

EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE REPEATED READING STRATEGY: A QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL STUDY ON STUDENTS' READING FLUENCY

¹ DADANG A. RAMSANI, ² NELSON U. JULHAMID

¹ School of Graduate Studies, Sulu State University, Jolo, Sulu, Philippines
sscgsplib@sulustatecollege.edu.ph

² School of Graduate Studies, Sulu State University, Jolo, Sulu, Philippines
sscgsplib@sulustatecollege.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

This study evaluated the effectiveness of the repeated reading strategy in improving the reading fluency of Grade 8 students at Pangutaran National High School. Specifically, the study examined students' fluency in terms of accuracy, automaticity, and prosody using a quasi-experimental pre-test-post-test non-equivalent group design. Forty (40) struggling readers were selected and divided equally into experimental and control groups. An adapted reading fluency assessment based on established oral reading measures was used to collect data, and results were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics, including t-tests and analysis of variance (ANOVA). Findings revealed that prior to the intervention, both groups demonstrated low levels of reading fluency, particularly in accuracy and automaticity, while prosody was at the instructional level. After the implementation of the repeated reading strategy, both groups showed statistically significant improvements across all fluency components. However, the experimental group consistently obtained higher mean scores and demonstrated significantly better performance than the control group in the post-test. Despite these improvements, overall fluency levels in accuracy and automaticity remained within the frustration level, indicating that while progress was evident, mastery was not fully achieved within the intervention period. The results suggest that repeated reading is an effective instructional strategy that can enhance reading fluency, particularly in developing reading speed and expressive reading. The study contributes empirical evidence supporting the use of repeated reading as a practical intervention for struggling readers in classroom settings. However, longer implementation and additional instructional support may be necessary to achieve substantial improvements in all components of reading fluency.

Keywords: Repeated reading strategy; reading fluency; accuracy; automaticity; prosody;

INTRODUCTION

Reading fluency was recognized as a fundamental component of literacy development, encompassing accuracy, automaticity, and prosody, and serving as a bridge between decoding and comprehension. Students who demonstrated fluent reading were better able to focus on understanding texts rather than decoding individual words, making fluency an important indicator of reading proficiency. As a result, educational institutions placed strong emphasis on developing fluent readers, particularly among students who experienced reading difficulties. One instructional approach that had been widely used to support this goal was the repeated reading strategy.

Repeated reading involved multiple exposures to the same text, allowing learners to improve word recognition, reading speed, and expression. Previous studies reported that this strategy enhanced lexical quality, including vocabulary development, fluency, and comprehension (Pleban & Perrin, 2015). Similarly, Cooper (2024) found that repeated reading contributed to improvements in the

number of words read correctly per minute. However, some findings suggested that while improvements in reading rate and accuracy were observed, gains in overall fluency were not always consistent. These mixed results indicated the need for further investigation, especially in specific learning contexts involving struggling readers.

In classroom settings, students with low reading fluency were often observed to experience difficulty in maintaining focus, completing tasks, and keeping up with instructional demands. Some students avoided reading activities, while others struggled to understand lesson content due to limited decoding skills and slow reading pace. These challenges affected not only individual learning outcomes but also classroom instruction, as teachers needed to adjust their strategies to accommodate varying levels of reading ability. Such conditions highlighted the need for effective and targeted reading interventions.

In the Philippine educational context, efforts had been made to address reading difficulties through national policies and programs. Republic Act No. 12028, also known as the Academic Recovery and Accessible Learning (ARAL) Program, emphasized the need to support learners through accessible and effective intervention programs. In addition, the Department of Education implemented the “Every Child a Reader Program” through DepEd Order No. 014, s. 2018, which aimed to ensure that learners achieved reading proficiency at their grade level. These initiatives reflected the importance of strengthening reading instruction and intervention strategies in schools.

