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Abstract

This research attempted to answer the question, how does listening while reading affect reading fluency with at-risk readers? The researcher collected data from four third grade students in an urban school to find out which of the three areas of fluency (accuracy, rate, prosody) would be affected by listening while reading. The researcher used Developmental Reading Assessments (DRA), running records, the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) Fluency Scale, timed readings, and teacher observations to collect data. The data was analyzed to find generalizations about the effectiveness of listening while reading on oral reading fluency.
Chapter 1

Introduction

Reading fluency is an essential element in becoming a proficient reader. In the third grade, students become increasingly aware of how to read with expression and recognize words automatically. When students are at risk of becoming proficient readers, various strategies can be used. Reissner (1996) explains that “listening to stories is a beneficial language acquisition strategy for children who are at-risk for reading failure” (p. 361). This study will examine the use of listening while reading using recorded stories.

During the 2005-2006 school year, the researcher taught in an urban elementary school while completing graduate coursework in childhood education. The strategies implemented in this study were used in addition to daily reading instruction.

Research Question

This study was designed to examine how listening while reading affects fluency with at risk third grade readers.

Limitations of the Study

Findings in this study are limited to four students in a third grade inclusion classroom in an urban school district in Western New York. Given the small number of participants in the study, data collected is not generalized to other third grade
classrooms. This study is also limited to one urban school. The results are more likely to be generalized if the data collected used a larger sample of students, in diverse settings, across urban and suburban schools for a longer period of time.

**Definitions**

**At-risk**

Students performing below grade level. In this study at-risk readers are reading below a 1.0 on the DRA.

**Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA)**

A tool that assesses fluency and comprehension using a running record, miscue analysis, and a rubric for story retelling.

**Fluency**

Reading skill that is made up of three parts: accuracy, rate, and prosody.

**Inclusion**

A classroom that has support services in the room. This is done so the child is not removed from the classroom to receive services. In this case, a special education teacher is in the classroom with the general education teacher at all times.

**Independent reading level**

Students read and comprehend a text independently with minimal frustration.
Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

Introduction

Reading fluency is an important part of the reading process. Unfortunately, it has been neglected as part of reading instruction. One reason for this lack of instruction is because fluency is often viewed as an outcome of skilled reading. Instead, it should be thought of as a contributing factor (Zutell & Rasinski, 2001).

Reading fluency is a multifaceted skill that requires tasks to be completed simultaneously. Words must be decoded from text and turned into sound. Words form sentences and meaning needs to be constructed from the text that is read. Another dimension can be added by reading expressively which also requires the reader to understand the words they are decoding (Reutzel & Hollingsworth, 1993; Griffith & Rasinski, 2004). One of the many strategies used to improve fluency is listening while reading (Oakley, 2005; Reissner, 1997; Lionetti & Cole, 2004; Sudzina & Foreman, 1990).

What is Fluency?

Fluency is comprised of three elements: accuracy, rate, and prosody (Hudson, Lane, & Pullen, 2005; Kuhn & Stahl, 2003; Oakley, 2005). Each element is important in creating a fluent reader. A reader needs to accurately decode words, read them at a fast enough rate in order to construct meaning, and read the text with appropriate expression. Essentially, each skill builds from the previous one.
Accuracy is used to describe the reader’s ability to decode words correctly. In order to read accurately, one must have the ability to blend sounds together and be familiar with many high frequency or sight words (Hudson, Lane, & Pullen, 2005). According to Fountas and Pinnell (2001), a text gradient can be used to determine what level book (A-Z) is appropriate for a specific grade level. Text difficulty is determined by vocabulary, sentence complexity, content, text structure, language and literacy features, themes and ideas, and print features. Levels can overlap between grade levels. For example, kindergarten level books range from A-C. First grade level books range from B-I, second grade H-M, third grade L-P. These leveled texts can be used as a guide for selecting books at a student’s independent and instructional reading level (students should be able to read with at least 90% accuracy rate).

Rate involves skills in automaticity and speed. Automaticity is quickly identifying words with little or no effort regardless of the words being in or out of context. Being able to automatically decode or recognize words allows the reader to shift his focus from decoding words to making meaning of sentences. Speed can be thought of in terms of how many words are read in a minute, or how long it takes to read a passage (Hudson, Lane, & Pullen, 2005). Students in grade two should be orally reading approximately 75-100 words per minute at their instructional level, grade three at 100-124, grade four at 115-140, grade five at 125-150, and grade six at 135-170 (Fountas & Pinnell, 2001).

