Teaching re-reading to Year 6 students from non-English speaking backgrounds (NESB) in a small group setting will improve their reading fluency, and their reading comprehension.

**ABSTRACT**

The hypothesis of this study is that teaching re-reading to Year 6 students from non-English speaking backgrounds (NESB) in a small group setting will improve their reading fluency, and in turn improve their reading comprehension. This paper discusses the link between reading fluency and comprehension, particularly amongst students in the middle years of schooling. A naturalistic school based study involving eight students who were equally divided into intervention and control groups to analyse the effect of explicit instruction of re-reading on fluency (speed and accuracy) and comprehension. The intervention group was given ten 20 minute, small group lessons, focusing re-reading. The results showed that when all students participated in re-reading over a three-week period, their fluency and reading comprehension increased. The results demonstrated this increase after teaching re-reading to the intervention group, and also after testing of the control group. The results showed that re-reading was an effective literacy strategy for improving reading comprehension and fluency in the intervention students who participated in the study. The results suggest implications for other learners with similar attributes and therefore further action research studies are recommended.

**INTRODUCTION**

There are many students in the middle years of schooling (Years 5-8) who experience some degree of difficulty with reading comprehension (DEST, 2003). For students who have learnt English as a Second Language (ESL) or those who are from non-English speaking backgrounds (NESB), inferential comprehension in particular tends to be particularly difficult for these students. While literal comprehension (where the answers are ‘on the lines’) is based on decoding and can be accomplished with skimming and scanning techniques, inferential comprehension (where the answers are ‘between the lines’) relies on the reader having a deeper understanding of the text. Similarly, evaluative comprehension (responding ‘beyond the lines’) requires students to draw upon prior knowledge and personal experience in order to make real world connections to the text. For students from NESB, it is inferential comprehension that proves the biggest challenge (Rose, Gray & Cowey, 1999). According to current educational research, one factor closely linked to success in reading comprehension is that of reading fluency (Stahl & Kuhn, 2002; Wolf & Katzir-Cohen, 2001).
In order to explore reading fluency, it is crucial to first understand the notion of fluency itself. Fluency is a complex aspect of reading, requiring students to read a text at a conversational rate with both accuracy and prosody (Armbruster, Lehr & Osborn, 2001; Hudson, Pulllen, Lane & Torgesen, 2009). *Reading accuracy* is described as the recognition and pronunciation of written words as spoken words (Galletly, Knight, Dekkers & Galletly, 2009). The authors also explain that reading thus creates a spoken message, to which the reader is able to apply language comprehension skills. *Prosody* relates to the patterns of stress and intonation in language (Princeton University Web Glossary, 2010). Considering the different aspects of fluency and its importance in the reading process. It is essential that readers have a rapid rate of processing, identifying and pronouncing words as they progress through a text. In this process, reading with fluency and prosody indicates that the reader is actively constructing meaning from the passage (Stahl et al., 2002; Wolf et al., 2001). Pearson and Hamm (2005) supported the notion that skilled readers are fluent readers. The research noted that competency and speed in word identification allow the reader to use his/her cognitive resources to focus upon comprehension instead of simply decoding. Pearson and Hamm’s suggestion that improvements in reading fluency may positively impact upon overall reading comprehension has relevance to the present action research project, as it supports the core hypothesis of this study.

For students in the middle years who have high levels of reading accuracy, fluency is not as closely linked to success in reading comprehension as it is to language comprehension (Hoover & Gough, 1990; Yovanoff, Duesbery, Alonxo & Tindal, 2005). However with poorer reading accuracy, success in literacy, including reading comprehension and independent reading, is critically linked to reading accuracy (Knight & Galletly, 2006; Yovanoff, Duesbery, Alonzo & Tindal, 2005). For students who experience difficulty with reading accuracy, research indicated links between student difficulties in reading accuracy and difficulties in other areas such as comprehension, independent reading, spelling, writing, vocabulary and language skills (Chard, Simmons & Kameenui, 1998 cited in Galletly et al., 2009).

Current research shows that middle years learners need to be particularly engaged in their learning in order to demonstrate academic performance and schooling success (DEST, 2003). DEST (2003) asserted that active, rather than passive participation in learning results in expanded “literate competence” (DEST, 2003). Engagement is an essential component of the school curriculum for middle years students (Budge, 2000; Culican, Emmitt & Oakley, 2001; Hamston & Murdoch, 2004; Watson, 2003). When students feel connected and valued in the educational process, not only are they more likely to enjoy learning, but perceptions of their
own abilities and levels of self efficacy increase (Schunk, 1989, in van Kraayenoord & Paris, 1997). Educational practice that includes the adolescent learner in decision making allows the learner to assume some level of control over what, and how, s/he is learning. Bereiter & Scardamalia (1987) label this process as becoming an “intentional learner”, and note that while taking control of one’s own learning may require some level of natural inclination and aptitude, it does require knowledge of reading strategies and how to apply them. Teachers therefore should actively teach students how to recognise their own learning styles, how to monitor success, and how to metacognitively reflect on their learning.

When analysing the needs of middle years learners from Non English Speaking Backgrounds (NESB), it is essential to acknowledge the complexities involved with literacy learning. In Australia, evidence suggests that students from low socio-economic, rural, NESB, indigenous backgrounds and boys are more likely to have lingering literacy problems carried from early years into the middle years (Comber, Badger, Barnett, Nixon & Pitt, 2002; DEST, 2003). This poses a challenge for educators who need to not only prepare students for higher educational study and engage students in real world learning through the plethora of modern multiliteracies, but also to teach basic English literacy skills that students need to communicate effectively.

There are a number of classroom practices that actively support literacy acquisition in the middle years. Scaffolding student learning is one such practice that promotes literacy development in all key learning areas (Culican, Emmitt & Oakley, 2001; Duke & Pearson, 2002; MyRead, 2010; Rose, Gray & Cowley, 1999). Effective teaching of re-reading requires teacher scaffolding to support fluency and comprehension. This process works incorporates teacher modelling, collaborative practice, fading of teacher support and eventual independent use of re-reading.

