

Addressing Unintended Instructional Messages About Repeated Reading

Nancy Frey, Douglas Fisher

What if teachers are telegraphing messages against rereading, and doing their students a disservice?

Anyone who has read a book to a 3- or 4-year-old recognizes this request: “Read it again!” Young children simply love to hear familiar tales read over and over. Klinkenborg (2009) noted that “childhood is an oasis of repetitive acts” (p. A18), and from the child’s viewpoint, rereading is valuable. The predictability of the story offers comfort and a sense of order. Children get to figure out who they are by comparing themselves to the actions of a storybook’s characters, thereby building their sense of identity. Young children also enjoy informational texts as they learn about the biological, social, and physical world. And, of course, there’s the opportunity to interact with a caring adult. Anyone who has read *The Poky Little Puppy* by Janette Sebring Lowrey to a sleepy toddler knows the wrath risked by skipping a page: “Start over!”

Young children are primed for rereading when they arrive at school. Yet, within a few years, most students protest at the suggestion that they read something again. “We read it already!” they whine. Leathers (2017) described her own struggle with a second grader named Michael: “He desperately needed practice with rereading familiar texts to build his reading fluency, but he saw no point in rereading. He needed a reason to reread. He needed a real audience” (p. 499). Elementary educators are aware of the value of rereading as a habit (e.g., Raney, Therriault, & Minkoff, 2000) and repeated reading as an instructional approach (e.g., Therrien, 2004), especially because of the positive impact on fluency and comprehension. Of course, students also need to read widely to develop their background knowledge, fluency, and comprehension (Frey & Fisher, 2013). Yet, many elementary students resist rereading.

Given the discrepancy between young students’ passion for rereading and older students’ dismay at it, our questions are these: What happens to repeated reading at school? More important, what can be done to ensure that students see the value of

rereading? In this article, we explore the evidence on the benefits of repeated reading and repetition for elementary students. We then identify three common instructional practices that appear to unintentionally telegraph the message that rereading is not desirable. In the final section, we present four instructional practices that encourage students to build the habit of rereading.

Two Strands, One Intention

Rereading behaviors and repeated reading draw on two related constructs. The first, rereading, is a habit that ultimately is under the direction of the student. The second, repeated reading, is an instructional routine devised to build fluency and comprehension. Underpinning both is the element of repetition. These practices, although implemented somewhat differently, have similar goals.

Because rereading is under the reader’s command, its application differs among readers. One critical habit that separates proficient and practiced readers from those who read inefficiently concerns rereading to clarify understanding and regain meaning when it is lost (Baker & Brown, 1984). The habit of doing so is a metacognitive skill, as the reader senses a comprehension problem and then attempts to resolve it. Importantly, effective readers don’t reread without purpose. Their use of rereading is governed by need. Although rereading evolves into a reflexive behavior for many adolescent and adult readers, it needs to be explicitly taught and

Nancy Frey is a professor in the Department of Educational Leadership at San Diego State University, CA, USA; e-mail nfrey@mail.sdsu.edu.

Douglas Fisher is a professor in the Department of Educational Leadership at San Diego State University, CA, USA; e-mail dfisher@mail.sdsu.edu.

fostered among younger students within the constellation of comprehension instructional strategies (Rapp, van den Broek, McMaster, Kendeou, & Espin, 2007).

Repeated reading is an instructional method first articulated by Samuels (1979). In its original form, repeated reading required a short passage of 50–200 words, read several times silently and aloud until sufficient levels of rate and accuracy were attained. Later efforts included corrective feedback from an adult, as well as student goal setting and progress self-monitoring. Repeated reading instruction has been extensively researched. For example, Levy, Nicholls, and Kohen (1993) reported that the technique resulted in grades 3–5 students' increased abilities in error detection and improved comprehension by grade-level readers as well as those reading below grade level.

A number of studies on repeated reading have been further analyzed using a statistical tool called a meta-analysis, which is used to calculate effect size across multiple studies. Therrien's (2004) meta-analysis of 16 studies has been widely cited and offers interesting information beyond the positive impact of repeated reading. This study revealed several essential instructional conditions: that repeated reading (a) is performed in the company of an adult who reads the passage first, (b) requires that the text be read three or four times by the student, and (c) involves corrective feedback. A more recent meta-analysis of 34 studies on the effects of repeated reading instruction for elementary students with learning disabilities confirmed these results. Lee and Yoon (2017) found that it was especially beneficial in building fluency, which was further enhanced when students were able to listen to the text being read before reading it themselves. Hattie's (2012) meta-analysis of meta-analyses found that repeated reading instruction provided an effect size of 0.67, equivalent to approximately 1.5 years of growth for a year in school.