Prosody makes oral reading sound like spoken language (Kuhn, 2004; Hudson, Lane, & Pullen, 2005) by using pitch or intonation, stress or loudness, and
appropriate phrasing. Readers also organize text into meaningful phrases that sound like spoken language when read orally.

The Importance of Fluency

Fluency is an important skill to master because it directly relates to comprehension. Ultimately, the goal of reading is to construct meaning from the text. As readers connect written and oral language and turn it into meaning, comprehension will increase (Therrien, 2004). However, in order to pull meaning out of text, fluent reading needs to occur. If a student has trouble reading fluently, they will find it difficult to reach their goal of constructing meaning (Griffith & Rasinski, 2004). Each aspect of fluency (accuracy, rate, and prosody) is critical and has a strong correlation to comprehension.

Accurate reading ensures that the correct meaning will develop. When errors are made and words are not read correctly, the meaning of the text will change. This will directly affect the meaning that is derived from the text. The more accurate a student reads, the fewer errors she will make. Errors would include omitting, substituting, and mispronouncing words. These errors may interfere with meaning. Miscues such as self correcting, repeating, hesitating may not interfere with meaning (Clay, 2000).

There is evidence that shows an increase in reading rate relates to higher levels of comprehension (Dowhower, 1987). If automaticity is not achieved, reading becomes slow and laborious. Too much effort is spent decoding words, which limits
cognitive resources that should be available for attaining meaning or comprehension (Hudson, Lane, & Pullen, 2005; Kuhn & Stahl, 2003). Oakley (2005) explains that “if a reader does not reach a fast enough pace, it is difficult to keep words or phrases in the short term memory long enough to string them together and make meaning” (p. 13). Automatic word recognition needs to develop through the reading of connected text. Identifying words in isolation does not ensure comprehension (Kuhn, 2004).

Prosody also provides a link between fluency and comprehension. It provides evidence of comprehension. In order to read expressively and accurately organize text into meaningful phrases, the reader must understand what is being read. Poor prosody would prove that the reader is unsure of how to appropriately group words and express them to generate meaning (Hudson, Lane, & Pullen, 2005; Kuhn & Stahl, 2003).

The Development of Reading Fluency

Reading and fluency development are best explained in terms of stages. Many models have evolved. However, there are two models that clearly define how reading and fluency develop. When looking at these models together, one can better understand the relationship between fluency and reading proficiency.

Chall (1996) developed a model for reading development that includes six stages: emergent literacy, conventional literacy, confirmation and fluency, reading for learning the new, multiple viewpoints, and construction and reconstruction.

Emergent literacy takes place before formal instruction begins. At this time, children
begin to understand that print represents language. They develop phonemic awareness and knowledge of how to handle books. Next, the conventional literacy stage is a period where formal instruction begins. Students focus on recognizing sound-symbol correspondences and establishing accuracy in decoding words. The next stage, confirmation and fluency, has an emphasis on shifting from learning to read, to reading to learn. During this time, students are not learning new skills, but are focusing on making reading automatic. Along with automaticity, readers develop prosodic features. Readers begin imitating conversational tones when reading. The final three stages of development occur after fluency has been achieved. Reading for learning the new represents a period when students begin to read a greater amount of expository text to learn content. After students build knowledge about a content area, they will encounter different sources of the same material. Here, students become critical thinkers as they evaluate these sources. Finally, students become critical readers by constructing their own views based on the different materials they read. This final stage is called construction and reconstruction.