This present study investigates the hypothesis that teaching re-reading to a small group of Year 6 students from NESB will improve reading fluency, and in turn, reading comprehension. Current research supports this hypothesis and shows that reading with expression and prosody is positively linked to fluency and successful reading comprehension (Schrauben, 2010; Whalley & Hansen, 2006). Careful analysis of the ‘multiple levels of text processing’ (MLOTP) model (Munro, 1985) revealed that at the sentence level, one of the strategies contributing to reading success is re-reading, or repeated reading. Related educational research indicates that while repeated reading of vocabulary words in lists may positively contribute to reading fluency, repeated reading of texts and prose results in the greatest gains in fluency (La Vasseur, Macaruso & Shankweiler, 2007). Therefore the focus on the present study is re-reading through text, rather than re-reading of isolated words.
Through the application of re-reading as a strategy to improve fluency, it is anticipated that participating students will reduce their intensity of concentration on the decoding process, and increase their focus on the meaning of the text/s and the content of what they are reading. Kucan & Beck (1997) refer to reading for meaning in this way as “deliberate, mindful or intentional reading.” Readers who do not need to focus their attention on decoding at word level are more able to use their cognitive capabilities for conceptual and text level thinking instead. For learners in the middle school, it is especially important to read with fluency and to be able to think about the meaning of text while reading, as the educational focus in the middle years of schooling shifts from early years focus on *how* to read in the early years, the acquisition of knowledge *from* reading in secondary school (Christie & Stenglin, 2006).

It should be noted that although the research indicated a positive link between improvements in reading expression, fluency and prosody, and gains in reading comprehension, some researchers challenged these conclusions (Schrauben, 2010). Schrauben has questioned whether gains in fluency result in gains in comprehension, or if perhaps fluency and prosody emerge amongst readers with improved comprehension.

**METHOD**

*Design*

The research design employed in the present study was a naturalistic school-based study conducted in an independent Catholic school in Melbourne, Australia. In this study, Year 6 students with NESB are given explicit instruction on the use of re-reading as a strategy for improving reading fluency and comprehension. A sequence of ten 20 minute lessons were implemented and data collected for subsequent analysis. All students were monitored before and after the intervention, in order to determine if the predicted hypothesised results occurred.

*Participants*

This study involves two groups of like students: a control group of four and an intervention group of four. The eight students in the study were selected based on their results in the TORCH test conducted school wide in February (see Table 1, below). The TORCH test is a standardised test for reading comprehension in which students must read a text and complete a cloze exercise to summary. All students chosen demonstrated poor reading comprehension, as evident in their low Stanine scores (scores which have been norm-referenced and standardised on a nine point scale). The selected participants are all from NESB, and attend a suburban school with a large NESB and ESL student population. All students are in Year 6. It
should be noted that students in the control group are from one Year 6 class, and students in the intervention group are in another.

Table 1: Participant information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Intervention=1</th>
<th>Control = 0</th>
<th>Age (in months)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years of Schooling</th>
<th>NESB</th>
<th>Previous Reading Recovery</th>
<th>TORCH test: February 2010 (Stanine score)</th>
<th>Attendance (No. of sessions /10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 1, each of the two student groups consisted of two boys and two girls. Similarly, each group is made up of three students with a February 2010 TORCH Stanine score of 1, and one student with a slightly higher Stanine score (a score of 2 in the intervention group, and 3 in the control group). Although TORCH scores are a more accurate measure of TORCH test comprehension performance, Stanine scores were used instead to indicate comprehension ability as TORCH scores for previous 2010 assessments were not available. All students selected for the study were similar in age, ranging in age from 138 months, to 147 months.

*Background information: Intervention group*

Student A was a female aged 142 months. She rarely volunteered to read aloud in class, but was willing do so if called upon. As evident in Table 1, Student A began the school year with a reading comprehension level of Stanine 1. During testing, she spoke in a quiet voice and explained to the teacher that she was happy to get a chance to improve her comprehension.

Student B was a male aged 138 months. He arrived at his current school less than 12 months prior to the study, and began the year with the highest comprehension score in the intervention group, scoring a Stanine 2.

Student C was a male aged 140 months. He had a tendency to call out in class, and demonstrated disruptive behaviour during testing. As Table 1 shows, this student began the year with a Stanine score of 1, demonstrating poor written comprehension.
Student D was a female aged 147 months. She was a highly articulate speaker who was often relied upon to help staff and school administration with special jobs and tasks. Her organisational skills were impressive, and she gave the impression to other staff in the school of being a highly capable academic student. Table 1 shows that this student began the year with reading comprehension level of Stanine 1.

*Background information - control group:*

Student AA was a male aged 144 months. He was an active member of the class who readily volunteered to participate in class reading activities. He started Year 6 reading at Stanine 1.

Student BB was a female aged 145 months. She was a diligent student who worked quietly in class. She demonstrated eagerness for group work activities, particularly when she was permitted to work with her friends, most of whom are highly academic. She began the year comprehending at Stanine 3, the entry highest score in the control group.

Student CC was a male aged 138 months. He was an active student who often landed himself in trouble for calling out in class, talking with friends or walking around the classroom without permission. He has openly expressed his disdain for reading activities in the classroom, and loudly complained if asked to read aloud or take part in an intervention activity. He was the only student selected for this study who has taken part in reading recovery in the past, and he began Year 6 at Stanine 1.

Student DD was a female aged 146 months. She was a quiet member of the class who rarely volunteered for literacy activities, but participated when called upon by the teacher. She began Year 6 with a reading comprehension of Stanine 1.

*Materials*

The following two assessment tools were used to monitor student progress:

1. The TORCH test (ACER, 2003) was used to assess students’ reading comprehension before and after the teaching intervention. To monitor the effect of re-reading, the TORCH test was administered to each student twice during pre-testing, and twice during post-testing. First, students were asked to complete the cloze passage according to the normal TORCH instructions (read the passage and fill in the gaps accordingly). The following day, students were specifically instructed to re-read the same passage at least twice and to make any necessary changes to their initial cloze responses. Hence for both pre and post testing, students received two sets of comprehension results; with and without being specifically instructed to re-read.
2. Running Records (Clay, 2000) were used to monitor reading fluency. Students were asked to read a text at Level 28, and were monitored for accuracy and fluency (recorded in words per minute). Students were then asked to re-read the same passage silently at least twice to silently ‘rehearse’ the reading, before a second Running Record was taken for each student. The pre- and post-testing Running Record results for reading fluency are presented in the Results section and in Table 2.