The evidence on investing in rereading and repeated reading is clear: Their impact on fluency and comprehension make them worthwhile practices in any elementary reading classroom. Yet, we still have those reluctant students to deal with. Why do students such as Michael hate rereading? Perhaps

without intending to, we found, teachers sent messages that inhibit a disposition students possessed when they came to school.

As part of a larger program evaluation on access to complex texts (Fisher & Frey, 2016), we analyzed the observations from 22 classrooms of teachers in kindergarten through sixth grade in six different elementary schools. These schools were ethnically diverse, with more than 50% of the students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch and between 22% and 48% of the students learning English as an additional language. Of the 22 teachers, 20 were female and two were male. Field notes were collected every other month for eight months in a single school year, for a total of 88 observations. The

findings we report are a posteriori, meaning that this knowledge was derived after discussing the classroom observations. We did not enter classrooms specifically searching for messages about rereading.

Three Practices That Discourage Rereading and Repeated Reading

Reading instruction in elementary schools is anchored by instructional practices derived from Pearson and Gallagher's (1983) seminal theoretical work on the gradual release of responsibility, which suggested that reading comprehension requires incrementally releasing responsibility to the learner. Pedagogically, the instructional moves of the teacher range from teacher modeling to guided instruction to independent application. At each phase, feedback is provided, and the role of the teacher shifts from instructor to guide to monitor. Over time, these instructional practices have come to be widely known as shared reading, guided reading, and independent reading. The importance of modeling and feedback cannot be overstated, as students rely on their teachers to share thinking so they can approximate it over time (e.g., Bandura, 1986). However, we argue that there are unintended messages associated with each of these phases of reading instruction that can undermine the value of rereading and in fact telegraph messages to students that rereading is not valuable.

PAUSE AND PONDER

- Why is repeated reading important?
- What is the evidence for repeated reading's effectiveness?
- What happens in shared readings, guided reading instruction, and independent reading that could communicate to students that repeated reading is not important?

Lack of Print Referencing During Shared Reading

Rereading can be devalued during a shared reading lesson when questions are not text-dependent and the rush to discussion takes precedence over slowing down to reread. Without question, talk is a vital aspect of meaning making and academic language development. Students should be discussing things that they read with others because these collaborative conversations build understanding and allow for the practice of argumentation. Yet, closing the book to proceed with the conversation communicates a relative unimportance of the text. Beck and McKeown (2001) found that the primary-grade teachers they observed led discussions that allowed students to use their background knowledge, rather than the linguistic content of the text.

We observed this in action in a third-grade classroom in March of the school year. The unit was on folktales and fables, and the class had been reading Cinderella variants. After the students read the book *Mufaro's Beautiful Daughters* by John Steptoe (1987) in collaborative groups, they reassembled for discussion. Many of the teacher's questions were about elements of Cinderella stories they had previously read, and students listed components of this story that were similar to the European fairy tale. Students did not reference evidence from the book, instead recalling details of the story from memory. Responses sometimes drifted to what they already knew, even when it was incorrect in the current context. For example, several students referred to Manyara, who is selfish and dismissive of others, as "the stepsister" even though she was a biological sibling. This error went uncorrected by the teacher, even though it could have been readily addressed by asking students to look back at the text.

When discussions were focused on a text, students were more likely to be directed to the illustrations rather than the text features. We cataloged 12 occurrences of this across the six schools. As an example, a kindergarten teacher read the picture book *Circle Dogs* by Kevin Henkes (2001) to her students in October of the school year. Emergent readers are coordinating numerous reading behaviors, including directionality and return sweep. However, in this lesson the teacher only pointed to text four times, and then only in a general manner, rather than emphasizing any specific text features. In addition, the discussion focused on the highly stylized

illustrations, but the teacher did not link them to these nouns in the print. Missed opportunities to do so included *dogs, sun, baby, Mama, and Papa*, which are repeated several times throughout the book, as are a number of sight words from the Dolch word list. Questions about the illustrations focused on the dogs' behaviors and actions, but not the print that conveyed this information.

