REPEATED READING REVISITED: RESEARCH INTO PRACTICE

Sarah L. Dowhower
Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, USA

Scholars have amassed evidence that repeated reading of a text facilitates literacy for both regular and disabled readers. Findings are summarized from five different lines of research that support the effectiveness of repeated reading: (a) reading fluency and comprehension; (b) text-processing strategies of good and poor readers; (c) repetitive listening, often called read-alouds; (d) study skills; and (e) rereading during the writing process. It is argued that because of the strong evidence of the effectiveness of repeated reading, this procedure should not be an adjunct to classroom instruction—its many variations should be woven into the very fabric of daily literacy instruction. Specific suggestions for teacher implementation are given, particularly, although not exclusively, applications geared to children with reading problems.

A child cries, "I want to hear the book again, Daddy!" A preschool class begs the teacher to read their favorite Big Book for the tenth time so they can chant along. A second grader gets a big smile on his face as he times himself fluently rereading the story at more than 100 words a minute. A confused middle school student is saying to herself, "I know if I backtrack and read through this again, I'll understand it better." A sixth grader sighs with relief as he goes over his original story once again—each time it is sounding better. Overjoyed with the A she received on her final, a college student realizes that reading through her class notes once a day for a week really paid off. Another college student, Jeremy, lies down on a sofa to read the *The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy* (Adams, 1979) for the 14th time.

What do all these incidents have in common? A procedure that is deceptively simple but extraordinarily powerful—repeated reading. Since the 1970s, scholars have established a compelling knowledge base that supports the practice of multiple readings of connected text to facilitate both learning disabled and regular students' reading and writing skills. Five different lines of research have added substantially to what is known about the value of rereading: (a) reading fluency and comprehension; (b) study skills; (c) text-processing strategies of good and poor readers; (d) repetitive listening, often called read-alouds; and (e) rereading during the writing process.

In this article, I summarize what has been learned about repeated reading (RR) in the last two decades and detail the most recent findings. I argue that because of the strong evidence of the effectiveness of repeated reading, the many different facets of this procedure should be integrated into the fabric of daily literacy instruction. Specific suggestions for applications are included,

Address correspondence to Sarah L. Dowhower, Miami University, 301 McGuffey, Oxford, OH 45056, USA.

Reading & Writing Quarterly: Overcoming Learning Difficulties, 10:343–358, 1994

Copyright © 1994 Taylor & Francis
1057-3569/94 $10.00 + .00

particularly, although not exclusively, applications geared to children with reading problems.

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH ON REPEATED READING UNTIL THE LATE 1980s

By far, the strongest line of research on repeated reading has been in the area of facilitating fluency and comprehension, a line of inquiry begun in the 1970s. Samuels, the originator of the term *repeated reading,* found that *unassisted rereading* procedures increased poor readers' oral fluency and comprehension (Dahl & Samuels, 1979; Samuels, 1976, 1979). (Unassisted repeated reading is a procedure in which students read short passages independently until they reach a set rate of reading speed. They have no model or audiotape to follow.) Another form of effective repeated reading, called *assisted repeated reading* (a read-along or listening-while-reading procedure with either a live model or audiotape), was first reported by Chomsky in 1976. Many researchers have supported and extended Chomsky's and Samuels's seminal work, finding that both independent and read-along forms of RR facilitate increases in reading rate, word accuracy, expression, and comprehension of practiced passages. In addition, there is initial evidence that RR increases overall reading ability across new passages. Practicing a series of passages may be more effective than practicing just one passage, possibly because it helps increase automaticity of high-frequency words, building a large core of quickly identified words (Carver & Hoffman, 1981; Dowhower, 1987; Herman, 1985; Knupp, 1988; Morgan & Lyon, 1979; Neill, 1980; O'Shea et al., 1985; Rashotte & Torgensen, 1985).

Furthermore, researchers have provided evidence that as a study strategy, rereading is at least as effective as underlining, summarizing, and outlining (Anderson, 1980; Howe & Singer, 1975). In the area of text processing, data suggest that for both good and poor readers, RR increases factual retention, with good readers benefiting further by focusing on higher levels of information (Barnett & Seefeldt, 1987). With technical or unfamiliar material, the first rereading seems to promote rote learning, and subsequent rereadings increase higher levels of recall (Bromage & Mayer, 1986). In addition, researchers have also reported that repeated read-alouds and shared readings (in which children listen over and over to a story and even begin to join in the telling) help children's comprehension of a story and encourage deeper processing of the text at all levels of development (Martinez & Roser, 1985; Morrow, 1988; Pappas & Brown, 1987; Yaden, 1988). I have provided a more detailed review of these lines of research elsewhere (Dowhower, 1989).

Lastly, writing and rereading appear to be closely connected. As the writing process gained popularity with older students and adults in the 1980s, scholars began exploring the power of rereading in the revising procedure. In a review of the literature in this line of research, Wall (1982) suggested that writing is literally "seeing" and then "re-seeing" and that it is not unusual for writers to reread, wait, and reread again until (with luck) they hit on something that

UNIV. OF NORTHERN COLORADO LIBRARY

works. An accumulating amount of research indicates that average and superior writers pause and reread more often than do less skilled writers. The act of rereading seems to give the author two different perspectives: that of the writer as reader and that of the reader as writer, through which alternatives and intended meaning are weighed.

