

**REPEATED READING, PAIRED READING ECHO READING
STRATEGIES AND READING FLUENCY PERFORMANCE
AMONG CHILDHOOD LEARNERS IN PUBLIC PRIMARY
SCHOOL IN AKWA IBOM NORTH –EAST SENATORIAL
DISTRICT**

BY

Mrs Hannah Sunday Ani.

phone: 08038174731, email: hannahsundayani@mail.com

Dr Ndifon Friday Ogobi.

phone: 08039626551, email: fridayogobi@gmail.com

and

Miss Lesoda Anne Bassey

Phone: 08062743764, email: lesodabassey@gmail.com

*Department of Early Childhood Education
University of Education and Entrepreneurship, Akamkpa*

Abstract

This study examined the impact of repeated reading, paired reading and echo reading strategy in enhancing pupils' reading fluency performance. To achieve the purpose of this study, three objectives, three research questions and hypotheses were formulated to guide the study; the null hypotheses were tested at .05 level of significance. The study utilized quasi experimental research design. The population of the study comprise of the 1419 primary one pupils in the 124 public primary schools in the nine local government areas in Akwa Ibom North East Senatorial District. A sample size of 140 primary one pupils was selected for the study using multistage sampling technique. The study had three experimental groups and one constant control group. The instrument used for data collection was "Reading Fluency Performance Test (FRPF). Means and standard deviation were used in answering the research questions while the null hypotheses were tested using Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) at .05 level of significance. From the data analyses, the major finding of the study was that there is a significant difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught reading fluency using repeated reading, echo reading and paired reading strategies compared with their counterparts who were taught using the look and say method. Secondly, those taught using repeated reading strategy performed better than those taught using echo reading and paired reading strategies. Based on the findings of the study, it was recommended among others that teachers and parents should utilize repeated reading, echo reading and paired reading strategies to teach their pupils or children reading fluency.

Key Words: Repeated reading, Paired reading, Echo reading Strategies and Reading Fluency

Introduction

Reading is one of the most significant elements for success in education, careers, and society as a whole. Reading is a basic critical language skill that any learner needs for academic success. In other words, it is one of the most important language skills. It is the barrier between one's being literate or illiterate. (Gu, 2023, p. 6) states that reading enables learners to gain exposure to the target language and receive valuable linguistic input to build up language proficiency. Reading is not only in language subjects, but also in all other school subjects. Through reading, one can acquire information either in a school setting or in society at large. There is always a purpose for reading; whether answering questions or reading for pleasure. Comprehension is central to the reading act. It constitutes the primary purpose for reading. In order to understand a text, one must have sufficient skills and strategies to enable comprehension of the written work. Failing to comprehend reading texts can result in poor performance in other areas of education (Cain and Oakhill (2024). Poor readers struggle with studies during school time, and they will likely continue to face similar challenges in their future careers. Reading deficiency may result in poor performance in other areas of education. It is therefore important to look for a new intensive reading approach that focuses more on improving reading fluency and reading comprehension.

Reading fluency has been through multiple conceptualizations. These include the rapid reading of individual words, reading words correctly, the speed at which one can read connected text, and reading with expression. Fluent reading is now conceptualized by reading scholars as a construct composed of three facets, or indicators. These include 1) the rate of one's reading, 2) the accuracy at which words are pronounced, and 3) the prosody (meaning expression) in one's voice that brings a text to life. While the indicators are individually identified, they work interactively to produce fluent reading. For example, the rate or pace with which one reads often simulates, to a loose extent, the pace of spoken language. Correctly pronouncing individual words is important to maintaining a smooth rate, otherwise the reader must stop to analyze and determine how to say the word which breaks the smoothness of the reading. As in speech, prosody is important to understanding the various interpretational nuances of the text, as it is in a conversation. Imagine speaking with someone who talks in a flat, monotone voice. Much interpretation would be lost and frankly, interest in the conversation would quickly wane. So, while fluency can be defined as three distinct indicators, they work interactively with each other to produce smooth reading that is both pleasant to listen to and as with speech, aids understanding (Salem, 2017).