Questions that reference print are especially important for emergent readers, who do not naturally attend to print. Evans, Williamson, and Pursoo (2008) found that young students only looked at print during shared readings 6% of the time. Without questions that draw their attention to the print and linguistic features of the text, students fail to learn the value of rereading to bolster their understanding, relying instead on what they knew prior to, or can recall from, the shared reading. This can privilege auditory memory over investigation and evidence from the text.

Rereading for Narrow Purposes During Guided Instruction

Guided reading lessons with young students often begin with a familiar reading as a review or introduction for what is to come. There are valid reasons to do so, as the rereading of a familiar text can have a priming effect, preparing students for additional instruction. In practice, however, these warm-ups often serve as little more than a way to set the lesson in motion while the teacher organizes materials or collects a running record on another student. Our observations of guided reading lessons suggest that teachers rarely asked any comprehension questions, paying scant attention to the contents of the familiar text. These teacher housekeeping behaviors occurred 18 times in our observations, and at no time did teachers respond with anything more than general praise for completing the task (e.g., "Good job! Thank you!"). The unintended message to the student? This isn't really important or interesting to me.

Repeated reading for fluency practice alone telegraphs a similar message to students. In its worst form, students read and reread a short passage of text solely for the purpose of increasing rate and accuracy (often having to count the number of words they read in a minute). Rasinski (2006) cautioned that repeated reading is misused when the emphasis on rate and accuracy trumps comprehension instruction, noting,

There are dedicated and well-meaning teachers who have taken this goal of improving reading rate to heart and focused their instruction on improving students' reading rate through repeated readings and other rate-building activities. Students in these classrooms have become faster readers, but their reading comprehension has not improved. Students learn what we teach them. Indeed, a new generation of students is appearing at U.S. university reading clinics, students who have learned to read fast but are poor comprehenders and poor readers. (p. 705)

In all observations of repeated reading instruction, fluency and accuracy were the focus of the lesson. As an example, we observed a fourth-grade teacher work individually with a student, using a passage from a commercial fluency program. After reading the passage aloud to Julian (all names are pseudonyms), the teacher reviewed the directions and set the timer. Three times, Julian read the informational passage, which concerned how astronauts' food is prepared and consumed during space travel. However, only rate and accuracy data were collected and discussed by the teacher. Only one question during the 13-minute exchange could even remotely be about comprehension: "Did you like this?" Although Julian nodded in the affirmative, the teacher did not ask him what he liked about the reading. The pair then returned to completing the chart of results. Although they discussed Julian's goals and progress, they never returned to the content of the text or drew any information from the text.

Recall that repeated reading is done in the company of an adult who reads the passage first to the student. Yet, without questions and discussion intended to foster comprehension, the student learns incorrectly that the only purpose for rereading is to read faster. Meaning isn't important; accurate word calling is. After all, if the teacher didn't seem to care about my understanding, thinks the student, why should I?

Privileging Novelty in Independent Reading

An essential practice for reading development is independent reading. Time spent reading independently and widely provides a practice effect, as students learn to apply what they have been taught. The correlational studies on reading volume and achievement are startling, even decades after they were first published. Among the largest is one completed by Anderson, Wilson, and Fielding (1988), who reported on the link between the number of

minutes fifth graders spent reading independently outside of school and their achievement on standardized tests. Those who read for 21 minutes a day read more than 1,800,000 words per year and reliably scored in the 90th percentile on reading tests. Comparatively, those who read for one minute a day outside of school consumed only 8,000 words per year and scored in the 10th percentile. In fact, reading volume was the strongest predictor of reading achievement.

These findings spurred a renewed attention on independent reading in and out of school. Understanding that it is difficult to get good at something you rarely practice, schools instituted dedicated independent reading time in classrooms. Some wide reading efforts limit students to books that fall within a narrow range of quantitative text complexity measures. However, the practice of matching a reader to a text is problematic at best. Glasswell and Ford (2011) described book leveling as providing "the illusion of a scientific cachet" while masking the fact that "reading levels are not the same as reading needs" (p. 209).

Worse yet, there are teachers who do not allow students to reread a book, telling them, "You read that already," and sending them back to the bookshelf to find something else. Any dedicated reader will tell you about the pleasure of returning to a book that he or she has read before, enjoying it for different reasons each time. Perhaps students in the primary grades need some opportunities to reread familiar books with a new purpose as they also expand their diet of texts and genres. It is important to note that the reading volume study did not concern itself at all with what students read, either in terms of reading level or whether any rereading had occurred. Rereading is sacrificed when choice is constrained by the level and novelty of the text.