NEW RESEARCH FINDINGS

Two areas of research on repeated reading have been particularly active in the last 5 years: repeated read-alouds with young children and repeated-reading procedures to develop silent and oral fluency and comprehension. In addition, several new studies have provided more insight into the function of RR in the text processing of good and poor readers. Finally, although the concept of rereading while writing gained attention in the early 1980s, more recognition of its importance in facilitating creative writing has recently emerged.

Read-Alouds and Shared Readings

Recent research findings suggest that teachers' repeated readings of stories (at least three times) to young children are a rich source of vocabulary enrichment and positively affect students' incidental learning of vocabulary words (Eller et al., 1988; Elley, 1989; Leung & Pikulski, 1990). Seemingly, the rereadings help develop familiar but partially developed concepts (Leung, 1992) and encourage exploration of new concepts and vocabulary, particularly after the third or fourth reading (Froese & Scott, 1992).

Repeated exposure to the same books encourages children to talk about the books and focus on deeper aspects and understandings. Along with earlier evidence, this is true not only in a one-to-one context at home (Yaden et al., 1989), but also in large groups at school (Froese & Scott, 1992). In a case study comparison with White (1954), Hill (1989) suggested that these reread books take hold of and inhabit the children's minds—although sometimes this is not evident until months later.

Adult interaction in the form of questioning and scaffolding during rereadings is important for recall, comprehension, and vocabulary development in preschool children (Cornell et al., 1988; Elster & Walker, 1992) as well as primary school children (Elley, 1989). Evidence is mounting that the quality and type of adult talk during repeated shared readings or read-alouds seem to make a difference in young children's literacy development.

Repeated reading may help young children learn to understand and begin to use a register different from the language spoken in their homes. In a study with strong implications for the teaching of linguistic-diverse students, Feitelson et al. (1993) found that listening to stories over and over in Arabic "book" language helped kindergarten children comprehend and become active users of this literacy register while at the same time not stigmatizing or discouraging their home language.

Development of Fluency and Comprehension When Practicing the Same Passage

Research on the effectiveness of repeated reading in developing overall reading ability and fluency and comprehension in students in Grades 3–5 reveals the following.

Assisted repeated reading (passively listening to audiotaped stories) does not necessarily increase slow readers' fluency, even when the readers are asked to practice until they think they can read the story fluently (Bohlen, 1988). Rasinski (1990), on the other hand, found that listening while reading with a teacher (who monitored the children's read-along) significantly raised the reading rate and accuracy of children at all ability levels.

A combination of rereading and retelling a story may be more effective than rereading alone in facilitating comprehension. Koskinen et al. (1989) used a sequence of silent reading, oral retelling, silent unassisted rereading, and second retelling to assess story comprehension. "It appears that reading, retelling and rereading provide students with opportunities to check understanding of the story in the first retelling and then, during the rereading, opportunity to fix misinterpretations or add story features missed in the first reading" (Koskinen et al., p. 237).

Able readers profit from unassisted RR in the same ways poor readers do. Regardless of the performance level of the stories (instructional or mastery), learning disabled as well as non-learning-disabled students were found to benefit from repeated reading, making gains in comprehension and fluency. When the students were instructed to read aloud and remember as much as they could, their "reading rate increased significantly from one to three readings, and . . . recall was significantly greater after three readings than after one reading" (Sindelar et al., 1990, p. 225).

Listening while reading (with a teacher as the model) and the same amount of unassisted repeated reading seem to facilitate similar significant gains in fluency (rate and accuracy). Rasinski (1990) found that a teacher's rereading a story orally in a fluent style while the student followed along silently was as effective as having the student practice a story independently. This finding supports my earlier findings that both assisted (read-along) and unassisted (independent) procedures were beneficial (Dowhower, 1987).

Multiple readings are more effective in increasing reading rate and comprehension than is training in either the segmentation of sentences or the use of intonation cues (Stoddard et al., 1993).

Development of Overall Fluency and Comprehension that Transfers to New Passages

Evidence indicates that repeated reading develops abilities that can be transferred to new texts. For example, various forms of assisted paired reading seem to encourage long-term gains in reading ability, especially for low-achieving students. For instance,

UNIV. OF NORTHERN COLORADO LIBRARY

- Students in group-assisted reading (choral rereading with the teacher, who emphasizes correct phrasing, intonation, and pitch) showed greater gains in overall comprehension and vocabulary than did students who did an equal amount of free reading (Eldredge, 1990).
- Paired assisted rereading with peers coupled with instruction in critical thinking significantly improved students' overall literal comprehension and their ability to infer main ideas and conclusions (Frost, 1990). This finding complements Koskinen and Blum's (1984) earlier finding that paired RR improves below-average readers' overall fluency ability.
- In addition, there is evidence that paired assisted reading using nonprofessional tutors, such as parents and older children, improves children's accuracy, comprehension, and attitudes toward reading. In a 7-year English study of paired reading that involved 2,370 regular or learning disabled students of all ages, nonprofessional tutors (same-age peer, cross-age peer, or parent) were able to raise significantly students' overall reading skills and attitudes. Parents, however, produced greater gains in comprehension than did cross-age tutors (Topping, 1989).