Reading fluency is defined by reading rate, word identification accuracy, and prosody (expression). Fluency is the bridge between word recognition and comprehension. In supporting young children's development as fluent readers, attention should be given to accuracy, expression, phrasing, smoothness and pace (rate). Texts used should be at

children's independent and instructional levels. Reading Fluency is a constrained skill and is dependent on the development of other skills that is automaticity, accuracy and prosody. Accuracy is 'the ability to identify most words correctly. It involves decoding, sight word recognition and guessing from context. Automaticity is the 'ability to recognize words rapidly and effortlessly, saving mental energy for comprehension'. Prosody is 'the ability to read with expression to support understanding and to convey meaning to others. It involves stress, phrasing and pitch. Five basic elements of effective fluency are; instruction/modelling of fluent reading, development of sight vocabulary, opportunities to apply word, identification skills, increasing amount of reading by offering numerous practice opportunities and focusing on expressive reading with appropriate phrasing. Reading Fluency should be explicitly taught using effective reading fluency strategies such as repeated reading strategy, echo reading strategy and paired reading strategy.

Repeated reading represents an educational strategy for building reading fluency in which pupils rereads a passage until meeting a criterion. Research shows that repeated reading can facilitate growth in reading fluency and other aspects of reading achievement. Repeated reading has gained popularity as a technique for helping pupils achieve reading fluency. It is widely implemented and can be used for pupils with and without disabilities. Repeated reading has several components that make it more efficient. Repeated reading involves rereading the same passage of text multiple times in one sitting. This is different from what is called fluency work in many published reading series. Reading the text at home each day of the week and readers theater are not approaches to repeated reading. Sustained silent reading is a common classroom practice, but it is not supported by research as a way to improve oral reading fluency. Spending class time reading silently or providing time for pupils to self-select books to read, are practices that help only those pupils who are already skilled readers. For pupils who are accurate but slow readers, it is better to spend classroom time doing repeated reading (Al-Kharousi, 2014).

In 2018, researchers at the Iowa Reading Research Center conducted a study with fourth graders that compared repeated reading to a new approach they called varied practice. Pupils were randomly assigned to either the repeated reading group or the varied practice group. Repeated reading involved re-reading the same passage three times with a partner. Varied practice involved reading three different passages in which 85% of the words overlapped, but were arranged in different order. Both groups made tremendous gains in words correct per minute after 30 sessions, conducted three to four times a week, over 12 weeks. Pupils in the repeated reading group improved oral reading fluency by 18.9 words correct per minute and pupils in the varied practice group improved by 20.9 words correct per minute.

Moreover, Roundy and Roundy (2019, p.55) suggested that “the success of repeated reading does not stem from one particular practice but from the discovery of learned morphological and syntactical cues.” Schwanflugel, (2014, p.499) stated that: "practice strengthen

connections between word and letter pattern in long-term memory, unitizes these letter patterns in memory so that they can be processed as whole units and proliferates the availability of instances of these word and letter unit representations in long-term memory with every encounter of them during reading". In reviews of research related to repeated readings, Dowhower (2014) and Moyer (2021) report that studies of repeated reading strategy have demonstrated improvements in students reading rate, and word recognition accuracy, better comprehension of both literal and higher-level information, and its use as an effective study strategy. Moreover, Rasinski (2023) maintains that improvements extend to unpracticed passages for pupils in primary through the middle grades and that repeated reading appears to be an effective intervention for pupils experiencing difficulty in learning to read. He stated that repeated reading strategy proved to be facilitating for slow and halting readers and to increase fluency rapidly and with apparent ease. Taguchi, Sasamoto, and Gorsuch (2016) considered repeated reading strategy as a "deceptively simple but extraordinary powerful" strategy in developing readers word recognition skills, overall fluency and comprehension. Research has shown that: 1- repeated readings improve both fluency and comprehension, repeated readings increase word recognition and lead to a decrease in word recognition errors, pupils read new selections at a faster pace than the initial speed on the previous reading selection. The number of rereading required reaching criterion reading speed decreases as pupils continue the technique, and repeated reading are an excellent motivational device. Repeated readings lead to faster processing of text, comprehension and encouraged deeper questioning and insights, Repeated readings help struggling readers break out word by-word reading to read with more meaningful phrasing, and as a study strategy, repeated reading is equal to if not better than other more complicated strategies (Rasinski,2023).

