



Read Naturally[®]
& Rationale
& Research



Read Naturally, Inc.
Saint Paul, Minnesota

Phone: 800.788.4085/651.452.4085

Website: www.readnaturally.com

E-mail: info@readnaturally.com

Table of Contents

Read Naturally Rationale.....	3
Struggling Readers Often Have Fluency Problems	3
Struggling Readers Do Not Read Enough	3
What Struggling Readers Need to Become Fluent	3
Who Needs Fluency Training?	4
Tools for Comparison: Oral Reading Fluency Norms.....	4
Read Naturally Steps	6
Select a Story	6
Key Words	6
Prediction.....	6
Cold Timing	6
Graph the Cold Timing Score.....	6
Read Along	7
Practice.....	7
Answer the Quiz Questions.....	7
Pass	7
Graph the Hot Timing Score	7
Retell.....	8
Word List.....	8
Select a Story	8
Control Group Studies	9
Case 1: Original Study, Minneapolis, Minn.	10
Case 2: University of Minnesota Study, Minneapolis, Minn.	11
Case 3: Third-Grade Students, Minneapolis, Minn.	13
Case 4: Special Education Students, Huron County, Mich.	16
Case 5: First-Grade Students, South Forsyth County, Ga.....	18
Case 6: Two-School Study, Minneapolis, Minn.....	20
Case 7: Four-School Study, Minneapolis, Minn.	22
Case 8: Third Graders, Southern California	25
Case 9: Second-Grade Students, Elk River, Minn.	27
Other Benefits of the Read Naturally Strategy	28
Bibliography.....	29

Read Naturally Rationale

The Read Naturally® program provides a method to improve reading fluency. Most struggling readers have fluency problems and spend little time reading. The Read Naturally program combines three powerful strategies for improving fluency: teacher modeling, repeated reading, and progress monitoring.

Struggling Readers Often Have Fluency Problems

Picture in your mind one of your struggling readers. Turn on the audio portion of your brain and listen to that student read. You would probably describe that student's reading as word-by-word, halting, slow, and laborious. Students with these characteristics associated with their reading have a fluency problem. Educators often describe reading problems in terms of fluency, indicating that teachers know fluency is an important component of good reading. Research demonstrates a strong correlation between fluency and reading comprehension (Armstrong, 1983; Breznitz, 1987; Knupp, 1988; Lesgold, 1985). Consequently, teachers need to develop the fluency of their students.

Struggling Readers Do Not Read Enough

Students become fluent readers by reading (Allington, 1983). Yet in our elementary schools, students read an average of only seven to eight minutes a day (U.S. Department of Education). Struggling readers read even less—hardly enough time to become proficient at something as difficult as learning to read. Struggling readers cannot or will not independently read the books in classroom libraries. When asked to read quietly, they sometimes pretend to read. Often these students cannot read the basals and anthologies in use in their classroom. Also, poor fluency is a self-perpetuating problem. Struggling readers read so few words during their instructional and independent reading time that the gap between them and their peers continually widens.

What Struggling Readers Need to Become Fluent

Struggling readers need a safe, structured, and highly motivating opportunity to engage in reading on a daily basis. Research supports teacher modeling, repeated reading, and progress monitoring as ways to involve struggling readers in the act of reading in order to improve their fluency and accelerate their reading achievement.

Teacher modeling improves the reading fluency of students (Eldredge & Quinn, 1988; Heckelman, 1969; McAllister, 1989; Reitsma, 1988).


Teacher modeling consists of a proficient reader modeling good, correct reading for a less able reader. Examples of this strategy are dyad reading, echoic reading, NIM (neurological impress method), and choral reading.

Repeated reading also improves fluency (Dowhower, 1987; Knupp, 1988; Koskinen & Blum, 1984; Larking, 1988; O’Shea, Sindelar, & O’Shea, 1985; Rashotte & Torgeson, 1985; Richek & McTague, 1988). With this strategy, the student reads a story of 100 to 200 words many times until able to read it fluently.

Finally, **daily monitoring of student progress** improves student achievement (Schunk, 1982). The student becomes more involved in the learning process, and the teacher remains aware of each student’s progress.

Combining teacher modeling, repeated reading, and progress monitoring creates a powerful tool to improve the reading fluency of struggling readers (figure 1).

Figure 1.
Combining Three
Powerful Strategies for
Improving Fluency



Who Needs Fluency Training?

Students who read slowly and laboriously need to improve their fluency. If a student’s average words-correct-per-minute score from two or three unpracticed readings of grade-level material places the student significantly below the 50th percentile of fluency norms, you should add a fluency-building program to his or her regular instructional program. You can use the table on the next page (figure 2) to determine which students need to work on fluency.