The assisted repeated reading procedure in which a student silently reads a text while listening to an audiotape of it does little to increase remedial readers' overall fluency and comprehension. Coates and Dowhower (unpublished manuscript) found that when there was no criterion rate of speed or other student monitoring of the reading process or involvement with the text, such as reading aloud with the tape, students reading below grade level made little progress in fluency after RR training.

Performing vast amounts of rereading of many familiar, predictable books in a tutorial setting helps beginning readers become successful readers. In one of the most effective repeated-reading programs to date, the Reading Recovery Project helps low-achieving 6-year-olds become successful readers in a one-to-one tutorial program. Reading and writing abilities are developed "within lessons that use natural language and predictable texts rather than isolated skill drills" (Hill & Hale, 1991, p. 480). The children repeatedly read hundreds of brief, predictable paperback books leveled by difficulty. Reading Recovery involves many factors, among which are "immersion in reading and writing, massive amounts of reading, using reading and writing together, early intervention, intensive instruction, highly trained teachers, one-on-one attention, growth in self-esteem, and use of good books instead of contrived text" (Pinnell, 1990, p. 21). Implementation of the entire program requires extensive teacher training, but daily repeated reading of many familiar books is a Reading Recovery technique that can be easily translated into a regular classroom phenomena.

Text Processing

Research on the effectiveness of repeated reading in developing middle school students' text-processing ability reveals the following.

Rereading or reinspection of stories on comprehension tests leads to signif-

icantly higher accuracy for inferential questions than for recall questions. Both low- and high-ability readers in middle school profited from reinspecting the text to extract clues for the best answer to a question (Rubenstein et al., 1988).

Better readers may make greater use of rereading as a processing strategy than do average or poor readers. Both competent and less competent readers were found to use backtracking (rereading as a comprehension repair strategy) when they encountered consecutive inconsistent sentences, but the less competent readers used almost no backtracking when larger amounts of text separated the inconsistent sentences (Clark, 1989). Gifted readers use rereading significantly more often than average readers do (Fehrenbach, 1991).

Recent evidence supports two relatively new text-processing theories associated with multiple readings: First, gains in reading rate occur because RR helps poor readers increase their speed in symbol naming, facilitating lexical access (Bowers, 1993). Second, distributed RR (multiple reading spread over time) facilitates recall better than does massed RR. This "deactivation hypothesis" suggests that students do not process a text as fully when it is in working memory as they do when they have not encountered the text for a while (Krug et al., 1990).

For poor readers learning new sight vocabulary, practicing whole text seems more advantageous than practicing isolated lists of words out of context. Greene et al. (1988) found that repeated reading (providing practice in accuracy for specific words in context) was more effective in terms of number of words learned and more efficient in terms of amount of time needed to reach mastery of each word than was practicing words out of context. This suggests that RR helps students tacitly attend to the context (through meaning and predictability) and the graphophonic cues at the same time because these new words (learned in context) were identified both in and out of context.

Rereading and Writing

Two recent studies suggest a strong tie between rereading and the genesis of creative narratives in children. In a case study of two children, Kapitzke (1990) found that repeated read-alouds influenced the children's composition writing. Felber et al. (1992) found that as children reread text, their fluency and comprehension increased and so did the quality of their original creative stories.

Finally, in addition to the aforementioned exploration of the reread/revise phenomenon in adult and older students' writing, an exciting new area of inquiry has evolved examining how young children reread their own writing. Sulzby et al. (1989) studied 123 kindergartners' repeated readings of their own compositions. From these two rereadings, Sulzby (1989) devised a checklist of 11 ways children respond to the request to reread what they have written. These fall on a continuum as follows:

Inaudible response
Refusal to read
Claim that it isn't writing

UNIV. OF NORTHERN COLORADO LIBRARY

Labeling/describing
Dialogue
Oral monologue—intonation-like storytelling
Written monologue—intonation-like written language
Naming of letters
Aspectual/strategic response—attending to print but not actually tracking it conventionally
Conventional response—reading from print
Other response—rereading behavior that does not fit into the other 10 categories

This continuum is an invitation to teachers and researchers to explore further the natural development of young children's rereading and early writing.

INTEGRATING REPEATED READING INTO LITERACY INSTRUCTION

Blum and Koskinen (1991) stressed that although there is certainly a sound conceptual base for the integration of repeated reading into literacy instruction, this procedure is still mostly used as an adjunct to reading instruction. They suggested that models of the integration of repeated reading into instruction need to be developed on the basis of carefully controlled research. In fact, numerous successful research-based models that combine not one, but many different rereading techniques have been reported in the literature (e.g., Blum & Koskinen, 1991; Cassady, 1988; Dowhower & Brown, 1992; Downs & Morin, 1990; Hoffman & Isaacs, 1991; Holdaway, 1979, 1982, 1986; Morris & Nelson, 1992; Rodicki, 1990; Reutzel & Fawson, 1989, 1991; Reutzel & Hollingsworth, 1993; Sudzina & Foreman, 1990; Topping, 1989).

