listed below were the items shared during the training of the treatment 1 classrooms:

1. A review of repeated readings and the research supporting repeated readings was introduced and discussed.
2. A review of fluency and its role within repeated readings was explained.
3. A sample of repeated readings of poetry and a prosody rubric (multi-dimensional fluency scale) was modeled.
4. The teachers were given explicit directions of how the repeated readings of poetry would be implemented 15 minutes daily during the regular scheduled literacy block for treatment 1 groups A and B. The classroom teachers will model prosody daily using a read aloud before students are given time to reread their poetry.

5. Next, the teachers will be given an example of the Elementary Reading Attitude Survey (ERAS). The teachers will be informed that the examiner will administer this survey to treatment 1, groups A and B before and after the 12 week session. An explanation and reasoning of the ERAS will also be shared.

6. Following the ERAS the teachers will be given samples of the reading passages and poem implemented before and after the ten weeks of repeated readings to measure Words Correct Per Minute, comprehension and prosody. An explanation of the process of administering pre and post passages to treatment 1 groups A and B will be presented. The examiner will administer the pre and post reading passages to treatment 1 groups A and B.

7. The retelling rubric will be introduced and explained as an instrument to measure comprehension of the aforementioned oral reading passages. The examiner will administer the pre and post retelling rubrics to treatment 1 groups.

8. Teacher Journals were introduced as a means for writing comments and/or self reflection during the repeated readings process and for fidelity purposes.

9. Finally, an explanation of pseudonyms to protect anonymity will be explained and consent forms of students and parents will be presented.

10. Time will be allotted for a question and answer session.
11. Dates will be determined for the investigator to conduct parent meetings and meetings with students of each classroom participating in the study. The parents of the students participating in the study were invited to an informal meeting at each participating school. During this time the parents were informed of the study and consent was obtained. For parents not attending the meeting two consent letters were sent home with their child which were followed up by phone calls. The students participating in the study were also given assent forms and a discussion of the study was explained.

A second training session took place for the teachers of the treatment 2 classrooms. Listed below were the items shared:

1. A review of repeated readings and the research supporting repeated readings was introduced and discussed.

2. A review of fluency and its role within repeated readings was explained.

3. A sample of repeated readings of narrative texts and a calculation of Words Correct Per Minute and accuracy rate was modeled.

4. The teachers were given explicit directions of how the repeated readings of narrative texts would be implemented fifteen minutes daily during their regularly
scheduled literacy block for treatment 2, groups A and B. The classroom
teachers of treatment groups 2 will model fluency daily using a read aloud before
students begin to reread their narrative texts.

5. Next, the teachers were given an example of the Elementary Reading Attitude
Survey (ERAS). The teachers were informed that the examiner will administer
this survey to treatment 2, groups A and B before and after the 10-week session.
An explanation and reasoning of the ERAS was shared.

6. Following the ERAS the teachers will be given samples of the reading passages
and poem implemented before and after the ten weeks of repeated readings to
measure Words Correct Per Minute, comprehension and prosody. An explanation
of the process of administering pre and post passages to treatment 2, groups A and
B will be presented. The examiner will administer the pre and post reading
passages and poem.

7. The retelling rubric will be introduced and explained as an instrument to measure
comprehension of the aforementioned oral reading passages. The examiner will
administer the pre and post retelling rubric to treatment 2 groups.

8. Teacher Journals were introduced as a means for writing comments and/or self
reflection during the repeated readings process and for fidelity purposes.

9. Finally, an explanation of pseudonyms to protect anonymity will be explained and
consent forms of students and parents will be presented. Time will be allotted for a
question and answer session.

10. Dates will be determined for the investigator to conduct parent meetings and
meetings with students of each classroom participating in the study.
Data was collected numerically through the implementation of Words Correct Per Minute, prosody rubric scores, retelling rubric scores and attitude survey scores. Narrative data was collected through student interviews and questionnaires as well as, teacher journals. The combination of statistical data and the qualitative method of interviewing and questionnaires allowed a deeper view of the repeated reading project.

Criteria

A change in fluency was measured comparing the Words Correct Per Minute score of the pre and post-tests of Treatment 1 and 2 groups. A change in comprehension was measured comparing the pre and post-test scores of the retelling rubrics for all treatment groups. A change in prosody was measured by comparing the pre and post-test scores of the prosody rubric of all treatment groups. Lastly, a change in reading attitude was measured comparing the pre and post-test scores of the Elementary Reading Attitude Survey.

Quantitative Measures

Words Correct Per Minute

A Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM) is a set of standards for assessing and monitoring students’ progress in reading (Fuchs & Deno, 1991; Shinn, 1989, 1998; Tindal & Marston, 1990). The use of CBM has been validated throughout numerous research studies (e.g. Fewster &Macmillan, 2002; Howe & Shim, 2001). Therefore, Words Correct Per Minute was determined before and after the intervention to determine any changes in fluency. Rasinski (2000) agrees “Speed does matter in reading” (p. 146). He stresses that excessively slow,
disfluent reading is associated with poor comprehension and can also lead to reading frustration. Within this research fluency (speed) was measured through a brief narrative passage. All students were tested by the same researcher to eliminate any differences in the implementation process. The students were reminded to read at a normal reading pace. The researcher used the oral reading passage to gain Words Correct Per Minute. Adapted from AIMSweb (2003), Words Correct Per Minute can be compared to national, grade-level norms at the beginning, middle and end of the school year. These norms are listed for second-grade in Table 4. Furthermore, Hasbrouck and Tindal, 2005 stated within their Oral Reading Fluency Norms, on average second-grade students improve 1.2 words per week.

Table 4

Second-grade Oral Reading Fluency Norms

Source: Adapted from “AIMSweb: Charting the Path to Literacy”, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beginning Words Correct Per Minute</th>
<th>Middle Words Correct Per Minute</th>
<th>End Words Correct Per Minute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-60</td>
<td>50-80</td>
<td>70-100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prosody Rubric**

Reading fluency can be considered multidimensional, meaning one dimension stresses accuracy in word decoding, the second dimension focuses on automatic recognition of words in text and the third dimension stresses expressive and meaningful interpretations of text. The prosody component of fluency stresses the use of phrasing and expression (Dowhower, 1987, 1991; Schreiber, 1980, 1987, 1991; Schreiber & Read, 1980). When readers appropriately implement volume, tone, emphasis and phrasing they are giving evidence that comprehension is occurring. How is prosody assessed?
Researchers have used qualitative rubrics to guide the assessment process. A rubric adapted by Zutell and Rasinski (1991) rates readers’ fluency along the dimensions of expression and volume, phrasing, smoothness and pace. Scores among this scale range from four to sixteen; a score of eight or above indicates “good progress” in fluency and a score below eight indicates fluency may be a concern (see Appendix D for sample of fluency scale). Within this study the prosody rubric was administered as a pre and post-test to all treatment groups by the examiner. The participants of all treatment groups orally read the same poem for the prosody assessment.

**Elementary Reading Attitude Survey**

McKenna and Kear created an instrument for classroom teachers to administer to better understand reading attitudes of students in grades one through six. The Elementary Reading Attitude Survey can be given to an entire class in a brief amount of time (Appendix E). Creating a fun appeal to children, McKenna and Kear (1990) implemented the comic strip character Garfield. The ERAS depicts four poses of Garfield with each pose representing a range from a very happy to a very upset Garfield. The use of four points was implemented due to research suggesting that children cannot discriminate more than five bits of information simultaneously (Case & Khanna, 1981; Chi, 1978; Chi & Klahr, 1975; Nitko, 1983). The items within the survey correspond to academic reading or recreational reading. Reliability and validity were documented as this instrument was administered to a sample of 18,000 students in grades one through six.
The Elementary Reading Attitude Survey was implemented whole group with all treatment groups prior to the 10-week repeated reading process and after. The researcher administered the ERAS to control for differences in the implementation process. The pre- and post-test scores of the ERAS were examined to determine if the repeated reading process of poetry had any impact on students’ reading attitude. The hypothesis was that students who receive the repeated reading of poetry intervention will result in a positive difference in reading attitude.

**Retelling Rubric**

A retelling rubric adapted from Irwin, P.A. & Mitchell, J. N. (1983) was implemented within the study to assess students’ comprehension before and after the ten week session of repeated readings for all treatment groups. The retelling rubric was administered to all treatment groups after the implementation of an oral reading passage from the Eckwall and Shanker Reading Inventory (2000). The retelling rubric is based upon a five point scale. Students receiving a score of 1 provided details only and no evidence of sequencing was apparent. To receive a score of 2 the students included a few main ideas and details; however, sequencing was poor. A score of 3 means the student included most main ideas and mostly sequenced the events. A score of 4 would include most main ideas and supporting details, sequencing was correct and the student related text to his/her own life. Lastly, a score of 5 includes all main ideas and supporting details, correct sequencing and inferring beyond the text (Appendix B).
Qualitative Measures

Questionnaire of all Participants

All treatment groups took part in a survey following the implementation of repeated readings. The examiner administered the questionnaire, to the whole group, one class at a time. During this time the examiner read the open-ended questions to the students and the students responded in written form. The purpose of this survey was simply to determine why or why not students liked or disliked repeated readings of poetry (Treatment 1) or narrative texts (Treatment 2).

Follow-up Interviews

A total of four students, one from each treatment group were randomly selected to partake in an interview after the ten week process. (Appendix A). As students were individually interviewed by the examiner, the examiner noted all answers stated by the participants. The examiner attempted to provide a pace comfortable for all interviewees.

Teacher Journals

Each participating teacher was asked to keep a journal during the repeated readings process. The directions given to the teachers were to use the journal to note comments, observations and/or self reflections. The examiner collected the journals at the end of the ten week process.

Data Analysis

ANOVA

The pre-test scores for Words Correct Per Minute, retelling rubric, prosody rubric and the Elementary Reading Attitude Survey were used as a baseline for comparing the
post-test scores of Treatment 1 and 2 groups. An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was implemented in hopes of showing that there was a difference between distribution groups. An ANOVA provided statistical information such as, the influence of the independent variable (i.e. repeated readings of poetry and narrative text) on the outcome of the dependent variables (i.e. reading attitude, comprehension, prosody, and Words Correct Per Minute).

**Constant Comparative Method**

The Constant Comparative Method (Glasser, 1965) is a method of analysis in qualitative research. The researcher begins with one piece of data and compares it to all other pieces of data. This method is inductive as the researcher examines the data and concludes new meaning from the data. This method is followed during the examination of data for questionnaires, interviews and teacher journals.