Repeated reading may have several practical disadvantages; over the long term, pupils may be tired from its use. Pupils may lose interest in and motivation for the repetition of previously read material. Moreover, repeated readings may be labour intensive for teachers as they are called on to provide assistance to individuals who are experiencing difficulty in initial readings. (Rasinski, 2023).

Paired reading is a research-based fluency strategy used with readers who lack fluency. In this strategy, more fluent readers can be paired with less fluent readers or children who read at the same level can be paired to read a story they have already read (Topping, 2015). With paired reading strategy, two pupils read together to improve their reading fluency. This method involves one pupil reading aloud while the other listens and provides support as needed. The roles are then reversed with each pupil taking turns as the reader and the listener. Usually teachers will pair more-fluent reader with less fluent-reader, although children who read at the same level can be paired too. Paired reading can be used with any book, taking turns reading by sentence, paragraph, page or chapter. Paired reading helps pupils work together, it encourages cooperation and peer –assisted learning. The presence of a peer can

reduce anxiety and build confidence. Hearing a peer read fluently serves as a model for expression, intonation and pacing. Reading with partner makes the reading experience more engaging and interactive (Topping, 2015).

Paired Reading is a straightforward and generally enjoyable way of more able readers to help less able readers. In paired reading, "pairs of pupils take turns reading and rereading the same passage to each other. Learners may be similar in reading level or one may be deliberately paired with a better reader" (Mcshane, 2015p.53). Blum and Koskinen (2011) created paired reading so that learners could work in pairs to achieve the goals of reading. Topping (2016) stated that paired reading technique has two main aspects: first, tutor and tutee read out loud simultaneously in close synchrony. This is termed "reading together". The tutor adjusts his or her reading speed to the tutee's pace as necessary. The tutee must read all the words out loud correctly. The tutor corrects any errors by again giving a perfect example of how to read the error word and ensuring that the tutee repeats it correctly. Second when the tutee feels confident enough to read a section of text unsupported, he/she signals by a knock, nudge, or other nonverbal signal for the tutor to be silent. The tutee then engages in reading alone, with the tutor listening and ready to help when necessary. The tutor praises the tutee regularly, especially for mastering difficult words or spontaneously self-correcting. The second aspect is termed "reading alone". When the tutee makes an error while reading alone, the tutor corrects as before (by modeling and ensuring perfect repetition), and then joins back in reading simultaneously. Any word not read correctly within a pause of four seconds is treated as an error; the tutee is not left to struggle. Throughout, a great deal of emphasis is placed on praising the tutee for correct reading and pausing from time to time to discuss the meaning of the text

According Kuhn and Schwanenflugel (2018), paired reading is effective for several reasons. First, pupils benefit from practicing the reading of connected texts, and this strategy ensures that pupils spend significant amounts of time reading aloud or following along with their partners. Second, paired reading provides learners with the opportunity to read a text repeatedly, which supports the development of automatic word reading. Third, because pupils receive correction and support from their partners during the reading, they are able to practice a text that they cannot yet read independently. Topping (2016) highlight the main advantage of paired reading which is that it has been used as an intervention for pupils with reading delay and also as a broad- spectrum mainstream method deployed inclusively for all pupils. He also sums up the advantages of paired reading as follows: it encourages pupils to pursue their own interests in reading material. ii. It makes the pupils more in control of what is going on. In other words, they make their decisions themselves in the light purposes. iii. Paired reading gives continuity. It eliminates stopping and starting to break up hard works. Besides, with paired reading it is easier for pupils to make sensible guesses at new words, based on the meaning of the surrounding words. While practicing paired reading, pupils are given a perfect example of how to pronounce difficult words, instead of being left to work it

out themselves. In paired reading, there is no failure. It is impossible not to get a word right within 4 seconds or so. In paired reading the pupils get lots of praise when he/she is doing well. Doing reading together, a pupil can learn to read with expression and the right pacing. Paired reading increases the amount of sheer reading practice student get. Paired reading gives tutors a clear, straightforward, and enjoyable way of helping their learners so no one gets confused, worried, or bad-tempered about reading.