**Procedure**

To conduct this research project, the eight students selected for the study were tested in order to collate pre-intervention data on their reading comprehension abilities (TORCH test) and reading fluency (Running Record). The students in the control group were not given any specific reading instruction for the period of the study, outside that included in the normal Literacy curriculum. The students in the intervention group were given ten twenty-minute lessons, conducted during the first three weeks of Term 4, focusing on the strategy of re-reading to improve fluency and reading comprehension. These lessons were conducted in the Year 6 classroom during Literacy lessons in the form of a focus group with the teacher. As previously mentioned, the control group are students from a different Year 6 class, so the chance of the control group students ‘picking up’ or overhearing the intervention strategies discussed was minimised. It should be noted that unusually, the teacher conducting this research project teaches the subject of Literacy to both Year 6 classes involved in the study. This has ensured the chance of re-reading coincidentally being taught to the control group during the time of the study was avoided.

An overview of the lesson sequence is provided below. The sequence shows the researchers’ gradual shift from teacher demonstration and modelling to student control and independent use of the re-reading strategy. *Note*: See Appendix A for full lesson plans, including specific resources used in for each lesson.

**Session 1:**


* Students practice re-reading with paragraph to demonstrate its impact. How did it feel to read after silently ‘rehearsing’?

**Session 2:**

* Students cut up a paragraph from ‘Camel Rider’, deciding where to pause.

* Group discussion about which pauses sounded best. Creation of group version, paused appropriately. Teacher models re-reading reads paragraph aloud. Students make necessary adjustments collaboratively.
* Students take turns reading in a boring or exciting way.

Session 3:
* Teacher models reading with poor then good fluency (improved using re-reading). Discuss differences in understanding. (teacher models)
* Students read next paragraph silently, giving it pauses and making it sound interesting. Discuss re-reading as a strategy.

Session 4:
* Students make small 'reminder' cards (see Appendix B) to be laminated and kept. Discuss what each card means, explicitly revising strategy of re-reading.
* Students discuss classmates they consider to be good readers. How do they sound when reading? Teacher instils confidence in students to do the same.

Session 5:
* Review content of small 'reminder' cards for reading- check students understand each card
* Students to read Year 3 TORCH test text independently, prompted to use reminder cards.
* Ask students to take turns reading the first paragraph aloud to the group, pausing carefully to make the text sound interesting.
* Teacher scaffolds student learning through collaborative practice of the strategies as students answer first part of cloze together.

Session 6:
* Students re-read Year 3 TORCH text independently and complete remainder of cloze exercise in pairs. (Teacher scaffolds through collaborative practice)
* Go through cloze responses as a group- discuss strategies

Session 7:
* Students to read Year 5 TORCH text and complete first half of cloze exercise, using reminder cards and strategies learnt so far. (Teacher guides practice of re-reading strategy)
* Go through answers as a group - discuss

Session 8:
* Students to re-read Year 5 TORCH text and complete second half of cloze exercise, using reminder cards and strategies learnt so far. (Teacher guides practice of re-reading strategy)
* Go through answers in pairs - discuss discrepancies and use of strategies to improve reading.

Session 9:
* Students read Year 4 TORCH text and complete first half of cloze independently, without any reminders to re-read.
* Students swap answers and correct as a group.
* Teacher monitors independent use of re-reading through discussion about how this task felt-did students re-read? Pause? Use reminder cards? How did they feel?
Session 10:

* Students re-read Year 4 TORCH text independently and complete cloze.

* Correct responses as a group – discuss how they found the answers, how the task felt (Teacher withdraws support, and monitors student use of the strategy)

* Revise content of ‘reminder’ cards and re-reading strategy. Make explicit the fact that these strategies work when reading in all subject areas.

**Details of Data Analysis**

Quantitative data relating to the performance of the eight participants in the areas of fluency and comprehension was collected during pre- and post-testing. The assessment session data was tabulated and analysed to identify changes (if any) in students’ fluency and comprehension performance (see Results section). Qualitative data was collected informally throughout the study, and analysed to determine reasons for unexpected results, and is referred to where relevant Discussion section. During discussion, particular focus has been placed on analysis of trends and changes, including comparing and contrasting levels of improvement between the control group and the intervention group. Detailed analysis was also conducted on individual student trends and differences between participant results. The results were further reviewed and analysed in order to gain an understanding of the possible reasons for differences and trends in each participant’s performance in reading fluency and comprehension.

**RESULTS**

The research results suggested that re-reading has a positive impact on reading fluency and comprehension. Whether students received intensive and explicit re-reading instruction or not, results demonstrated reading improvement after re-reading was attempted.

**Result 1: Pre-testing**

1a: Pre-testing of reading accuracy showed that the control group began the study with a lower reading accuracy than that of the intervention group.

1b: Pre-testing of reading speed showed that the control group and the intervention group began the study at similar reading speeds.

1c: Pre-testing of reading comprehension showed that the control group and the intervention group began the study at similar levels.
**Result 2: Post-testing**

2a: From pre- to post-testing, students in the intervention and control groups improved reading accuracy. Students in the control group improved reading accuracy by a larger average percentage than those in the control group.

2b: From pre- to post-testing, students in the intervention group increased average reading speeds. The control group, however, improved from pre- to post-testing, but speed declined during post testing.

2c: From pre- to post-testing, students in the intervention and control groups improved reading comprehension. Students in the control group demonstrated a greater average increase.

**Result 3: Individual student performance**

3a: Most students improved their reading accuracy during the study. A small number of students showed reductions in accuracy, and one from the control group showed noticeably high improvement.

3b: Most students improved their reading speed during the study. Some experienced fluctuating reading speed.

3c: Most students improved their reading comprehension during the study, with just two reducing their comprehension results from pre- to post-testing.

Before and after the literacy intervention, all eight students were tested to determine levels of reading fluency and comprehension. The data collected is shown below, in Table 2.