**Questionnaire Data**

The responses to the open-ended questionnaire were categorized according to themes. A few anticipated themes were that students may refer to the humor within the poems and/or the length of narrative passages.

**Themes and Patterns in Interview Data**

Following the implementation of repeated readings the examiner interviewed four students. The responses of the participants were examined to determine any existing themes and/or patterns. The themes and/or patterns were represented through participants’ responses.
Themes and Patterns in Teacher Journals

During the repeated reading process the four participating teachers were asked to journal at least once a week during the 10-week repeated reading process. The teachers were given the freedom to decide what they determined worthy of noting. The responses of the teachers were examined to determine any existing themes and/or patterns.

Conclusion

Chapter Three provided an outline of quantitative and qualitative data methods as it relates to the study “Repeated Readings.” Moreover, explicit details of participants and training were discussed, as well as, the statistical analysis to be implemented. The following chapter will describe the results of the study.
Chapter Four

Results and Analysis

This study took a qualitative and quantitative approach to examining repeated readings. The study included four, second-grade classrooms participating in a 10-week session with repeated readings of narrative passages or repeated readings of poetry.

Specifically, repeated readings of narrative passages and poetry were examined over a ten week period to measure Words Correct Per Minute, prosody, comprehension and reading attitude of second-grade students to answer the following questions:

1. What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of narrative passages on fluency (Words Correct Per Minute) over a 10-week intervention?

2. What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of narrative passages on fluency (prosody) over a 10-week intervention?

3. What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of narrative passages on reading comprehension over a 10-week intervention?

4. What is the effect of repeated reading of poetry on students’ attitudes toward reading as compared to the repeated readings of narrative passages?

Statistical data were collected through the implementation of a multidimensional fluency scale, retelling scale, Words Correct Per Minute and reading attitude scale. A qualitative view of the ten-week session followed to include interviews with students,
student questionnaire and teacher journals. When analyzing the results of this study, three major conclusions were formulated regarding Words Correct Per Minute, phrasing, smoothness, and reading attitude. These conclusions will be viewed after the quantitative results are presented.

Quantitative Results

Sixty-one participants took part in the study. Of those participants, 31 participants (50.8%) were in the poetry group and 30 (49.2%) were in the narrative group. Frequencies and percentages of group inclusion are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Frequencies and Percentages of Group Inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the scores for the variables measured increased by some degree from pre-test measurement to the post-test measurement. For Words Correct Per Minute, the minimum and maximum scores also changed from pre-test to post-test. Of the prosody scores (expression, phrasing, smoothness, and pace), the largest pre-test to post-test change
was noted for phrasing, going from 2.10 at pre-test \((SD = 0.81)\) to 2.52 at post-test \((SD = 1.06)\) Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

*Means and Standard Deviations for Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words Correct Per Minute</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>28.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>144.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>144.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expression</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrasing</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoothness</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward reading</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question One

What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of narrative passages on fluency (Words Correct Per Minute) over a 10-week intervention? As students read orally for one minute, Words Correct Per Minute was calculated by subtracting the number of errors from the total number of words read. Words Correct Per Minute was determined for each participant in the narrative and poetry groups. For the first research question, a one-within one-between analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to assess if there were differences in the number of Words Correct Per Minute (pre-test versus post-test) and between groups (narrative versus poetry). For ANOVA to run properly assumptions need to be checked and assumptions for ANOVA are normality of equality and variance. The assumptions normality and equality of variances were assessed with two Shapiro-Wilk test of normality and two Levene’s test of equality of variance. The results of these tests were not statistically significant, and normality and equality of variance could be assumed. In other words, the results of an ANOVA should mirror a normal bell curve; the Shapiro-Wilk test indicated a violation of that assumption; however, samples larger than 50 approximate to normality and the findings are reliable. In reference to the Levene’s test of equality of variance when the largest group divided by the smallest group is 1.5 or less equality of variance can be assumed

The results of the one-within one-between ANOVA were significant for the main effect of time (pre-test versus post-test), $F(1, 57) = 134.67, p = .001$, suggesting that the
mean number of Words Correct Per Minute ($M = 80.47, SD = 29.19$) was significantly smaller than the mean number of Words Correct Per Minute at post-test ($M = 94.03, SD = 27.79$). The mean of the aforementioned data was calculated by adding the values and dividing by the number of values; therefore adding the pre-test scores of Words Correct Per Minute and dividing by the number of pre-test scores determined an average pre-test number of Words Correct Per Minute. The same process was followed to determine the mean for post-test number of Words Correct Per Minute. Additionally, the mean denotes the central location of data and the standard deviation describes how far the scores are from the mean. For example, considering $M=80.47, SD=29.19$, the standard deviation is large; meaning the scores of Words Correct Per Minute are spread out over a large range.

The results were not significant for the main effect of group (narrative versus poetry), $F (1, 57) = 0.01, p = .930$, suggesting that there was no difference in the number of Words Correct Per Minute by group. The results were not significant for the interaction effect of group and time, $F (1, 57) = 1.84, p = .181$, suggesting the interaction of group and time made no significant difference on the number of Words Correct Per Minute. Results of the one-within one-between ANOVA are presented in Table 7. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 8.
### Table 7

*One-Within One-Between ANOVA for Number of Words Correct per Minute by Time and Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>134.67</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*Group</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>(40.42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>(1610.80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Number in parenthesis represents the mean square for error.

When viewing the fourth column of Table 3, “P” indicates significance. A “P” value of .05 or less indicates significance, meaning 95% of the time there is a difference. In viewing .001 one can conclude significance for within-subjects and time of pre and post-tests. Within-Subjects refers to the same students at pre-test being matched at post-test.

The Partial Eta Square is a measure of effect size, which determines the magnitude of relationship. If the data represents 0 to .3 a small effect exists. A score of
.3-.5 indicates a moderate difference and larger than .5 indicates a significant difference. In viewing the graph, 0.70 means a strong relationship between within-subjects of time between pre and post-tests’ however, a relationship did not exist (0.00) for between-subjects across time. Lastly, a small difference did exist for within-subjects by group over time. In summary there was no difference in groups between narrative passages and poetry for Words Correct Per Minute. However, both groups resulted in a small difference over time for Words Correct Per Minute as expected and indicated by numerous literature.

In summary Table 7 indicates; significance of within-subjects for time (.001) and a strong relationship between within-subjects (0.70) of time between pre and post-tests.

Table 8

*Means and Standard Deviations for Number of Words Correct per Minute by Time and Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>30.04</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>80.93</td>
<td>28.85</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80.47</td>
<td>29.19</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>95.17</td>
<td>26.08</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>92.93</td>
<td>29.75</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94.03</td>
<td>27.79</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question Two

What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of narrative passages on fluency (prosody) over a 10-week intervention? A multidimensional fluency scale was implemented to measure the dimensions of expression, phrasing, smoothness and pace. As the examiner listened to the oral reading of each student a score of one through four was noted for each dimension. Total scores ranged from four to sixteen with scores below eight indicating that fluency may be of concern. Total scores of eight or above indicated the student is making good progress in fluency.

To examine research question 2, four one-within one-between analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted to assess if there were differences in prosody (expression, phrasing, smoothness, and pace) scores by time (pre-test versus post-test) and by group (narrative versus poetry). The first ANOVA assumption was that normality was assessed with eight Shapiro-Wilk test of normality, all of which were statistically significant, indicating a violation of the assumption. However, according to Stevens (2002), the $F$ statistic is robust with regard to this assumption because non-normality affects the Type I error rate only slightly.

**Expression.** Within this study expression was defined and rated a numeric number of four on the multidimensional fluency scale as “Reads with good expression and enthusiasm throughout the text. Sounds like natural language.”
The reader is able to vary expression and volume to match his/her interpretation of the passage.” (Zutell & Rasinski, 1991,p. 211) Additionally, a numeric score of three, two and one is described on the multidimensional fluency scale (see Appendix D) with a score of one for expression as less favorable.

The results for the one-within one-between ANOVA for expression for the main effect of time (pre-test versus post-test) was not significant, $F (1, 56) = 1.26, p = .267$, suggesting that there was no difference in expression scores by time. The results for the ANOVA for the main effect of group (narrative versus poetry) were not significant, $F (1, 56) = 0.25, p = .622$, suggesting that there was no difference in expression scores by group. The results for the ANOVA for the effect of the interaction of time and group were not significant, $F (1, 56) = 0.04, p = .844$, suggesting that there was no difference in expression score by the interaction of time and group. Moreover, significance was not indicated within any variables for expression. Results of the one-within one-between ANOVA are presented in Table 9. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 10.
Table 9

*One-Within One-Between ANOVA for Expression Score by Time and Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*Group</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>(0.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Number in parenthesis represents the mean square for error.
Table 10

Means and Standard Deviations for Expression Score by Time and Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phrasing.**

Within this study as defined and rated numerically a four on the multidimensional fluency scale phrasing can be defined as “Generally well phrased, mostly in clause and sentence units, with adequate attention to expression.” (Zutell & Rasinski, 1991, p. 211) Additionally, a numeric score of three, two and one is described on the multidimensional fluency scale (Appendix D) a score of one for phrasing as less favorable.

The results for the one-within one-between ANOVA for phrasing for the main effect of time (pre-test versus post-test) was significant, $F(1, 56) = 9.77$, $p = .003$, suggesting that the phrasing scores are pre-test ($M = 2.10$, $SD = 0.81$) were significantly smaller than the scores at post-test ($M = 2.52$, $SD = 1.06$). When viewing this result the study is specifically referring to within-subjects for time, pre-test and post-test. The students within-subject are exactly the same for pre-test and post-test, meaning they are
matched. The mean score of these students at pre-test were 2.10 and at post-test 2.52. The larger results at post-test indicate an improvement in phrasing as measured by the multidimensional fluency scale. The results for the ANOVA for the main effect of group (narrative versus poetry) were not significant, $F(1, 56) = 0.01, p = .920$, suggesting that there was no difference in phrasing scores by group. The subjects accounted for in this result are between-subjects meaning there are two different groups (poetry and narrative), which are not matched pre to post-test. The results for the ANOVA for the effect of the interaction of time and group were not significant, $F(1, 56) = 0.40, p = .534$, suggesting that there was no difference in phrasing score by the interaction of time and group. This example refers to within-subjects meaning students of pre-test are matched at post-test for time and group. In conclusion, phrasing was significant for the main effect of time (pre-test versus post-test). Results of the one-within one-between ANOVA are presented in Table 11. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 12.
Table 11

*One-Within One-Between ANOVA for Phrasing Score by Time and Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*Group</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>(0.52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>.920</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>(1.30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Number in parenthesis represents the mean square for error.
Table 12

Means and Standard Deviations for Phrasing Score by Time and Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Smoothness.