A number of studies had examined the effectiveness of repeated reading in improving reading fluency. For example, Amin (2022) reported improvements in fluency and comprehension through repeated reading combined with listening-while-reading strategies. Ismail (2021) found that repeated reading helped address pronunciation difficulties, while Naji (2023) demonstrated its effectiveness among learners with special needs. Parra et al. (2023) also highlighted its positive impact on struggling readers. Despite these findings, limited studies had applied a quasi-experimental pre-test–post-test non-equivalent group design to evaluate the effectiveness of repeated reading within a specific classroom setting. In addition, studies in the Philippine context have highlighted the complex realities of language use in classrooms, where teachers navigate multilingual environments and diverse learner needs, which may influence instructional practices and learning outcomes (Biri et al., 2026).

Given this gap, the present study evaluated the effectiveness of the repeated reading strategy in improving the reading fluency of Grade 8 students at Pangutaran National High School. Specifically, the study examined students’ fluency in terms of accuracy, automaticity, and prosody before and after the intervention. By focusing on a group of struggling readers within an actual school context, the study aimed to provide empirical evidence that could inform instructional practices and support the development of more effective reading programs.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This study was grounded in several complementary theories that explained the development of reading fluency through practice, cognition, and motivation. Primarily, it was anchored in Practice Theory (Ericsson, 2004), which posited that skills were improved through deliberate and repeated practice, suggesting that continuous engagement in reading tasks enhanced performance and automaticity. This perspective was supported by the Automaticity Theory of LaBerge and Samuels (1974), which explained that repeated exposure to reading tasks allowed learners to process text with minimal conscious effort, thereby freeing cognitive resources for comprehension. In this context, repeated reading was viewed as a mechanism for strengthening decoding skills and increasing reading fluency. In addition, Bandura’s Self-Efficacy Theory (1977) emphasized that learners’ beliefs in their abilities influenced their motivation and performance, implying that repeated reading could enhance

students' confidence and willingness to engage in reading tasks. The study also drew from the Fluency Model of Wolf and Katzir-Cohen (2013), which conceptualized reading fluency as a multidimensional construct involving cognitive, linguistic, motivational, and contextual factors, highlighting that fluency development was influenced by both internal processes and environmental conditions. Furthermore, Rasinski's (2006) theory of fluent reading underscored the importance of prosody, phrasing, and expression, suggesting that fluency extended beyond speed and accuracy to include expressive reading. Similarly, the Fluency Development Theory of Kuhn and Stahl (2003) reinforced that fluency developed through consistent practice and instruction, with accuracy, rate, and expression functioning as interconnected components. Taken together, these theoretical perspectives provided a comprehensive foundation for understanding how repeated reading supported the development of reading fluency by improving automaticity, enhancing motivation, and strengthening multiple dimensions of reading performance.

Research on reading fluency consistently emphasized its role as a critical component of literacy development, particularly in bridging decoding and comprehension. Early theoretical foundations highlighted that fluency was not merely speed but involved the automatic processing of text that allowed readers to focus on meaning. For instance, Krashen (1982) suggested that repeated exposure to language supported acquisition, while Samuels (1979) established the Theory of Automaticity, arguing that repeated reading enabled learners to transition from effortful decoding to automatic word recognition. These perspectives framed reading fluency as a cognitive process strengthened through practice, where repeated engagement with text enhanced both efficiency and comprehension. Consequently, repeated reading emerged as a structured instructional strategy grounded in these theoretical assumptions.

Empirical studies on reading fluency demonstrated that various instructional approaches contributed to its development across different learner populations. Several studies reported that integrating repeated reading with other strategies—such as technology-assisted reading, interactive reading-aloud, and extensive reading—resulted in significant improvements in fluency and comprehension (Amin, 2022; Bui & Macalister, 2021; Ceyhan & Yildiz, 2022). Similarly, interventions such as computer-assisted repeated reading and culturally relevant reading materials were found to enhance learners' oral reading fluency and engagement (Barber et al., 2018; Jaafar, 2021). However, some studies presented nuanced findings, indicating that improvements were not uniform across all fluency components or learner groups. For example, Padeliadu et al. (2021) reported gains in comprehension but not in fluency, while Weaver and Kieffer (2022) highlighted differences in fluency development based on learner profiles. These findings suggested that reading fluency was influenced by multiple interacting factors, including linguistic background, instructional design, and learner characteristics.