Of the 26 occurrences we observed when rereading was discouraged, steering students away from texts that were outside of their assigned reading level or because a book had been previously read were the most common. Two examples are illustrative. A fourth-grade student wanted to read *Percy Jackson and the Lightning Thief* by Rick Riordan (2006) in large part because an older cousin was reading it and had recounted some of the protagonist's adventures. However, the student's performance on a computerized reading test suggested that this book's Lexile level of 740 was too difficult for him; his current performance was 650. He had checked

out the book in his school library and presented it to his teacher during his reading conference. The teacher compared the book's quantitative level to her master list of student independent reading levels and gently explained that the book "would be too hard" and that she didn't want him to "get frustrated and quit."

Although the student explained why he wanted to read it, the teacher was not persuaded. Instead, she gave him a different adventure book written at a lower level. After he glumly left the table, she explained her reasoning to us and her care in trying to locate a book in the same genre. Yet, the student's body language spoke volumes. He wanted to read a specific title, not just any adventure book. We appreciated the teacher's concern, but we had to question whether her abundance of caution was warranted. After all, this was an independent reading choice. What was the worst thing that could happen? In fact, it was our debriefing of this incident that first led us to reexamine our data a posteriori, resulting in this report of findings.

Our second example illuminates the practice of forbidding students from rereading books they enjoy. A fifth-grade student had torn through the mystery *The Westing Game* by Ellen Raskin (1997) in less than a week as an independent reading selection, and she wanted to read it again to locate the clues she had missed the first time around. Her classroom used a points-based system for independent reading, which included passing a comprehension quiz. She had already passed the quiz, but she explained, "I know I missed stuff now that I got the answer, so I want to read it again now that I know how it ends." Her teacher agreed that it was an excellent book but explained, "You can't get points on a book you've already read. Don't you want to pick something else so you can keep going? You're almost at the next level [of the independent reading program]." The student agreed with the teacher that "not getting more points doesn't make sense" and chose another book. However, this student lost the opportunity to linger over the intricate author's craft of this classic. Perhaps even more troubling was the girl's ready agreement with her teacher that extrinsic rewards were more important than intrinsic ones.

In sum, although rereading is an essential tool for comprehension, especially to clarify and deepen understanding, some classroom practices discourage students from rereading. A failure to reference print and linguistic content provides a poor model

for students about the need to reread to locate information. When rereading does occur but is limited to narrow purposes, such as for a warm-up activity or to improve rate and accuracy but not comprehension, we diminish it as a comprehension tool. Also, when we value independent reading only when a new title is selected, we tell students that "one and done" is sufficient.

Four Practices That Foster Repeated Reading

Eliminating practices that discourage rereading is only a partial solution. Teachers must also incorporate intentional instructional moves that promote rereading. Because rereading is a vital comprehension tool, it is leveraged frequently during close reading of complex texts. Throughout the lesson, the teacher uses rereading to deepen student understanding, whether this is accomplished through shared reading with emergent readers, during small-group instruction with older readers, or as a whole class. In fact, repeated reading of the text, whether by the teacher or the students, is a key indicator of close reading. However, simply demanding that students read or listen to a passage again is not likely to be beneficial. Changing the task and purpose, asking really good questions, and pressing for evidence are three methods for fostering rereading throughout the reading day. Providing an audience offers a fourth method for making repeated reading a powerful comprehension approach.

Change the Task and Purpose

Changing the task and purpose provides students an authentic reason for rereading. During a shared reading with the picture book *On a Beam of Light* by Jennifer Berne (2013), a first-grade teacher introduced the text, saying, "I'm going to read about a famous scientist named Albert Einstein. The first time I read it will be so you can get some ideas about his life."

After finishing the book, she said, "Now we're going to read it a second time, and this time I want you to listen and look for evidence that tells us if this story could be true." Her change of purpose for reading helped her students focus on the nonfiction elements of the narrative. Her students agreed that the bulk of the book could have been fiction, but the last page offered information about Einstein's discoveries.

“Show me where you found that,” the teacher said. A student replied, “It says right here [pointing] about the moon and about spaceships.” Focusing on print references, the teacher then said, “Can you touch the word on this page that says *moon*?”