The practical suggestions and examples given in the following sections support the idea that rereading should be integrated into the total literacy curriculum for varying purposes and groupings; with a variety of materials and modalities; and in direct teacher instruction and modeling, independent practice, and cooperative learning settings. These applications have been gleaned from the research on weaving RR into the fabric of reading and language arts instruction on a permanent basis using either literature-based or basal approaches. Applications appropriate for the instruction of both learning disabled and non-learning-disabled students, individually, in pairs, and in small or large group settings, are listed.

Tips for Implementing Repeated Readings with Individual Students

(1) Keep practice passages to 50–300 words. If the child is not reading with at least 85% accuracy, the text is too difficult.

(2) Acceptable oral reading rates for readers vary, but they seem to fall within a range of 75–120 words per minute (wpm). For example, Samuels (1979) and Herman (1985) used 85 wpm as a criterion with older remedial students. Hoffman (1987a, 1987b) used a 75-wpm criterion with primary chil-

dren, whereas Dowhower (1987) and Erickson and Krajenta (1991) suggested 90–100 wpm as an acceptable indicator of fluency for second graders. O'Shea et al. (1985) found rates of 120 wpm and higher with third graders after repeated-reading training.

(3) When a child can reach an acceptable rate of speed and accuracy by the second reading of a new passage, it is time to move up to a more difficult text level.

(4) If a student is reading below 45 wpm, the assisted or read-along reading technique, with either teacher or audiotape modeling, seems to work best. Once the student attains 60 wpm (Stoddard et al., 1993, used 70 wpm), the unassisted or independent technique seems more efficient.

(5) It is not always necessary to set a criterion rate for repeated readings, especially if the child is not reading at an extremely low rate of speed and accuracy. Three to five independent rereadings may be all that are needed for the child to gain optimal fluency and recall (Dowhower, 1989; O'Shea et al., 1985; Sindelar et al., 1990; Spring et al., 1981; Stoddard et al., 1993).

(6) Setting a criterion rate may be necessary for many low-achieving children to gain fluency. In several RR studies in which no rate criterion was set, low-achieving children showed no significant gains in word recognition or reading speed (Coates & Dowhower, unpublished manuscript; Foley et al., 1991; Homan et al., 1993). For example, Coates and Dowhower (manuscript submitted for publication) concluded that when using the read-along technique with audiotapes, teachers best ensure active processing and acceptable rates of fluency when they set a reading rate criterion or require overt participation such as "mumble" reading or reading aloud with the tape. Although tentative, Weinstein and Cooke's (1992) research suggests that a viable alternative to a fixed rate is the requirement that a student demonstrate three successive improvements.

(7) If an assisted (read-along) procedure is preferred, set up listening posts in the classroom or library where a tape recorder, book, and tape are provided. Have the children keep a record of how many times they listen to the tape and have them indicate when they think they are ready to read the book fluently.

(8) If an unassisted (independent) procedure is preferred, equip reading corrals with a timing device such as an hourglass, egg timer, or stopwatch so that the children can keep a record of how fast they read each time they practice a story. Set a criterion rate of speed that must be reached on one book before another book is started.

(9) Send home short stories two or three times a week. Have the children read these stories to as many listeners as they can. The listeners should sign their names with the date on a sheet of paper attached to the back of the story. For a bit of fun, the students can even read the story to their pets, teddy bears, or imaginary friends. Parents would then, of course, sign those names.

Tips for Implementing Repeated Readings in Paired Groups

Researchers in England (Topping, 1989) have trained same-age tutors, cross-age tutors, and parents to improve children's reading skills through repeated

UNIV. OF NORTHERN COLORADO LIBRARY

assisted readings. Two stages are involved in this paired assisted reading: First, in *simultaneous oral reading,* the tutor and child read in close synchrony. This is actually participant modeling, in which the tutor furnishes the child with a model of correct reading at the same time the child is reading him- or herself. Subsequently, in *reinforced individual reading,* the child reads alone but receives positive verbal reinforcement for correct words. The child is taught to use a nonverbal signal to indicate when he or she wishes to change from simultaneous reading to independent reading (Morgan & Lyon, 1979). An important aspect of paired reading is that the child freely chooses the book or other reading material that will be read. (For more details in implementing this method, see Pumfrey, 1986; Topping & McKnight, 1984).

In the United States, Blum and Koskinen (1991) have had success with children working in pairs, in a technique called paired repeated reading. They suggest that two students select short segments of 50 words or less to read three times to each other. The student who reads rates his or her improvement after each reading, and the listener also comments on how the partner's reading has improved. In one version of this paired reading, the teacher first reads aloud the text while the children follow in their own copy. The children then listen to an audiotaped version of the text at a reading center, after which they begin the paired reading (see Foley et al., 1991; Koskinen & Blum, 1984, 1986).