Li and Nes (2021) investigated the effects of paired reading on reading fluency and reading accuracy of four students with limited English proficiency. Using a single-subjects research design, the study paired the students with a skilled reader and examined students' reading performances under different controlled conditions. Results showed that the students benefited from the paired reading intervention and demonstrated steady improvement in reading fluency and accuracy. Results indicated that paired reading can serve as a useful instructional alternative to facilitate students learning to read.

Another reading strategy that can enhance pupils' reading fluency is echo reading. Chen (2018) describe echo reading strategy as a strategy where the teacher reads a portion of a shared text aloud, models a fluent reading of the text, the learners then echo (imitate) her fluency as they re-read the same passage repeatedly. Echo reading involves the teacher reading aloud a text line by line or sentence by sentence modeling appropriate fluency. After reading each line, the pupils echo back the reading of the line with the same rate and prosody. This activity can be done with individual pupils, small groups, or larger groups of pupils. Parents or teachers can help by choosing a book or story on the child's reading level. Pointing to word as they are being read to in order to ensure the child is tracking along. Modeling appropriate reading technique by maintaining a consistent pace, pausing at punctuation and enunciating clearly help pupils read fluently (Homan, 2013).

Despite the relevance of reading fluency, it is disheartening that the researcher through on-the spot observation discovered that some primary school pupils in the area of study cannot read fluently (they cannot read with the right diction, accurate pronunciation and speed). Their inability to read fluently could be attributed to so many factors such as poor teaching strategy. The look and say method of teaching reading is currently utilized in public primary schools. The look and say method of teaching reading is also known as the whole- word approach, teaches reading by having children recognize words as complete units, relying on visual memory and context rather than sounding out letters. It is against the back drop that the researcher was motivated to examine the effectiveness of repeated reading strategy, echo reading strategy and paired reading strategy in enhancing pupils reading fluency in Akwa Ibom North East Senatorial District.

Statement of the Problem

Through on-the spot observation as an education officer, the researcher observed poor

reading fluency among primary school pupils. Some pupils cannot pronounce words correctly with the right stress and intonation pattern without the interference of the mother tongue accent. Some do not observe punctuation marks when reading, while some read slowly. Reading fluency is the ability to read accurately, smoothly and with correct expression. Non- fluent readers have to spend more time decoding, spending less time for comprehending the text. Pupils' poor reading fluency could be attributed to many factors such as lack of high-quality suitable teaching and learning materials to teach reading fluency. Some schools do not create time to practice nor teach reading fluency. Some teachers also believe children can learn reading fluency without being taught. Some teachers do not utilize appropriate teaching method to teach pupils reading fluency. It is against this backdrop that the researcher was motivated to examine the effectiveness of repeated reading strategy, echo reading strategy and paired reading strategy in enhancing reading fluency ability of public primary school pupils in Akwa Ibom North East Senatorial District.

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study was to examine the effectiveness of repeated reading, echo reading, and paired reading strategies in enhancing the reading fluency of public primary school pupils' in Akwa Ibom North- East Senatorial District. Specifically, the objectives were to:

- I. determine the difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught reading fluency using repeated reading strategy and those taught using the conventional reading strategy (look and say method).
- ii. determine the difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught reading fluency using paired reading strategy and those taught using the conventional reading strategy (look and say method).
- iii. determine the difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught reading fluency using echo reading strategy and those taught using the conventional method (look and say method).

Research Questions

The following research questions were formulated to guide the study.

1. What is the difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught reading fluency using repeated reading strategy and those taught using the conventional reading strategy (look and say method)?
2. What is the difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught reading fluency using paired reading strategy and those taught using the conventional reading strategy (look and say method)?
3. What is the difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught reading fluency using echo reading strategy and those taught using the conventional method (look and say method)?

Research Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were formulated to guide the study:

- H₀₁:** There is no significant difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught reading fluency using repeated reading strategy and those taught using the conventional reading strategy (look and say method).
- H₀₂:** There is no significant difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught fluency using paired reading strategy and those taught using the conventional reading strategy (look and say method).
- H₀₃:** There is no significant difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught reading fluency using echo reading strategy and those taught using the conventional method (look and say method).