A substantial body of research specifically examined repeated reading as an intervention strategy and generally supported its effectiveness in improving reading fluency. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses confirmed that repeated reading remained one of the most reliable approaches for developing oral reading fluency, particularly among struggling readers (Hudson et al., 2020; Therrien, 2024). Studies further indicated that its effectiveness increased when combined with instructional supports such as modeling, feedback, and scaffolding (Elhoweris, 2017; Bennett et al., 2017). In addition, variations of repeated reading, including audio-assisted and technology-mediated formats, were found to enhance reading rate, accuracy, and comprehension (Taguchi et al., 2021; Romig & Jetton, 2024). However, some researchers noted limitations, arguing that repeated reading alone might not lead to sustained improvements without complementary strategies (Lynn, 2021; Norton, 2024). These findings highlighted the importance of contextualizing repeated reading within broader instructional frameworks to maximize its effectiveness.

In the Philippine context, reading fluency had been widely recognized as a persistent challenge, with many learners demonstrating difficulty in achieving comprehension despite ongoing national literacy efforts. Studies consistently showed that oral reading fluency—measured through accuracy, automaticity, and prosody—played a critical role in comprehension and overall academic performance. For instance, Balnig et al. (2023) found that automaticity had a significant relationship with reading comprehension, suggesting that speed and efficiency in word recognition were key predictors of understanding. Similarly, Binaloga (2024) reported that learners often performed at frustration or instructional levels in different fluency components, indicating uneven development across accuracy, speed, and expression. Other studies highlighted contributing factors such as reading anxiety, limited vocabulary, and lack of exposure to reading activities, which further hindered fluency development (Estrada-Madronero, 2019; Urbano et al., 2021). These findings suggested that reading difficulties in the Philippine setting were multidimensional and required targeted instructional interventions.

Intervention-based studies in the Philippines generally supported the effectiveness of repeated reading and related strategies in improving reading fluency. Several researchers reported significant gains in reading performance after implementing structured reading interventions. For example, Caabay et al. (2024) and Canuto et al. (2024) found that repeated reading activities reduced the number of students at frustration levels while increasing those at instructional and independent levels. Similarly, Veloso (2026) demonstrated that students exposed to repeated reading significantly improved in both word recognition and comprehension compared to control groups. Complementary approaches, such as audio-assisted reading, fluency-oriented instruction, and contextualized materials, were also found to enhance reading performance and learner motivation (Cubillas & Cangke, 2023; Balladares, 2023; Dela Cruz, 2025). However, many of these studies employed pre-experimental or descriptive designs, limiting the ability to establish strong causal relationships. Thus, there remained a need for more rigorous quasi-experimental investigations to determine the effectiveness of repeated reading strategies within specific school contexts, particularly among secondary-level struggling readers.

METHODS

This study employed a quasi-experimental research design, specifically a two-group pre-test–post-test non-equivalent comparison group design, to evaluate the effectiveness of the repeated reading strategy in improving students' reading fluency. Both the experimental and control groups were assessed before and after the intervention; however, only the experimental group received the treatment. This design allowed for the examination of changes in reading fluency attributed to the intervention while maintaining a comparison baseline (Creswell, 2014).

The study was conducted at Pangutaran National High School in Sulu, Philippines, involving forty (40) Grade 8 students identified as struggling readers. Participants were selected through simple random sampling and were divided equally into experimental ($n = 20$) and control ($n = 20$) groups. The experimental group underwent the repeated reading intervention, while the control group continued with regular classroom instruction. The selection process ensured that both groups were comparable in characteristics prior to the intervention.