**Table 2: Pre and Post Testing: Fluency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>PRE</th>
<th>POST</th>
<th>1st read</th>
<th>2nd read</th>
<th>1st read</th>
<th>2nd read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FLUENCY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speed (words per minute)</td>
<td>Accuracy (%)</td>
<td>Speed (words per minute)</td>
<td>Accuracy (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (intervention)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (intervention)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (intervention)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (intervention)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>102.25</td>
<td>95.25</td>
<td>122.25</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>125.5</td>
<td>95.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA (control)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB (control)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC (control)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 shows pre and post testing fluency results for all students involved in the study. Fluency was measured in two ways; speed (words per minute) and accuracy (%). Each student completed pre testing tasks twice and post testing tasks twice, once independently, then again after being clearly instructed to re-read. It should be noted that both pre and post testing for fluency was conducted using the same text, a passage from the book ‘Alpacas in Heaven’, at reading level 28. While use of the same text has potentially increased the risk of students learning the text during the testing process, it does ensure consistency and fairness of comparison.

Table 3: Pre and Post Testing: Comprehension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>1st read Raw score</th>
<th>1st read TORCH score</th>
<th>1st read Stanine</th>
<th>2nd read Raw score</th>
<th>2nd read TORCH score</th>
<th>2nd read Stanine</th>
<th>1st read Raw score</th>
<th>1st read TORCH score</th>
<th>1st read Stanine</th>
<th>2nd read Raw score</th>
<th>2nd read TORCH score</th>
<th>2nd read Stanine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (intervention)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (intervention)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (intervention)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (intervention)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>36.25</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA (control)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB (control)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC (control)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD (control)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>35.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>44.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows student data for comprehension. In both pre and post testing, students were asked to complete a TORCH test to collect ‘1st read’ data. Then, after being specifically asked to re-read the text, students used a different coloured pen to attempt to improve the accuracy of their cloze responses, hence the term ‘2nd read’. To minimise the chance of students remembering the plot of the test passage, which could skew comprehension results, a different text was used for post testing. Although TORCH scores and Stanine results are normed, it must be noted that the text used for pre testing (‘A Horse of Her Own’) is recommended for Years 4, 5 and 6, while the text used for post testing (‘The Accident’) is recommended for Years 6, 7 and 8. Therefore the text used for post testing is a more difficult comprehension task for Year 6 students. For each test, students received three scores; a raw score, a TORCH score and a Stanine score.
Figure 1: Running Record: Comparison of control group and intervention group pre-test reading accuracy results

Figure 1 shown above represents the average scores for fluency, recorded as accuracy (%) for the control and intervention groups during pre testing before the study began. The graph shows that both the control and intervention groups improved their reading accuracy after instruction to re-read. While both groups improved from 1st read to 2nd read, it is clear that the control group entered the study with an average reading accuracy lower than that of the intervention group. Even after re-reading for the 2nd read, the control group did not reach the level of accuracy the intervention group did.

Figure 2: Running Record: comparison of control and intervention group pre-test reading speed results

Figure 2, shown above, represents the average pre testing results for reading speed, recorded in words per minute. This graph compares the control group with the intervention group, demonstrating similar entry level reading speeds. As Figure 2 shows, students in the intervention group entered the study reading at a slightly faster average rate on their first read (109.25 words/min) compared to the same task for the control group (102.25 words/min). After
specific instruction to re-read, both groups increased their average reading speeds to the similar 123 words/min for the intervention group, and 122.25 for the control group.

Figure 3: TORCH test: Comparison of control group and intervention group pre-test reading comprehension results

Figure 3 shows pre testing results for comprehension. This graph compares the control and intervention groups’ average comprehension skills upon entry into the study. While slightly lower, the students in the intervention group entered the study with very similar average comprehension levels to those in the control group. For the purposes of this study, only TORCH scores have been graphed to compare and analyse comprehension, as raw scores cannot be compared between tests, and Stanines, while normed, are not as specific at TORCH scores.

**Group Trends**

When analysing the effect re-reading has had during the study, the data demonstrates that of all three aspects of reading tested (fluency measured by accuracy, fluency measured by speed and comprehension), it has been fluency measured by speed that has been the most positively affected by the intervention process. Figure 6 shows that the intervention group had an average increase in reading speed of 20 words per minute during the first read from pre to post testing. As shown in Figure 7, the control group experienced an increase of just 13.75 words per minute for the same tests. During the second read, and after specific instruction to re-read, the intervention group increased their average speed from pre to post testing by 21.75 words, while the control group experienced a decrease of 5.25 words per minute.
Both the control group and intervention groups increased fluency as measured in accuracy from the first read to the second read, and from pre to post testing (Figures 4 and 5). Although the intervention group improved its average accuracy from pre to post, comparison of Figure 4 with Figure 5 demonstrated that it is, in fact, the control group that has shown the larger improvement in accuracy during the time of the study. The control group increased accuracy during first reads by 1.5% and increased accuracy during second reads by 2%. By comparison, the intervention group only increased their average reading accuracy during first reads by 0.5% and increased accuracy during second reads by 0.75%.

Analysis of Figures 8 and 9 demonstrate the trend towards increased comprehension levels from first read to second read. Comparison between the intervention group data (Figure 8) and the control group data (Figure 9) shows that it was the control group that increased comprehension performance the most during the period of the study, as demonstrated in results from pre to post testing TORCH results. The intervention group increased their average first read TORCH scores by 3.75 and second read TORCH scores by 4.25. The control group however, increased their average first read TORCH scores by 14.25 and second read TORCH scores by 11.75.

Figure 4 compares average accuracy scores for the intervention group’s pre and post testing. The intervention group demonstrated some improvement in reading accuracy from first read to second read, and also from pre to post testing. During pre testing, the group’s average reading accuracy improved by 0.25% (from 95.25% to 95.5%), and during post testing accuracy improved by 0.5% (95.75% to 96.25%). The first readings increased by 0.5% accuracy (from 95.25% to 95.75%), and the second readings increased by 0.75% accuracy (from 95.5% to 96.25%).
Figure 5 compares average accuracy scores for the control group's pre and post testing. The control group demonstrated improvement in reading accuracy from first read to second read, and also from pre to post testing. During pre testing, the control group’s accuracy increased by 0.5% (from 93.75% to 94.25%). During post testing however, the intervention group’s accuracy increased by 1% (from 95.25% to 96.25%). From pre to post testing, the first readings increased by 1.5% accuracy (from 93.75% to 95.25%), and the second readings increased by 2% accuracy (from 94.25% to 96.25%).