Tools for Comparison: Oral Reading Fluency Norms

Dr. Jan Hasbrouck and Dr. Gerald Tindal published the results of an extensive study of oral reading fluency in 2005. The results of their study are published in a technical report entitled “Oral Reading Fluency: 90 Years of Measurement,” which is available on the University of Oregon’s website, www.brtpjects.org/tech_reports.php.

The table below (figure 2) provides the oral reading fluency rates for students in grades 1 through 8 as determined by the data. You can use this information to draw conclusions and make decisions about the oral reading fluency of your students. Students scoring significantly below the 50th percentile using the average score from two or three unpracticed readings from grade-level materials need a fluency-building program.

Figure 2.
Hasbrouck-Tindal Oral
Reading Fluency Norms
(2005)

Grade	Percentile	Fall WCPM*	Winter WCPM*	Spring WCPM*	AWI** (words growth per week)
1	90		81	111	1.9
	75		47	82	2.2
	50		23	53	1.9
	25		12	28	1.0
	10		6	15	0.6
2	90	106	125	142	1.1
	75	79	100	117	1.2
	50	51	72	89	1.2
	25	25	42	61	1.1
	10	11	18	31	0.6
3	90	128	146	162	1.1
	75	99	120	137	1.2
	50	71	92	107	1.1
	25	44	62	78	1.1
	10	21	36	48	0.8
4	90	145	166	180	1.1
	75	119	139	152	1.0
	50	94	112	123	0.9
	25	68	87	98	0.9
	10	45	61	72	0.8
5	90	166	182	194	0.9
	75	139	156	168	0.9
	50	110	127	139	0.9
	25	85	99	109	0.8
	10	61	74	83	0.7
6	90	177	195	204	0.8
	75	153	167	177	0.8
	50	127	140	150	0.7
	25	98	111	122	0.8
	10	68	82	93	0.8
7	90	180	192	202	0.7
	75	156	165	177	0.7
	50	128	136	150	0.7
	25	102	109	123	0.7
	10	79	88	98	0.6
8	90	185	199	199	0.4
	75	161	173	177	0.5
	50	133	146	151	0.6
	25	106	115	124	0.6
	10	77	84	97	0.6

*WCPM = words correct per minute

**AWI = average weekly improvement

AWI is the average words per week growth you can expect from a student. It was calculated by subtracting the fall score from the spring score and dividing the difference by 32, the typical number of weeks between the fall and spring assessments.

Because there is no fall assessment in grade 1, the AWI for grade 1 was calculated by subtracting the winter score from the spring score and dividing the difference by 16, the typical number of weeks between the winter and spring assessments.

Read Naturally Steps

Select a Story

The student selects a story at the assigned reading level.

Most Read Naturally® levels include 24 high-interest, nonfiction stories. Selecting the correct Read Naturally level for each student ensures that each student can work with material that is appropriate for his or her reading ability. Letting students select which stories to read puts them in charge of their learning. Since the stories are all at the same reading level, the order in which the students complete the stories is unimportant.

Key Words

The student reads the key words and their definitions, tracking and subvocalizing with the recording.

This is a vocabulary step that teaches students some of the important words that are used in the story. They learn how to pronounce the words and what they mean.

Prediction

The student writes a sentence using the title, picture, and key words to predict what the story will say about the topic.

This activity prepares the students to read the story by thinking briefly about the topic before beginning to read. They should spend only a minute or two on this activity.

Cold Timing

The student times him- or herself for one minute, orally reading the selected story for the first time and marking unknown words.

This step establishes a baseline for measuring the student's improvement. Marking unknown words makes the student aware of words and phrases to pay particular attention to during the read along step.

Graph the Cold-Timing Score

The student or computer graphs the number of words read correctly in the one-minute timing.

Cold-timing scores are typically marked in blue, and hot-timing scores are typically marked in red. Using a consistent color for the cold- and hot-timing scores helps students and teachers to quickly see the line of progress on a graph.

Read Along

The student reads along while listening to a recording of the story, usually three times. The students should quietly subvocalize as they read.

This is the teacher modeling step, which helps students build word recognition and accuracy and encourages proper pronunciation, expression, and phrasing. The Read Naturally stories are read at a pace that allows students to actually read along.

Practice

The student practices reading the story without audio support several times until able to read at the predetermined goal rate. Students time each practice.

The practice step is the fluency-building step. Reading the passage over and over allows the student to master the story. Timing each practice keeps the student motivated.

Answer the Quiz Questions

The student answers questions about the story—five questions in Sequenced levels 1.0 through 5.0 and nine questions in Sequenced levels 5.6 through 8.0.

Answering questions encourages students to read for comprehension and helps ensure that they understand what they read. Because most of the questions in each series follow a particular pattern, over time teachers can see which types of questions are difficult for the student.