Methodology

This study adopted quasi experimental research design. This research design was adopted for the study due to its numerous advantages as enumerated by Sambo (2018) which include revealing which instructional strategy is better than the other and to identify differences in the performance (scores) of the two groups.

The area of study was Akwa Ibom North-East senatorial District which has nine local government areas. The nine local government areas are Uyo, Etinan, Ibesikpo Asutan, Ibiono Ibom, Itu, NsitAtai, Nsit Ibom, Nsit Ubium and Uruan.

The population of the study comprise of the 1419 primary one pupils in the 124 public primary schools in the nine local government areas in Akwa Ibom North East Senatorial District (SUBEB, 2016).

A sample size of 140 primary one pupils was used for the study. They were selected using multistage sampling technique; involving stratified sampling technique, and simple random sampling technique).

The instrument used for data collection was Reading fluency performance Test (FRPF), designed by the researchers to measure pupils' fluency performance in pronunciation skills, use of intonation, stress, reading speed and observation of punctuation marks when reading. The instrument was rated in 100%.

RFPT was validated by three experts; an expert in English Education, and two experts in educational research all from the University of Uyo, Uyo. They all made constructive critiques and corrections which the researchers adhered to.

To determine the reliability of the instrument (RFPT), a pilot test was done with a group of 35 primary one pupils who were not part of the study sample. The results of the two tests

were compared and correlated using cronbach formula. From the result obtained, the reliability index of the instrument was .85. This implied that the instrument was reliable for data collection.

In the experimental procedure, the researchers groomed three research assistants who assisted in the field work. Six weeks were used for the experiment. At first week, a pre-test was given to both the experimental groups and the control group, week 2- week 5, both the experimental groups and the control groups were taught reading fluency using different instructional strategies. The four experimental groups were given treatment which was teaching pupils reading fluency using three different reading strategies while the control group had no treatment, they were taught reading fluency using the conventional method (look and say method). At week 6, a post-test was given to both the experimental groups and the control groups and data collected were marked, scored and sent for analysed.

The Reading Fluency Performance Test (RFPT) was used for data collection both at the pre-test and the post-test intervals. The instrument evaluated pupils' reading fluency performance on five broad areas which were pronunciation skills (20 marks), use of intonation (20 marks), stress (20 marks), reading speed (20 marks) and observation of punctuation marks (20 marks) while reading. The Reading Fluency Performance Test instrument had a total of 100 marks. The research questions were answered using mean and standard deviation while the hypotheses were tested using Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) at .05 level of significance.

Results

Research question one:

What is the difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught reading fluency using repeated reading strategy and those taught using the conventional reading strategy (look and say method)?

Table 1: Difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught reading fluency using repeated reading strategy and those taught using the conventional reading strategy (look and say method)

Group	Pre-test scores				Post test scores			
	N	x	SD	MD	N	x	SD	MD
Experimental (Repeated reading Strategy)	35	30.4	4.8		35	82.7	11.5	
				0.6	0			14.2
Control group (Look and say method)	35	29.8	7.4		35	68.5	9.6	
Total	70	30.1	6.1		70	75.6	12.5	

Source: Field Data (2025)

Research Question Two

What is the difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught reading fluency using paired reading strategy and those taught using the conventional reading strategy (look and say method)?

Table 2: Difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught reading fluency using paired reading strategy and those taught using the conventional reading strategy (look and say method)

Group	Pre-test scores				Post test scores			
	N	x	SD	MD	N	x	SD	MD
Experimental (paired reading strategy)	35	41.0	5.9		35	98.5	10.9	
Strategy				0.1	0			10.0
Control group (Look and Say Method)	35	40.9	7.2		35	68.5	9.10	
Total	70	41.0	6.6		70	73.5	11.1	

Source: Field Data (2025)

Research Question 3

What is the difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught echo reading strategy and those taught using the conventional method (look and say method)?

Table 3: Difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught echo reading strategy and those taught using the conventional method (look and say method).