Tips for Implementing Repeated Readings in Small or Large Groups

Holdaway's (1979, 1982, 1986) shared reading experience (SRE) with adult modeling and multiple rereading of enlarged text is perhaps one of the best models of the implementation of RR in a large-group classroom setting. Designed to replicate the "favorite book syndrome" or the home bedtime story in the classroom by constructing a natural literacy learning situation, the SRE has three stages: (a) The teacher reads the big book aloud while pointing to the words, always encouraging the children to read along and make predictions based on the title and pictures. (b) The children and teacher reread again and again their favorite Big Book stories, with the teacher stressing skills such as conventions of print, expressive reading, self-correction strategies, and sight words in context. (c) The children work independently on extension projects and independent or paired rereadings with either the big book or normal-sized versions. (For additional SRE ideas, see Cassady, 1988.)

Another large-group implementation of RR is an adaptation made by Dowhower and Brown (1992) of the literature webbing strategy of Reutzel and Fawson (1989, 1991). In a 10-week study of first graders, Dowhower and Brown found that students who received in-depth teaching of several predictable books showed significant long-term comprehension gains over a control classroom in which a traditional basal approach was used. Brown taught five books, each for a 2-week period, spending approximately 20–25 hr of classroom time on each book. Instruction followed the six-step literature webbing strategy (read title and text excerpts, predict the order of the text excerpts, read the book straight through, confirm or correct the predictions, list similar books,

discuss personal responses to the book, and participate in independent extension activities). The authors estimate that by the end of each 2-week period each child had reread the book at least 40 times for various purposes, in different modalities, to different audiences, and in a variety of settings, including teacher-directed, independent, and cooperative learning situations. Writing activities involving each book's content were also a key component.

For small reading groups, Hoffman (1987a, 1987b) and Hoffman and Isaacs (1991) devised a successful oral recitation lesson (ORL) approach consisting of the teacher's reading the story aloud and then constructing a story map or summary with the children. The children choral-read with the teacher and then practiced the text independently until they met a criterion of 75 wpm and 98% accuracy before starting the next story. Reutzel and Hollingsworth (1993) recently found ORL to be more effective than equal amounts of traditional round-robin reading in facilitating fluency and comprehension.

A combination of paired repeated reading and ORL is used in Morris and Nelson's (1992) small-group supported oral reading technique. This 3-day reading cycle based on the elements of modeling, practice, and feedback seems easy to incorporate into a classroom reading program:

Day 1: The teacher expressively models a story aloud (oral previewing) and asks clarifying and predictive questions during the reading. Together the teacher and children do echo reading.

Day 2: Strong and weak children are paired and read alternating pages. Children help each other practice 100-word passages assigned for concentrated practice. Then the pairs return to the beginning of the story and read the opposite alternating pages.

Day 3: Children read their assigned text to the teacher individually, as the teacher marks miscues and gives feedback. Expert reading is considered 91–95% accuracy.

The research findings of Koskinen et al. (1989), noted earlier, lend themselves to yet another practical application for rereading in small-group settings. The teacher tells the students that good readers are able to retell accurately the stories they read but emphasizes that it takes practice to be a good storyteller. Next, the children read silently and then together retell the story orally. They then reread the story silently and retell the story in their own words, by either writing it independently or telling it orally to a partner or into a tape recorder. The rereading after the first retelling gives the children the opportunity to check their understanding, and the second retelling allows them to correct misinterpretations and insert missed story features.

Other Ideas for Integrating Repeated Readings into Literacy Instruction

The following are other ideas for incorporating repeated readings into daily reading and writing instruction in the classroom.

Give each child in the classroom a box of various library books categorized

UNIV. OF NORTHERN COLORADO LIBRARY

at three levels, which are designated by colored bookmarks. A red bookmark in the book would indicate that the book is too difficult for the child to read alone—this would be a read-aloud book. A yellow bookmark would indicate that the book was an assisted reading book, one that the child would read together with a fluent reader. Finally, a green bookmark would indicate that the book was at the child's independent level and should be reread without much assistance. With massive amounts of rereading, a read-aloud book will soon become an assisted one for the child and an assisted book will soon become an independent one. These books could be used in a variety of ways. Green-tagged independent books could be texts for seatwork activities or silent sustained reading; red- and yellow-tagged books could be material for homework (read-alouds with parents or assisted tuition), peer tutoring, or direct teacher instruction.

Be sure to read aloud to students once or more a day as a listening activity. Encourage the children to pick favorite books to be read again and again. Discuss vocabulary and encourage the children to ask questions and make comments. Stop at various junctures in the book and ask questions, getting the children to state in their own words what happened. As White (1954) did with her student, let the books "take hold and inhabit the children's minds" (p. 164).

In the area of text processing, Rubenstein et al.'s (1988) and Clark's (1989) findings suggest that teachers need to teach rereading as a comprehension repair strategy. Discuss repeated readings as a "fix-up strategy" with students who are having comprehension difficulties. Model look-backs (rereading) with a think-aloud technique, particularly for inferential questions the students cannot answer or inconsistencies in the text or parts of the text that are vague and misleading. Davey (1983) stated that in using think-alouds, teachers first need to relate their own thoughts about the text, so that students can see how and when to do the same thing; the students then should be given ample practice with partners and independently.