Pass

The teacher times the student reading the story for one minute, counting errors. To pass, the student must read the story at the goal rate, make three or fewer errors, read with good expression, and answer all of the questions correctly.

Graph the Hot-Timing Score

The student or computer graphs the number of words read correctly in the one-minute pass timing.

The hot-timing score is marked as a red bar above the blue bar for the cold-timing score. Seeing their progress motivates students to continue improving and increases their self-esteem.

Retell

The student writes a retell by writing a specific number of ideas learned from a story, writing for a specific amount of time, or writing a summary.

This is another way to encourage students to think about the ideas in the story, not just the words. If you allow students a specific amount of time to write retells, you can have them graph how many words they wrote during the allotted time to show their progress.

Word List

In the Phonics Series, the student practices the word list until he or she can read a predetermined number of words in one minute. The student then tries to pass the word list by reading it for his or her teacher.

Select a Story

The student selects a new story and completes the steps again.

Note: The Read Naturally steps differ slightly when using Read Naturally Software Edition (SE). For example, students do not need to color in their own graphs, since the program does the graphing for them.

After the student completes 12 stories in a level, the teacher and student decide whether the student should continue in the same level with the same goal, adjust the reading-rate goal, or move to more difficult reading material.

Control Group Studies

Students from diverse backgrounds and from many different geographic areas have made significant improvements in reading fluency and in comprehension scores. This section describes some of the control group studies that provide evidence of Read Naturally®'s effectiveness.

The following control group studies are included in this section:

- **Case 1: Original Study, Minneapolis, Minn.**
The original study that launched the Read Naturally strategy.
- **Case 2: University of Minnesota Study, Minneapolis, Minn.**
A 10-week study of low-performing third graders, conducted by researchers at the University of Minnesota.
- **Case 3: Third-Grade Students, Minneapolis, Minn.**
A nine-month study comparing demographically matched third graders where one group received Read Naturally instruction and one group did not.
- **Case 4: Special Education Students, Huron County, Mich.**
A study comparing special education students receiving Read Naturally instruction with other special education students and with general education students.
- **Case 5: First-Grade Students, South Forsyth County, Ga.**
A three-week study comparing first graders using Read Naturally Software Edition (SE) with a control group.
- **Case 6: Two-School Study, Minneapolis, Minn.**
A year-long study comparing demographically matched students in two schools, where one group received Read Naturally instruction and one group did not.
- **Case 7: Four-School Study, Minneapolis, Minn.**
A year-long study comparing demographically matched students in four schools, where one group received Read Naturally instruction and one group did not.
- **Case 8: Third-Grade Students, Southern California**
A 10-week study comparing six third graders who received intervention instruction using Read Naturally SE with six matched students who did not.
- **Case 9: Second-Grade Students, Elk River, Minn.**
A 12-week study comparing students who received Read Naturally instruction with a control group.

**Case 1:
Original Study,
Minneapolis, Minn.**

During the 1989–1990 school year, Candyce Ihnot combined teacher modeling, repeated reading, and progress monitoring into the Read Naturally strategy in a third-grade classroom at a large Minneapolis public school. The classroom consisted of seven third-grade special education students and 18 Title I students. Because the school used a collaborative model for delivering instruction to students with special needs, a classroom teacher, a special education teacher, and a Title I teacher (Candyce Ihnot) worked together to provide instruction to the students.

During her time with the seven special education students, Candyce used the Read Naturally strategy to supplement instruction in the basal. During her time with the Title I students, Candyce provided instruction in phonics to supplement instruction in the basal. At the end of seven weeks the special education students (using the Read Naturally strategy) improved their reading fluency by an average of 2.35 words per week. The Title I students made an average gain of 1.23 words per week.

After seeing the results from the previous seven weeks, Candyce then used the Read Naturally strategy with the Title I students over 13 weeks. During the 13 weeks, these students gained an average of 2.15 words per week. The instruction they received from the classroom teacher and the special education teacher remained constant between the two periods.

Figure 3.
Average Gains in Fluency for
Special Education and Title I
Students

		Special Education with Read Naturally	Title I
October	Mean	34.0	50.2
	Standard Deviation	8.7	11.9
November	Mean	50.7	58.7
	Standard Deviation	9.0	13.2
March	Mean	-	86.7
	Standard Deviation	-	16.2
Average Weekly Gain	Over 7 Weeks	2.35	1.23*
	Over 13 Weeks	-	2.15**

*Without Read Naturally

**With Read Naturally

**Case 2:
University of
Minnesota Study,
Minneapolis, Minn.**

A study by researchers at the University of Minnesota found that students using Read Naturally SE had 39 percent greater gains in fluency than students in a control group. The study was lead by Theodore Christ, Ph.D., an associate professor in the University’s Department of Educational Psychology. Read Naturally SE is a computer-based intervention designed to improve reading accuracy and fluency.