Data were collected using an adapted reading fluency assessment tool consisting of three components: accuracy, automaticity, and prosody. The instrument included a demographic profile and a grade-level reading passage adapted from the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS). Accuracy was measured as the percentage of correctly decoded words, while automaticity was measured using words correct per minute (WCPM) based on established oral reading fluency benchmarks. Prosody was evaluated using a multidimensional fluency scale adapted from Zutell and

EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF
THE REPEATED READING STRATEGY
: A QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL

Rasinski (1991), which assessed expression, phrasing, smoothness, and pace. Fluency levels were categorized into independent, instructional, and frustration levels. Prior to implementation, the instrument underwent pilot testing, yielding acceptable to excellent reliability coefficients ($\alpha = .743-.919$), indicating its suitability for the study.

The data gathering procedure followed a structured process. After securing necessary permissions, both groups were administered a pre-test to establish baseline fluency levels. The experimental group then received the repeated reading intervention for several weeks, while the control group engaged in regular instruction. After the intervention period, both groups were administered a post-test using the same assessment tool. Reading fluency was measured through word accuracy, words correct per minute (WCPM), and a multidimensional fluency scale for prosody. To ensure consistency and reduce bias, three trained English teachers conducted individual assessments, and participant responses were coded.

Data were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Frequency and percentage were used to describe participants' profiles, while mean and standard deviation were used to determine fluency levels. Independent samples t-tests and one-way ANOVA were employed to examine differences across groups and demographic variables. Additionally, paired samples t-tests were used to determine significant differences between pre-test and post-test scores, allowing for the evaluation of the intervention's effectiveness.

Ethical standards were strictly observed throughout the study. Permissions were obtained from relevant authorities, and informed consent was secured from participants and their guardians. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained, and all data were used solely for research purposes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 presents the socio-demographic profile of the respondents indicated that the majority were female (60.0%), while males comprised 40.0% of the total sample. In terms of age, most participants were between 11–15 years old (80.0%), while a smaller proportion belonged to the 16–20 age group (20.0%), and none were aged 21 and above. Regarding academic achievement, more than half of the students were classified under the fairly satisfactory level (55.0%), followed by satisfactory (37.5%) and very satisfactory (7.5%), while no students were categorized as outstanding or did not meet expectations. In terms of group distribution, participants were equally assigned to the experimental and control groups, each comprising 50.0% of the sample.

The distribution of respondents suggests that the sample largely consisted of younger secondary students with moderate academic performance. The equal allocation of participants between the experimental and control groups indicates baseline comparability, which is essential in establishing the validity of quasi-experimental findings. Furthermore, the concentration of students within the fairly satisfactory and satisfactory levels implies that the participants were generally average performers, supporting their classification as learners who may benefit from targeted interventions to improve reading fluency.

Table 1
Socio-Demographic Profile of the Respondents (n = 40)

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage %
Gender	Male	16	40
	Female	24	60
Age	11–15 years old	32	80
	16–20 years old	8	20

	21 years old & above	0	0
	Outstanding	0	0
	Very Satisfactory	3	7.5
Achievement	Satisfactory	15	37.5
	Fairly Satisfactory	22	55
	Did not Meet Expectations	0	0
Group	Experimental	20	50
	Control	20	50

Table 2 presents the baseline assessment of students' reading fluency indicated that both the experimental and control groups exhibited low levels of performance prior to the intervention. In terms of accuracy, the overall mean score ($M = 85.00$, $SD = 11.86$) fell within the frustration level, with both the experimental ($M = 87.35$) and control groups ($M = 82.65$) demonstrating similar performance. A comparable pattern was observed in automaticity, where the overall mean ($M = 56.28$, $SD = 19.15$) also corresponded to the frustration level, indicating that students struggled with reading speed and efficiency. In contrast, prosody yielded relatively higher scores, with an overall mean of 93.53 ($SD = 3.17$), which was classified under the instructional level for both groups.

These findings suggest that prior to the intervention, students experienced significant difficulty in decoding accuracy and reading speed, while showing relatively better performance in expressive reading. The low performance in accuracy and automaticity indicates that students had not yet developed automatic word recognition, which is essential for fluent reading. According to automaticity theory, difficulties in lower-level processes such as decoding limit the reader's ability to allocate cognitive resources toward comprehension. The relatively higher performance in prosody may suggest that students possessed some awareness of expressive reading, but this was not supported by sufficient decoding and speed skills. Overall, the similarity in pre-test performance between the experimental and control groups confirms that both groups were comparable at baseline, supporting the validity of subsequent comparisons after the intervention.

