iejee

International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education
March 2021, Volume 13, Issue 4, 421-431

The Effect of Interactive Reading Aloud on Student Reading Comprehension, Reading Motivation and Reading Fluency*

Sümeyra Ceyhan*[a], Mustafa Yıldız[b]

Received : 23 July 2020
Revised : 25 November 2020
Accepted : 8 February 2021
DOI : 10.26822/iejee.2021.201

* This study was developed from the thesis titled "The Effect of Interactive Reading Aloud on Student Reading Comprehension, Reading Motivation and Reading Fluency".

[a]*Corresponding Author: Sümeyra Ceyhan. Muş Alparslan University Faculty of Education, Department of Primary Education, Muş, Turkey.
E-mail: s.ceyhan@alparslan.edu.tr
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2452-8830

[b] Mustafa Yıldız. Gazi University Gazi Faculty of Education Department of Primary Education Education, Ankara, Turkey.
E-mail: mustafa@gazi.edu.tr
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3885-5322

Abstract

This study aimed to examine the effect of interactive reading aloud (IRA) lessons on students' reading comprehension levels, reading motivation, and reading fluency skills. A mixed experimental design was used to model the study. This study was conducted in a Turkish public school in the academic year 2017–2018, with 62 second-grade students, 22 in the first experimental group, 20 in the second experimental group, and 20 in the control group, and it lasted for 11 weeks. The IRA lessons within the research scope were performed by the researcher in one experimental group and by a second-grade teacher who was responsible for the class itself in the other experimental group. Reading Comprehension Rubric, Motivation to Read Profile scale, and Rubric for Reading Prosody were used as the data collection tool. The findings of the study revealed that reading comprehension, reading motivation, and reading fluency levels of the students in the experimental groups were higher than those of the students in the class, where lessons were taught on the basis of the current Turkish lesson curriculum. Furthermore, it was determined that IRA practices improved students' levels of reading comprehension, reading motivation and reading fluency skills, independently of the practitioner.

Keywords:

Interactive Reading Aloud, Reading Comprehension, Reading Fluency, Reading Motivation

Introduction

Reading is a meaning-making process that is conducted in a regular environment by using prior knowledge in line with an appropriate method and purpose based on the presence of effective communication between an author and reader (Akyol, 2011). Comprehension is to make sense of the information received through reading after it is processed in mind. While reading, mind, on the one hand, creates meaning from what the eyes collect from writing, and on the other hand, it combines these with the meanings in the previous lines. In other words, mind carries thoughts from one line to the next and links to the previous and next thoughts. This process is called

meaning formation or sense-making (Güneş, 2009). Motivation is of great importance for reading, as reading is a demanding choice (Guthrie et al., 2004). Reading motivation is defined as "personal goals, values, and beliefs that affect reading processes, outcomes, and topics" (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997). Individuals who are motivated enough to read are considered fluent readers (Hasbrouck & Tindal, 2006). Reading fluency means reading the sentence with appropriate intonation, prosody, and expressiveness (Allington, 2006). Required strategies that are taught to children can improve the students' motivation to read, reading fluency skills, and reading comprehension levels. Thus, it aims to make them better readers. In literature, one of the reading activities, which affect reading comprehension, reading motivation, and reading fluency skills is said to be Interactive Reading Aloud (IRA) lessons taught to students by one or more teachers within regular planning (Lane & Wright, 2007; Morrison & Wlodarczyk, 2009; Tompkins, 2006; Trelease, 2013).

Interactive reading aloud is defined as planned reading of children's books aloud by a practitioner (Meller et al., 2009). During IRA, the teacher, by modeling thinking aloud teaches students the reading strategies for comprehension before, during, and after reading. Students listen to their teachers, and with the guidance of their teachers, they guess about the book they are listening, re-create the images in mind, make connections, question, identify the main theme, summarize, check the predictions, evaluate, and learn new vocabularies. During the IRA practices, teachers also use graphic organizers to improve reading comprehension and teach reading comprehension strategies, scaffolding, and think-aloud strategies. When interactive reading aloud is performed, students are provided with conversations, information, and explanations about the book read. Students have fun listening to the book and their curiosity about the book is aroused, and most importantly, fostering vocabulary, forming conditions for child's brain to enjoy reading, promoting prior knowledge, providing a role model for reading, and stimulating an interest in reading are all ensured by interactive reading aloud (Trelease, 2013). According to Routman (1991). IRA not only increases the levels of student reading comprehension but also improves their listening skills, vocabulary, and enables them to have a positive attitude toward reading. During the IRA process, teachers and students interact each other and this process can be explained by Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory based on sociocultural constructivism. According to sociocultural theory, learning takes place through dialogues. These dialogues occur between teacher-to-student, student-to-student, and text-to-student, and thus, learning occurs thanks to the inner dialogues made by the student (Vygotsky, 1978). Social constructivists claim that students learn self-learning with the help of the ideas, classroom dialogues, interactions, and discussions organized by the teacher (Yang & Wilson, 2006).

