

Repeated Reading as a Strategy for Improving Grade 2 Pupils' Reading Assessment Performance

Saminda R. Asequia, Lolita A. Dulay, PhD.

Bukidnon State University, Malaybalay City, Philippines-8700

Bukidnon State University, Malaybalay City, Philippines-8700

Email address: 2401118920@student.buksu.edu.ph; lolitadulay@buksu.edu.ph

Abstract— This classroom action research examined changes in reading assessment scores among seven Grade 2 pupils following a repeated reading intervention at San Nicolas Central Elementary School, Bukidnon, during school year 2022–2023. A one-group pretest–posttest design was used. The researcher administered a five-item assessment described in the source study as adapted from the EGRA ARATA tool and provided repeated reading activities and individual reading sheets. Pretest scores ranged from 0 to 2 (mean = 0.71 out of 5), whereas posttest scores ranged from 3 to 5 (mean = 4.00 out of 5). All seven pupils improved, with a mean gain of 3.29 points. Five pupils were classified as average and two as high at posttest, compared with seven classified as poor at pretest. The findings document improvement in this small classroom group, although the uncontrolled design and inconsistencies in the assessment labels limit causal conclusions. Further assessment with clearer measurement procedures and a larger sample is recommended.

Keywords— Repeated reading; Grade 2; early literacy; classroom action research; pretest–posttest; reading assessment

I. INTRODUCTION

Early reading instruction requires pupils to recognize print, connect letters with sounds, and practice decoding. Repeated exposure to appropriate reading material is one classroom strategy intended to strengthen familiarity and recall. The source action research identified difficulty sustaining attention to lessons and limited learning follow-up at home among some pupils at San Nicolas Central Elementary School. These observations motivated a focused reading intervention for learners needing additional support.

The study investigated reading assessment performance before and after a repeated reading strategy among seven Grade 2 pupils during school year 2022–2023. Specifically, it asked whether pupils' scores improved after the intervention. Because the study used a single group without a comparison condition, changes can be described but cannot be attributed exclusively to the intervention.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design and Participants

The research used a one-group pretest–posttest classroom action research design. Seven Grade 2 pupils from San Nicolas Central Elementary School, Don Carlos III District, Division of Bukidnon, participated. The source manuscript also refers to a larger class enrollment, but the analysis reported here is limited to the seven pupils for whom paired scores were provided.

B. Intervention and Assessment

The intervention consisted of individually provided reading activity sheets containing a limited number of items, reading practice in a quiet location with reduced distractions, and repeated reading of passages with teacher support. The manuscript did not report the exact number, duration, or frequency of intervention sessions.

The pretest and posttest were described as based on the EGRA ARATA tool. The source alternately labels the assessed skill as letter-name and sound recognition and familiar-word reading; consequently, the precise construct measured by the five-item score requires clarification before journal submission. Scores for each pupil were reported on a scale of 0 to 5.

C. Data Analysis

Paired pupil scores were summarized descriptively using means, score ranges, and individual gains. No inferential significance test was documented in the source study. Accordingly, statistical significance is not claimed here.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Pretest and Posttest Performance

TABLE I. Pupil-Level pretest and posttest scores

Pupil	Pretest / 5	Posttest / 5	Gain
S1	0	3	+3
S2	0	3	+3
S3	0	5	+5
S4	1	4	+3
S5	2	4	+2
S6	1	4	+3
S7	1	5	+4

As shown in Table I, every pupil obtained a higher posttest score. The total correct responses increased from 5 of 35 possible responses at pretest to 28 of 35 at posttest. The mean increased from 0.71 to 4.00 out of five items, representing a descriptive mean gain of 3.29 points. These values were calculated directly from the individual scores reported in the original study.

The original classification system identified all seven pupils as poor before the intervention, five as average after it, and two as high after it. The classifications in Table II replicate the researcher's reported categories rather than independently validated cutoffs because the category

thresholds in the source publication do not consistently match raw five-item percentages.

TABLE II. Summary of reported performance

Measure	Pretest	Posttest
Number of pupils	7	7
Mean score (out of 5)	0.71	4.00
Score range	0–2	3–5
Poor (reported category)	7	0
Average (reported category)	0	5
High (reported category)	0	2

B. Interpretation and Limitations

The consistent upward movement in individual scores suggests that the pupils demonstrated stronger performance on the administered reading assessment after the repeated reading activities. The results are consistent with the practical rationale for providing structured opportunities to encounter and rehearse reading material. Nevertheless, this study cannot separate intervention effects from practice effects, maturation, differences between test administrations, or other concurrent instruction.

The original report refers to learning retention, but the available evidence consists of immediate pretest and posttest scores; no delayed retention assessment is documented. The results are therefore more accurately interpreted as short-term improvement in reading assessment performance, not proof of durable retention. Similarly, the research question concerning a statistically significant increase remains unanswered without an appropriate inferential analysis and clearly documented testing assumptions.

IV. CONCLUSION

Seven Grade 2 pupils demonstrated higher five-item reading assessment scores after participating in a repeated reading intervention. Their mean score increased from 0.71 to 4.00, and all pupils improved individually. These findings

support the feasibility of using repeated reading as a classroom support strategy for this group, but do not establish causal effectiveness or long-term retention. Teachers may consider structured repeated reading with ongoing progress monitoring. Future studies should specify intervention dosage, clarify assessment content and scoring, document ethical safeguards, and include delayed assessment or a suitable comparison group.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher expresses sincere gratitude to Almighty God for His wisdom, guidance, and strength throughout the completion of this study. Heartfelt appreciation is extended to the school administrators, teachers, and learners whose cooperation, support, and participation contributed to the successful conduct of this research. The researcher also acknowledges the valuable encouragement and assistance of colleagues, family, and friends who provided inspiration and support throughout the research process. Above all, this study is dedicated to the continuous improvement of teaching and learning and to the advancement of quality education for all learners.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. C. Butler, "Repeated testing produces superior transfer of learning relative to repeated studying," *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, vol. 36, no. 5, pp. 1118–1133, 2010. doi: 10.1037/a0019902.
- [2] A. A. Callender and M. A. McDaniel, "The limited benefits of rereading educational texts," *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 30–41, 2009. doi: 10.1016/j.cedpsych.2008.07.001.
- [3] J. D. Karpicke and H. L. Roediger, "Repeated retrieval during learning is the key to long-term learning," *Journal of Memory and Language*, vol. 57, pp. 151–162, 2007.
- [4] J. P. Mestre, *Transfer of Learning from a Modern Multidisciplinary Perspective*. Greenwich: Information Age Publishing, 2005.
- [5] D. L. Schwartz, S. Varma, and L. W. Martin, "Dynamic transfer and innovation," in *International Handbook of Research on Conceptual Change*, S. Vosniadou, Ed. New York: Routledge, 2008, pp. 479–508.