Finally, rereading can be integrated into writing instruction in at least two ways: through the revision process during and after the first draft and through the sharing of final compositions. Heller (1991) underscored the rationale for rereading in the revision stage:

> The rewriting phase of the composing process best illustrates the recursive nature of writing. As we write, we are continuously reading and rereading our work to ensure that what we are communicating makes sense to our audience. As we reread what we write, we very often rewrite our ideas, making additions, substitutions, deletions, and rearrangements in order to construct meaning. (p. 91)

Heller listed five questions that children can ask themselves to guide their rereading/rewriting process and to encourage critical thinking about work in progress:

1. Will what I have written make sense to my audience?
2. Do the words in my sentences clearly state my ideas?

3. Are my sentences and paragraphs arranged in an orderly way?
4. Did I include enough details to support my main ideas?
5. Is my work interesting to read? (p. 91)

It is also important for children to share their written work many times and in many different authentic social settings in the classroom. This can be done through the "author's chair" (Graves & Hansen, 1983), peer partners or small-group read-alouds, and cross-grade-level buddies (Heller, 1991). The "author's chair" concept is a particularly excellent way to celebrate a child's composition. A child is seated in a special chair in front of the whole class and reads his or her creation aloud for all to enjoy and cherish. All children get a chance to occupy the chair to read and even reread their compositions.

CONCLUSION

Although there is still much to learn about the best ways to use repeated reading in the classroom, the evidence is mounting to suggest that it should be used not as an isolated technique, but as a main component of reading and writing instruction throughout the day. Rereading should permeate the entire reading/language block, including the writing process, independent reading and writing activities, paired reading, and direct instruction. The challenge before teachers and researchers is to determine how best to accomplish that. Exciting possibilities exist for integration and innovative applications, among them closed-caption TV; videotapes with subtitles; and interactive computer programs, such as CD-ROM books and novels in multimedia hypertext.

Aside from the reading and writing skills that seem to be facilitated by repeated readings, one other facet of rereading bears mention—the sheer joy it provides. Just as children and adults love to watch favorite movies over and over, readers of all ages seem to find books or sections of books that they enjoy rereading time and time again. Why? For the melodies of the language, the flow of ideas, or the companionship of an old friend. It is more than the desire for fluency and comprehension that makes a young child request a particular book for the tenth time or makes Jeremy, a preservice education major, read *The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy* (Adams, 1979) 14 times and *Not a Penny More, Not a Penny Less* (Archer, 1986) 25 times. Aware of the intuitive pleasure he gets from rereading his favorite novels and of the findings from the RR research he learned in his reading methods course, Jeremy contends, "Certainly now when children ask me to read their favorite story for the fourth time that day, I'll smile and start reading willingly—knowing that the child will be receiving the joy and benefits RR has to offer."

REFERENCES

Adams, D. (1979). *The hitchhiker's guide to the galaxy.* New York: Harmony Books.

Anderson, T. H. (1980). Student strategies and adjunct aids. In R. Spiro, B. Bruce, & W. Brewer (Eds.), *Theoretical issues in comprehension: Perspectives from cognitive psy-*

UNIV. OF NORTHERN COLORADO LIBRARY

chology, artificial intelligence, linguistics, and education (pp. 483–502). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Archer, J. (1986). *Not a penny more, not a penny less.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Barnett, J. E., & Seefeldt, R. W. (1989). Repetitive reading and recall. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 21* (41), 351–361.

Blum, I., & Koskinen, P. (1991). Repeated reading: A strategy for enhancing fluency and fostering expertise. *Theory into Practice, 30,* 195–200.

Bohlen, L. (1988). *Building fluency through repeated reading in third grade.* Unpublished master's thesis, Kean College of New Jersey, Union, NJ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 294 158)

Bowers, P. (1993). Text reading and rereading: Determinants of fluency beyond word recognition. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 25,* 133–153.

Bromage, B. K., & Mayer, R. E. (1986). Quantitative and qualitative effects of repetition on learning from technical text. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 78,* 271–278.

Carver, R. P., & Hoffman, J. V. (1981). The effect of practice through repeated reading on gain in reading ability using a computer-based instructional system. *Reading Research Quarterly, 19,* 374–390.

Cassady, J. (1988). Beginning reading with big books. *Childhood Education, 65,* 18–23.

Chomsky, C. (1976). After decoding: What? *Language Arts, 53,* 288–296.

Clark, H. (1989, March). *The effect of amount of intervening text on detection of semantic inconsistencies by competent and less competent college readers.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 319 005)

Cornell, E., Senechal, M., & Broda, L. (1988). Recall of picture books by 3-year-old children: Testing and repetition effects in joint reading activities. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80,* 537–542.

Dahl, P. R., & Samuels, S. J. (1979). An experimental program for teaching high-speed word recognition and comprehension skills. In J. E. Button, T. Lovitt, & T. Rowland (Eds.), *Communications research in learning disabilities and mental retardation* (pp. 33–65). Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.

Davey, B. (1983). Think-aloud—modeling the cognitive processes of reading comprehension. *Journal of Reading, 27,* 44–47.

Dowhower, S. L. (1987). Effects of repeated reading on second-grade transitional readers' fluency and comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly, 22,* 389–406.

Dowhower, S. L. (1989). Repeated reading: Research into practice. *The Reading Teacher, 42,* 502–507.