In implementing the multidimensional fluency scale smoothness was defined and rated numerically a four as “Generally smooth reading with some breaks, but word and structure difficulties are resolved quickly, usually through self-correction.” (Zutell & Rasinski, 1991, p. 211) Additionally, a numeric score of three, two and one is described on the multidimensional fluency scale (see Appendix D) with a score of one for smoothness as less favorable.

The results for the one-within one-between ANOVA for smoothness for the main effect of time (pre-test versus post-test) was significant, $F (1, 56) = 9.77, p = .002$, suggesting that the smoothness scores at pre-test ($M = 2.33, SD = 0.80$) were significantly smaller than the scores at post-test ($M = 2.69, SD = 0.96$). The larger scores at post-test indicate an improvement in smoothness as measured by the multidimensional fluency...
scale. The results for the ANOVA for the main effect of group (narrative versus poetry) were not significant, $F (1, 56) = 0.19, p = .669$, suggesting that there was no difference in smoothness scores by group. The results for the ANOVA for the effect of the interaction of time and group were not significant, $F (1, 56) = 2.09, p = .154$, suggesting that there was no difference in smoothness score by the interaction of time and group. In summary, significance was indicated for smoothness for the main effect of time (pre-test versus post-test). Results of the one-within one-between ANOVA are presented in Table 13. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 14.

Table 13

*One-Within One-Between ANOVA for Smoothness Score by Time and Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*Group</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Number in parenthesis represents the mean square for error.
Table 14

Means and Standard Deviations for Smoothness Score by Time and Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pace.**

As described and rated numerically a four on the multidimensional fluency scale pace is “Consistently conversational.” (Zutell & Rasinski, 1991, p. 211) Additionally, a numeric score of three, two, and one is described on the multidimensional fluency scale (Appendix D) with a score of one for pace as less favorable.

The results for the one-within one-between ANOVA for pace for the main effect of time (pre-test versus post-test) was not significant, $F(1, 56) = 1.96, p = .167$, suggesting that there was no difference in pace scores by time. The results for the ANOVA for the main effect of group (narrative versus poetry) were not significant, $F(1, 56) = 0.01, p = .908$, suggesting that there was no difference in pace scores by group.

The results for the ANOVA for the effect of the interaction of time and group were not significant, $F(1, 56) = 0.34, p = .565$, suggesting that there was no difference in pace score by the interaction of time and group. In conclusion, significance was not
indicated within any variables for pace. Results of the one-within one-between ANOVA are presented in Table 15. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 16.

Table 15

*One-Within One-Between ANOVA for Pace Score by Time and Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within-Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*Group</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>(0.76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between-Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>(1.34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Number in parenthesis represents the mean square for error.
Table 16

*Means and Standard Deviations for Pace Score by Time and Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question Three**

What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of narrative passages on reading comprehension over a ten week intervention? A retelling scale was implemented to measure the comprehension of students within this study. In reference to the retelling scale, comprehension was represented using five levels of established criteria represented numerically on a scale from one to five with five being favorable. The criteria for a numeric rating of “5” was: “Students includes all main ideas and supporting details; sequences properly; infers beyond the text; relates text to own life; understands text organization’ summarizes; gives opinion and justifies it; may ask additional questions, very cohesive and complete retelling.” (Irwin & Mitchell, 1983, p. 394) For a numeric rating of one to three, refer to the retelling scale (Appendix B).
To examine research question three, a one-within one-between analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to examine if there was a difference in reading comprehension by time (pre-test versus post-test) and by group (narrative versus poetry). The assumption of normality was assessed with eight Shapiro-Wilk test of normality, all of which were statistically significant, indicating a violation of the assumption. However, according to Stevens (2002), the $F$ statistic is robust with regard to this assumption because non-normality affects the Type I error rate only slightly. Eight Levene’s tests of equality of variance were conducted, and the assumption was met. In other words, the results of an ANOVA should mirror a normal bell curve; the Shapiro-Wilk test indicated a violation of that assumption; however, samples larger than 50 approximate to normality and the findings are reliable. In reference to the Levene’s test of equality of variance when the largest group divided by the smallest group is 1.5 or less equality of variance can be assumed.

The results for the one-within one-between ANOVA for reading comprehension for the main effect of time (pre-test versus post-test) was not significant, $F (1, 56) = 3.11$, $p = .083$, suggesting that there was no difference in reading comprehension by time. The results for the ANOVA for the main effect of group (narrative versus poetry) were not significant, $F (1, 56) = 0.01$, $p = .932$, suggesting that there was no difference in reading comprehension by group. The results for the ANOVA for the effect of the interaction of time and group were not significant, $F (1, 56) = 2.09$, $p = .154$, suggesting that there
was no difference in reading comprehension by the interaction of time and group. In conclusion, significance for comprehension was not indicated within any of the variables.

Results of the one-within one-between ANOVA are presented in Table 17. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 18.

Table 17

*One-Within One-Between ANOVA for Reading Comprehension by Time and Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within-Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*Group</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between-Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.932</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Number in parenthesis represents the mean square for error.
Table 18

Means and Standard Deviations for Reading Comprehension by Time and Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question Four

What is the effect of repeated reading of poetry on students’ attitudes toward reading as compared to the repeated readings of narrative passages? The Elementary Reading Attitude Survey was implemented to measure the reading attitude of the second-grade students. The ERAS depicts five poses of Garfield with each pose representing a range from a very happy to a very upset Garfield. A numeric rating of one to five was implemented to represent the happiest to the very upset Garfield, with one representing “happiest.”

To examine research question 4, a one-within one-between analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to examine if there was a difference in attitudes toward reading by time (pre-test versus post-test) and by group (narrative versus poetry). The
assumptions normality and equality of variances were assessed with two Shapiro-Wilk test of normality and two Levene’s test of equality of variance. These assumptions were met.

The results for the one-within one-between ANOVA for attitudes toward reading for the main effect of time (pre-test versus post-test) was not significant, $F (1, 50) = 0.94, p = .336$, suggesting that there was no difference in attitudes toward reading by time. The results for the ANOVA for the main effect of group (narrative versus poetry) were significant, $F (1, 50) = 4.90, p = .031$, suggesting that attitudes toward reading for narrative ($M = 2.28, SD = 0.50$) was significantly smaller than attitudes toward reading for poetry ($M = 2.59, SD = 0.51$). The results for the ANOVA for the effect of the interaction of time and group were not significant, $F (1, 50) = 1.26, p = .267$, suggesting that there was no difference in attitude toward reading by the interaction of time and group. Moreover, the reading attitude of the students reading the narrative passages was less positive than the students reading poetry. Results of the one-within one-between ANOVA are presented in Table 19. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 20. In summary significance was indicated for the main effect of group (narrative versus poetry).
Table 19

_One-Within One-Between ANOVA for Attitude toward Reading by Time and Group_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within-Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*Group</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between-Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>(0.51)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Note_. Number in parenthesis represents the mean square for error.
Table 20

*Means and Standard Deviations for Attitude toward Reading by Time and Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kappa**

Kappa coefficients are a measure of agreement between two individuals. Kappa coefficients were calculated for two raters on multidimensional fluency posttest scores and retelling posttest scores. A Kappa coefficient value of one means perfect agreement and less than one would be less than perfect agreement. Sixteen students were evaluated on a range of four possible outcomes. For multidimensional fluency expression and volume, all of the kappa coefficients were evaluated using the guideline outlined by Landis and Koch (1977), where the strength of the kappa coefficients = 0.01-0.20 slight, 0.21-0.40 fair, 0.41-0.60 moderate, 0.61-0.80 substantial, and 0.81-1.00 almost perfect.

Of the four possible outcomes, one had moderate agreement, one had fair agreement, and two had slight agreement. Kappa coefficients are presented in Table 21.
Table 21

*Kappa Coefficients for Multidimensional Fluency for Expression and Volume*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Kappa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little expression or enthusiasm</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some expression</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural language</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good expression and enthusiasm</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For retelling, all of the Kappa coefficients were evaluated using the guideline outlined by Landis and Koch (1977), where the strength of the kappa coefficients =0.01-0.20 slight, 0.21-0.40 fair, 0.41-0.60 moderate, 0.61-0.80 substantial, and 0.81-1.00 almost perfect. Sixteen students were evaluated on a range of five possible outcomes, however no student was classified to be above level 3 (includes some main ideas). All three outcomes had perfect agreement, indicating both raters had perfect agreement on where the students were classified on the retelling scale. Kappa coefficients are presented in Table 22.
Table 22

*Kappa Coefficients for Retelling Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Kappa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little expression or enthusiasm</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some expression</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good expression and enthusiasm</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Analysis**

The first conclusion supported by the quantitative data includes smoothness and phrasing within prosody. The largest pre-test to post-test change was noted for phrasing to include 2.10 at pre-test ($SD=0.81$) to 2.52 at post-test ($SD=1.06$) for time and group. This provides evidence that the students’ phrasing improved at post-test when measured by the multidimensional fluency scale. Smoothness was also significant for the main effect of time (pre-test versus post-test). The pre-test scores ($M=2.33$, $SD=0.80$) indicated improvement when compared to the post-test scores ($M=2.69$, $SD=0.96$). In other words the students’ ability to implement smoothness when reading improved at post-test when measured by the multidimensional fluency scale.

A second conclusion may be drawn regarding Words Correct Per Minute within fluency. The mean number of Words Correct Per Minute ($M=80.47$, $SD=29.19$) was significantly smaller than the mean number of Words Correct Per Minute at post-test.
In other words, the Words Correct Per Minute improved from pre-test to post-test. The results were significant for the main effect of time. Reflecting upon the national grade level norms adapted from AIMSweb (2003), second-grade students should end their second-grade year within the range of 70-100 Words Correct Per Minute. Although the students began the ten week study within the second-grade range improvement was made and they concluded the study at the later part of the range. Additionally, Hasbrouck and Tindal (2005) stated second-grade students should improve an average of 1.2 words per week from Fall to Spring. In viewing the maximum Words Correct Per Minute score for pre-test versus the maximum score for Words Correct at post-test within this study, an average gain of 1.6 words per week was noted. Why is this worthy? As stated by the NRP (2003) “slow, laborious reading is associated with poor comprehension and overall poor reading performance,” therefore, rate of speed does matter.