Group	Pre-test scores				Post test scores			
	N	x	SD	MD	N	x	SD	MD
Experimental (Echo reading strategy)	35	42.5	5.7		35	77.0	11.8	
				0.7	0			8.5
Control group (Look and Say Method)	35	43.2	6.3		35	68.5	9.01	
Total	70	42.9	6.0		70	72.8	11.5	

Source: Field Data (2025)

Hypotheses One

There is no significant difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught reading fluency using repeated reading strategy and those taught using the conventional reading strategy (look and say method).

Table 4: Summary of the Analysis of C ovariance (ANCOVA) on the difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught reading fluency using repeated reading strategy and those taught using the conventional reading strategy (look and say method)

Source of variation	Type III sum of square	Df	Mean square	F	P. Value
Corrected model	5504.988	2	2752.492	35.078	.000
Intercept	4954.390	1	4954.390	63.139	.000
Pretest scores	1962.074	1	1962.074	25.005	.000
Groups	3411.025	1	3411.025	43.470	.000
Error	5257.355	67	78.468		
Total	411140.00	70			
Corrected total	10762.343	69			

a.R squared=.512 (adjusted R. squared = .497

Significant at .05 alpha level. **Source: Field Data (2025)**

Table 1 and Table 4. shows that the calculated F-Value of 43.470 and the probability value of .000 in respect of the between group treatment for the two groups, since the P-value =.000 was less than 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected. This implies that there is a significant difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught reading fluency using repeated reading strategy and those taught using the conventional reading strategy (look and say method) with a mean difference scores of 14.2.

Hypotheses Two: There is no significant difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught fluency using paired reading strategy and those taught using the conventional reading strategy (look and say method).

Table 5: Summary of (ANCOVA) Analysis of Covariance on the differences in the mean performance scores of pupils taught reading fluency using paired reading strategy and those taught using the conventional reading strategy (look and say method)

Source of variation	Type III sum of square	DF	Mean square	F	P. Value
Corrected model	4380.239	2	2190.119	35.536	.000
Intercept	3687.259	1	3687.259	59.828	.000
Pretest scores	2650.181	1	2650.181	43.001	.000
Groups	1654.718	1	1654.718	26.830	.000
Error	4129.247	67	61.631		
Total	386520.000	70			
Corrected total	8509.486	69			

a.R squared = .515 (Adjusted R. squared = .500*

Significant at .05 level alpha level.

Source: Field Data (2025)

The result as presented in Table 2 and 5. shows the calculated F-value of 26.849 and the probability value of .000 for the two groups. Since the P-value - .000 was less than 0.05 level of significance, the null hypotheses were rejected. The posttest means performance scores of pupils taught reading fluency using paired reading strategy and those taught using the conventional reading strategy (look and say method) ($X = 78.5$) was greater than the mean scores performance of those taught using the conventional method ($X = 68.5$) with a mean difference of 10.0.

Hypotheses Three

There is no significant difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught echo reading strategy and those taught using the conventional method (look and say method)?

Table 6: Summary of Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) on the differences in the mean performance scores of pupils taught echo reading strategy and those taught using the conventional method (look and say method)

Source of variation	Type III sum of square	DF	Mean square	F	P. Value
Corrected model	7304.77	2	3652.39	169.75	.000
Intercept	1571.4212	1	1571.442	73.04	.000
Pretest scores	6036.145	1	6036.145	280.343	.000
Groups	1195.181	1	1195.181	55.549	.000
Error	1441.570	67	21.56		
Total	379444000	70			
Corrected total	8746.343	69			

a.R squared = .835 (Adjusted R. squared = .830)* Significant at .05 level alpha level.

Source: Field Data (2025)

The result as presented in Table 3 and 6 shows calculated F-Value of 55.549 and the probability value of .000 for the groups. Since the P-value = .000 was less than 0.05 level of significance at the degrees of freedom 1 and 67, the null hypothesis was rejected. The mean scores performance of those taught reading fluency using echo reading strategy and those taught using the conventional method (look and say method) with a mean difference of 8.5.

Findings

From the results analyzed, the major findings of the study were:

- I. There is a significant difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught reading fluency using repeated reading strategy and those taught using the conventional reading strategy (look and say method).
- ii. There is a significant difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught reading fluency using paired reading strategy and those taught using the conventional reading strategy (look and say method).
- iii. There is a significant difference in the mean performance scores of pupils taught reading fluency using echo reading strategy and those taught using the conventional method (look and say method).