According to Vygotsky (1978), "good learning" occurs in the zone of proximal development, which indicates the difference between the existing and potential developmental levels of children (Adam, 2017). The zone of proximal development refers to the distance between what a child can do independently and what a child can do with the help of any more knowledgeable person (Scharlach, 2008). In interactive reading aloud lessons, students are taught reading comprehension strategies with appropriate books and book plans selected by the teacher. While performing this teaching, an appropriate scaffolding strategy is used according to the level of the student. Throughout the whole process, the teacher is a model for students by thinking aloud. At the end of this process, it trains students who can read fluently, are motivated to read and can comprehend when they read their own. Think-aloud is a teaching strategy used by teachers to model thinking and thought process to students (Dunston & Headley, 2002). The literature review revealed that special methods have been developed to read books aloud to children. These research-based methods are Dialogic Reading Strategy, Text Talk Strategy, and Print Referencing Strategy (Lane & Wright, 2007). Interactive reading aloud as a process contains all three of these strategies because each is considered a read-aloud strategy. Dialogic reading is the method of reading illustrated books to children by an adult. However, this reading greatly differs from ordinary readings. In traditional reading, an adult reads and a child listens, but in dialogic reading, the child learns to be a storyteller (Whitehurst et al., 1994). The text talk strategy is a read-aloud strategy aiming to foster vocabulary growth (Beck & McKeown, 2001). Print referencing is a strategy that uses verbal and non-verbal cues, especially to encourage children's attention and interactions with print and writing in a book. Talking about the writing of the story enables the child to know about the language and linguistic features used (Justice & Ezell, 2004). In her study, Hazzard (2016) first taught students to make connections, make predictions, and think on the text while reading a book through the IRA lessons. The findings of her study revealed that average and below level students in the experimental group comprehended what they read better and higher-level students were more motivated to read. Mitchell (2015) investigated the effect of a well-planned IRA lesson on second-grade students, performed the IRA lessons for her students every day and taught them reading comprehension skills during the lessons. She postulated that students' reading comprehension levels, at the end of the study, improved. Spencer (2011) claimed that the IRA lessons improved students' reading comprehension, reading fluency, and motivation to read and vocabulary. The

findings of the study by Delacruz (2009) conducted with second-grade students, revealed that the reading comprehension levels of the students attending the IRA lessons were higher than those who did not.

In this study, the effects of interactive reading aloud practices performed by a teacher or other practitioners within a specific plan on students' reading comprehension levels, reading motivation, and reading fluency skills were examined. In line with this purpose, this study examined the following research questions:

1. Do reading comprehension levels of elementary school second-grade students differ significantly according to their attendance to the IRA lessons?

2. Do reading motivation levels of elementary school second-grade students differ significantly according to their attendance to the IRA lessons?

3. Do reading fluency levels of elementary school second-grade students differ significantly according to their attendance to the IRA lessons?

Method

Research Model

The study used a 3 x 2 mixed experimental design for the effectiveness of the IRA practices on the features dealt within the research scope regarding the second-grade students. The first factor in the experimental design represents the group variable (experimental 1(R), experimental 2(T), and control), and the second factor indicates repeated measures (pretest and posttest). Dependent variables of the study are comprehension, reading fluency, and reading motivation levels of the students. The independent variable of the study was IRA practice. The experimental process is shown in Table 1.

Study Group

A convenience sampling method, one of the purposeful sampling methods, was used to determine the study group. The convenient sample method was preferred due to time, resource, and labor limitations (Büyüköztürk et al., 2016). The study group consisted of 62 second-grade students, 22 in the experimental group 1(R), 20 in experimental group 2(T), and 20 in the control group, at a Turkish public school in Çankaya district of Ankara province in the academic year 2017–2018.

Data Collection Tools

While determining reading comprehension and reading fluency levels of students included in the study group, a text selected in line with expert opinions was used. In addition, "Reading Comprehension Rubric" for determining students' reading comprehension levels, "Motivation to Read Profile" scale for determining students' levels of reading motivation, and word recognition percent, reading rate, and "Rubric for Reading Prosody" for determining students' reading fluency levels were used.