The study was a randomized control trial that was conducted in late 2008 and early 2009 across six schools with 109 low-performing students in third grade. Those students assigned to the Read Naturally group received intervention instruction for 30 minutes per day, five days a week, for 10 weeks. Students in the control group received normal classroom reading instruction with no supplemental fluency instruction.

Multiple standardized measures of reading accuracy and fluency indicated that students in the Read Naturally group outperformed students in the control group on all measures of accuracy and fluency.

The study examined the students’ fluency gains using results from Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) assessments. The Read Naturally students gained, on average, 1.53 words correct per minute (WCPM) per week compared to 1.10 WCPM per week for students in the control group—39 percent greater gains for students in the Read Naturally group.

Figure 4 illustrates that the DIBELS average for the Read Naturally group was below that of the control group at pre-test, and after 10 weeks of intervention, the Read Naturally students outperformed those in the control group.

Figure 4.
Chart Comparing Average
DIBELS Scores Over the
Course of the 10-Week
Study



Students in the Read Naturally group gained, on average, .40 WCPM more than students in the control group. The magnitude of improvement should be compared to typical growth and expected levels of achievement among third-grade students. Published estimates of typical growth in third grade approximate 1.2 WCPM among students in general education and .58 WCPM among students in special education. Students are expected to exceed 100 WCPM by the end of the third grade if they are to be successful on large-scale, state-wide assessments. A sustained additional improvement of .40 WCPM across the academic year is substantial. Assuming a typical growth rate of approximately 1.20 WCPM per week, a 39 percent improvement would result in improved growth to 1.68 WCPM per week, which is a cumulative gain of 14.4 more words read correct across 36 weeks.

These results were not specific to DIBELS measures. After accounting for pre-test levels of performance, the students in the Read Naturally group scored one to two standard score units better on most standardized measures of fluency and accuracy after 10 weeks of intervention. If extrapolated across the school year, those gains would translate to approximately three to seven standard score units of improved performance for those students within the Read Naturally group compared to the control group. Such improvements would be substantial.

The observed gains for the experimental group were obtained with minimal resources. Teacher and personnel time is one of the most valuable resources in schools. The Read Naturally intervention was implemented with minimal support. Teachers received the recommended training in the Read Naturally strategy and completed the Read Naturally SE Self-Study course to supplement them in the software implementation. Individual teachers were able to supervise their groups of students while the students received individualized instruction from Read Naturally SE.

The complete results for this study are available on the Read Naturally website: www.readnaturally.com/pdf/UofMnReadNaturallyStudy.pdf

**Case 3:
Third-Grade
Students,
Minneapolis, Minn.**

A study of third-grade students in the Minneapolis Public Schools showed that students using Read Naturally had greater reading gains than comparable students who did not use Read Naturally. The study was based on data collected during the 2003–2004 school year. Throughout the school year, one group of students used Read Naturally Masters Edition (ME) and Read Naturally SE, while one group did not.

A total of 44 third-graders from three Minneapolis schools were included in the study. Each Read Naturally student was matched with a student who was not in a Read Naturally program but had comparable baseline test scores and demographics. The demographic criteria were grade, English language learner status, special education status, free or reduced price lunch status, racial/ethnic category, home language, and gender.

The students were evaluated using three assessments—the Northwest Achievement Levels Test (NALT), the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (MCA), and Read Naturally’s *Reading Fluency Monitor*.^{*} The test results are shown in figures 5 through 8. The NALT and RFM results are deemed to be statistically significant, but the MCA results are not, due to the small sample size.


Figure 5.
Average Scores on Three
Reading Assessments

		Control Group	Read Naturally
Northwest Achievement Levels Test	Baseline (Spring 2003)	178.5	178.4
	Final (Spring 2004)	187.7	192.3
	Increase	9.2	13.9
Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments		1331.4	1363.2
Reading Fluency Monitor Assessments	Fall 2003	49.3	48.7
	Winter 2004	64.5	71.5
	Spring 2004	76.3	85.1
	Increase	27.0	36.4

^{*}*Reading Fluency Monitor* has been replaced by Reading Fluency Benchmark Assessor.


A comparison of the students' NALT pre-test scores with their final test scores in Spring 2004 showed that, on average, the Read Naturally students had gains of 13.9 points compared to gains of only 9.2 by students not in a Read Naturally program (see figure 6).

Figure 6.
Average Scores on the
Northwest Achievement
Levels Test




A comparison of 22 matched pairs of students with MCA scores in grade 3 showed that students in the Read Naturally program scored higher than the control group. Specifically, the average score for the Read Naturally students was 1363.2 compared to an average score of 1331.4 for the control group (see figure 7).