Discussion of Findings

Tables 1 and 4. showed that pupils taught reading fluency using repeated reading strategy and those taught using the conventional reading strategy (look and say method). This finding is in line with the findings of Young (2019), Herman (2015), Taguchi, Sasamoto, and Gorsuch (2016) who in their various studies considered repeated reading strategy as a “deceptively simple but extraordinary powerful” strategy in developing readers' word recognition skills, overall fluency and comprehension. The results of their findings have shown that repeated reading improves fluency and comprehension, increase word recognition and lead to a decrease in word recognition errors. Pupils read new selections at a faster pace than the initial speed on the previous reading selection.

Roundy and Roundy (2019, p.55) suggested that “the success of repeated reading does not stem from one particular practice but from the discovery of learned morphological and syntactical cues.” Schwanflugel, (2014, p.499) stated that: "practice strengthen connections between word and letter pattern in long-term memory, unitizes these letter patterns in memory so that they can be processed as whole units and proliferates the availability of instances of these word and letter unit representations in long-term memory with every encounter of them during reading". In reviews of research related to repeated readings, Dowhower (2014) and Moyer (2021) report that studies of repeated reading strategy have demonstrated improvements in students reading rate, and word recognition accuracy, better comprehension of both literal and higher-level information, and its use as an effective study strategy. Moreover, Rasinski (2023) maintains that improvements extend to unpracticed passages for pupils in primary through the middle grades and that repeated reading appears

to be an effective intervention for pupils experiencing difficulty in learning to read. He stated that repeated reading strategy proved to be facilitating for slow and halting readers and to increase fluency rapidly and with apparent ease.

Table 2 and 5 revealed that pupils taught reading fluency using paired reading strategy and those taught using the conventional reading strategy (look and say method). This finding is in consonance with the findings of Topping (2016), Stahl (2016), (Adams, 2019), and Chall (2016) which states that paired reading could be used as an intervention strategy for pupils with reading delay and also as a broad- spectrum mainstream method deployed inclusively for all pupils. They also sum up the advantages of paired reading as follows: i. it encourages pupils to pursue their own interests in reading material. ii. It makes the pupils more in control of what is going on. In other words, they make their decisions themselves in the light purposes. iii. Paired reading gives continuity. It eliminates stopping and starting to break up hard works. Besides, with paired reading it is easier for pupils to make sensible guesses at new words, based on the meaning of the surrounding words.

While practicing paired reading, pupils are given a perfect example of how to pronounce difficult words, instead of being left to work it out themselves. In paired reading, there is no failure. It is impossible not to get a word right within 4 seconds or so. In paired reading the pupils get lots of praise when he/she is doing well. Doing reading together, a pupil can learn to read with expression and the right pacing. Paired reading increases the amount of sheer reading practice student get. Paired reading gives tutors a clear, straightforward, and enjoyable way of helping their learners so no one gets confused, worried, or bad-tempered about reading.

Tables 3 and 6 prove that pupils taught reading fluency using echo reading had higher mean performance scores than those taught using the conventional method of teaching reading (Look and say method). The rationale behind the observed result could be because echo reading strategy offers learners models where they can observe and imitate their stress pattern. The finding of this study agrees with the findings of Catts (2022), Susan (2013) and Erica, (2014) who stated that echo reading helps learners improve in areas of stress, proper phrasing, words identification, listening skills and building up self-confidence.

Echo reading involves the teacher reading aloud a text line by line or sentence by sentence modeling appropriate fluency. After reading each line, the pupils echo back the reading of the line with the same rate and prosody. This activity can be done with individual pupils, small groups, or larger groups of pupils. Parents or teachers can help by choosing a book or story on the child's reading level. Pointing to word as they are being read to in order to ensure the child is tracking along. Modeling appropriate reading technique by maintaining a consistent pace, pausing at punctuation and enunciating clearly help pupils read fluently (Homan, 2013).