Figure 6 represents the intervention group's pre and post testing results for reading speed (recorded as words per minute). The graph demonstrates an increase in reading speed between first and second readings, and also between pre and post testing. During pre testing, the intervention group increased reading speed by 20 words/min (from 102.25 to 122.25). During post testing, they increased reading speed by 21.75 words/min (from 125.5 to 147.25).
Figure 7 represents the control group’s pre and post testing results for reading speed (recorded as words per minute). The graph demonstrates an increase in reading speed from first read to second read during pre testing, but a decrease in reading speed from first to second read during post testing. During pre testing, the control group’s average speed increased by 13.75 words/min (from 109.25 to 123). During post testing, average reading speed decreased by 5.25 words/min (from 124 to 118.75).

Figure 8 shows the intervention group’s average scores for comprehension, comparing pre test and post test results. Students’ average results improved from first read to second read in both pre and post testing. First read TORCH scores increased by 3.75 (from 31.25 pre to 35 post), and second read TORCH scores increased by 4.75 (from 36.25 pre to 41 post). During
the study, the average first reading results increased by a TORCH score of 3.75 (from 31.25 to 35), and the second readings increased by a TORCH score of 4.75 (from 36.25 to 41).

Figure 9: TORCH Test: Comparison of pre- and post-testing results for control group reading comprehension

Figure 9 shows the control group’s average scores for comprehension, comparing pre test and post test results. Students’ average results improved from first read to second read, as well as increasing from pre to post. First read TORCH scores increased by 14.25 (from 30 pre to 44.25 post), and second read TORCH scores increased by 12.25 (from 35.25 pre to 47 post). During the time of the study, the control group’s average first readings increased by a TORCH score of 14.25 (from 30 to 44.25), and their second readings increased by a TORCH score of 11.75 (from 35.25 to 47).

Participant Differences

The following sequence of graphs shows how individual students performed in each assessment task. Each student’s data is shown together, clearly demonstrating progress from the first and second pre-test assessments to the first and second post-test assessments.
Figure 10: Comparison of student performance in the assessment of reading fluency: accuracy (%)

Figure 10 shows all student results for reading fluency, recorded with accuracy (%). Students A-D are from the intervention group, and students AA-DD are in the control group. Figure 10 demonstrates the trend for students to improve their reading accuracy after re-reading (evident in the difference between first read and second read for either pre or post testing).

Figure 11: Comparison of student performance in the assessment of fluency: reading speed (words per minute)

Figure 11 shows the fluency results for individual students when tested for reading speed. Reading speed has been recorded as words per minute. Students A to D are the intervention group, and students AA to DD are the control group. The graph demonstrates the trend for students in the intervention group (A to D) to increase reading speed during the study more noticeably than students in the control group (AA to DD). Figure 11 also shows that for six out of eight students in the study (all except BB and DD in the control group), the post testing second
read was read most fluently, as measured by reading speed. Because the same text was used for pre and post testing, this was the fourth time students had read the same passage.

Figure 12: Comparison of student performance in the assessment of comprehension (TORCH scores)

Figure 12 shows the comprehension results for each student in the study. Students A to D are the intervention group, and students AA to DD are the control group. As shown above, the group trend is for improvement in TORCH scores during the study. All students except two (student A in the intervention group and student AA in the control group) achieved their highest overall TORCH score on the post testing second read. Only one student (student DD in the control group) earned a decrease in TORCH score from first to second read of a text. This occurred during pre testing, when her raw score dropped from 1 to 0 (see Table 3), resulting in a final torch score of 14 for this test.

**Individual Student Trends**

Results for individual students involved in the study demonstrate the trend for improvement in both fluency and accuracy from pre- to post-testing. While some students have shown a decrease in either reading speed or accuracy from pre- to post-testing, they have improved in the other aspect of fluency during the same test.
Figure 13: Student A: Comparison of reading accuracy, speed and comprehension

Figure 13 shows individual performance for student A (part of the intervention group) for each assessment task in pre- and post-testing. The data shows her reading fluency in both accuracy and speed increased from pre- to post-testing, yet her comprehension level was lower for comprehension than it was during pre-testing. In both pre- and post-testing, student A was unable to improve her reading comprehension after re-reading from first read to second read.

Figure 14: Student B: Comparison of reading accuracy, speed and comprehension

Figure 14 above shows individual reading data for student B (intervention group). During pre-testing, this student maintained a constant reading accuracy for both first and second reading of the text 97%, yet improved reading speed. He also improved his comprehension results. In post-testing, this student improved from first read to second read in all areas tested, reading more accurately, more quickly and demonstrating increased comprehension.

Figure 15: Student C: Comparison of reading accuracy, speed and comprehension
Figure 15 above shows individual data for student C (intervention group). The trend for this student was to improve in all areas, particularly when comparing pre- to post-test data. During pre-testing, student C maintained the same level of accuracy and comprehension, improving after the second read in just reading speed. After the intervention however, he demonstrated improvement in all areas.

Figure 16: Student D: Comparison of reading accuracy, speed and comprehension

Figure 16 above shows individual testing results for student D (intervention group). This student’s results show that during pre-testing she could maintain her reading accuracy and increase speed, yet during post-testing, her reading accuracy decreased as her reading speed increased, surpassing her previous reading speed.

Figure 17: Student AA: Comparison of reading accuracy, speed and comprehension

Figure 17 above shows individual testing results for student AA (control group). During pre-testing, this student’s reading accuracy dropped when speed increased from first to second read. During post-testing however, he was able to maintain his reading accuracy and still increase reading speed. In pre-testing, student AA improved his comprehension in the second reading of the text, but was unable to do so in post-testing.
Figure 18: Student BB: Comparison of reading accuracy, speed and comprehension

Figure 18 above shows individual testing data for student BB (control group). This student’s data lacks a clear trend, but does provide some insight into student performance. During pre-testing, student BB decreased reading speed and accuracy from first to second reading, and was the only student in the study to do so. During post-testing however, she increased her reading accuracy while her speed decreased. Student BB’s TORCH test data show consistent improvement in comprehension from the first read of pre-testing to the second read of post-testing.