Figure 7.
Average Scores
on the Minnesota
Comprehensive Assessments



A comparison of the *Reading Fluency Monitor* scores for 20 third-grade students receiving Read Naturally instruction were compared with 20 matched students from RFM third-grade growth norms. The results showed that the Read Naturally students increased their scores on benchmark passages by an average of 36.4 points compared to an average increase of 27.0 points for the control group (see figure 8).

Figure 8.
Average Reading Fluency
Monitor Scores



**Case 4:
Special Education
Students, Huron
County, Mich.**

Students' assessments in Huron County, Michigan, showed a substantial discrepancy in oral reading fluency between general education students and special education students (see figure 9). To try to narrow this gap, the Huron Intermediate School District implemented the Read Naturally program targeted at special education students.

School psychologists Gloria Johnson and Jim Weaver collected and analyzed data to compare the test results of special education students who received Read Naturally instruction with the test results of special education students without Read Naturally instruction and with general education students.

As indicated by the slope of the Read Naturally graph lines (in blue) in figure 9 and the data in the table in figure 10, the special education students who received Read Naturally instruction had greater gains in fluency than the special education students without Read Naturally instruction.

Figure 9.
Comparison of Grade-Level
Reading Performance (in
Words Correct Per Minute)




Figure 10.
Gains in Fluency (in Words Correct Per Minute)

	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8
Special Ed. Without Read Naturally	2.61	17.62	16.69	20.12	1.79	2.11
Special Ed. With Read Naturally	19.83	19.1	17.63	20.95	18.13	15.8

The school district used reading mazes to evaluate comprehension. In the timed reading maze task, the student is given a grade-level paragraph in which every seventh word is deleted. The student is presented with three choices and is asked to select the best word to fill in the blank, based on the context of the story. The results from the reading mazes indicated that special education students receiving Read Naturally instruction had greater gains in comprehension than the general education students (see figure 11).

Figure 11.
Gains in Comprehension Based on Reading Maze Results

	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8
General Education	6	4	4	4	0	2
Special Ed. With Read Naturally	7.2	5.7	6.2	3.5	3.4	3.0

**Case 5:
First-Grade Students,
South Forsyth County,
Ga.**

A study in South Forsyth County, Georgia, by Christy Mesa of Piedmont College showed that first graders using Read Naturally SE improved significantly more than their fellow students who did not use the program.

Read Naturally SE had been a successful reading component in the third through fifth grades at the school. As a result, a study was designed to see if this program could be implemented successfully at the first grade level.

The subjects for the study were 12 students in a first grade class at Cumming Elementary School. Six of the students used Read Naturally SE for 45 minutes a day, four days a week. Another six students (the control group) remained in the classroom and continued normal reading activities.

Mesa first established a baseline for the students by using their STAR, Comprehension Reading Test (CRT), and Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) test scores. After three weeks in their respective reading programs, the students were then re-tested using the same tests.

The results indicated that the Read Naturally group increased their fluency and comprehension scores considerably more than the control group (see figures 12 through 15).

Figure 12.
Average Scores on Three
Reading Tests

		Control Group	Read Naturally
STAR Test	Baseline (10/20/03)	.77	.77
	Final (11/18/03)	1.02	1.22
	Increase	.25	.45
Comprehension Reading Test	Baseline (10/20/03)	3.67	4.33
	Final (11/18/03)	4.33	6.00
	Increase	.67	1.67
Oral Reading Fluency Test	Baseline (10/20/03)	52.2	55.2
	Final (11/18/03)	74.3	83.0
	Increase	22.2	27.8

Figure 13.
Average Scores on the STAR
Test




Figure 14.
Average Scores on the
Comprehension Reading Test





Figure 15.
Average Scores on the Oral
Reading Fluency Test



**Case 6:
Two-School Study,
Minneapolis, Minn.**

A study of students in two Minneapolis schools showed that students using Read Naturally had greater reading gains than comparable students who did not use Read Naturally. The study was based on data collected in Spring 2003 through Spring 2004. Throughout the 2003–2004 school year, one group of students used Read Naturally ME and SE, while one group did not.

A total of 102 students from two Minneapolis schools were included in the study. Each Read Naturally student was matched with a student who was not in a Read Naturally program but had comparable baseline test scores and demographics. The demographic criteria were grade, English language learner status, special education status, free or reduced price lunch status, racial/ethnic category, home language, and gender.


The students were evaluated using three assessments—the Northwest Achievement Levels Test (NALT), the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (MCA), and Read Naturally’s *Reading Fluency Monitor*. The test results are shown in figures 16 through 19.