The students in a sixth-grade class were reading *Wonder* by R.J. Palacio (2012). Much of the reading and discussion of the novel occurred in small-group literature circles, but the teacher reserved some passages for a closer inspection of the text. One such passage, which occurred about one third of the way through the book, involved the character Auggie’s older sister Olivia. Auggie has a severe birth defect, and his sister recalls waking up one night to see her mother standing outside Auggie’s room, watching him sleep. After the teacher invited students to read the passage silently, he asked them to read it again and to annotate it this time. Each student had a personal copy of the text. The teacher said,

Here’s what I want you to focus on this time. The author spends half of this passage using descriptive language about the way Auggie’s mother looked as she stood in the hall. Make a note in the margin of your book about the how the author paints this picture with words. Then, we’ll discuss it together.

In both of these cases, the teachers provided authentic reasons for students to reread by changing the purpose and the task.

Ask Really Good Questions

The inclusion of questions that cause readers to return to a text builds the habit of rereading. Asking young students “Point to a letter in your name” and “Let’s count the words on this page” causes them to look at text to locate information (Zucker, Ward, & Justice, 2009). Text-dependent questions cognitively challenge students and reinforce the importance of mining the reading to analyze at literal, structural, and inferential levels (see Figure 1). These foci of questioning promote critical thinking and deep comprehension.

The use of text-dependent questions is one vehicle for changing the task and the purpose. But it is the pacing and sequencing of these questions that deepens understanding. Readers can usually gain a general meaning of a text that is within their cognitive and developmental range, but they must be taught to mine a text for deeper meaning. Literal-level questions focus on general understanding and key details and aid in establishing foundational knowledge. But questions that explore the structure of the text, including vocabulary and author’s craft, illuminate less apparent elements that assist in comprehension.

In the continued lesson from the passage in *Wonder*, the teacher asked about the word *apparition*:

I noticed that many of you circled this word in your annotations because it was confusing, and it’s true the author doesn’t explain it directly, but think about the

Figure 1
Text-Dependent Questions That Promote Rereading

Cognitive phase	Primary grades: <i>On a Beam of Light</i> (Berne, 2013)	Intermediate grades: <i>Wonder</i> (Palacio, 2012)
<i>Literal meaning:</i> What does the text say?	What object sparked young Albert’s imagination? How do you know?	What are some of the worries Auggie and his parents have about attending a school? What is your evidence?
<i>Structural meaning:</i> How does the text work?	In what ways did other people’s ideas about Albert change from the beginning of the book to the end?	How do Mr. Browne’s monthly precepts align with the plot? What examples can you use to support your answer?
<i>Inferential meaning:</i> What does the text mean?	Why do you think the author called this book <i>On a Beam of Light</i> ?	“When given a choice between right or kind, choose kind.” In what ways do Jack, Julian, and Auggie struggle with this advice?

context clues you can use. Please reread this passage and see if you can't unlock the definition of this word.

After a few minutes, the teacher brought the students back together. Two students located *ghostlike* and *angelic* midway through the passage. "And the description, about the dark hallway and the blue nightlight," says another student. "Yeah, like, I can imagine her mom is in a nightgown, and she probably would look like a ghost or something," adds still another. In short order, the class has co-constructed the meaning of *apparition* without the teacher having to define it. "That's the thing," the teacher said. "Good writers have the clues in there. You just have to know how to look."

Press for Evidence

Young readers tend to rely on memory and recall rather than textual evidence if not asked to do so. Asking follow-up questions that require students to locate evidence facilitates rereading. Asking "Where did you find that?" requires that students reread the portion of the text containing the pertinent information. A first-grade teacher noted that this has a further benefit: equitable response distribution. She said,

I have a few students who are eager to answer nearly every question, which is a problem because they dominate the discussion. I've gotten more strategic about adding "And how do you know?" to my questions. It gets them to slow down a little.

The range of questions focused on evidence from the text used to prompt rereading included the following:

- "How do you know that?"
- "Can you show everyone where you found that?"
- "What words did the author use to explain ___?"
- "Put your finger on the sentence that shows ___."
- "What did the author say about that, and where?"

One of the teachers noted that she often uses questions to get everyone involved:

After asking a student to locate evidence, I'll say, "While Hunter is looking for the answer, I want everyone to look for the answer, too. When you've found it, show

me a thumbs-up." Otherwise, there's only one student looking, when they should all be looking.