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made:

- I. Teachers and parents should utilize repeated reading, echo reading and paired reading strategies to teach their pupils or children reading fluency. Teachers, especially English teachers that are not fluent in reading should be re-trained through workshops, conferences or seminar so that they will not model wrong pronunciation/intonation for pupils to imitate.
- ii. School administrators should establish reading fluency clubs in their school in order to groom children better in their reading fluency performance. School should conduct inter school reading fluency competitions in order to motivate, evaluate and reinforce pupils' reading fluency performance.
- iii. Positive reinforcement should be given to pupils who read fluently. This will motivate non- fluent readers to study more.

REFERENCES

- Adams, M. J. (2019). *Beginning to read, thinking and learning about print*. 1st Edition. MIT Press. Cambridge, 118p.
- Berends, I. P. (2021). Orthographic analysis of words during fluency training to promotes reading of new similar words. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 30 (1): 129 -139.
- Cats, H. W. (2022). The role of speed of processing, rapid naming and phonological awareness in reading achievement. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 35 (5): 510 – 512.
- Chall, J. S. (2016). *Stages of reading development*. 2nd Edition. Elsevier, Ohio, 22p.
- Chen, C. I. (2018). *The effect of echo reading on Taiwanese University fluency and comprehension*. PhD Thesis, National Pingtung University, Taiwanese, 125P.
- Erica M. (2014). Using echo reading and tracking simultaneously during small group read aloud with preschool children PhD Thesis.
- Fuchs, L. S. (2018). Oral reading fluency as an indicator of reading competence. A theoretical, empirical and historical analysis. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 5 (1): 239 -240.
- Herman, P. A. (2015). The effect of repeated reading in reading rate speech pauses and word recognition accuracy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25 (3): 375 -380.
- Homan (2013). Use of Social Media among Students of Nigerian Polytechnic. *International Conference on Communication, Media, Technology and Design, Istanbul – Turkey*, 304.
- Hudson, R. F. (2015). Reading fluency assessment and instruction; what, why and how? *The Reaching Teaching*, 58 (8): 702 – 704.
- Jeon, E. H. (2019). Oral reading in second language reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language* 24 (2): 186 – 189.
- Kuhn, M. R. and Stan, S. A. (2013). Fluency. A review of developmental and remedial practices. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95 (1): 3 – 12.
- Li, K. Y. and Nes W. A. (2021) Teacher-student interaction in social studies learning. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 10 (2), 660-667.
- Mathson, D. V. and Yamashita, G. (2020). *Fluency instruction, research – based best practices*. 2nd Edition. Guilford Press, New York, 85p.
- Mathson, M. (2020). The parent's role on literacy development. *Childhood Education* 69 (1): 142 – 145.
- Miller, J. and Schwanenflugel, P. J. (2016). Prosody of syntactically complex sentences in the oral reading of young children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98 (2): 839 – 841.
- Rasinski, T. V. and Topping, S. (2020). Effect of repeated reading and paired reading in reading fluency. *Journal of Educational Research*, 83 (4): 147 – 150.
- Samuel, s. J. (2016). *Reading fluency: it's past, present and future*. 4th Edition. Omando Press, New York, 158p.
- Schenider, K. and Strickland, H. (2017) *An investigation into the effectiveness of Paired reading with incorporation of additional corrective procedure*. M.Ed Dissertation, Edith Cowan University, New York, 113P.

- Schneider, P. J. (2017). Paired reading intervention. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 13 (2): 291 – 292.
- Stahl, S. A. (2016). Teaching children to become fluent and automatic reader. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 38 (2): 357 – 358.
- Stephanie, A. G. (2014). *Effects of repeated reading, paired reading and demonstration on reading fluency*, M.Ed dissertation, Grand valley state University, USA, 495p.
- Susana P. (2013). A synthesis of research fluency development. Study of eight Meta analyses. *European Journal of Special Education Research* 4 (3):16-20.
- Topping, K. (2015). Paired Reading. A powerful technique for parent use. *The Reading Teacher*, 40 (1): 608 – 614.
- Tran, T. N. (2014). Reading speed improvement in speed reaching and its effects on language memory span. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 11 (2): 5 – 10.
- Young, A. R. (2016). Effects of prosodic modeling and repeated reading on poor readers' fluency and comprehension. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 17 (1): 59 – 61.