Text Used in Determining Reading Comprehension and Reading Fluency Levels

To select the text to be used in determining the reading comprehension and reading fluency levels of the students in the study group, A text appropriateness form developed by the researcher was used. While developing this text appropriateness form, in order to identify the criteria included in the form, developmental characteristics of the second-grade students and the elements that a text appropriate to this grade level should include were taken into consideration. Accordingly, the literature was reviewed and three field experts' opinions were obtained. Then, the text appropriateness form developed by the researcher and three texts, namely Yarişmaci Marti (The Competitor Seagull), Gamze ve Arkadaşi (Gamze and Her Friend), Yavru Kedi (The Kitten), included in the Turkish course books were taught in the second grade with the recommendation by the Turkish Ministry of National Education. They were then presented to the same three experts contributing to the form development process in order to obtain their opinions. Based on the experts' opinions, the text named "Yarişmaci Marti" was decided to be used in the evaluation.

Reading Comprehension Rubric

Reading Comprehension Rubric, developed by the researcher, consists of 10 criteria. The highest possible

Table 1

IRA Experimental Process

Groups	Pretest		Posttest
Experimental 1(R)	R1	IRA practice (11 weeks)	R4
Experimental 2(T)	R2		R5
Control	R3	----------	R6

score obtained from the rubric was 20, while the lowest score was 0. For the preparation of the rubric, first, rubrics in literature and suitable for the second-grade level were examined. Then, a rubric was prepared to be used in the study and expert opinion was asked. The rubric was corrected and finalized in line with the expert opinions obtained. Regarding the reading comprehension rubric, expert opinion was asked for content validity, while an exploratory factor analysis was conducted for construct validity. As a result of validity analyses, the one-factor 10-items structure of the rubric used in this study was confirmed.

The findings revealed that the total variance ratio explained by this one-factor structure was 53.28%. For the measurement regarding the structure consisting of the determined items, a reliability analysis was conducted and Cronbach α value was found to be .84. The findings revealed that measures obtained from the rubric were reliable. To determine inter-rater reliability of the measures obtained from the reading comprehension rubric, Cohen's kappa coefficient was calculated. Chi-square value for the significance of inter-rater reliability on each item was examined. The findings, therefore, revealed that all items were statistically significant. In other words, inter-rater reliability scores for each item showed a very good level.

Motivation to Read Profile Scale

The study used the "Motivation to Read Profile" scale adapted into Turkish by Yıldız (2013) to determine the students' reading motivation levels in the study group. It is a 4-point Likert type scale comprising two sub-dimensions called "Reader Self-Perception" and "Value toward Reading." The scale has 18 items with nine items on each sub-dimension. The highest score possible to be taken from the scale was 72, while the lowest score was 18. The increase in the score shows that students' reading motivation also increases, and the decrease in the score indicates the decrease in students' reading motivation. The adaptation study of the scale by Yıldız (2013) was conducted for third-, fourth- and fifth- grade students. As the study group in this research was second-grade students, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed to retest whether the scale structure e provides a fit model. The findings of the analyses revealed that the goodness-of-fit values were adequate, and consequently, the two-dimensional structure of the motivation to read profile scale for the second-grade students was confirmed (Chi-square (X^2) = 206,66; degree of freedom (*df*) = 134; $\frac{\chi^2}{df}$ 1,54;*p*.00; root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .03, standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) = .04;incremental fit index (IFI) = .99; comparative fit index (CFI) = .99; normed fit index (NFI) = .90;Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) = .99). The Cronbach α reliability coefficient was calculated to prove the level of reliability of measures obtained. The findings of the analyses revealed that the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient .90 for the scale, .91 for value toward reading sub-dimension, and .95 for reading motivation sub-dimension. As a result, it is safe to say that the measurements were reliable.

Data Collection Tools Used in Determining Reading Fluency Level

The word recognition percent is obtained by dividing the number of words read correctly in 60 seconds by the total number of words and then multiplying by 100 (Akyol et al. 2014). To determine the reading rate that affects determining the reading fluency level, the number of words that the student correctly reads per minute is calculated. Words that were read correctly also included the words that were read incorrectly at first, but then corrected and reread by the student. Reading fluency includes the student's skill of reading a text with a good expression, namely, reading prosody, reading rate, and word recognition (Akyol et al. 2014). In this study, "Rubric for Reading Prosody" developed by Zutell and Rasinski (1991) and adapted into Turkish by Yıldırım et al. (2009) was used to determine the levels of reading the prosody of the students. This rubric comprises four dimensions: "expression and volume," "phrasing and intonation," "smoothness," and "pace." The lowest score to be taken from the rubric was 4, while the highest score was 16. The results of the Cohen's kappa test were evaluated in the inter-rater reliability for the Reading Prosody rubric. Accordingly, the inter-rater reliability obtained from each criterion in the Reading Prosody rubric was found to be at a very good level.