Ehri (1995) created a model to explain the four phases of sight-word development: prealphabetic, partial alphabetic, full alphabetic, and consolidated alphabetic. These four phases correspond with Chall’s (1996) first three stages of reading development. The prealphabetic phase is similar to the emergent literacy stage. Letter-sound relationships are not yet established. Students may recognize words because of visual attributes. Pikulski and Chard (2005) explain that children may recognize the word monkey because of the tail at the end of the word. She may
also read other words such as my or pony as monkey for the same reason. The partial alphabetic phase also corresponds with Chall’s (1996) emergent literacy stage. During this second phase, there are connections made between some letters and sounds. In most cases, children will read the initial and final letters of a word. Sight word recognition begins but remains incomplete. Students are in the full alphabetic phase when they have developed a full understanding of the alphabetic system. This phase corresponds with Chall’s (1996) conventional literacy stage. Students achieve accuracy when recognizing sight words and use decoding skills to read unfamiliar words. Students are “sight word reading” rather than decoding letters (Beech, 2005). Finally, during the consolidated alphabetic phase, readers begin to notice letter patterns that occur throughout different words. This allows the reader to “reduce the memory load”. For example, when reading the word chest, the reader may break it up into ch-est rather than ch-e-s-t. This consolidation will allow for cognitive resources to be focused on other needs such as comprehension rather than decoding each letter. This final phase corresponds with Chall’s (1996) confirmation and fluency stage.

Since the transition between second and third grade is a critical point for readers to develop fluency, it is important to understand what students between the ages eight and ten are capable of understanding. According to Cruttenden (1984), prosodic development is limited at eight years old. Students process stress patterns poorly. Even at the ages of nine and ten, children are not able to understand some prosodic features at adult levels. According to Chafe (1988), punctuation does not fully dictate all prosodic features. There are more pauses in oral speech that are not
dictated by punctuation. The argument explains that “it is possible that prosody is an irrelevant feature of fluent reading fundamentally unrelated to reading skill at this age” (Schwanenflugel, et al, 2004, p. 120).

Figure 1

Chall’s Stages of Reading Development

- Emergent Literacy
  - Conventional Literacy
    - Confirmation and Fluency
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          - Construction and Reconstruction

Ehri’s Phases of Sight-Word Development

- Prealphabetic Stage
  - Partial Alphabetic Stage
    - Full Alphabetic Stage
      - Consolidated Alphabetic
Characteristics of Fluent and Non-Fluent Readers

Fluent readers are skilled in all three areas of fluency. They are able to read accurately at a conversational rate with appropriate prosody for long periods of time. These skills are not lost if the reader does not practice them (Hudson, Lane, & Pullen, 2005). Fluent readers have achieved automatic word recognition. They no longer need to use the majority of their efforts decoding words.

Fluent readers demonstrate they understand the text they read when there is appropriate use of prosody. Grouping text into meaningful phrases and using appropriate pitch and stress indicates this understanding (Kuhn & Stahl, 2003; Kuhn, 2004). The most important indicator is that the reader’s oral reading sounds like spoken language (Kuhn, 2004; Schwanenflugel, et al, 2004).

Non-fluent readers often read in a slow, laborious, monotone, word-by-word manner (Hudson, Lane, & Pullen, 2005; Kuhn & Stahl, 2003; Kuhn, 2004). This reading does not sound like spoken language. Since automaticity is not achieved, readers rely on other sources such as context to recognize words and comprehend the text (Kuhn & Stahl, 2003). Students who are not fluent readers are less likely to read for pleasure. This is not the same for fluent readers who have a positive outlook on reading and a positive concept of themselves as readers. Reading is a more enjoyable activity (Oakley, 2005).
How is Fluency Assessed?

In order to assess reading fluency, teachers need to observe and listen to students read aloud (Zutell & Rasinski, 1991). Since fluency is comprised of accuracy, rate, and prosody, there are various instruments used to measure each element in separation.

To assess accuracy, a running record and miscue analysis are useful tools. The running record was designed by Marie Clay (Clay, 2000). It gives detailed information about the reader’s behaviors and error patterns. When administering a running record, the teacher is listening to the student read a passage. During this time, the observer is recording any miscues made by the reader (repetition, omission, substitution, self correction, mispronunciation, and hesitation). An accuracy score is calculated by finding the ratio of errors to the total number of words in the passage. (Self corrections, repetitions and hesitations are miscues, not errors.) The ratio is then converted into a percent of accuracy. Running records can be helpful in finding out how students are gathering information and what texts are appropriate for them to read.