Figure 16.
Average Scores on Three
Reading Assessments

		Control Group	Read Naturally
Northwest Achievement Levels Test	Baseline (Spring 2003)	187.2	187.3
	Final (Spring 2004)	193.4	195.8
	Increase	6.2	8.5
Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments		1327.6	1380.9
Reading Fluency Monitor Assessments	Fall 2003	68.1	67.7
	Winter 2004	76.4	89.2
	Spring 2004	87.8	100.0
	Increase	19.7	32.3


A comparison of the students' NALT pre-test scores in Spring 2003 with their test scores in Spring 2004 showed that, on average, the Read Naturally students had gains of 8.5 points compared to gains of only 6.2 by students not in a Read Naturally program (see figure 17). This represents approximately one-third of a year of additional reading growth for the Read Naturally students.

Figure 17.
Average Scores on the
Northwest Achievement
Levels Test




A comparison of 44 matched pairs of students with MCA scores in grades 3 and 5 showed that students in the Read Naturally program scored significantly higher than the control group. Specifically, the average score for the Read Naturally students was 1380.9 compared to an average score of 1327.6 for the control group (see figure 18).

Figure 18.
Average Scores
on the Minnesota
Comprehensive Assessments



A comparison of the *Reading Fluency Monitor* scores for 48 matched pairs of students from both schools (grades 3, 4, and 5) showed that the Read Naturally students increased their scores on benchmark passages by an average of 27.5 points compared to an average increase of 23.2 points for the control group (see figure 19).

Figure 19.
Average Reading Fluency
Monitor Scores



Case 7: Four-School Study, Minneapolis, Minn.

A study of four Minneapolis schools showed that students in Read Naturally programs had significantly greater reading gains than their peers who did not use Read Naturally. The study was based on data collected in Spring 2003 through Spring 2004. Throughout the 2003–2004 school year, one group of students used Read Naturally ME and SE, while one group did not.

A total of 156 students from four Minneapolis schools were included in the study. Each Read Naturally student was matched with a student who was not in a Read Naturally program but had comparable baseline test scores and demographics. The demographic criteria were grade, English language learner status, special education status, free or reduced price lunch status, racial/ethnic category, home language, and gender.


The students were evaluated using three assessments—the Northwest Achievement Levels Test (NALT), the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments (MCA), and Read Naturally’s *Reading Fluency Monitor*. The test results are shown in figures 20 through 23.

Figure 20.
Average Scores on Three
Reading Assessments

		Control Group	Read Naturally
Northwest Achievement Levels Test	Baseline (Spring 2003)	184.6	184.6
	Final (Spring 2004)	192.9	195.4
	Increase	8.3	10.8
Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments		1307.3	1366.4
Reading Fluency Monitor Assessments	Fall 2003	63.7	63.1
	Winter 2004	73.9	82.0
	Spring 2004	86.9	90.6
	Increase	23.2	27.5


A comparison of the students' NALT pre-test scores in Spring 2003 with their test scores in Spring 2004 showed that, on average, the Read Naturally students had gains of 10.8 compared to gains of only 8.3 by students not in a Read Naturally program (see figure 21).

Figure 21.
Average Scores on the
Northwest Achievement
Levels Test




A comparison of 44 matched pairs of students with MCA scores in grades 3 and 5 showed that students in the Read Naturally program had an average score of 1366.4 compared to an average score of 1307.3 for the control group (see figure 22).

Figure 22.
Average Scores
on the Minnesota
Comprehensive Assessments



A comparison of the *Reading Fluency Monitor* scores for 78 matched pairs of students from all four schools (grades 3, 4, and 5) showed that the Read Naturally students increased their scores on benchmark passages by an average of 27.5 points compared to an average increase of 23.2 points for the control group (see figure 23).

Figure 23.
Average Reading Fluency
Monitor Scores



**Case 8:
Third Graders,
Southern California**

A study by Stacy Wright, a Masters in Education student at California State University San Marcos, found that students using Read Naturally SE had greater gains in fluency and comprehension than students who did not receive intervention instruction.

The study involved 12 third-grade students in southern California who were identified by their teachers as “at risk.” The students were paired up based on similarities in their learning and academic profiles. One student from each pair was randomly assigned to an experimental group, and the other student was assigned to a control group.

All students were given a pretest to determine their baseline reading fluency and comprehension levels.

The students in the experimental group used Read Naturally SE for 30 minutes a day, three times a week, for 10 weeks. The students in the control group remained in the general education classroom and did not receive any reading intervention instruction.


After 10 weeks, all of the students were given a posttest to determine their growth in reading fluency and comprehension. The results are summarized in figures 24 through 26.

Figure 24.
Average Scores on Three
Reading Assessments

		Control Group	Read Naturally
Oral Reading Fluency <i>Words Read Per Minute</i>	Pretest	117	106
	Posttest	118	128
	Increase	1	22
Comprehension <i>Percentage of Comprehension Questions Answered Correctly</i>	Pretest	62%	63%
	Posttest	62%	68%
	Increase	0%	5%


A comparison of the students' pretest and posttest scores for oral reading fluency showed that, on average, the Read Naturally students had gains of 22 words per minute compared to average gains of only one word per minute by students in the control group (see figure 25).

