

Complete APA bibliographic reference:

Allinder, R. M., Dunse, L., Brunken, C. D., & Obermiller-Krolikowski, H. J. (2001). Improving fluency in at-risk readers and students with learning disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education, 22* (1), 48-54.

Three to five descriptor terms that best describe the topic:

Main: Fluency, oral reading

Type of Article:

Quantitative Research

Levels:

Middle School (6-8)

Briefly stated major purpose of the study:

The study investigated the effects of oral reading strategy instruction on word identification, word attack, and passage comprehension measures for seventh grade learning and reading disabled students.

Research article – summarize the major findings in 1- 4 sentences:

The study compared the effects of a specific fluency strategy intervention to a general direction to read well between two groups of seventh grade struggling readers in a suburban middle school setting. The 50 students involved in the study received small group instruction for 10 weeks from either a certified teacher or speech-language pathologist in a remedial reading class setting. Results were mixed with no significant differences found between the two groups on word identification and word attack, however, significant differences were noted on passage comprehension and maze tests with the specific strategy group performing better. The authors concluded that specific fluency strategy instruction has potentially beneficial effects for struggling secondary school readers.

Quantitative Study Information:

Independent Variables Included:

Specific strategy group. No specific strategy group.

List Dependent Variables:

WRMT-R Word Identification: Pretest/Posttest. WRMT-R: Pretest/Posttest. WRMT-R: Pretest/Posttest. CBM maze.

(Woodcock Reading Mastery Test – Revised. Curriculum Based Measure – Maze.

Treatment:

Fifty-minute class periods, three times a week, using comprehension, phonics, and oral reading instruction either with specific strategy instruction or a general prompt to read well.

Reliability: MAT .80; CELF-3 (Test retest .90; CELF-3 .55 to .77); WRMT-R .80;

Validity: CBM Maze - various comparisons