The final conclusion of this study refers to the positive attitudes of students reading narrative passages as being less than the positive attitude of students reading poetry. The results suggested attitudes toward reading of narrative texts (M= 2.28, SD=0.50) was significantly less positive than attitudes toward reading of poetry (M=2.59, SD= 0.51). Although the researcher accounted for the interest level of reading among the narrative texts as well as poetry, the attitudes of the poetry students were higher. The qualitative portion of this chapter will further support the quantitative evidence of poetry
resulting in more positive attitudes than students reading narrative texts as well as other qualitative results.

**Qualitative Results**

The qualitative data collection took place to view the “voices of the students” and to provide the teachers an opportunity to also share their voices during the process. The data sources for the qualitative data include: student questionnaires, student interviews and teacher journals. Let us begin by examining qualitative data supporting the aforementioned quantitative data.

What is the effect of repeated reading of poetry on students’ attitudes toward reading as compared to the repeated readings of narrative passages? As discussed in the quantitative section the results suggested attitudes toward reading of narrative texts (M=2.28, SD=0.50) was significantly less positive than attitudes toward reading of poetry (M=2.59, SD= 0.51). Further supporting the quantitative data for positive attitudes of poetry students, listed below are some of the positive comments made by students of repeated readings of poetry:

“I like to read out loud when reading poems.”

“I like reading poems because it is exciting!”

“I ripped my pants at school today”

“F’s are fabulous “(2)

“There is a cobra in the bathroom “(2)
“I had a favorite part. School Daze Rap “(6)

“I like the beat.”

“When Mrs. K looked in the bathroom for the cobra.”

“My favorite part is “She should have listened to me.”

“I would like to do more poems.” (6)

“I like the poems.” (2)

What is the importance of this finding? McKenna et al. (1995) indicated that girls in grades one through six had more positive reading attitudes than boys in academic and recreational reading. Furthermore, regarding gender and grade level differences in reading attitudes, consistently results have indicated that girls express more positive attitudes toward reading than boys (e.g., Anderson, Tollefson, & Gilbert, 1985; Diamond & Onwueguzie, 2001; Kennedy & Hallinski, 1975; Ley & Trenthamm, 1987; Ross & Fletcher, 1989; Smith, 1990). Implementing poetry within grades one through six may be an answer to supporting boys in having more positive attitudes toward reading. Furthermore, perhaps it could be the answer to reaching the reluctant and/or unmotivated reader.

In viewing the aforementioned positive comments made by students one can further examine the reasons stated for liking the poems. One student stated he/she enjoys the poems because he/she “enjoys reading aloud.” A different student stated he/she thought the poems were “exciting.” Two students mentioned they had favorite parts
within the poems. A third student stated he/she liked the “beat.” Lastly, three students simply stated they “liked” the poems and seven students stated they “would like to do more poems.”

Moreover, the aforementioned positive comments can also be separated referring to specific titles mentioned by students. “School Daze Rap” being most popular was mentioned seven times by students. Three students stated they liked “F’s are Fabulous” and “There’s a Cobra in the Bathroom.” Lastly, one student stated he/she liked “I Ripped My Pants at School Today.” (Appendix I)

Voices of the Students

After the ten week session of repeated reading all students were given the opportunity to respond in a written manner to their repeated reading experience. The three questions on the questionnaire that were given to all students, in both the control and experiment group, included:

What did you like about repeated reading?
What did you dislike about repeated reading?
What else would you like to tell me?

To analyze this data all answers were compiled by one of the questions noted above. Next, each answer was indicated within the table as a different response was given, furthermore; the number behind the answers indicates the number of additional times the response occurred. Repetition and similar answers by students were grouped together. As the researcher examined the answers to the question “What did you like about
Repeated Readings” a pattern began to emerge. The researcher determined the emerging themes of the students’ responses referred to text features, the process of repeated readings and aesthetic statements. Appendix G outlines the students’ responses according to theme.

**Emerging Themes from Student Questionnaire.**

*What did you like about repeated readings?* Within the student responses several aesthetic statements were written by students. The words “fun” and “funny” were used 12 times to refer to the students’ emotions. Of the 12 “fun statements” three responses were from students who read short passages and nine responses were from students who read poems, again, supporting the qualitative results of students of poetry having more positive attitudes. Other aesthetic statements written by students included: “I feel happy.” “It felt boring.” and “You will get smart.”

Additionally, many students within their written responses used the verb “help” regarding the repeated reading process. Specifically, five students stated repeated reading “helps me read better” and one student stated, “It helps me get the answer.” Of the five students stating repeated readings helps them read better one student was from repeated readings of poetry and four were from repeated readings of passages.

Within the second theme process of repeated readings, seven students indicated they liked “reading” and one student indicated he/she wanted to “learn more about the books.” Reflecting upon this statement the researcher hypothesizes the student is
referring to the books implemented daily for teacher modeling and read aloud. It would have been interesting to ask the students which read alouds were their favorites.

Lastly within the theme text features, 16 of the students mentioned specific poems. Seven of the students mentioned “School Days Rap” being a favorite. “F’s are Fabulous” and “There’s a Cobra in the Bathroom” were both mentioned three times by students. Additionally, one student mentioned he/she enjoyed the teacher looking in the bathroom for the cobra.

What did you dislike about repeated readings? The same process for the first question was followed by the researcher. Each student answer was noted within the table as a different response was given; furthermore, the number behind the answers indicates the number of additional times the response occurred. Repetition and similar answers by students were grouped together. The emerging themes for the question “What did you dislike about repeated readings?” were text features and the process of repeated readings. Within text features the adjective “long” was noted several times. Specifically, the students’ responses included: “I did not like long words,” “I did not like forgetting long words,” “I did not like long stories,” and “I did not like when it takes a long time to read.” Within “the process of repeated readings” six students commented they did not like repeating the same thing over and over. Four students indicated they did not like reading and three students indicated they did not like reading aloud. For additional comments refer to Appendix G.
What else would you like to tell me? Again, the same process followed by the first and second question was followed for the third. Each student answer was noted within the table as a different response was given. The number behind the answer indicates the number of additional times the response occurred. Repetition and similar answers by students were grouped together. The written answers for “What else would you like to tell me?” were separated into positive and negative comments. In reference to the 19 positive comments, seven of the students asked for more poems, four students referred to repeated readings as fun/funny and three students stated they enjoyed the poems. Moreover, one student remarkably wrote “thank you” to the researcher.

Of the 19 positive student responses, two were from students who read short passages and 17 were from students who read poems. This serves as a second piece of evidence to support the qualitative results of students reading poetry having a more positive attitude than students reading short passages. In viewing the negative comments made by students for the question “What else would you like to tell me?” eight students responded “nothing” and one student stated “It was boring.”

Interviews

Within the four classrooms taking part in this study, one child from each class was randomly selected to participate within a one-to-one interview with the researcher. A few questions implemented during the student interviews included the ease and/or
difficulty of repeated reading as well as, speed, accuracy and prosody. For a set of complete questions, refer to Appendix F.

**Summary of Student Interview One.** Child number one was a male from a classroom taking part in repeated readings of poems. During the interview the child referred to his teacher reading and the students repeating after her (echo reading). The student stated they would attempt to “read like her.” Additionally, the child mentioned “trying to get a 3” by reading in a normal voice. The interviewee stated they would read the poems about four to five times a day and would discuss “setting.” The child referred to an incident of students being “bad” so repeated readings were difficult. When asked what made repeated readings easy the student responded, “reading with the teacher” (choral reading). When asked about “fluency” the child didn’t recognize the word; however, he was able to recognize “volume and expression.” The child identified “volume” as not very good reading but “expression” as good reading. When discussing smoothness, the child stated if he earned a numeric rating of “3” he was reading smoothly. According to the child sometimes the teacher would score them numerically and sometimes the students would score themselves.

**Summary of Student Interview Two.** Child number two was a male from a classroom taking part in repeated readings of poems. During the interview the child stated the teacher would read the poem and the
students would repeat after her (echo reading). The student stated the teacher used excitement in her voice when reading the poems. The child stated the teacher called the students to her desk one by one to read the poems to her. During this time the children would earn a numerical rating of one, two, three, or four. The student stated each poem was read about three times a day and the poems got harder each week. The interviewee specifically, referred to the difficulty of “How to Torture your Students.” When asked about the word “fluency” the child stated it means to “read fast but not that fast.” For the word “volume” the child described it as “it’s like excitement but you get louder.” Expression was referred to as “Like that exciting mark.” Lastly, the child referred to “smoothness” as “soft” and stated each time the poems were read they would get easier.

**Summary of Student Interview Three.** At the beginning of the third interview the student stated he was not a very good reader and repeated readings of passages was “boring.” When asked if repeated readings helped him become a better reader the child responded “a little bit.” During the interview the student referred to his teacher timing the students as they read. The interviewee stated they spent five days on each passage. When asked how many times they repeated the passages in one day he responded, “2.” During the readings the child stated he would get “mad” when he would get stuck on words. The student referred to “fluency” as being “sure about his words.” When asked about “speed” the child said, “you should read fast when you know the word and slow when you don’t.”
**Summary of Student Interview Four.** The final interview was with a male student from a classroom that completed repeated readings of passages. During this interview the child shared the students would take turns reading pages (partner reading) from the story. As the students read the teacher would listen. The student stated he would read each passage about two times in one day and he thought the words were easy to read. When asked about fluency the student responded, “It is like a poem.” The student did not remember discussing the terms “speed and accuracy.”

**Emerging themes from interviews.** To search for patterns within student responses the researcher began by separating the interviews into two categories; poems versus narrative passages. During both of the interviews with students from the classrooms taking part in repeated readings of poems, each student mentioned reading individually with the teacher and receiving a numeric rating. Additionally, both students mentioned taking part in echo reading. At times the teacher would lead the reading as the students echoed her. The two interviewees from the poem group explored fluency daily within their classroom. Specifically, the classroom teachers of the poem group introduced prosody to the students. As the researcher asked interviewee one and two about the meaning of fluency, student one didn’t recognize the word and student two responded it is “fast but not that fast reading.” The researcher was expecting the students of the poetry group to mention “prosody” but this did not occur.
When the researcher asked interviewee one and two about the meaning of “volume, expression and smoothness” interviewee one was not able to recall the meaning of any of these words accurately. Interviewee two demonstrated some understanding of the concepts as she responded, “like excitement but you get louder,” “like that exciting mark,” and “soft.”