Provide an Audience

Audience and performance are authentic motivators for rereading text because they offer a purpose for doing so. One method of providing an audience is Readers Theatre, which requires two or more readers to perform the text aloud. Unlike a conventional theater performance, the script remains present and other elements such as props, movement, and lighting are absent. The purpose is to use authentic practice to build oral reading fluency, prosody, and comprehension, all the while keeping eyes on text. Martinez, Roser, and Strecker (1998) documented its use with second-grade students who participated in five-day sequences of Readers Theatre. The researchers documented ways these small groups made meaning of the script, noting that "students themselves initiated discussion regarding oral interpretation that delved into comprehension on a deep level" (p. 332), and returned to the text to reach consensus on details of the performance.

A fifth-grade teacher we observed used a Readers Theatre technique to bring dialogue-heavy passages to life. "I want them to hear these characters in their heads as they read," he explained. "The dialogue is rich, funny, and sometimes poignant. I'm also teaching about direct and indirect characterization right now, and dialogue is one important example of the author's craft."

One passage occurs late in *Wonder*, after Auggie and four friends narrowly escape a beating by some older boys. The teacher met with the five students who would be performing this for the class later in the week. "So, you've read this and you understand how it fits into the plot, but let's talk about their emotions and how the author shows this," said the teacher. "Well, they're relieved that they got away," said one student. "And they're all pumped up, too," added another. "But how do you know? Can you go back into the text to figure out where you're getting that impression?" asked the teacher.

Using a scripted version of the passage, the students and their teacher annotated the evidence, including punctuation marks, phrases such as "we all started laughing" and the author's descriptions of the characters trading high-fives and being out of breath from running. Satisfied that the group was on their way to capturing the emotional heart

of the passage, the teacher left them to work out tracking the dialogue, assigning roles, and beginning rehearsals. Two days later, the group performed it, using their radio voices to bring the scene to life.

Audiences can be smaller, too, and families are some of the very best. A second-grade teacher co-constructed a summary of *On a Beam of Light* with her class during shared writing, then filmed students reading portions of the summary. Each student wore a white wig and mustache to mimic Einstein and performed a segment of the class summary, adding an additional line about how they believed they were like the great scientist. One student said, “I’m like Albert Einstein because I don’t give up”; another said, “I’m like Albert Einstein because I have lots of questions.” The students rehearsed using the Readers Theatre technique for several days, then filmed their performance. “I used this video at Back to School Night with the families,” said the teacher. “Parents couldn’t have been prouder of their children. After I showed it to them, I talked about why rereading is so important and about ways that they can encourage rereading at home.”

Conclusion

The habit of rereading is used to clarify understanding, unearth deeper meaning, and sometimes just for the pleasure of revisiting favorite characters. We think of the student who wanted to find the clues she missed the first time around in *The Westing Game*. No one forbids us as adults from rereading short passages or entire books, yet without intending to, caring educators can unintentionally communicate

a belief that rereading isn’t held in high regard. Consider the experiences you have had with a book you’ve returned to and carried away a new or different understanding. Klinkenborg (2009) said, “The real secret of re-reading is simply this: It is impossible. The characters remain the same, and the words never change, but the reader always does” (p. A18). Our charge as educators is to apprentice students into the reading world. That means we must ensure that our words and actions provide that invitation every day.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, R.C., Wilson, P.T., & Fielding, L.G. (1988). Growth in reading and how children spend their time outside of school. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 23(3), 285–303.
- Baker, L., & Brown, A.L. (1984). Metacognitive skills in reading. In P.D. Pearson (Ed.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 353–394). New York, NY: Longman.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Beck, I.L., & McKeown, M.G. (2001). Text talk: Capturing the benefits of read-aloud experiences for young children. *The Reading Teacher*, 55(1), 10–20.
- Evans, M.A., Williamson, K., & Pursoo, T. (2008). Preschoolers’ attention to print during shared book reading. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 12(1), 106–129. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888430701773884>
- Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2016). Systems for teaching complex tests: A proof-of-concept investigation. *The Reading Teacher*, 69(4), 403–412. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1409>
- Frey, N., & Fisher, D. (2013). *Rigorous reading: 5 access points for comprehending complex texts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Glasswell, K., & Ford, M. (2011). Let’s start leveling about leveling. *Language Arts*, 88(3), 208–216.
- Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Klinkenborg, V. (2009, May 29). Some thoughts on the pleasure of being a re-reader. *The New York Times*, p. A18.
- Leathers, J. (2017). Fluency: It’s all about audience. *The Reading Teacher*, 70(4), 499. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1534>
- Lee, J., & Yoon, S.Y. (2017). The effects of repeated reading on reading fluency for students with reading disabilities: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 50(2), 213–224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219415605194>
- Levy, B.A., Nicholls, A., & Kohen, D. (1993). Repeated readings: Process benefits for good and poor readers. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 56(3), 303–327. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jecp.1993.1037>
- Martinez, M., Roser, N., & Strecker, S. (1998). “I never thought I could be a star”: A Readers Theatre ticket to fluency. *The Reading Teacher*, 52(4), 326–334.
- Pearson, P.D., & Gallagher, M.C. (1983). The instruction of reading comprehension. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 8(3), 317–344. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-476X\(83\)90019-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-476X(83)90019-X)
- Raney, G.E., Therriault, D.J., & Minkoff, S.R.B. (2000). Repetition effects from paraphrased text: Evidence for an integrated representation model of text representation. *Discourse Processes*, 29(1), 61–81. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326950dp2901_4
- Rapp, D.N., van den Broek, P., McMaster, K.L., Kendeou, P., & Espin, C.A. (2007). Higher-order comprehension processes in struggling readers: A perspective for research and