Figure 19: Student CC: Comparison of reading accuracy, speed and comprehension

Figure 19 above shows individual testing data for student CC (control group). This student has demonstrated a trend of improvement throughout the time of the study. The only decrease this student experienced was in reading speed during pre-testing, and accuracy improved at the same time.
Figure 20: Student DD: Comparison of reading accuracy, speed and comprehension

Figure 20 above shows individual testing data for student DD (control group). During pre- and post-testing, this student improved reading accuracy consistently, yet decreased reading speed in post-testing. Although demonstrating a decrease in comprehension results from first to second reading in pre-testing, student DD earned a much higher score during post-testing, which was then improved further in the second read.

**DISCUSSION**

*Results vs prediction*

At the commencement of the study, it was anticipated that student post testing results of the intervention group data would be superior to that of the control group in each area tested; fluency (accuracy and speed) and comprehension. However, as demonstrated in the Results section, this was not the case. In fact, the only area the intervention group demonstrated results higher than the control group was in fluency, as recorded with reading speed (see Figures 6 and 7). While the intervention group did improve reading accuracy and comprehension during the study, this improvement was not as great as that of the control group.

As discussed above, comparison between the control group and the intervention group pre and post testing data did not match original predictions of the study. Although in effect an oxymoron, the same data that serves to disprove the hypothesis of this study in fact supports it also. It appears as though students in the control group, who have had no specialised teaching during the period of the study, have improved their reading performance by the same degree, if not more, than the students in the intervention group has. However, this is not the case. While the control group has, in fact, outperformed the intervention group from pre to post testing in reading accuracy and comprehension, it has not been without some degree of teaching about the value of re-reading. In addition to regular classroom instruction for literacy
learning, the control group has been informally and implicitly taught the strategy of re-reading through the testing process. During pre testing, all students involved in the study were asked to read a passage from a text to the teacher once, then carefully re-read it to ‘rehearse’ before reading it again. By doing this, students were subtly made aware of the positive impact re-reading and multiple reading of the same text can have on reading fluency. In effect, this was an informal ‘lesson’ taught to both the control and intervention group students. Similarly when being pre tested for comprehension skills, students were asked to carefully re-read the TORCH test passage to try to improve their answers after their first attempt. This implicitly demonstrated to students that re-reading has the potential to positively impact on reading comprehension.

Results that did not fit predictions

Some individual student data did not fit predictions of student achievement. Analysis of reading accuracy data in Figure 10 shows student CC (in the control group) demonstrated the biggest individual improvement from first read in pre testing (88%) to second read in post testing (94%). Improvement of this degree, particularly for a student in the control group, was unexpected. There are two likely causes of this dramatic increase. One is the fact that reading a text with an accuracy of only 88%, the level 28 text was at a frustration level (Informal Reading Inventory, or IRI) for the student who demonstrated the lowest reading accuracy of all the students involved in the study. Hence student CC had more ‘room for improvement’. A second, more probable explanation for this improvement relate to comments made by the student during post testing. Student CC began post testing reading slowly, stumbling over some words before self-correcting. He demonstrated an increase in confidence during his reading of the text, which he later explained to the teacher. He said that after pre testing, he had asked other students how to pronounce the word ‘alpaca’, which appears several times in the text ‘Alpacas in Heaven’. The student explained that at first he couldn’t remember how to say it, but then he remembered and he knew he would read the story better. This qualitative anecdotal information demonstrates that student CC did in fact ‘learn’ the test between pre and post testing, hence data demonstrating a large improvement in reading accuracy.

Analysis of individual student comprehension data shows unexpected results for three students, but one in particular (see Figure 12). During both pre and post testing, most students were able to improve their cloze passage responses after re-reading, gaining a higher TORCH score for the second read than for the first read. Student A (in the intervention group), however, was not able to improve results in pre or post testing, and neither could student AA (in the control group) during post testing. There was only one student whose TORCH score in fact decreased after re-reading. Student DD (in the control group) changed her one correct
answer to an incorrect answer during pre testing, resulting in a second read raw score of 0 (see Table 3). This defies prediction, and suggests some degree of guesswork during cloze passage completion, as well as uncertainty and a lack of confidence in her ability to comprehend the text correctly.

Findings vs Current research in Lit Review

The lesson sequence developed for in this study (Appendix A) incorporates the key principles of the ‘Model of Teaching and Learning’, also known as the ‘Collins Model’ (Collins, Brown & Newman, 1989). During the lesson sequence, the teacher demonstrated application of what Collins et al. term the “teacher responsibilities” by modelling how to read with expression and fluency, then guiding and coaching students as they engage in reading tasks. Towards the end of the lesson sequence, the teacher used cues such as reminders and ‘reminder cards’, scaffolding students as teacher support faded. These aspects of teaching are supported by Rose, Gray and Cowey (1999) who note the importance of preparing students before reading, scaffolding students carefully, and allowing students to have the chance to practise what they have learned. Rose et al. document the development of these principles into the ‘Reading to Learn’ pedagogy. Collins et al. go further however, explaining that there are “student responsibilities” during the learning process too. In this way, students must be given the opportunity to articulate what they have learned, to reflect on new knowledge and explore ways to use new knowledge in tasks beyond the lesson context. These final three elements were present in the sequence of lessons in this research project, yet were not as explicit as those led by the teacher. It is essential, however, for students to develop and utilise responsibility in their own learning, as this adds to meta-cognition, self-talk and self-efficacy. In addition, students need to explore ways to apply new knowledge to other fields and subjects. Examples of this related to re-reading could be re-reading before reading aloud from the bible more during Religious Education to enhance fluency, or re-reading to make better sense of worded problems in Mathematics.

As discussed during the introduction, there is a strong link between reading comprehension and reading accuracy for those students who demonstrate poor reading accuracy (Knight & Galletly, Yovanoff et. al., 2005). The findings of this study confirm that students who demonstrate poor reading accuracy also demonstrate poor reading comprehension. Conversely, it would be expected that improvement in reading accuracy for these students would result in improvement in reading comprehension. This was not demonstrated during the study, but would be an expected result if the study continued for a longer period of time. As research suggests, students with relatively low levels of reading accuracy are also more likely to demonstrate low levels of other literacy skills, including reading comprehension, spelling,
writing, vocabulary and language skills (Chard, Simmons & Kameenui, 1998 in Galletly et. al., 2009). The link between fluency (accuracy and reading speed) and comprehension was analysed in this study, but future investigation would be needed to compare this research with naturalistic data in other aspects of literacy achievement.