Figure 25.
Average Oral Reading
Fluency Scores



A comparison of the students' pretest and posttest scores for comprehension showed that, on average, the Read Naturally students had gains of five percent in the number of comprehension questions answered correctly compared to no gain by students in the control group (see figure 26).

Figure 26.
Average Comprehension
Scores



**Case 9:
Second-Grade
Students, Elk
River, Minn.**

For 12 weeks in 1997, 24 second-grade students at Lincoln Elementary School in Elk River, Minnesota, spent 30 minutes a day using Read Naturally. One or two adults worked with these students in groups of six. At the end of the 12 weeks, these students increased their reading fluency by an average of 92 percent. A control group of 10 students (who did not use Read Naturally) made an average gain of 38 percent in reading fluency over the same 12 weeks (see figures 27 through 29).

Figure 27.
Average Fluency Scores in
Words Per Minute

	Control Group	Read Naturally
3/11/97	75.60	49.08
4/22/97	94.40	85.29
5/30/97	104.50	94.25
Average Point Gain	28.60	45.17

Figure 28.
Growth in Fluency Over a
12-Week Period





Figure 29.
Comparison of Average
Point Gains



Other Benefits of the Read Naturally Strategy

As demonstrated in these case studies, the Read Naturally® strategy results in significant improvement in the reading fluency of students. But teachers have also noted other benefits of the strategy.

Students work independently. The structure of the Read Naturally strategy allows students to work independently most of the time. Students' time on task is very high, and they spend most of the instructional time engaged in the act of reading. As a result, teachers can give their time to more students, students of different levels can participate in the program at the same time, and, perhaps most importantly, students feel responsible for their own success.

Students take charge of their own reading growth. Many students enjoy the opportunity to select their own reading material. They enjoy reading the interesting stories, learning to read them with ease, and watching their progress on the graphs.

Getting feedback motivates students. The students often tell teachers directly that the immediate and frequent feedback the strategy provides is very valuable. This immediate feedback encourages students to beat their previous scores, and, as a result, many students get hooked on the strategy much like they get hooked on a game. This motivates them to continue to improve.

Students develop greater confidence. Students often demonstrate increased confidence in their academic abilities, higher self-esteem, and hope for their academic future.

Students exhibit fewer behavior problems. The greatest behavior management problem for the teacher is finding time to listen to the oral reading of all the students eagerly waiting to demonstrate their improved reading rates.

Students get excited about reading. Students show an increased interest in coming to reading class. Many students report reading books at home, and parents comment on the reading and attitude improvements of their children. Improving fluency makes reading easy enough for many students that they choose to read for pleasure, which after all, is a goal of most reading teachers.

Bibliography

- Allington, R. (1983). Fluency: The neglected reading goal. *The Reading Teacher*, 36, 556–561.
- 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, 285–303.
- Armstrong, S. W. (1983). The effects of material difficulty upon learning disabled children's oral reading and reading comprehension. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 6, 339–348.
- Breznitz, Z. (1987). Increasing first graders' reading accuracy and comprehension by accelerating their reading rates. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79(3), 236–242.
- Chard, D. J., Vaughn, S., & Tyler, B. J. (2002). A synthesis of research on effective interventions for building reading fluency with elementary students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 35(5), 386–406.
- Chomsky, C. (1976). After decoding: What? *Language Arts*, 53(3), 288–296.
- Dowhower, S. L. (1987). Effects of repeated reading on second-grade transitional readers' fluency and comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 22(4), 389–405.
- Eldredge, J. L., & Quinn, D. W. (1988). Increasing reading performance of low-achieving second graders with dyad reading groups. *Journal of Educational Research*, 82(1), 40–46.
- Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Hosp, M. K., & Jenkins, J. R. (2001). Oral reading fluency as an indicator of reading competence: A theoretical, empirical, and historical analysis. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 5(3), 239–256.
- Hasbrouck, J. E., Ihnot, C., & Rogers, G. H. (1999). "Read Naturally:" A strategy to increase oral reading fluency. *Reading Research & Instruction*, 39(1), 27–38.
- Hasbrouck, J. E., Woldbeck, T., Ihnot, C., & Parker, R. I. (1999). One teacher's use of curriculum-based measurement: A changed opinion. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 14(2), 118–126.
- Hasbrouck, J., & Tindal, G. A. (2006). Oral reading fluency norms: A valuable assessment tool for reading teachers. *The Reading Teacher*, 59(7), 636–644.
- Heckelman, R. G. (1969). A neurological impress method of remedial-reading instruction. *Academic Therapy*, 5(4), 277–282.
- Knupp, R. (1988). Improving oral reading skills of educationally handicapped elementary school-aged students through repeated readings. Practicum paper, Nova University (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 297275).
- Koskinen, P. S., & Blum, I. H. (1984). Repeated oral reading and the acquisition of fluency. In J. Niles & L. Harris (Eds.), *Changing perspectives on research and in reading/language processing and instruction: 33rd yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 183–187). Rochester, NY: National Reading Conference.
- LaBerge, D., & Samuels, S. J. (1974). Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading. *Cognitive Psychology*, 6, 292–323.
- Larking, L. (1988). Repeated readings to young children. *Australian Journal of Reading*, 11(1), 36–41.
- Lesgold, A., Resnick, L. B., & Hammond, K. (1985). Learning to read: A longitudinal study of word skill development in two curricula. In G. Waller & E. MacKinnon (Eds.), *Reading research: Advances in theory and practice*. New York: Academic Press.
- McAllister, E. A. (1989). A study of peer tutors using the neurological impress method. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Savannah, GA, February 23, 1989. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 302837).
- Morgan, P. L., & Sideridis, G. D. (2006). Contrasting the effectiveness of fluency interventions for students with or at risk for learning disabilities: A multilevel random coefficient modeling meta-analysis. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 21(4), 191–210.

- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel. Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction* (NIH Publication No. 00-4769). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel. Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction: Reports of the subgroups* (NIH Publication No. 00-4754). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Osborn, J., Lehr, F., & Hiebert, E. H. (2003). A focus on fluency. Retrieved November 11, 2008, from http://www.prel.org/products/re_/fluency-1.pdf.
- O'Shea, L. J., Sindelar, P. T., & O'Shea, D. J. (1985). The effects of repeated readings and attentional cues on reading fluency and comprehension. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 17*(2), 129–141.
- Pikulski, J. J., & Chard, D. J. (2005). Fluency: Bridge between decoding and reading comprehension. *The Reading Teacher, 58*(6), 510–518.
- Pinnell, G. S., Pikulski, J. J., Wixon, K. K., Campbell, J. R., Gough, P. P., & Beatty, A. S. (1995). *Listening to children read aloud: Data from NAEP's integral reading performance record at grade 4*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics.
- Rashotte, C. A., & Torgeson, J. K. (1985). Repeated reading and reading fluency in learning disabled children. *Reading Research Quarterly, 20*(2), 180–188.
- Rasinski, T. V. (2004). Assessing reading fluency. Retrieved November 11, 2008, from http://www.prel.org/products/re_/assessing-fluency.pdf.
- Rasinski, T. V. (2003). *The fluent reader: Oral reading strategies for building word recognition, fluency, and comprehension*. New York: Scholastic Professional Books.
- Rasinski, T. V. (1990a). Effects of repeated reading and listening-while-reading on reading fluency. *Journal of Educational Research, 83*(3), 147–150.
- Rasinski, T. V. (1990b). Investigating measures of reading fluency. *Educational Research Quarterly, 14*(3), 37–44.
- Reitsma, P. (1988). Reading practice for beginners: Effects of guided reading, reading-while-listening, and independent reading with computer-based speech feedback. *Reading Research Quarterly, 23*(2), 219–235.
- Reutzel, D. R., & Hollingsworth, P. M. (1993). Effects of fluency training on second graders' reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Research, 86*(6), 325–331.
- Richek, M. A., & McTague, B. K. (1988). The "Curious George" strategy for students with reading problems. *The Reading Teacher, 42*(3), 220–226.
- Samuels, S. J. (2002). Reading fluency: Its development and assessment. In A. E. Farstrup & S. J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 166–183). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Samuels, S. J. (1997). The method of repeated readings. *The Reading Teacher, 50*(5), 376–381.
- Schunk, D. H. (1982). Progress self-monitoring: Effects of children's self-efficacy and achievement. *Journal of Experimental Education, 51*(2), 84–93.
- Shaywitz, S. (2003). *Overcoming dyslexia: A new and complete science-based program for reading problems at any level*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Skinner, C. H., Logan, P., Robinson, S. L., & Robinson, D. H. (1997). Demonstration as a reading intervention for exceptional learners. *School Psychology Review, 26*(3), 437–447.
- Torgeson, J. K., Rashotte, C. A., & Alexander, A. W. (2001). Principles of fluency instruction in reading: Relationships with established empirical outcomes. In M. Wolfe (Ed.), *Dyslexia, fluency, and the brain* (pp. 333–355). Parkton, MD: York Press.
- Turpie, J., & Paratore, J. R. (1995). Using repeated reading to promote reading success in a heterogeneously grouped first grade. In K. A. Hinchman, D. J. Leu, & C. K. Kinzer (Eds.), *Perspectives on literacy research and practice: 44th yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 255–264). Chicago: National Reading Conference.



ReadNaturally[®]

www.readnaturally.com

RN1207-0809