A miscue analysis “provides an in-depth analysis of a student’s reading behavior and text processing, yielding specific information about that student’s reading ability” (Fountas & Pinnell, 2001, p. 489). Here, the observer can analyze the errors made. Typically, three questions are asked when analyzing errors: “Did the meaning or the messages of the text influence the error? Did the structure (syntax) of the sentence up to the error influence the response? Did the visual information from
the print influence any part of the error?” (Clay, 2000, p. 21). By answering these questions, teachers can better understand the behaviors and determine instructional needs.

When assessing rate, it is most common to evaluate timed readings. Usually this is measured by how many correct words a student can read in one minute. When selecting material for a student to read there are a few things to consider. According to Samuels (1979) the passage should be at the reader’s independent reading level (passage that the student can read with at least 95% accuracy) and be a passage that the student has read before. In order to find the correct words per minute (CWPM), find the total number of words read in a minute, and subtract the number of errors made during that time.

“A student’s reading prosody can be measured only through observation of an oral reading of a connected text” (Hudson, Lane, & Pullen, 2005 p. 707). Various scales have developed in attempts to generate a quantifiable score for prosody. Zutell and Rasinski (1991) found that teachers often feel insecure in making subjective judgments when assessing fluency. Because evaluating prosody is very subjective, there are different scales to choose from that focus on different areas. The National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) Fluency Scale is a four point scale that focuses on the student’s “naturalness” of reading. This includes phrasing, adherence to syntax, and expressiveness. Zutell and Rasinski (1991) created a multidimensional fluency scale that breaks up fluency into three sections (phrasing, smoothness, and
pace). Each section is then rated on a four point scale. This scale embodies more than just prosody. It also evaluates reading speed without using a timed reading.

**Connection Between Listening and Reading Fluency**

Listening While Reading (LWR) is one of three methods derived from the Neurological Impress Method (NIM). NIM promotes fluency by allowing students and teachers to read aloud simultaneously. LWR is a strategy that encompasses the concept of NIM by encouraging students to read along with a person or audiotape of a speaker (Therrien, 2004).

“Children use several senses while listening to recorded books: listening (auditory), looking (visual), and following with a finger (tactile)” (Sudzina & Foreman, 1991, p. 8). Students who are global learners with strong tactile and kinesthetic tendencies may benefit most from LWR. Based on improvements in a comprehensive test of basic skills, these authors found that LWR improved vocabulary, comprehension, and oral reading skills. Oral reading skills were not described in terms of specific fluency skills.

Giving students the opportunity to preview a reading passage will increase their reading rate when they read the passage aloud. Both previewing by LWR and silent previewing will increase reading rate. However, LWR is more effective in increasing reading rate (Lionetti & Cole, 2004). In a similar study, Daly and Martens (1994) found that the largest gains in accuracy were a result of listening to an audiotape of a passage.
Lionetti and Cole (2004) took their findings a step further by researching the effects of two rates of LWR on fluency. The authors hypothesized that listening to a passage at a slower rate, similar to the reader's rate, would be more beneficial than listening to it at a rate faster than the reader's rate. Results did not support their hypothesis. Neither rate was more beneficial in increasing reading rate. However, both improved oral reading rates.

According to Mikkelsen (1981), optimal improvement occurs when students read a text at their frustration level while listening to a tape player. This is more beneficial than reading only with the teacher or reading an independent level text with a tape player.

Rasinski (1990) did not find noticeable differences between repeated reading and LWR in terms of improvement. Both strategies are effective. However, teachers may want to consider using LWR as a strategy to improve fluency because it is less labor intensive for teachers. Using tape recorded readings allows students to be more independent and interested in their reading. Reissner (1997) describes LWR as a "time efficient method to bring those at-risk to a comparable level as those who have been exposed to a print rich environment" (p. 298). Along with oral reading improvement, she also found that this method improved attitudes, motivation, and self confidence.
Conclusion

Listening plays an important role in the development and improvement of reading fluency. Listening to an appropriate model of fluent reading is necessary for students to become successful and fluent readers. Since fluency is a critical element in reading, it is important to provide useful tools and strategies to promote growth in this reading skill. The purpose of this research is to develop a better understanding of how LWR affects the different elements of fluency.
Chapter 3

Methodology

Introduction

This study was carried out in an urban elementary school (Grades K-5) located in Western New York. The researcher sought to determine what effects listening while reading had on reading fluency with at-risk third graders.