For students with poorer reading accuracy however, success in literacy, including with reading comprehension and independent reading, is crucially linked to reading accuracy. For students who experience difficulty with reading accuracy, research indicates a link to likely difficulties in other areas such as comprehension, independent reading, spelling, writing, vocabulary and language skills (Chard, Simmons & Kameenui, 1998 in Galletly et. al., 2009).

Implications for teaching practice

The results of this study suggest that the participating students experienced some degree of academic benefit from being taught to the strategy of re-reading. Although students in the control group were not part of the focus sessions, their reading improvement indicated acknowledgement of the value of re-reading due to the emphasis placed on it during pre and post testing. In moving forward from this study, the students involved in the project need to be explicitly encouraged, prompted and praised for their continuous use of re-reading in order to promote its use as an automatised reading strategy. A gradual move to independent use of the strategy is anticipated for the students involved in the study, with continual teacher support.

When applied to the classroom context, the results of this study support the hypothesis that re-reading is a strategy that has the potential to influence and improve student fluency and possibly comprehension. It is recommended that re-reading be taught to the other students in Year 6 who were not part of this study. It is also recommended that re-reading be included in planning for literacy instruction by middle years teachers, particularly to be used with students similar to those identified in this study. In this way, re-reading, as well as other reading strategies at word, sentence, text, conceptual, and dispositional levels (Munro, 1985) would be made explicit to students. For students from NESB particularly, it is essential that new learning content be explained and clarified. Implicit instruction where reading strategies are mentioned, then assumed to be learned, are not sufficient, particularly for middle years learners from NESB who are already academically at risk.

In addition to expanding this study to other Year 6 students, the general teaching implication of this study is that re-reading is a strategy that could be applied to other learners. Inclusion of re-
reading instruction, in addition to other reading strategies with early primary students, and in a secondary setting could see student fluency and comprehension improve further.

Another implication for teaching practice based on the results of this study is the wider application of re-reading across key learning areas (KLAs). This includes reminders to use the strategy when reading text of different genres and in multimodal formats, such as textbooks, novels, advertising and online. For students to participate in “deliberate, mindful or intentional reading” as defined by Kucan & Beck (1997), re-reading must be valued and discussed by teachers in different fields of expertise in order to ensure students read carefully to elicit meaning from what they read. In improving fluency, attention to prosody and time given for students to think about prosodic choices would enhance the literacy component of subject specific learning to facilitate this. Ultimately, it is hoped students will add re-reading to their internal repertoire of strategies to be used both selectively and automatically when reading.

**Directions for future research**

Future research suggested by the results of the present study include an investigation into other reading strategies that could be explicitly taught alongside re-reading, with the ultimate goal of improving the reading comprehension of all students. Munro (2003) documents the teaching of several literacy strategies simultaneously to enhance student performance. In this way, students would be able to draw upon not just their knowledge and experience of re-reading, but also the other reading ‘tricks’ and strategies being taught to maximise reading success. In contrast, it would be interesting to note how student reading performance would change if instead of focusing on re-reading to improve fluency in general, one aspect of fluency was focused on instead. For example, if students concentrated on improvement in reading speed without concern for accuracy, then spent time concentrating on accuracy and not speed, their eventual reading skills might benefit more.

Investigation into different ways to promote reading comprehension would be a valuable avenue for future study or research, particularly regarding strategies deigned or tailored to help students from NESB, such as those included in this study. The MLOTP model (Munro, 1885) suggests that in addition to re-reading, other sentence level strategies that promote reading success include visualising, paraphrasing, listening to oneself during reading and pausing during reading to consolidate the content of what has been read. Future research into these strategies and their success in the Year 6 classroom would be of benefit to current students, as well as the wider educational community through the sharing of professional knowledge.
Another possible avenue for future research would be the continuation of the re-reading focus group to see if focusing on one strategy over time has a greater impact on reading success, particularly on reading comprehension. While a ten-lesson intervention is powerful enough to create some change in student performance, improving reading comprehension in the long term may require a longer or more intense intervention.

Current research indicates that repeated reading of texts and prose results in greater fluency improvement than repeated reading of vocabulary words in lists (La Vasseur, Macaruso & Shankweiler, 2007). Despite this research, experimenting with the two types of re-reading (re-reading prose and re-reading words in isolation) could prove fruitful, particularly if focused on a specific student population, such as those from NESB to determine if naturalistic teaching observations match the data referred to in educational research. Investigation could include the impact on fluency of teaching students to re-read words in isolation as well as in prose, such as using flash cards of key vocabulary and repeated readings of a text.

**CONCLUSION**

Re-reading had a positive impact on the reading ability (fluency and comprehension) of the eight students who participated in the present study. Re-reading extended the participants’ time to think carefully about the content of the text and to make prosodic decisions that affect the fluency of their reading, and in turn, their comprehension of each passage. The research showed that the provision of specific instructions about the process of re-reading, together with specific instructions about fluency and phrasing, enabled the participants to read more accurately, more quickly and with a better understanding of what they read. While it was expected that only students in the intervention group who were given explicit instruction about re-reading would demonstrate improvement, students in both the intervention and control groups demonstrated improved results after re-reading during the testing process. Current educational literature together with this study’s results support the hypothesis that re-reading may result in improved reading success.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Lesson Plans

10 Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Lesson Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1       | * Introduction to sequence of ten lessons, explaining that students are going to focus on reading comprehension with the teacher for a few weeks.  
* Group discussion about feelings towards reading silently, at home, at school, out loud  
* Introduction of the term ‘fluency’: teacher demonstrates  |

Resources

4 copies of novel: Camel Rider by Prue Mason
reading a text with poor fluency, and good fluency. Discuss the difference (pausing in the right places, reading in your head first to practice, thinking about the hard words before you start.)

* Students select a paragraph from class novel to practice on, reading silently to ‘rehearse’ reading, then reading aloud to group.