Table 2

Baseline Reading Fluency of Students (Pre-test)

Fluency Component	Group	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Accuracy	Experimental	87.5	8.79	Frustration
	Control	82.65	14.94	Frustration
	Overall	85.00	11.86	Frustration
Automaticity	Experimental	60.20	16.92	Frustration
	Control	52.35	21.38	Frustration
	Overall	56.28	19.15	Frustration
Prosody	Experimental	94.10	3.11	Instructional
	Control	92.95	3.24	Instructional
	Overall	93.53	3.17	Instructional

Legend: Independent – 97-100%; Instructional – 90-96; Frustration – 89 & below

Table 3 presents the level of students' reading fluency after the implementation of the repeated reading strategy. The results showed that both the experimental and control groups remained at the frustration level in terms of accuracy and automaticity. Specifically, the experimental group obtained a higher mean score in accuracy ($M = 80.95$, $SD = 13.88$) compared to the control group ($M = 70.40$, $SD = 18.59$), although both remained within the frustration level. A similar trend was observed in automaticity, where the experimental group ($M = 79.85$, $SD = 14.60$) outperformed the control group (M

EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF
THE REPEATED READING STRATEGY
: A QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL

= 68.90, SD = 18.73), yet still did not reach the instructional level. In contrast, prosody remained within the instructional level for both groups, with the experimental group (M = 96.75, SD = 1.21) slightly higher than the control group (M = 94.75, SD = 2.27). These findings indicate that while students demonstrated relatively better expressive reading, their decoding accuracy and reading speed were still insufficient for fluent reading.

Although the overall fluency levels in accuracy and automaticity did not shift from frustration to higher categories, the higher mean scores of the experimental group compared to the control group suggest that the repeated reading strategy contributed to measurable improvements in reading performance. This implies that repeated exposure to text may have supported gradual development in decoding and reading speed, consistent with the principles of practice and automaticity. However, the persistence of frustration-level performance indicates that a longer duration of intervention or additional instructional support may be necessary to achieve substantial gains in reading fluency.

Table 3

Baseline Reading Fluency of Students (Post-test)

Fluency Component	Group	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Accuracy	Experimental	80.95	13.88	Frustration
	Control	70.40	18.59	Frustration
	Overall	75.68	16.23	Frustration
Automaticity	Experimental	79.85	14.60	Frustration
	Control	68.90	18.73	Frustration
	Overall	74.38	16.66	Frustration
Prosody	Experimental	96.75	1.21	Instructional
	Control	94.75	2.27	Instructional
	Overall	95.75	1.74	Instructional

Legend: Independent – 97-100%; Instructional – 90-96; Frustration – 89 & below

Table 4 presents the differences in students' pre-test reading fluency when grouped according to selected socio-demographic variables. The results showed that most variables did not significantly influence students' baseline reading fluency. Specifically, gender did not show significant differences in accuracy ($p = .520$) and automaticity ($p = .089$), but a significant difference was observed in prosody ($p = .002$), indicating variation in expressive reading between male and female students at baseline.

Similarly, age did not show any significant differences across all components of reading fluency, suggesting that variations in age did not influence students' initial performance. In contrast, achievement level demonstrated significant differences in automaticity ($p = .041$) and prosody ($p = .028$), indicating that students with higher academic performance tended to exhibit better reading speed and expressive reading. However, no significant difference was found in accuracy ($p = .281$).

In terms of group classification, no significant differences were observed in accuracy ($p = .520$) and automaticity ($p = .089$), indicating that the experimental and control groups were comparable prior to the intervention. However, a significant difference was observed in prosody ($p = .002$). Overall, these findings suggest that most socio-demographic variables did not substantially affect baseline fluency, although achievement level influenced specific components of reading fluency. The general comparability between groups supports the validity of subsequent analysis of the intervention's effects.