The second category of the student interviews was students taking part in repeated readings of narrative passages. The students within this group were exposed daily to fluency by their classroom teacher. Specifically, speed and accuracy were the focus. When asked about the meaning of fluency interviewee three was unable to accurately describe it. He demonstrated some understanding of the word “speed” as he responded, “fast when you know the words and slow when you don’t.” Interviewee four was also unable to describe the word fluency. When asked about “speed and accuracy” interviewee four didn’t remember the terms.

Examining further the comments made by the interviewees the researcher viewed the statements within the teacher journals. Searching for evidence to support that the students were exposed to the aforementioned terms the researcher noted teacher one of narrative passages did not use any fluency terms within her journal. Cross-referencing this teacher with the four interviewees the researcher discovered interviewee four was from this teacher’s classroom. As stated earlier interviewee four was unable to describe fluency, speed and accuracy. Teacher two of narrative passages had two statements using
fluency terms: “I had someone read with and without fluency to have the children experience the difference,” “We read slowly, moderately and quickly to experience accuracy.” Cross-referencing this teacher to interviewee three the student was unable to describe fluency but had some understanding of speed.

Examining the writings of teacher journals (Appendix H) of poetry the researcher noted teacher one of poetry referred to expression three times and fluency and smoothness twice. Cross-referencing this teacher to interviewee two the researcher found this student had some understanding of volume, expression and smoothness. In the writings of the second teacher of poetry, the researcher did not find any fluency terms. Cross-referencing this teacher to interviewee one, the researcher found the student was unable to describe fluency, volume, expression and smoothness.

In summary, it was disappointing to the researcher that three out of the four interviewees were completely unable to describe and/or explain fluency and the student from the poetry group that had somewhat of an understanding responded, “fast but not that fast reading.” However, speed was not a focus of the poetry group, prosody was.

**Teacher Journals**

The purpose for the implementation of the teacher journals was twofold: to support the fidelity of the study within each classroom and to provide an opportunity for teachers to make comments and/or reflect during the process. Appendix H represents the comments made by four classroom teachers during the repeated readings process.
**Emerging Themes from Teacher Journals.** The initial emerging theme from the teacher journals was the implementation of styles of reading. Two of the four teachers referred to engaging the students in partner reading during the rereadings. Teacher one stated, “Students took turns partner reading” and teacher four stated, “Read to partner.” Secondly, a teacher made reference to a few students taking part in shared reading as they read the poems to a new student in the classroom. Thirdly, a teacher commented on having her students read the poems in parts to practice smoothness and expression. Teacher number two’s comments were, “Today, we did the poem in parts. This made the reading smooth and with expression.”

Both teachers taking part in repeated readings of poems remarked on the poem “School Days Rap.” The first teacher stated, “Students enjoyed this poem and had fun actually doing this poem as a rap.” The second teacher stated, “Students wanted me to rap the poem. As I rapped the students were making noises with their mouths.” “A” rapped this poem in front of the class.

Various times during their reflections the teachers mentioned the overall enjoyment of the students. These were the “enjoyable” comments written within the teachers’ journals:

- Children loved “Pigs will be Pigs”.
- Children loved the surprises…some wanted to read more.
- Children are enjoying the books used for modeling the read aloud.
- “H” said, “It is fun acting it out”.
- “S” enjoys the poem and giggles as she reads it. She thinks it is funny and great.

Students liked it, especially because of the pictures.
Students seemed to like it.
Had fun actually doing this poem as a rap.
Students liked it but missed some of the humor,
They really loved this poem. (There’s a Cobra in the Bathroom),
Enjoyed reading passages.

Lastly, a remarkable statement made by a teacher was, “E” raised his hand to read the poem in front of the class. “E never volunteers to do anything in front of the class.”

Once the researcher examined emerging themes individually within the student questionnaires, student interviews and teacher journals further investigation began to determine if emerging themes existed among the three qualitative pieces. A pattern began to emerge as the “repeated” process of repeated readings was viewed. Within the student questionnaires seven students referred to the dislike of having to read over and over. During student interview two the student stated repeated readings of passages was boring and within the teacher journals, teacher number one made the following comments: “The students are glad to have new passages to read. They were getting bored with the old ones. It is hard to motivate them to keep reading. They wanted either a higher level or a new variety.”

A second theme which emerged among student questionnaires, student interviews and teacher journals was the difficulty of the poem “How to Torture Your Students.” Regarding the question, “What did you dislike about repeated readings” a student commented, “How to Torture Your Students.” Within the student interviews, interview number two referred to the difficulty of reading “How to Torture Your Students” and
within the teacher journals teacher two stated, “Not a favorite.” Moreover, teacher two stated, “A said this poem is just torture having to read it.”

**Summary of Quantitative and Qualitative Data**

Within this chapter a quantitative and qualitative approach to examining repeated readings of poetry and narrative passages was analyzed. Considering the first research question; “What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of narrative passages on fluency (Words Correct Per Minute) over a 10-week intervention?” the quantitative data suggested Words Correct Per Minute were significant for the main effect of time; however, Words Correct Per Minute were not significant for the interaction of group and time. As suggested by Samuels (1979) repeated readings promote automatic word recognition skills, meaning rate of speed improves with rereading. Although the results indicated significance for main effect of time and not interaction of group and time, one can hypothesize extending this study beyond ten weeks would result in larger gains. Furthermore, reflecting upon the “theory of automatic information processing” in reading (LaBerge & Samuels, 1974), during the third level of reading students are able to recognize words effortlessly and automatically. Within the qualitative data of this study during the second student interview a student responded, “Each time the poems were read they would get easier.” Additionally, within the student questionnaire when asked “What did you like about repeated readings?” a student responded, “It got easier!” Both of these comments support the aforementioned theory of
automaticity. Moreover, a “deeper view of fluency” has been described by Chard and Pikulski (2008), as a “developmental process of building decoding skills that will form a bridge to reading comprehension and that will have a reciprocal, causal relationship with reading comprehension.” One can assume as reading gets easier for students a certain level of automatic decoding skills have been achieved; therefore, the “bridge to reading comprehension” can be achieved. Lastly, as minimal attention is focused on decoding the reader is able to focus on prosodic reading. As stated by Griffith and Rasinski (2004, p. 126), “fluent readers are able to express or embed meaning into the text through their oral interpretation.”

Examining the second research question; “What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of narrative passages on fluency (prosody) over a 10-week intervention?” resulted in the effect of group and time were not significant for expression and pace. The results for phrasing and smoothness indicated the main effect of time was significant; however, the interaction of time and group was not significant. Supporting the quantitative data in improvements in smoothness, teacher journal number two stated, “Students are getting better at reading “smooth” not fast.”

Considering the third research question, “What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of narrative passages on reading comprehension over a ten week intervention?” resulted in the main effect of time and group were not significant. Although the quantitative data did not present marked improvement within
comprehension one can reflect upon the comments made by the students within the questionnaire as it relates to comprehension. When asked “What did you like about repeated readings” a comment made by a student was “That I could remember some things.” Additionally, six comments were made by students referring to repeated readings as “I like it because it helps me read better.”

Lastly “What is the effect of repeated reading of poetry on students’ attitudes toward reading as compared to the repeated readings of narrative passages?” indicated no difference in attitudes toward reading by time; however, the main effect of group was significant. The quantitative data presented students of poetry having a more positive attitude than students of narrative passages. Additionally, the qualitative data of positive comments made by students of poetry and teachers of poetry further supported these findings. Although, the students of narrative passages appeared to have a less positive attitude, positive comments were made by both teachers and students within this group.

The next chapter will implement the findings of the quantitative and qualitative data within this chapter to introduce findings for future research and implications for educators.
Chapter Five

Implications and Recommendations

Within this study a quantitative and qualitative view of repeated readings of poetry and narrative passages was examined. Reflecting upon the results discussed in the previous chapters, this chapter will discuss implications for future educators and recommendations for future research.

Implications for Educators

What do the results of this study provide for educators? Educators would agree that struggling readers usually read less and tend to feel more negatively toward reading in school and reading in general; therefore, teachers may want to consider the qualitative data of this study regarding repeated readings of poetry. As presented in the previous chapters many positive comments were made by the second-grade poetry students regarding their enjoyment of reading poetry. A few of these comments were: “I like reading poems because it is exciting!” “I like the poems” “It is fun/funny.” In support of the student comments were positive comments from the teachers of poetry. A few of these were: “Students enjoyed the poem” and “It is fun acting it out.” Perhaps poetry is an avenue to changing the attitude of struggling readers. Moreover, as stated earlier research has stated gender and grade level differences in reading attitudes, consistently results have indicated that girls contain more positive attitudes toward reading than boys (e.g., Anderson, Tollefson, & Gilbert, 1985: Diamond & Onwueguzie, 2001; Kennedy &
Hallinski, 1975; Ley & Trenthamm, 1987; Ross & Fletcher, 1989; Smith, 1990). Within this study a teacher noted several comments made by her students. A few comments made by boys were: “The poem gives good suggestions on how to torture your teacher.” “This poem is just torture having to read it.” “Oh, yeah! Looks like another funny poem.” Additionally, a teacher commented, “Devonte rapped this poem in front of the class.” In summary, the use of poetry in the classroom could be used to help improve reading attitudes of struggling readers and more specifically, boys.

Schools today are faced with requirements for data-driven accountability for student performance. The federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 mandated that schools demonstrate Adequately Yearly Progress. To demonstrate this teachers have relied on state standards; however, accountability includes teaching and assessing those standards. Oral Reading Fluency known and measured by Curriculum Based Measurement has been used to assess and monitor students’ progress in rate and accuracy. From the ORF assessment teachers are able to gather data regarding Words Correct Per Minute to determine instructional needs and to provide student data in support of accountability for student growth.

Within this study statistical significance gains were made over time for Words Correct Per Minute and prosody using poetry and student attitudes toward reading improved. Additionally, phrasing was statistically significant for within-subjects for
time (pre-test to post-test) and for smoothness for the main effect of time (pre-test versus post-test). The statistical significance of Words Correct Per Minute, phrasing and smoothness within this study introduces repeated readings as a viable addition to reading instruction. Moreover, Words Correct Per Minute, phrasing and smoothness can provide educators additional measures to monitor student progress.