Subjects

This study was conducted in a third grade inclusion classroom in an urban elementary school in Western New York. Four subjects participated in this study. All four subjects were male. The ethnic makeup of the subject group was as follows: two African American, one Caucasian, one Hispanic. Three had Individualized Education Plans. Two received speech and language services and one received English as a Second Language (ESL) services. All four subjects received free or reduced lunch. They were selected based on their Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) score in September of 2005. Students receiving a score of 1.0 or below met criteria to participate in the study.

Three teachers worked in the classroom: the general education teacher, the special education teacher, and the researcher, who was an intern teacher (15 hours a week) while completing graduate coursework.
Research Design

The researcher collected data for thirteen weeks during the second half of the school year. Collection of data began after a human subjects proposal was submitted to and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at SUNY Brockport (Appendix A). The researcher collected the data in an attempt to examine the question: What effects does listening while reading have on reading fluency with at-risk third grade students?

Data Collection Instruments

Before subjects were chosen, unobtrusive data about independent reading levels were obtained. The Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) was given to every student in the classroom in September, 2005. Subjects receiving a score of 1.0 or below were chosen to participate in this study. The DRA was administered twice during the study: once before implementing the listening while reading strategy and once after thirteen weeks of regular use of this strategy in order to analyze student progress.

A letter of informed consent was read to the participants and sent to their parents to explain the purpose of the study (Appendix B). Parents and subjects were informed that there were no anticipated risks in participating and this activity would be done along with the regular reading routine.

Each subject participated in a listening while reading (LWR) activity once a week. Students listened to and read along with a story on tape. This was observed by
the researcher to be sure students followed along. After reading with the tape, each subject would read the book aloud to the researcher. During this time three pieces of data were collected. A running record (Appendix C) was completed to determine accuracy. The level of prosody used to read the story was determined using the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) prosody scale (Appendix D). The researcher also calculated the amount of correct words read in the first minute of reading the passage aloud. Accuracy, prosody, and correct words per minute were determined each week for 13 weeks for each participant. During the read alouds, the researcher also noted observed behaviors of each subject.

Triangulation of Data

The researcher used various data collection instruments in order to triangulate data to ensure reliable and valid research (Mills, 2003). The DRA, Running Record, NAEP Prosody Scale, and Correct Words per Minute assess different elements of fluency (accuracy, rate, prosody). The chart below shows how the data collection instruments assess different areas of fluency.

Figure 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DRA</th>
<th>Running Record</th>
<th>NAEP Prosody Scale</th>
<th>Correct Words per Minute</th>
<th>Field Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosody</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analysis

Data were analyzed by plotting DRA scores, accuracy scores, prosody level, and correct words per minute on a chart for each subject (Appendix E). The researcher looked for themes and patterns with each element of fluency. Generalizations were developed comparing listening while reading with accuracy, prosody and rate.

Conclusion

The generalizations developed in this study are limited to four students in a third grade inclusion class in an urban school. Data gathered from these four participants can be used to inform other teachers about the effectiveness of listening while reading on reading fluency with at risk third grade readers. However, data can not be generalized to other groups of third grade students in other school settings.
Chapter 4

Findings

Introduction

Does listening while reading improve oral reading fluency? If so, which areas does it improve? How does listening while reading affect fluency with at-risk third grade readers? The researcher examined the three areas of fluency (accuracy, prosody, and rate) and how each was affected by the LWR intervention. During the course of eight weeks, the researcher collected data using the DRA, running records, NAEP Prosody Scale, timed readings, and field notes. The data collected was then analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively for each student. Upon evaluation, the researcher made generalizations that are described below.

Generalizations

Generalization 1: Listening While Reading (LWR) improves oral reading accuracy.

Two sources were analyzed to determine how LWR affected accuracy. The researcher compared DRA scores from September, January, and May. The DRA given in May was administered by another teacher to ensure an unbiased score. The researcher also looked at progress throughout the eight weeks of the implemented activity.

In September, each student’s reading level was below a 1.0 according to the DRA. Before the intervention took place, another assessment was administered in
January. Two of the students showed slight growth raising scores from 0.3 to 0.6 and 0.6 to 0.8. The other two students tested below their score in September. After the intervention took place, the same assessment was given in May. The reading level for each child had at least doubled since January before the intervention began.