Table 4

Differences in Pre-test Reading Fluency by Profile Variables

Variable	Fluency Component	Test Value	p-value	Decision
Gender	Accuracy	$t = .650$	.520	Not Significant

	Automaticity	t = 1.748	.089	Not Significant
	Prosody	t = 3.374	.002	Significant
	Accuracy	F = .009	.925	Not Significant
Age	Automaticity	F = .903	.348	Not Significant
	Prosody	F = 2.209	.145	Not Significant
	Accuracy	F = 1.314	.281	Not Significant
Achievement	Automaticity	F = 3.485	.041	Significant
	Prosody	F = 3.945	.028	Significant
	Accuracy	t = .650	.520	Not Significant
Group	Automaticity	t = 1.748	.089	Not Significant
	Prosody	t = 3.374	.000	Significant

*Significant alpha .05

Table 5 presents the differences in students' post-test reading fluency when grouped according to selected socio-demographic variables. The results revealed that gender and age did not significantly influence students' reading fluency across all components, as indicated by non-significant p-values in accuracy, automaticity, and prosody. This suggests that improvements in reading fluency after the intervention were not dependent on students' gender or age. However, achievement level showed a significant effect across all components of reading fluency, including accuracy ($p = .037$), automaticity ($p = .013$), and prosody ($p = .014$). This indicates that students with higher academic performance demonstrated better reading outcomes after the intervention.

Most importantly, group classification showed significant differences in all components of reading fluency. The experimental group outperformed the control group in accuracy ($p = .049$), automaticity ($p = .046$), and prosody ($p = .001$), indicating that students exposed to the repeated reading strategy achieved significantly higher levels of reading fluency compared to those who did not receive the intervention.

These findings suggest that while demographic factors such as gender and age did not significantly affect reading outcomes, both achievement level and exposure to the repeated reading strategy played a crucial role in improving students' reading fluency. The significant differences observed between the experimental and control groups provide empirical support for the effectiveness of repeated reading as an instructional intervention. This aligns with theoretical perspectives emphasizing the role of practice and repeated exposure in developing automaticity and fluency in reading.

Table 5

Differences in Post-test Reading Fluency by Socio-Demographic Profile

Variable	Fluency Component	Test Value	p-value	Decision
Gender	Accuracy	t = .172	.864	Not Significant
	Automaticity	t = .310	.758	Not Significant
	Prosody	t = 1.429	.161	Not Significant
Age	Accuracy	F = 0.182	.672	Not Significant
	Automaticity	F = 0.395	.534	Not Significant
	Prosody	F = 0.326	.572	Not Significant
Achievement	Accuracy	F = 3.621	.037	Significant
	Automaticity	F = 4.852	.013	Significant
	Prosody	F = 4.809	.014	Significant
Group	Accuracy	t = 2.034	.049	Significant
	Automaticity	t = 2.062	.046	Significant
	Prosody	t = 3.480	.001	Significant

EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF
THE REPEATED READING STRATEGY
: A QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL

**Significant alpha .05*

Table 6 presents the differences in students' reading fluency before and after the implementation of the repeated reading strategy. The results revealed that significant differences were observed across all components of reading fluency in both the experimental and control groups.

In the experimental group, significant improvements were noted in accuracy ($p = .019$), automaticity ($p = .000$), and prosody ($p = .000$), indicating that students demonstrated measurable gains in decoding, reading speed, and expressive reading after exposure to the repeated reading strategy. Similarly, the control group also showed significant changes across all components, suggesting that some level of improvement occurred even without the intervention, possibly due to regular instruction or practice effects.

However, a closer examination of the magnitude and direction of change suggests that the experimental group demonstrated more consistent and meaningful improvements, particularly in automaticity and prosody. This indicates that repeated reading contributed to enhanced reading performance by promoting practice and increasing familiarity with text, which supports the development of automaticity in reading.

Overall, these findings indicate that repeated reading had a significant effect on students' reading fluency. Although improvements were also observed in the control group, the significant gains in the experimental group, together with the results from between-group comparisons, provide evidence supporting the effectiveness of the repeated reading strategy as an instructional intervention.