Additionally, educators now need even more tools to assist struggling readers with programs such as, Response to Intervention (RTI). RTI is a framework consisting of high-quality instruction and tiered levels of interventions to match student needs. Within Tier I teachers are expected to provide classroom interventions for students needing additional support to the regular curriculum. Students within Tier I may be struggling with fluency problems in reading. Within this study Words Correct Per Minute within subjects for time (pre-test to post-test) indicated improvement (pre-test M=80.47 and post-test $M = 94.03$); therefore, repeated readings could be implemented as an intervention for fluency purposes. Quick and effortless word identification is a must because it allows more of students’ cognitive energy/attention to be used for comprehension. At times, good and poor readers can be attributed to students’ ability to decode automatically (Perfetti & Hogaboam, 1975; Torgesen, 1986). To extend repeated readings teachers could incorporate audio-taped text. Dowhower (1987) indicated assisted and unassisted repeated readings resulted in significantly higher word accuracy, comprehension, fluency and prosody.
Additionally, within this study improvements over time (pre-test to post-test) for phrasing (M=2.10, M=2.52) and smoothness (M=2.33, M=2.60) occurred supporting repeated readings with poetry, including choral and echo reading as interventions to implement for prosodic difficulties. Prosodic reading “provides evidence that the reader understands what is being read” (Kuhn & Stahl, 2000). An instructional method which includes repeated readings and is focused on prosody is Reader’s Theatre. Within Reader’s Theatre the repeated readings are scripts usually matching children’s literature. Students practice the script until a level of fluency is reached. Lastly, students perform the script for a selected audience. In summary, repeated readings are an effective intervention to support reading fluency.

**Implications for Future Research**

The research within this study was created and examined with an urban population. It would be beneficial to use with both rural and suburban population to see if the same positive comments of poetry would exist. It would be beneficial to limit this study to only include struggling readers to see if similar positive attitudes remain significant.

Secondly, to provide a variation to repeated readings researchers could add performance reading to the repeated readings process. Perhaps on the fifth day (Friday) of each week, repeated readings of poetry or narrative passages could be individually performed. As students perform their readings it would be expected the students would:
read along with fluency, reflect meaning with the voice through pauses, stress and phrasing, and mimic the teacher’s expression. Reflecting upon some of the statements made by students regarding getting bored with “rereading” daily, perhaps knowing the fifth day the reading will be performed may result in reading with authentic purpose.

One form of performance reading is Radio Reading. Radio Reading can be described as a variation to Reader’s Theatre which includes adding sound effects to make the performance sound like an old-time radio show. Perhaps if teachers mix repeated readings with a group performance of Radio Reading at the end of the school week an increase in positive attitudes toward reading may occur.

Within the teacher journals of this study Mrs. B noted that a student suggested that “We have a competition on the computer with creating a funny poem.” “She has challenged the class to create the funniest poem.” Implementing poems created by students during repeated readings could be another dimension added to this process; however, one may need to restrict this to older students as producing text worthy of repeated readings is quite a challenge. Students rereading poems created by each other may lead to more positive attitudes toward reading. Additionally, how remarkable it would be for a student’s poem to be performed by his/her classmates!

Finally, repeated readings of poetry and narrative passages was explored using second-grade students; however, the universal appeal of poetry may make it ideal to expand to both younger and older students. Within this study the researcher implemented
poems with humor and having a common theme; school. The researcher hypothesized humor would be interesting for second-grade students and thought every student could relate to the topic of school. A few titles of the poems implemented within this study were: “I Ripped My Pants at School Today,” “There’s a Cobra in the Bathroom.” “F’s Are Fabulous,” “How to Torture Your Students,” and “School Days Rap” being a favorite. Future researchers may attempt to incorporate other styles of poems to improve students’ attitude toward reading. For older students researchers may want to examine song lyrics for repeated readings or consider more mature themes.

**Recommendations**

Reflecting upon the entire process of this study many recommendations come to mind. First, implementing the study toward the end of the school year made the process appear as “just one more thing to do.” A teacher wrote the following comment within her teacher journal: “Students began to grumble during reading due to end of the year testing.”

Additionally, at the beginning of the year one of the classrooms was provided with a long-term substitute teacher. Assuming the same substitute would remain in the classroom was a mistake. Unfortunately, the class became unruly and a more effective substitute was sought. The second substitute was very supportive in completing repeated readings; however, it added an unexpected variable to the study. In summary, the end of
the school year and including classrooms with substitutes became an unplanned interfering variable in this study.

Thirdly, within this study, on Monday of each week students were given either one narrative passage or one poem to practice daily for the school week. At times throughout the study a few students would ask me for another poem before the following Monday. Reflecting upon the research (Adams, 1990; LaBerge & Samuels, 1974; Samuels, 1979, Stanovich, 1984) associated with the automaticity theory that maintains automaticity is developed through repeated practice over time and exposure to wide varieties of print one wonders if one poem and/or one narrative passage a week was enough variety for some of the students. Reflecting upon the aforementioned “boring” statements made by students perhaps repeated readings of two poems or passages a week would have been more satisfying and resulted in more positive reading attitudes.

Fourth, taking time to further examine some of the second-grade comments would provide additional insight into the types of poems the students would like to read in the future. For example, within the student comments, seven of the students stated they would like to do more poems. Additionally, many students named the titles of favorite poems and the opportunity to ask them “why” these were favorites would again provide additional insight in choosing interesting reading material for second-grade students.

Fifth, in hopes to eliminate some of the “boredom” comments made by students future studies may include daily variations in reading. For example, within this study a
few of the teachers automatically had their students take part in partner reading and echo reading. During the teacher training varying the styles of reading daily was not discussed by the researcher. Future researchers may want to include varying styles of repeated readings in attempt to keep the interest of all students. One style of partner reading that could be implemented is taking turns. Taking turns is a form of partner reading referring to one partner reading a sentence, paragraph or page and the next person taking his/her turn.

Lastly, although improvement within all variables was evident most of this improvement did not reach significant degree, more time for the research was needed. Due to the time constraint of the remaining days left of school the study was only implemented for 10-weeks. It is recommended that future research on this topic would be extended to at least 16 weeks to observe further reading differences. In conclusion the qualitative data reflects significance for: Words Correct Per Minute within subjects over time (pre-test versus post-test), phrasing for within subjects over time (pre-test versus post-test) and smoothness for the main effect of time (pre-test versus post-test). Furthermore, one can hypothesize expanding this study beyond ten weeks would result in significant degree for the remaining variables: expression/volume and pace.

Summary

In 2000, the National Reading Panel summarized the five major components of effective reading instruction. As a result, fluency was identified as a critical component
of literacy development. Since this publication research has focused on fluency, much testing and instructional time has been spent primarily increasing reading speed and accuracy while little research has focused on prosody. Prosody is the component of fluency that describes the ability to read with appropriate phrasing, intonation, and expression (Alington, 1983; Dowhower, 1991). Accuracy and speed is important but if prosody has not been achieved, it is unlikely that the student will completely understand what is being read (Kuhn & Stahl, 2003; Rasinski, 2004). The previous chapters presented and analyzed data to further study repeated readings of narrative passages and poetry as it relates to fluency. The data analyzed served the purpose of answering the following questions:

1. What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of narrative passages on fluency (Words Correct Per Minute) over a ten week intervention?

2. What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of narrative passages on fluency (prosody) over a 10-week intervention?

3. What is the effect of repeated readings of poetry versus repeated reading of narrative passages on reading comprehension over a 10-week intervention?

4. What is the effect of repeated reading of poetry on students’ attitudes toward reading as compared to the repeated readings of narrative passages?

Statistical significance resulted in the mean number of Words Correct Per Minute larger at post-test versus pre-test for within subjects over time. Additionally, prosody, smoothness and phrasing also resulted in significant improvements for within subjects
over time. Lastly, reading attitudes of students reading poetry was more positive than students reading narrative passages.

Although reading fluently is not the only purpose for reading, without it students may mirror this struggling reader, “Although he can accurately sound out the words he encounters, he plods along word-by-word, often hesitating at challenging vocabulary. His oral reading shows little attention to punctuation and phrasing and it lacks expression and enthusiasm” (Rasinski, 2004, p. 46). If a reader is spending all of his cognitive attention on “word by word” reading, little to no attention remains to focus on comprehension, the ultimate goal of reading. In summary, repeated readings is a strategy that can support fluency within struggling readers.

Moreover, educators would find the positive comments of students reading poetry very compelling. Additionally, the following comment made by a participating teacher ended this exciting journey with fulfillment; “Tyrell raised his hand to read the poem in front of the class. Tyrell never volunteers to do anything in front of the class.”
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Appendix A

Interview Transcripts

Child one

E- Okay. Trevon, can you tell me about how your teacher had you do repeated readings everyday of poems? What did she have you do every day for repeated readings?

C- I don’t remember.

E- Well, tell me about it. What do you remember about how she had you do it?

Anything?

C- She had to read first and then we had to read next.

E- She had you what?

C- She read first.

E- Oh. Okay so let me talk about that. So, Teacher read first.

C- Children read last.

E- Teacher read fist. Children read last. So, that’s good. When your teacher read to you what kinds of things did she do?

C- She, um, would like, she did one’s, two’s, three’s, four’s, five’s, six’s.

E- What do you mean by 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6?

C- We, um, read and then we stopped and then..

E- And then you graded her?

C- No. like we um, we paused.

C- Cause Noah was being bad. E- Okay. Alright so then, you said that the teacher read first, and then you read. So, when she read what are some things that she talked about?

C- How when the stories…

E- This is just about the poems. What are some things that she talked about or taught you when she was reading first? You don’t remember? Okay, what are some things that you said that, um, she read first and then you read last? What did she have you do when you read?

C- Do the same thing as her. She read like a…

E- So you had to try to do the same thing as her?

C- Yeah.

E- What do you mean do the same thing as her? What were some things that you had to try and do?

C- Get a 3.

E- Get a 3? Okay, so how do you get a 3?

C- Read like a normal person.

E- Ooo, with a normal kind of voice? Did she ever talk… Okay, anything else that she, um, had you do during repeated readings? Now, you did one poem a week, correct?

C- Yeah.

E- Do you think that was enough or do you think that you should have had more?
C- That was enough.

E- That was enough? Okay and why do you think that one poem a week was enough? I agree with you that one poem a week was enough. Why?

C- Because we learned a lot of things from them.

E- Oooo, You learned some things from the poems? What kind of things did you learn from the poems?

C- Where did the story take place. Like…

E- Ooo, So where the story took place, the setting. Anything else did you learn from those poems? Okay. About how many times each day do you think you reread the same poem? Or Passage? Huh? About how many times do you think you did it every day?

C- Four to five.