TAKE ACTION!

1. Review your literacy instruction to determine if you are unintentionally telegraphing messages to students about the value of repeated reading.
2. Invite students to reread texts with a new purpose during independent reading.
3. Return to the text often during shared readings and read-alouds.
4. Update close reading lessons to include intentional rereading of the text using text-dependent questions.

- intervention. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 11(4), 289–312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888430701530417>
- Rasinski, T. (2006). Reading fluency instruction: Moving beyond accuracy, automaticity, and prosody. *The Reading Teacher*, 59(7), 704–706. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RT.59.7.10>
- Samuels, S.J. (1979). The method of repeated readings. *The Reading Teacher*, 32(4), 403–408.
- Therrien, W.J. (2004). Fluency and comprehension gains as a result of repeated reading: A meta-analysis. *Remedial and Special Education*, 25(4), 252–261. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07419325040250040801>
- Zucker, T.A., Ward, A.E., & Justice, L.M. (2009). Print referencing during read-alouds: A technique for increasing emergent readers' print knowledge. *The Reading Teacher*, 63(1), 62–72. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RT.63.1.6>

LITERATURE CITED

- Berne, J. (2013). *On a beam of light: A story of Albert Einstein*. San Francisco, CA: Chronicle.
- Henkes, K. (2001). *Circle dogs*. New York, NY: Greenwillow.
- Palacio, R.J. (2012). *Wonder*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Raskin, E. (1997). *The Westing game*. New York, NY: Puffin.
- Riordan, R. (2006). *Percy Jackson and the Olympians: The lightning thief*. New York, NY: Puffin.
- Steptoe, J. (1987). *Mufaro's beautiful daughters: An African tale*. New York, NY: Lothrop, Lee & Shepard.

MORE TO EXPLORE

- Visit ReadWriteThink.org for the lesson “Let’s Read It Again: Comprehension Strategies for English-Language Learners” by Christine Kalemba. This lesson focuses on students in grades K–2 and shows how to engage students in repeated reading: <http://www.readwritethink.org/classroom-resources/lesson-plans/read-again-comprehension-strategies-1045.html>.
- ReadWriteThink.org also has a podcast series called Chatting About Books: Recommendations for Young Readers. Episode 14 has information for parents and educators about the value of repeated reading: <http://www.readwritethink.org/parent-afterschool-resources/podcast-episodes/benefits-repeated-readings-30261.html>.
- Summers, D. (2014, July 22). Let reluctant readers go to the dogs [Web log post]. Retrieved from <https://literacyworldwide.org/blog/literacy-daily/2014/07/22/let-reluctant-readers-go-to-the-dogs> (Take a look at this article about reading to dogs. Students often reread texts when they are reading to animals.)

HELP US SPREAD THE WORD ABOUT ILA!

It's easy!

Visit literacyworldwide.org/ilatoolkit to get everything you need to share information about ILA in person and with your social network.

Show your aspiring teachers, administrators, council members, fellow educators, friends, or community how ILA transforms lives through literacy.

INTERNATIONAL
LITERACY
ASSOCIATION

Spread the word about ILA and inspire others to join the movement.
Visit literacyworldwide.org/ilatoolkit today!