Data Analysis

To examine the effects of interactive reading aloud practice on the relevant-dependent variables, the analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to test the differences between the changes in the experimental and control groups before and after the implementation. By using ANCOVA, it was aimed to statistically control for a variable or variables associated with the dependent variable, other than a factor or factors whose effect was tested in the research (Büyüköztürk et al., 2016). The variable aimed to be controlled in this study was the pretest scores obtained from the experimental and control groups. The effect of the experimental process that might arise due to the differences in pretest scores of the groups was avoided by controlling the pretest scores of control and experimental groups.

Experimental Process

The experimental process of the study lasted for 11 weeks. Thirty-three class hours were practiced three

days a week and one class hour per day. During this practice, 11 illustrated children's books were used, i.e., one book for each week. The books were read three times within different plans to complement each other every day. Over the course of 33 - hour practice, to observe the lesson and interact with each other at times, the grade teacher was present in the class where the practice was performed by the researcher, and the researcher attended the class where the practice was performed by the grade teacher. While selecting the books to be used in the process, based on the opinions taken from seven field experts, 80 illustrated children's books were determined by the researcher first. In line with those examinations, it was agreed that 20 of 80 books selected together with the field experts at the beginning were deemed appropriate to be used for IRA studies. A detailed book list for these 20 books and the book evaluation form prepared to evaluate the books were presented to the field experts. With the opinions obtained from the field experts, 12 books, 11 principals, and one substitute, were selected to be used in the experimental process. Book plans were prepared by the researcher for the selected books. While preparing the book plans, the books that would be read for the practice every week were initially read in detail by the researcher. During these readings, what would be done before, during and after reading was decided for the first, second, and third readings of the book. Accordingly, during the lesson, the things to be done related to question-answer, visualizing, identifying the main theme, making a prediction, making an inference, summarizing, identifying the characters in the story, identifying the setting of the story, identifying the words and idioms whose meaning students would not be able to know, identifying the aspects of writing, including spelling and punctuation in the story, and associating with real life and providing preliminary information for students to comprehend the book better were all agreed.

Materials to be used in the lessons were prepared by the researcher before the lessons. These materials include detailed lesson plans prepared so that no details are missed during the teaching process. Word cards, including the meanings of words and idioms are covered in the book plan and the details about the meaning and use of which are not known by students. Pictures are used to better understand the story in the book and objects are provided when needed to facilitate students' reading comprehension.

FINDINGS

Table 2 shows the findings of ANCOVA analysis conducted to make a group comparison for the pretest and posttest reading comprehension scores of the students included in experimental 1(R), experimental 2(T), and control groups.

Table 2 shows that the difference in corrected posttest mean scores of the groups for reading comprehension was statistically significant ($F_{(2;58)}$=16,08; p <.01; p <.05). The findings of the post hoc test performed to find sources of difference revealed that the statistical difference was in favor of the students in experimental groups between the experimental 1(R) and control, and experimental 2(T) and control. Based on this finding, it would be safe to conclude that IRA practices positively affect the second-grade students' reading comprehension scores. The findings of another paired comparison revealed that there was no statistically significant difference in pretest and posttest comparison of experimental 1(R) and experimental 2(T) groups in terms of reading comprehension scores. In other words, no positive or negative change occurred in the reading comprehension scores of experimental 1(R) and experimental 2(T) groups for which IRA practices were performed by the researcher and teacher. Considering that the plan for the process of practicing IRA applied in both experimental groups is the same. It would be possible to say that the practitioner effect does not make a significant difference in IRA practices.

Table 3 presents the results of ANCOVA analysis conducted to make a group comparison for the pretest and posttest reading motivation scale and sub-factor scores of the students included in experimental 1(R), experimental 2(T), and control groups.