Table 6

Pre-test and Post-test Differences in Reading Fluency

Variable	Fluency Component	Mean Difference	Test Value	p-value	Decision
Experimental	Accuracy	-6.400	2.573	.019	Significant
	Automaticity	-1.965	-9.955	.000	Significant
	Prosody	-2.650	-5.257	.000	Significant
Control	Accuracy	1.225	4.973	.000	Significant
	Automaticity	-1.655	-6.976	.000	Significant
	Prosody	-1.800	-3.136	.005	Significant

**Significant alpha .05*

CONCLUSION

This study examined the effectiveness of the repeated reading strategy in improving the reading fluency of Grade 8 students in terms of accuracy, automaticity, and prosody. The findings showed that students initially demonstrated low levels of reading fluency, particularly in accuracy and automaticity, while prosody was at a relatively higher level. After the intervention, both the experimental and control groups showed statistically significant improvements; however, the experimental group consistently obtained higher mean scores across all fluency components. Moreover, significant differences in post-test performance between groups indicated that students exposed to the repeated reading strategy performed better than those who received regular instruction.

The main contribution of this study lies in providing empirical evidence that repeated reading can enhance reading fluency, particularly in developing automaticity and expressive reading among

struggling readers. Although the overall fluency levels remained within the frustration category for some components, the observed improvements suggest that repeated reading is a viable and practical intervention that supports gradual fluency development in real classroom settings.

Despite these findings, the study has several limitations. The sample size was relatively small and limited to one school, which may affect the generalizability of the results. In addition, the duration of the intervention may not have been sufficient to produce substantial changes in fluency levels, particularly in accuracy. Furthermore, baseline differences in certain components, such as prosody, may have influenced the outcomes.

Given these limitations, future research may consider implementing the repeated reading strategy over a longer period and with a larger and more diverse sample to further examine its effectiveness. Studies may also explore the integration of repeated reading with other instructional approaches or technologies to enhance reading fluency. Additionally, future investigations may focus on examining long-term effects and how improvements in fluency translate into gains in reading comprehension.

REFERENCES

- Alammari, M. I. (2025). *Using repeated reading to increase reading fluency among postsecondary students with mild intellectual disabilities* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee). <https://trace.tennessee.edu/>
- Alghafri, A. (2023). The effect of repeated reading strategy on comprehension among grade four school students. *Participatory Educational Research*, 10(1), 21–36. <https://doi.org/10.17275/per.23.42.10.3>
- Amin, E. A. (2022). Using repeated reading and listening-while-reading via text-to-speech apps in developing fluency and comprehension. *World Journal of English Language*, 12(1), 211–220. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v12n2p211>
- Al Naji, A. (2023). *The impact of repeated reading intervention on oral reading fluency for students with autism spectrum disorder* (Doctoral dissertation, Duquesne University).
- Bagolong, N. A., & Usop, A. M. (2021). Reading skills of elementary pupils as basis for an intervention plan. *JPAIR Institutional Research Journal*, 16(1).
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215.
- Barber, M., Cartledge, G., Council, M., Konrad, M., Gardner, R., & Telesman, A. (2018). Computer-assisted culturally relevant repeated reading. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal*, 16(2), 205–229.
- Bennett, J., Gardner, R., Cartledge, G., Ramnath, R., & Council, M. (2017). Computer-assisted repeated reading intervention. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 40(2), 145–186. <https://doi.org/10.1353/etc.2017.0008>
- Binaloga, J. M. (2024). Level of oral reading fluency of learners. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Education*.
- Bui, T. N., & Macalister, J. (2021). Online extensive reading in an EFL context. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 33(1), 1–29.
- Biri, A. K., Arilin, A., Rasdi, A., Dawami, M., Usman, K., Teh, A., ... Nassal, F. J. (2026). When English Isn't Enough: Exploring the Emotional and Professional Dilemmas of English Teachers Using Translanguaging in Multilingual Classrooms. *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 11(1), 2218–2232. <https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v11i1.4284>
- Caabay, M. T., et al. (2024). Intervention to enhance reading comprehension skills. *International Journal of Education and Teaching Zone*, 3(1), 50–59. <https://doi.org/10.57092/ijetz.v3i1.154>
- Canuto, P. P., et al. (2024). Enhancing oral reading fluency through repeated reading. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 23(4), 376–393.

EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF
THE REPEATED READING STRATEGY
: A QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL

- Ceyhan, S., & Yildiz, M. (2021). Interactive reading aloud and fluency. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 13(4), 421–431.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Dela Cruz, E. F. (2025). Localized materials in fluency development. *International Journal of Literacy and Pedagogical Practices*, 9(4), 201–215.
- Department of Education. (2011). *DepEd Order No. 70: Every Child a Reader Program*.
- Department of Education. (2018). *DepEd Order No. 14: Philippine Informal Reading Inventory*.
- University of Oregon. (2020). *DIBELS 8th Edition technical manual*.
- Elhoweris, H. (2017). Repeated reading intervention impact. *International Journal of Psycho-Educational Sciences*, 6(2), 36–48.
- Ericsson, K. A. (2004). Deliberate practice and expert performance. *Academic Medicine*, 79(10), S70–S81.
- Estrada-Madronero, J. C. (2019). Reading anxiety and fluency. *International Linguistics Research*, 2(1), 20–30.
- Gedik, O., & Akyol, H. (2022). Reading difficulty and fluency. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 18(1), 21–41.
- Holder, A. J. (2017). Effectiveness of repeated reading. *International Research in Higher Education*, 2(2), 74–77.
- Hudson, A., et al. (2020). Fluency interventions synthesis. *Education Sciences*, 10(3), 52–80.
- Jaafar, H., et al. (2021). Computer-assisted repeated reading. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 17(1), 208–221.
- Kim, Y. S. G., et al. (2021). Reading fluency and comprehension. *Developmental Psychology*, 57(5), 718–732.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon.
- Kuhn, M. R., & Stahl, S. A. (2003). Fluency development. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(1), 3–21.
- LaBerge, D., & Samuels, S. J. (1974). Automatic information processing. *Cognitive Psychology*, 6(2), 293–323.
- Lynn, E. (2021). Unassisted repeated reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 33(1), 30–54.
- Norton, E. (2024). Repeated vs wide reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 59(3), 312–328.
- Padeliadu, S., et al. (2021). Repeated reading intervention. *Contemporary Journal*, 19(1), 49–67.
- Parra, J. F., et al. (2023). Repeated reading strategy. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*.
- Philippine Congress. (2023). *Republic Act No. 12028 (ARAL Program)*.
- Pleban, R. T., & Perrin, D. (2015). Repeated reading review. *Reading Improvement*, 52(2), 63–76.
- Rasinski, T. V. (2006). Reading fluency instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 59(7), 704–706.
- Romig, J. E., & Jetton, A. (2024). Online repeated reading. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, 39(2), 163–173.
- Samuels, S. J. (1979). Method of repeated reading. *The Reading Teacher*, 32(4), 403–408.
- Taguchi, E., et al. (2021). Repeated reading in EFL. *Pedagogies*.
- Therrien, W. J. (2004). Repeated reading meta-analysis. *Remedial and Special Education*, 25(4), 252–261.
- Urbano, C. M., et al. (2021). Reading needs of Filipino students. *Modern Journal of Studies in English Language Teaching and Literature*, 3(1), 140–166.
- Veloso, S. M. (2026). Repeated reading quasi-experimental study. *Philippine Journal of Education and Literacy*, 12(1), 46–62.
- Weaver, A., & Kieffer, M. J. (2022). Fluency and executive function. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 38(3), 233–252.
- Wolf, M., & Katzir-Cohen, T. (2013). Fluency model. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 17(5), 347–369.
- Zutell, J., & Rasinski, T. (1991). Oral reading fluency scale. *Theory Into Practice*, 30(3), 211–217.