Dowhower, S. L., & Brown, K. (1992). The effects of predictable materials on first graders' reading comprehension: A teacher action research study. *Ohio Reading Teacher, 25* (2), 3–10.

Downs, J., & Morin, S. (1990). Improving reading fluency with precision teaching. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 22*(3), 38–40.

Eldredge, J. L. (1990). Increasing the performance of poor readers in the third grade with a group-assisted strategy. *Journal of Educational Research, 84,* 69–77.

Eller, R., Papas, C., & Brown, E. (1988). The lexical development of kindergartners: Learning from written context. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 20,* 5–24.

Elley, W. (1989). Vocabulary acquisition from listening to stories. *Reading Research Quarterly, 24,* 174–187.

Elster, C., & Walker, C. (1992). Flexible scaffolds: Shared reading and rereading of story books in head start classrooms. In C. Kinzer & D. Leu (Eds.), *Literacy research, theory*

and practice: Views from many perspectives (pp. 445–452). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Erickson, L., & Krajenta, M. (1991). How fast should young readers read? *Illinois Reading Council Journal, 19*(2), 10–14.

Fehrenbach, C. (1991). Gifted/average readers: Do they use the same reading strategies? *Gifted Child Quarterly, 35*(3), 125–127.

Feitelson, D., Goldstein, Z., Iraqi, J., & Share, D. (1993). Effects of listening to story reading on aspects of literacy acquisition in a diglossic situation. *Reading Research Quarterly, 28*(1), 71–79.

Felber, S., Flood, J., & Lapp, D. (1992, April). *The effects of oral reading fluency on students' comprehension measured by free recall of narrative stories.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Foley, C., Farr, H., & Chang, E. (1991). Supplementing a fifth-grade basal reading program with taped and paired repeated reading. *Journal of Reading Education, 17,* 6–14.

Froese, C. V., & Scott, J. A. (1992, April). *Repeated readings of storybooks to kindergarten students.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Frost, S. B. (1990). *Increasing reading achievement through repeated paired reading.* Unpublished master's practicum report, Nova University, Miami, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 323 508)

Graves, D. H., & Hansen, J. (1983). The author's chair. *Language Arts, 60,* 176–183.

Greene, E., Torgesen, J., & Wager, W. (1988, January). *Effects of new computer technology on increases in children's word recognition automaticity.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, New Orleans.

Heller, M. F. (1991). *Reading-writing connections: From theory to practice.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Herman, P. A. (1985). The effect of repeated readings reading rate, speech pauses, and word recognition accuracy. *Reading Research Quarterly, 20,* 553–564.

Hill, B. C. (1989). Books before five revisited. *Language Arts, 66,* 309–317.

Hill, L. B., & Hale, M. G. (1991). Reading recovery: Questions classroom teachers ask. *The Reading Teacher, 47,* 480–483.

Hoffman, J. V. (1987a). Rethinking the role of oral reading in basal instruction. *Elementary School Journal, 87,* 367–374.

Hoffman, J. V. (1987b). Research into practice: Developing reading fluency. *Reading Today, 5,* 7.

Hoffman, J. V., & Isaacs, M. E. (1991). Developing fluency through restructuring the task of guided oral reading. *Theory into Practice, 30,* 184–194.

Holdaway, D. (1979). *Foundations of literacy.* Exeter, NH: Heinemann.

Holdaway, D. (1982). Shared book experience: Teaching reading using favorite books. *Theory into Practice, 21,* 293–300.

Holdaway, D. (1986). *Stability and change in literacy learning.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Homan, S., Klesius, J., & Hite, C. (1993). Effects of repeated readings and nonrepetitive strategies on students' fluency and comprehension. *Journal of Educational Research, 87,* 94–99.

Howe, M. J. A., & Singer, L. (1975). Presentation variables and students' activities in meaningful learning. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 45,* 52–61.

UNIV. OF NORTHERN COLORADO LIBRARY

Kapitzke, C. (1990). Writing as rereading: Semantic genesis of two children's narratives. *Language and Education, 4,* 181–204.

Knupp, R. (1988). *Improving oral reading skills of educationally handicapped elementary school-aged students through repeated readings.* Doctoral thesis, Nova University, Miami, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 297 275)

Koskinen, P. A., & Blum, I. H. (1984). Repeated oral reading and the acquisition of fluency. In J. Niles & L. Harris (Eds.), *Changing perspectives on research in reading / language processing and instruction: Thirty-third yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 183–187). Rochester, NY: National Reading Conference.

Koskinen, P. A., & Blum, I. H. (1986). Paired repeated reading: A classroom strategy for developing fluent reading. *The Reading Teacher, 40,* 70–75.

Koskinen, P. Gambrell, L., & Kapinus, B. (1989). The effects of rereading and retelling upon young children's reading comprehension. In S. McCormick & J. Zutell (Eds.), *Cognitive and social perspectives for literacy research and instruction* (pp. 233–239). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Krug, D., Davis, T. B., & Glover, J. A. (1990). Massed versus distributed repeated reading: A case of forgetting helping recall? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82,* 366–371.