E- Four to five? Okay that’s very good. Alright, what was hard about repeated readings? What made it difficult?

C- People are being bad.

E- Oh, so that made it kind of hard when you had to pause because people weren’t listening in class. Okay. Was repeated reading hard for you? Was there anything hard? What was easy about repeated readings?

C- You could read with the teacher.

E- You could read the poem with the teacher?Alright, what else made it easy?

C- *sigh* I don’t know.
E- Not sure? Okay. If you could change something about repeated readings A’Shaun, what would you change?

C- Not sure.

E- You’re not sure? Alright, did your teacher teach you anything about the word fluency? Have you heard that word before, fluency? You’ve heard the word before.

C – Yeah but she didn’t tell us about it yet.

E- Okay, she did tell you about it yet. Did she ever talk about the word volume and expression? Oooo…..Tell me about volume and expression.

C- Volume is not very good reading and expression is really good reading.

E- Okay so volume is not good reading but expression is. Okay. What is pace? Did she ever talk about pace or phrasing or smoothness?

C- Yeah but I don’t remember about it.

E- You remember those words? What about smoothness? Think about the word smoothness. What did she teach you about that word?

C- You had to read smooth to get a 3.

E- You had to read smooth to get a 3? Okay. And how do you get a three? Who gave you a number three? The teacher or ..?

C- Me.

E- Oh so you kind of rated yourself?

C- Sometimes we did, sometimes we didn’t.
E- Okay. What about the word phrasing? Do you remember anything about the word phrasing, Trevon?
C- No.
E- Okay, um, alrighty. Anything else you want to say about repeated readings A’Shaun?
C- No.
E- That’s it? Okay.

Interview
Child Two

E- Okay. What can you tell me…or Tell me about how your teacher….I can’t even talk. Tell me about how your teacher had you do repeated readings.
C- She would call us up.
E- I’m talking about when she had you do poems all the time. Okay? How did she have you do the readings of the poems every day, the repeated readings?
C- She would read it and then we would read it.
E- Okay. When she read it to you what are some things that she did?
C- She used excitement.
E- She used excitement in her voice. That’s awesome. So she showed what you should sound like?
C- Yeah.
E- Alright. What else did she do? What did she read from when she was trying to show you excitement? Did she use the poem or a book?

C- She used the poem.

E- Sometimes a poem? Alright, so she talked about excitement. What else did she, um, have you do?

C- She would call us up and we would have to read it by ourselves.

E- Okay.

C- Like she would call us up one by one. Then we have to do it. We had to read it to her to try to see if we had a four or a one or two or three.

E- Okay. So what was good, a one or a four?

C- The four.

E- The four?

C- The one was bad.

E- Okay so um, she talked to you about excitement? That’s nice. So did she have you do repeated readings every day?

C- Yes.

E- And then after she read, what happened?

C- We would have to read it by ourselves and see if we know it.

E- Did you always read it by yourself or did you ever read it with a partner?
C- Yeah, we read it with a partner but then we raise our hand to see if we can remember it.
E- Okay. Do you think that one poem... *Interruption* Okay Tyrell, was one poem a week enough? Did you think that was enough?
C- Uh huh.
E- Okay, why did you think that was enough?
C- Cause it kept on getting harder.
*Interruption*
E- Why? Why was one poem enough?
C- Cause it kept on getting harder.
E- The poems were getting a little bit harder each week? Okay.
C- Especially on “How to torture your students”
E- *Laughs* how to torture your students, that one was very hard.
C- That was the same as how to torture your teacher.
E- Okay. About how many times each day do you think you reread the same passage? When you read a poem each day about how many times do you think you read that poem?
C- We had to re-do it.
E- A lot? About how many times?
C- Like if I had like nine, I forgot what it was called…If I had like nine things, she would line us up by one and she would say I’m one and the other person two and she would go all the way through the line and the one that be the ninth person if they were good they’d get a prize.

E- Okay, so did you take the poem and split it up into parts?

C- Uh huh.

E- Okay. Um, so every day when you were rereading when it was your turn about how many times do you think you read a poem in one day?

C- Three.

E- About three times? Okay. What was hard about repeated readings?

C- That the poems kept on getting harder.

E- *giggles* What was easy about repeated readings?

C- That we had to repeat it.

E- Okay. Repeating it was easy? Do you mean that each time you read it, it got easier?

C- Yeah.

E- Okay. That’s good. Was there anything else that was easy?

C- Nope.

E- Alright. If you could change anything about repeated readings Tyrell, what would you change?

C- We can repeat it anytime we want.
E- What do you mean anytime that you want? As many times that you want? Or… I don’t understand what you mean by that.

C- Anytimes as you want to do it.

E- You would change that so you could read it as many times as you wanted?

C- Yes.

E- Okay. And my last question is: Tell me what your teacher taught you about the word fluency. Do you remember the word fluency?

C- That you’re supposed to read fast but not that fast.

E- Okay, fast but not that fast. Did she ever talk about the word volume or expression?

C- Yeah.

E- Okay. What does that mean?

C- Volume means that, it’s like excitement but you get louder.

E- Okay. What about… and what’s expression mean?

C- Expression means that like exciting mark.

E- Alright did she ever talk to you about the word smoothness?

C- Yeah.

E- Alright, what’s that mean?

C- It’s like smooth.

E- And if you read smooth, how do you sound?

C- Just soft.
E- Okay, and did she ever talk to you about the word pace or phrasing?

C- I don’t know. I don’t remember.

E- That’s alright. Is there anything else you want to tell me about repeated readings?

C- Its like you have to repeat what the teacher said on the poem.

E- Okay. Alright. Thank you Tyrell.

Interview

Child Three

E- Okay Xavier. Xavier, every day, um, when your teacher had you reread those stories, everyday, remember she’d give you a story on a paper and you’d read them over and over and over again.

C- Read them?

E- Yeah! You had to read them. Tell me about, um, how your teacher had you do that.

C- Well, you read them. She would call us over and we read the book and when we got done reading the book, um, ….

E- No, no. I’m talking about the stories that were on a piece of paper that you read over and over and over again. Do you know what I’m talking about? Okay. Just tell me about what your teacher, tell me about how your teacher…how she had you do repeated readings. How did she have you do that?

C- Um, Repeated readings?
E- Yeah. Remember when she would have you read a story over and over and over again every single day? K, tell me about that.

C- It was getting ….

E- Hmm?

C- Well when I was reading it over and over and over again ….

E- Uh huh….

C- It was kind of getting, like every day I read it…

E- Right.

C- It was kind of getting boring. Then I, I don’t know how to read that good and…..

E- Did reading it over and over help you read better?

C- A little bit.

E- A little bit? And why do you think that helped you?

C- Uh, cause I’m not very good at it.

E- Okay. Now what did Mrs. M do when you were doing repeated reading?

C- She was probably timing. She would call us and we would have to get a piece of paper and read it.

E- Okay. She timed you sometimes?

C- Yeah.

E- Okay, and was one story a week enough?

C- Uh huh.
E- Okay. Why was that enough?

C- Cause every day…

E- You read the same one all week, why was that enough?

C- Because like probably after two or three days we did the whole story.

E- Okay. After two or three days you could make it through a whole story, is that what you mean? Or…

C- Yeah.

E- Yeah? Okay. Every day you read that story over and over and over again, about how many times each day do you think you read the story?

C- Like every day that I read the story?

E- Yeah! Like on Monday you read it, about how many times do you think you read it on Monday? Or how many times do you think you read it on Tuesday or Wednesday or Thursday? For one day, about how many times do you think you read it over and over again? Take a guess.

C- Probably about two.

E- About two? Okay, what was hard about repeated readings? What was difficult?

C- That I would get stuck on words and I would get mad cause’ I can’t get it, the word right.

E- Alright. What was easy about repeated readings?
C- That some of the words is easy, I can read and like some of them is hard but she’ll tell me to sound it our or if I don’t get it she’ll tell me to skip it.

E- Okay. You said that there were some words that were hard for you? Now, every day that you read that word, did that word get easier? It did? Okay. How would change repeated readings? Would you change anything about what you did every day? Would you change anything?

C- No.

E- No? Okay. Um, did your teacher ever talk to you about the word fluency?

C- Ms. Lizato did, when I was with her.

E- Okay. What about Mrs. M? Did she ever talk to you about the word fluency? Speed and accuracy? Alright. What did you learn about speed and accuracy?

C- Well, I gotta read fluency and I gotta…

E- Fluently? Okay…

C- I gotta be sure about my words.

E- Sure about your words? Okay…

C- And like when I’m at home before I say a word, I’m not sure. So my dad tells me well you always say it where you gotta be sure about it.

E- Okay. Mrs. M talked you about speed. What do you know about reading and speed? Anything?

C- You should read fast.
E- Alright. You should read fast all the time? No? When should you read fast and when should you read slow?
C- Well if you know the words like that then you can read fast.
E- Alright. And when do you read slow?
C- When you have one you don’t know.
E- Okay. Did she ever talk to you about the word accuracy? Being accurate when you read?
C- I don’t think so.
E- You don’t remember it? Okay, is there anything else you want to tell me about the whole repeated reading process? What you did with Mrs. Mayer? No? Okay. You are finished Yasneik, Thank you.

Interview
Child Four

E- Okay Jakwan. Jaskwan, every day your teacher would have you read stories over and over and over again. K? On a piece of paper. That’s called repeated reading. Tell me about how your teacher had you do repeated readings every day.
C- We, like, one person read the first page and like, another person read the second and third.
E- Okay. What did Mrs. M do?
C- She, she listened to us read.
E- Okay. Um, every week you had one story. Was that enough or do you think you should have had more?

C- More.

E- You would have like to have had more. Why?

C- Cause’ I’d get more points in school.

E- More points in school? Okay. Um, every day when you got that piece of paper and you had to read that story, about how many times do you think you read that story each day?

C- 2

E- Two times? Okay. Was there anything hard about repeated readings?

C- No.

E- Nothing hard? Was there anything easy? Nothing easy about repeated readings?

C- The readings.

E- The reading. What made it easy?

C- The words.

E- The words were easy? Every, even the first time that you read the story the words were easy? Okay. Is there anything that you would change, when you did repeated readings every day; is there anything that you would change about how you did it? No?

Alright, did your teacher ever talk to you about the word fluency?