* Discuss what they noticed about reading aloud after re-reading. Introduce this term as a reading strategy they are going to learn how to use. (Explicit description of re-reading strategy)

2

* Remind students what re-reading is. Explain that good readers pause when they read, and think about where these pauses go.

* Students each use an enlarged photocopy of a paragraph, cut into strips. Students use scissors to cut the paragraph up in the places they think there should be a pause.

* Each student reads paragraph aloud, with pauses in the places they decided upon. Discuss differences between students’ choices. Discuss where the pauses should go to make the paragraph sound the best.

* Teacher reads original paragraph aloud using the students’ pauses so students can decide if they sound right.

* Students take turns reading paragraph aloud again, concentrating on making it sound exciting. Experiment with reading aloud in a boring or exciting way. (Teacher modelling of re-reading in action. Collaborative use of re-reading aloud)

3

* Review of last session- thinking about where to pause when reading. Discuss the fact that it takes time to decide where to pause and how to read- this makes our reading sound FLUENT. Revise idea of re-reading before reading out loud or answering comprehension questions

* Look at a paragraph together- students read once independently. Teacher reads text in a boring way with no pauses, emphasis or fluency. Teacher asks how easy it was to understand the text.

* Teacher and students discuss where to mark the text to indicate where they should pause. Teacher reads text again to students with pauses and appropriate stress. Teacher asks students if they understood more easily. Why? Discuss how re-reading helped the teacher put pauses in, making it more easily understood. Teacher makes it explicit that this is what good readers to in their heads.

* Students read short text independently, focusing on re-reading and reading fluently, and answer oral questions as a
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **4** | * Review previous lesson: when you read fluently, with pauses in the right places, it is easier to understand!  
* Students to make small ‘reminder’ cards for reading that say *When I read I..*  
- **look at the whole paragraph to decide where the ‘breaks’ are**  
- ‘**hear** the difficult words in my head to check I’m saying them correctly’  
- ‘**say** each sentence in my head to make sure they sound interesting’  
- **re-read in my head, thinking about what the sentences mean**  
* Discuss and read each card, explicitly revising strategy of re-reading  
* Discuss peers they consider to be ‘good readers’. What do they do that makes their oral reading sound so good? How do they sound (professional, confident, calm, loud). Explain that these readers re-read in their head to practice the hard words, and read slowly with careful pauses. Give students confidence by telling them they can do it, now that they know the tricks! | - Photocopied ‘reminder’ cards  
- Cardboard, textas, laminator, hole punch, keyrings |
| **5** | * Review content of small ‘reminder’ cards for reading- check students understand each card  
* Students to read Year 3 TORCH text independently. Prompt students to use reminder cards and strategies learnt so far.  
* Ask students to take turns reading the first part of the passage aloud to the group, pausing carefully to make the text sound interesting. Remind students that doing this will make the text easier to understand.  
* Go through first part of cloze answers as a group, scaffolding students to think about what they have read, and to re-read certain sections to clarify meaning. (Teacher scaffolds student learning through collaborative practice)  
* Discuss strategies they used/ feelings/ confidence/ what they will do the same or differently next time | - TORCH test (“Grasshoppers” – Year 3 level) |
| **6** | * Revise small reminders on cards. Discuss how re-reading and making reading sound interesting/ fluent helps reading easier.  
* Students re-read Year 3 TORCH text independently and complete remainder of cloze exercise in pairs. Prompt | - TORCH test (“Grasshoppers” – Year 3 level) |
students to use reminder cards when reading, and to work together to decide on the answers. Remind students that they are different ways to fill in the gaps, and they need to work together to choose their responses. (Teacher scaffolds through collaborative practice)

* Go through cloze responses as a group- discuss strategies they used, did they feel nervous? Did they remember to re-read to choose where to pause when they read in their heads? How confident would they feel reading this text aloud now that they have read it silently?

| 7 | * Revise re-reading and its benefits. Remind students of what to do when they read a new text
* Students to read Year 5 TORCH text independently and complete first half of cloze exercise, pretending they are doing a real comprehension test. Prompt students to use reminder cards and strategies learnt so far. (Teacher guides practice of re-reading strategy)
* Go through answers as a group- discuss strategies/ feelings/ confidence/ what they should do in the future when they read
* Students read certain sections aloud, demonstrating appropriate pausing
* Discuss difficult vocab- experiment with saying it in different ways to work out what sounds right. Remind students this is what good readers do in their heads when they re-read. | TORCH test (“Earthquakes” – Year 5 level) |
|---|---|---|
| 8 | * Revise re-reading and its benefits. Remind students of what to do when they read a new text
* Students re-read Year 5 TORCH text independently and complete cloze exercise, imagining they are reading this story for fun at home. Prompt students to use reminder cards and strategies learnt so far. (Teacher guides practice of re-reading strategy, with gradual release of teacher input)
* Go through answers to remainder of cloze in pairs- compare responses. Group to discuss whether they have improved/ feel more confident etc. | TORCH test (“Earthquakes” – Year 5 level) |
| 9 | * Teacher tells students that they are going to have a different type of lesson- instead of talking before reading, they are going to read without any reminders to see how they go.
* Students read text and complete cloze.
* Swap answers and correct as a group.
* Discuss how this felt- did they remember to re-read? | TORCH test (“The bear who liked hugging people” – Year 4 level) |
Pause carefully to make text sound fluent? Did anyone look at reminder cards? Did they feel nervous? (Teacher monitors independent use of re-reading)

| 10 | * Last session- students to read passage independently and complete cloze.  
    | * Correct responses as a group – discuss how they could tell, how they found the answers, how they found the task  
    | * Revise content of ‘reminder’ cards and make sure students know they can use these strategies in all subject areas. These are things good readers do every time they read.  
    | * Informal student feedback to teacher- did they like these sessions? Do they feel like their reading has improved? |

TORCH test (“The bear who liked hugging people” – Year 4 level)

POST TESTING

**Appendix B:** Reminder cards created for students in intervention group

**READING REMINDERS**

**WHEN I READ I..**

- look at the whole paragraph
to decide where the ‘breaks’ are

- ‘hear’ the difficult words in my head to check I’m saying them correctly

- ‘say’ each sentence in my head to make sure they sound interesting

- re-read in my head, thinking about what the sentences mean