Leung, C. (1992). Effects of word-related variables on vocabulary growth through repeated read-aloud events. In C. Kinzer & D. Leu (Eds.), *Literacy research, theory and practice: Views from many perspectives* (pp. 491–498). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Leung, C., & Pikulski, J. J. (1990). Incidental learning of word meanings by kindergarten and first-grade children through repeated read aloud events. In J. Zutell & S. McCormick (Eds.), *Literacy theory and research: Analyses from multiple paradigms* (pp. 231–239). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

Martinez, M., & Roser, N. (1985). Read it again: The value of repeated readings during storytime. *The Reading Teacher, 38,* 782–786.

Morgan, R., & Lyon, E. (1979). Paired reading—a preliminary report on a technique for parental tuition of reading-retarded children. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 20,* 151–160.

Morris, D., & Nelson, L. (1992). Supported oral reading with low-achieving second graders. *Reading Research and Instruction, 32,* 49–63.

Morrow, L. M. (1985). Retelling stories: A strategy for improving children's comprehension, concept of story structure, and oral language complexity. *Elementary School Journal, 85,* 647–661.

Morrow, L. M. (1988). Young children's responses to one-to-one story readings in school settings. *Reading Research Quarterly, 23,* 89–107.

Neill, K. (1980). Turn kids on with repeated readings. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 12,* 63–64.

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,* 129–142.

Pappas, C., & Brown, E. (1987). Young children learning story discourse: Three case studies. *Elementary School Journal, 87,* 455–466.

Pinnell, G. S. (1990). Success for low achievers through reading recovery. *Educational Leadership, 48*(11), 17–21.

Pumfrey, P. D. (1986). Paired reading: Promise and pitfalls. *Education Research, 28,* 89–94.

Rashotte, C. A., & Torgensen, J. K. (1985). Repeated reading and reading fluency in learning disabled children. *Reading Research Quarterly, 20,* 180–188.

Rasinski, T. V. (1990). Effects of repeated reading and listening-while-reading on reading fluency. *Journal of Educational Research, 83,* 147–150.

Reutzel, D. R., & Fawson, P. C. (1991). Literature webbing predictable books: A prediction strategy that helps below-average first grade readers. *Reading Research and Instruction, 30*(4), 20–29.

Reutzel, D. R., & Fawson, P. C. (1989). Using a literature webbing strategy lesson with predictable books. *The Reading Teacher, 43,* 208–215.

Reutzel, D. R., & Hollingsworth, P. M. (1993). Effects of fluency training on second graders' reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Research, 86,* 325–331.

Rodicki, A. (1990). The effects of modeling and repeated taped reading instruction on the learning disabled child as ways to improve reading comprehension, fluency and word recognition. Master's thesis, Nova University, Miami, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 335 813)

Rubenstein, H., Kender, J., & Mace, F. C. (1988). Do tests penalize readers for poor short term memory? *Journal of Reading, 32,* 4–10.

Samuels, S. J. (1976). Automatic decoding and reading comprehension. *Language Arts, 53,* 323–325.

Samuels, S. J. (1979). The method of repeated reading. *The Reading Teacher, 32,* 403–408.

Sindelar, P., Monda, L., & O'Shea, L. (1990). Effects of repeated readings on instructional- and mastery-level readers. *Journal of Educational Research, 83,* 220–226.

Spring, C., Blunden, D., & Gatheral, M. (1981). Effect on reading comprehension of training to automaticity in word-readings. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 53,* 779–786.

Stoddard, K., Valcante, G., Sindelar, P., O'Shea, L., & Algozzine, B. (1993). Increasing reading rate and comprehension: The effects of repeated readings, sentence segmentation, and intonation training. *Reading Research and Instruction, 34*(4), 53–65.

Sudzina, M., & Foreman, P. (1990). The use of recorded books in a first grade classroom with Chapter I children. *Ohio Reading Teacher, 25,* 7–14.

Sulzby, E. (1989). Forms of writing and rereading example list. In J. Mason (Ed.), *Reading and writing connections* (pp. 51–63). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Sulzby, E., Barnhart, J., & Hieshima, J. (1989). Forms of writing and rereading from writing. In J. Mason (Ed.), *Reading and writing connections* (pp. 31–63). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Topping, K. (1989). Paired learning: Tutoring by non-teachers. *The Paired Reading Bulletin, No. 5.* Available from the Oastler Centre, 103 New St. Huddersfield, HD1 2VA, West Yorkshire, England.

Topping, K. J., & McKnight, G. (1984). Paired reading—and parent power. *Special Education: Forward Trends, 11*(3), 12–15.

Wall, S. (1982). In the writer's eye: Learning to teach the rereading/revising process. *English Education, 14,* 6–17.

Weinstein, G., & Cooke, N. (1992). The effects of two repeated reading interventions on generalization of fluency. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 15,* 21–28.

White, D. (1954). *Books before five.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Books. Reissued in 1984.

Yaden, D. (1988). Understanding stories through repeated read-alouds: How many does it take? *The Reading Teacher, 41,* 556–560.

Yaden, D. B., Smolkin, L. B., & Colon, A. (1989). Preschoolers' questions about pictures, print conventions, and story text during reading aloud at home. *Reading Research Quarterly, 24,* 188–214.

UNIV. OF NORTHERN COLORADO LIBRARY