Classroom instruction can also be a contributing factor to the growth in these four students. However, the improvement between January and May is far greater than the improvement between September and January when there was no intervention. This generalization is illustrated below.

Graph 1
**Generalization 2:** Listening While Reading (LWR) seems to improve prosody with most students.

The affects of LWR on prosody was analyzed using the NAEP rubric when administering the DRA. A prosody score was not given on September’s DRA because it is not a part of the assessment. Therefore, scores are only compared between January and May.

In January, the students’ prosody levels ranged from one to three on the four point scale. After eight weeks of intervention, the levels ranged from one to three. Three of the four students improved the level of prosody used when reading orally on the DRA. Two of those students increased their prosody by one level. Not every student showed unusual growth with prosody like they did with accuracy. However, according to field notes, each subject seemed to better understand the use of expression after hearing the modeled version. This was demonstrated by students attempting to mimic the expression used in the recordings. This generalization is illustrated with graph 2.
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Generalization 3: Listening While Reading (LWR) does not seem to have an affect on reading rate.

Throughout the eight weeks of implementation, the researcher tracked the progress of reading rate. The affect of LWR on rate was analyzed by comparing the difficulty of the book and CWPM read by the student.

Each student experienced differences with their reading rate. One student showed continuous improvement with reading rate. One student showed a decrease in reading rate. Two students did not have any pattern develop. Since the data were inconsistent, it is not yet possible to determine if LWR directly affects reading rate. This generalization is illustrated with graphs 3 through 6.

Graph 3
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Generalization 4: Students enjoyed Listening While Reading (LWR).

Based on field notes and teacher observations, it could be concluded that the four students enjoyed participating in the listening while reading activities. When the researcher would call a student over to participate he would look excited or make a comment such as “yes, it’s my turn”. Some students made it very obvious that they looked forward to the activity and wanted to participate. If it was not a student’s turn to participate, he would usually come up to me and ask a question like “When will it be my turn, I want to read again.” Not only did these students enjoy listening while reading, they were excited to participate in the activity.
Chapter 5

Implications

Introduction

Over the course of eight weeks, the researched implemented listening while reading. According to the data, Listening While Reading (LWR) seems to improve accuracy and prosody with at-risk readers in this study. Students also proved to enjoy the activity.

Implications

• Providing at-risk students with a model of fluent reading allows them to create meaning from the text as they listen. In turn, these students will enjoy rereading.

• Listening while reading is an effective intervention when used with reading instruction.

• Teacher observations may not align with quantitative data. However, these evaluations are valuable. They can be used to guide classroom instruction.

• Providing students with a book on tape or CD is a time efficient method to give them a model of fluent reading. This will allow teachers to use their time for other instruction.

• Students looked forward to the LWR activities by indicating their desire listen to stories and read them aloud.
Suggestions for Further Studies

- To gain further knowledge of how Listening While Reading (LWR) affects reading fluency, the researcher might take a longer period of time to conduct more extensive research.

- The researcher might include more than four students in the study. The study could include at-risk readers in other third grade classes or grades. The study could also include students that are not at-risk.

- Data could be collected in different schools, suburban and urban, to represent a wider range of students.

- A wider variety of texts could be used during the intervention. Students could participate with more expository texts.

- The research could include baseline data for all areas of fluency in September, rather than just accuracy.
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Appendix A
To: Danielle Pietrantoni  
From: Colleen Donaldson, Institutional Review Board Administrator  
Date: February 24, 2006  
Ref: Project #: 2005-161

Project Title: Improving accuracy and fluency with struggling third grade readers

Your proposal, "Improving accuracy and fluency with struggling third grade readers" has been approved for one year from this date.

You must use only the approved consent form or informational letter and any applicable surveys or interview questions that have been approved by the IRB in conducting your project. If you desire to make any changes in these documents or the procedures that were approved by the IRB you must obtain approval from the IRB prior to implementing any changes.

If you wish to continue this project beyond one year, federal guidelines require IRB approval before the project can be approved for a second year. A reminder continuation letter will be sent to you in eleven months with the specific information that you will need to submit for continued approval of your project. Please note also that if the project initially required a full meeting of the IRB (Category III proposal) for the first review, then continuation of the project after one year will again require full IRB review.