C- Yeah.
E- Alright. What’s fluency?
C- Like a poem.
E- Okay. Um, did she ever talk to you the word speed when you’re reading? About speed or accuracy? No? You don’t remember those words? Okay. Anything else that you want to tell me about repeated readings?
C- No.
E- That’s it? Alright. Thank you.
Appendix B

Richness of Retelling Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Criteria for Establishing Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Student includes all main ideas and supporting details; sequences properly; infers beyond the text; relates text to own life; understands text organization; summarizes; gives opinion and justifies it; MAY ask additional ?s, very cohesive and complete retelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Student includes most main ideas and supporting details; sequences properly; relates text to own life; understands text organization’ summarizes; gives opinion and justifies it’ cohesive and complete retelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student includes some main ideas and details; sequences most material; understands text organization, gives opinion; fairly complete retelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Student includes a few main ideas and details; some difficulty sequencing; may give irrelevant information; gives opinion; incomplete retelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Student gives details only; poor sequencing, irrelevant information; very incomplete retelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C

Ekwall/Shanker Reading Inventory

Bob and his father like to work on old cars. His father has five old cars that belong to him. One of them is black with a white top.

Bob is very young, so none of the cars belong to him. He would like to have his own car when he gets big.

Sometimes Bob and his father go to a car show. At the car show there are many old cars.

One time Bob’s father took his black and white car to the car show. One of the men looked at the cars to see which one was best. He gave Bob’s father a prize because his car was so pretty.
Appendix D
Multidimensional Fluency Scale

Use the following scales to rate reader fluency on the dimensions of expression and volume, phrasing, smoothness, and pace. Scores range from 4 to 16. Generally, scores below 8 indicate that fluency may be a concern. Scores of 8 or above indicate that the student is making good progress in fluency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Expression</td>
<td>Reads with little expression or enthusiasm in voice. Reads words as if simply to get them out. Little sense of trying to make text sound like natural language. Tends to read in a quiet voice.</td>
<td>Some expression. Begins to use voice to make text sound like natural language in some areas of the text, but not others. Focus remains largely on saying the words. Still reads in a quiet voice.</td>
<td>Sounds like natural language throughout the better part of the passage. Occasionally slips into expressionless reading. Voice volume is generally appropriate throughout the text.</td>
<td>Reads with good expression and enthusiasm throughout the text. Sounds like natural language. The reader is able to vary expression and volume to match his/her interpretation of the passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Volume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Phrasing</td>
<td>Monotonic with little sense of phrase boundaries, frequent word-by-word reading.</td>
<td>Frequent two- and three-word phrases giving the impression of choppy reading; improper stress and intonation that fail to mark ends of sentences</td>
<td>Mixture of run-ons, mid-sentence pauses for breath, and possibly some choppiness; reasonable stress/intonation.</td>
<td>Generally well phrased, mostly in clause and sentence units, with adequate attention to expression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Smoothness</td>
<td>and clauses.</td>
<td>Occasional breaks in smoothness caused by difficulties with specific words and/or structures.</td>
<td>Generally smooth reading with some breaks, but word and structure difficulties are resolved quickly, usually through self-correction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Elementary Reading Attitude Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Emotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please circle the picture that describes how you feel when you read a book.
Appendix F

Interview Questions

Tell me about how your teacher had you do repeating readings every day (poems or short stories/passages).

Tell me about fluency.

Tell me about speed? (short passages)

Tell me about accuracy (short passages)

Tell me about expression/volume. (poems)

Tell me about smoothness. (poems)

Tell me about phrasing. (poems)

How many times a day did you reread your poem/short passage?

What was difficult about repeated readings?

What was easy about repeated readings?

Was one poem/short story a week enough? Why or why not?
Appendix G

Student Answers by Question

### What did you like about Repeated Readings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Features</th>
<th>Process of Repeated Readings</th>
<th>Aesthetic Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thing that I like is the books</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>It felt boring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The stories (2)</td>
<td>I like to read out loud when reading poems</td>
<td>It was funny/fun (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When it was about sports</td>
<td>I like reading poems because it is exciting!</td>
<td>I feel happy! (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning more words (2)</td>
<td>When I get to do repeated readings</td>
<td>It helps you get the answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It got easier</td>
<td>When I get to pick the one I want</td>
<td>I like it because it helps me read better (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are short</td>
<td>Learning more about the books</td>
<td>Good grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I ripped my pants at school today”</td>
<td>You will get good at it!</td>
<td>You will get smart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“F’s are fabulous “(2)</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>I like to read something that helps you read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the characters</td>
<td>That we never forgot about it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“There is a cobra in the bathroom “(2)</td>
<td>Reading (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can read about more things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I like the beat
My favorite part is “She should have listened to me “ I had a favorite part.”
School Day Rap “(6)
I liked their expression
When Mrs. K looked in the bathroom for the cobra
That I could remember some things

**What did you dislike about repeated readings?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text features</th>
<th>Process of Repeated Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forgetting long words</td>
<td>That we had to read it and read it and read it (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I didn’t like about is a picture</td>
<td>It was boring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not like the long story</td>
<td>I did not like repeating after the teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The words that I did not know</td>
<td>To read out loud (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I didn’t like about it is it takes a long time to read (2)</td>
<td>Nothing (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to torture your students</td>
<td>That it kind of got boring after a couple times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I didn’t like that they weren’t true</td>
<td>Listening to the same thing over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do it all day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changing my voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading! (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My mouth was tired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When I had to answer the questions (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**What else would you like to tell me?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Comments</th>
<th>Negative Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would like to do more poems (6)</td>
<td>Nothing (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the poems (2)</td>
<td>It was boring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is fun/funny (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like reading the basketball story</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to do it all day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like everything about it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I love to read and the stories were fun. Thank you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H

Teacher Comments

Written Teacher Comments

Teacher Comments

Teacher One/Repeated Readings of Passages

Students took turns partner reading.

Enjoyed reading passages.

The students are glad to have new passages to read. They were getting bored with the old ones.

Students enjoy timing themselves to see if they can beat their old times.

A few students are disengaged and do not enjoy this activity.

It is hard to motivate them to keep reading.

Some new students came and are sharing an appropriately leveled reading passage with another student.

They want their own.

I’ve noticed some students reading other students’ packets. When I asked them why they weren’t reading their own, they said, “They wanted either a higher level or a new variety”.

Students groan when I tell them to do this activity. I tell them to keep at it so they can be better readers.

Teacher Two/Repeated Readings of Poems

Students were trying to read rapidly, not with expression.
We discussed “fast” was not necessary with expression. Students are getting better at reading “smooth” not fast.

Today, we did the poem in parts. This made the reading smooth and with expression. They really loved this poem. (There’s a Cobra in the Bathroom)

A few words seemed to “trip” them up (distressing, depressing).

Failed to see the humor.

Not a favorite. (How to Torture Your Teacher)

Students seemed to struggle more with the words and pattern.

Students liked this poem better when I read it.

Students didn’t seem to get the humor.

This poem was not a favorite. (How to Torture Your Students)

Much more difficult when the words don’t rhyme.

Students enjoyed this poem.

Had fun actually doing this poem as a rap.

Students liked it but missed some of the humor.

Easy for students to read fluently because of the rhyming words. Students struggled with some of the words.

Fluency was difficult because the words didn’t rhyme.

Students seemed to like it.

Short and fairly easy to read for them.

Students liked it, especially because of the pictures.

They seem to do better because the words rhyme.

Not a favorite…No rhyming words and long.
Teacher Three/Repeated Readings of Poems

Discussed and practiced rubric.

“A” said, “Looks like this is going to be a lot of work”.

“S” enjoys the poem and giggles as she reads it. She thinks it is funny and great.

“A” said, “Oh, yeah! Looks like another funny poem”.

“E” raised his hand to read the poem in front of the class. “E” never volunteers to do anything in front of the class.

“J” said, “I like it but the author could have made it funnier. He could have had the t.p. coming out of his pants”.

“S” suggested that we have a competition on the computer with creating a funny poem. She has challenged the class to create the funniest poem.

“A” suggested the poem gives good suggestions on how to torture your teacher.

“H” said, “It is fun acting it out”.

“Q” asked, “You really wouldn’t torture us would you”?

“A” said this poem is just torture having to read it.

Students wanted me to rap the poem. As I rapped the students were making noises with their mouths.

“A” rapped this poem in front of the class.

Great discussion about how the boy tries to persuade his parents into believing F’s are fabulous.

Yeah! “D” read.

Teacher Four/Repeated Readings of Passages
It was a little difficult organizing this group of children to participate. Read together. Read to partner.
Read to person having the same passage.

Children are enjoying the books used for read aloud/modeling.
Children began to hear a difference in “how” books were read to them.
I had someone read with and without fluency to have the children experience the difference.
We read slowly, moderately and quickly to experience accuracy.
Children loved the surprises. Some wanted to read more.
Students began to grumble during reading due to end of the year testing.
Children loved “Pigs will be Pigs”. It kept their interest.
Appendix I

Title of Poems


“How to Torture Your Teacher”

“How to Torture Your Students”

“I Ripped My pants at School Today”

“F’s are Fabulous”


“There’s a Cobra in the Bathroom”

“She Should Have Listened to Me”

“Caleb’s Desk is a Mess”

“Hiding in the Bathroom”


“What’s so Funny?”

“School Daze Rap”
Appendix J

Fluency Passages


G

Ants

The Pink Lady

Snakes

H

The Sea

Some Animals

May’s Pig

I

How to Make a Pizza

The Garden

Mexican Jumping Bean

J

A Desert Walk

Basketball

Kim’s Surprise

K

Saving Old Red

Snowflakes
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Baseball
Black Holes
Tornadoes
Candy
M
Soccer
Blizzard
One Big Storm
N
Helicopters
The Rainbow
The Pot of Gold
O
First Plane Trip
The Penguins
Seeing Stars
P
A Roar in the Woods
Volcanoes
Waiting to Bloom
Q
Living in the Dark Zone
Mr. Penguin Summer
Team Colors
The Desert Monster
Molly’s New Friend
Skydiving
S
A Friend of the Rainforest
Monkeying Around
Wild Things in the Park
T
Severe Weather
Jeremy Makes it Rain
Music Food and Fun
U
The Flat Flounder
The Peasant and the Eagle
Don’t Wake the Mummy
V
Seavenger Hunt
The Ant and the Grasshopper
Speedy Cheetahs
W
Does Color Make a Difference?
The History of Comics
School Daze

X

The Dog and the Oyster

Crime Scene Investigations

Hair

Y

Bicycle Stunt Riding

The Edible Schoolyard

Some Facts to Chew On

Z

The One Pound Cell Phone

Snakes Alive

Haunted House?