Contact Colleen Donaldson, IRB Administrator, Office of Academic Affairs, at (585) 395-2523 or cdonalds@brockport.edu. Immediately if:

- the project changes substantially,
- a subject is injured,
- the level of risk increases
- changes are needed in your consent document, survey or interview questions or other related materials.

Best wishes in conducting your research.
Appendix B
Statement of Oral consent for students:

Student, for the next several weeks I will have some students listen to stories as they follow along in their book. This activity will be done along with our daily reading routine. The reason I am having some students practice this activity is because I am doing some research for college. I want to know what will help you become better readers. I want to see if listening to a story first, will help you read that story better. When you are listening to and reading the story I will be watching your behaviors. I will look to see how you follow along with your finger and if you are paying attention as you listen and read. I will give you a DRA test before you start this activity and again in several weeks to see if there is improvement. Is it okay with you that I use my notes about your listening and reading in my research?
Dear Parent or Guardian,

For the next several weeks, some students will have an opportunity to read books and listen to taped recordings of stories as they read along. This activity will be done along with our daily reading routine. As we work on reading skills, I will be watching for improvement. I would like to look at improvements made with the students' reading skills as part of my research for my masters program. I am a student at SUNY Brockport College in the Department of Education and Human Development. I need your permission to include your child's progress as part of my evaluation of this activity. No child's name will be used, and there are no anticipated risks involved in participating. Please sign the bottom portion of this form and return it to school with your child if you agree to let me use the results of your child's work in my research. I appreciate your support. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at

Sincerely,

Miss Pietrantoni

I have read this letter and agree to let my child's work be used for Miss Pietrantoni's research on reading while listening to taped recordings of stories.

Parent/Guardian Signature

Date

FEB 24 2006
Appendix C
I Like Cheese
By: Robin Pickering

I like cheese. Do you like cheese?

There are many different kinds of cheese.

1. I like yellow cheese. This cheese is chewy.
2. I eat the cheese on bread.

I like gooey cheese. It's fun to eat!

2. I like chunks of white cheese.

1. I put the cheese on salad.

1. This cheese looks like powder.

2. I shake it on pizza.

I like cheese with holes.

1. The holes are called eyes.

1. My mom likes stinky, yucky cheese.

1. I think it smells like dirty socks!

I like melted cheese. It's very hot.

1. I like to dip chips into the cheese.

Which kind of cheese do you like to eat?
Appendix D
| Level 4 | Reads primarily in large, meaningful phrase groups. Although some regressions, repetitions, and deviations from text may be present, these do not appear to detract from the overall structure of the story. Preservation of the author's syntax is consistent. Some or most of the story is read with expressive interpretation. |
| Level 3 | Reads primarily in three- or four-word phrase groups. Some smaller groupings may be present. However, the majority of phrasing seems appropriate and preserves the syntax of the author. Little or no expressive interpretation is present. |
| Level 2 | Reads primarily in two-word phrases with some three- or four-word groupings. Some word-by-word reading may be present. Word groupings may seem awkward and unrelated to larger context of sentence or passage. |
| Level 1 | Reads primarily word by word. Occasional two-word or three-word phrases may occur—but these are infrequent and/or they do not preserve meaningful syntax. |

Figure 28-4. NAEP's Scale for Assessing Oral Reading Fluency

Appendix E
NAEP's Integrated Reading Performance Record  Oral Reading Fluency Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Reads in large, meaningful phrase groups. Although some regressions, repetitions, and deviations from text may be present, these do not appear to detract from the overall structure of the story. Preservation of the author's syntax is consistent. Some or most of the story is read with expressive interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Reads primarily in three- or four- word phrase groups. Some smaller groupings may be present. However, the majority of phrasing seems appropriate and preserves the syntax of the author. Little or no expressive interpretation is present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Reads primarily in two- word phrases with some three- or four- word groupings. Some word-by-word reading may be present. Word groupings may seem awkward and unrelated to larger context of sentence or passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Reads primarily word by word. Occasional two- word or three- word phrases may occur-but these are infrequent and/or they do not preserve meaningful syntax.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>