As Table 3 presents, based on the reading motivation, values toward reading and reader self-perception pretest scores of experimental and control groups, the difference in corrected posttest mean scores was statistically significant ($F_{(2;58)}$ = 28,98; $F_{(2;58)}$ = 17,21; $F_{(2;58)}$ = 16,52; p < .01; p < .05). The findings of the post hoc test performed to find sources of difference revealed that

Table 2

ANCOVA Results of Pretest and Posttest Reading Comprehension Scores

Source of variance	SS	*df*	MS	*F*	*p*	η^2	Difference
Model	310,94	3	10365	19,51	.00	.50	
Pretest	149,69	1	149,69	28,18	.00	.33	
Group	170,88	2	85,44	16,08	.00*	.36	Experimental1(R) > control Experimental2(T) > control
Error	308,11	58	5,31				
Total	5445,00	62					

Table 3

ANCOVA Results of Pretest and Posttest Reading Motivation Scores

	Source of variance	SS	*df*	MS	*F*	*p*	η^2	Difference
Reading motivation	Model	1813,09	3	604,36	53,30	.00	.73	Experimental1(R) > control Experimental2(T) > control
	Pretest	956,79	1	956,79	84,39	.00	.59	
	Group	657,27	2	328,64	28,98	.00*	.50	
	Error	657,62	58	11,34				
	Total	237832,00	62					
Value toward Reading	Model	323,60	3	107,87	25,01	.00	.56	Experimental1(R) > control Experimental2(T) > control
	Pretest	146,74	1	146,74	34,03	.00	.37	
	Group	148,45	2	74,23	17,21	.00*	.37	
	Error	250,10	58	4,31				
	Total	59599,00	62					
Reader self-perception	Model	543,59	3	181,20	30,39	.00	.61	Experimental1(R) > control Experimental2(T) > control
	Pretest	285,21	1	285,21	47,84	.00	.45	
	Group	197,02	2	98,51	16,52	.00*	.36	
	Error	345,78	58	5,96				
	Total	59545,00	62					

the statistical difference was in favor of the students in experimental groups between the experimental 1(R) and control, and experimental 2(T) and control. According to this finding, it has been observed that IRA practices positively affect the second-grade students' reading motivation, value toward reading, and reader self-perception scores. According to findings of another paired comparison, no statistically significant difference has been observed in the pretest and posttest comparison of experimental 1(R) and experimental 2(T) groups in terms of reading motivation, value toward reading, and reader self-perception scores. In other words, no positive or negative change occurred in the reading motivation, value toward reading, and reader self-perception scores of experimental 1(R) and experimental 2(T) groups for which IRA practices were performed by the researcher and teacher. Based on this finding, considering that the plan for the process of practicing, IRA applied in both experimental groups is the same, we can conclude that the practitioner effect does not make a significant difference in IRA practices.

Table 4 presents the results of ANCOVA analysis conducted to make a group comparison for the pretest and posttest reading rate scores of the students included in the experimental 1(R), Experimental 2(T), and control groups.

Table 4 shows the ANCOVA results for the pretest and posttest reading rate scores. As the table presents, the difference in corrected posttest mean scores for the total number of words read correctly per minute was statistically significant ($F_{(2;58)}$ = 4,07; p = .02; p < .05). The findings of the post hoc test performed to find sources of difference revealed that the statistical difference was in favor of the students in experimental groups between the experimental 1(R) and control, and experimental 2(T) and control. Based on this finding, it can be said that IRA practices have a positive effect on the reading rates of the second-grade students. As a result of another paired comparison, no statistically significant difference has been observed in pretest and posttest comparison of experimental 1(R) and experimental 2(T) groups in terms of reading rate. That is to say, no positive or negative change occurred in the reading rate scores of experimental 1(R) and experimental 2(T) groups for which IRA practices were performed by the researcher and teacher.

Accordingly, considering that the plan for the process of practicing, IRA applied in both experimental groups is the same, it would be safe to say that the practitioner effect does not make a significant difference in IRA practices.

Table 5 shows the results of ANCOVA analysis conducted to make a group comparison for the pretest and posttest word recognition scores of the students included in the experimental 1(R), experimental 2(T), and control groups.

Table 5 shows the ANCOVA results of retest and posttest word recognition scores. As the table presents, the difference in corrected posttest mean scores for word recognition was statistically significant ($F_{(2;58)}$ = 5,61; p = .01; p < .05). The findings of the post hoc test performed to find sources of difference revealed that the statistical difference was in favor of the students in experimental groups between the experimental 1(R) and control, and experimental 2(T) and control. According to this finding, IRA practices positively

Table 4

ANCOVA Results of the Pretest and Posttest Reading Rate Scores

Source of variance	SS	*df*	MS	*F*	*p*	η^2	Difference
Model	16949,38	3	5649,79	51,11	.00	.73	
Pretest	15429,46	1	15429,46	139,59	.00	.71	
Group	899,62	2	449,81	4,07	.02*	.12	Experimental1(R) > control Experimental2(T) > control
Error	6410,89	58	110,53				
Total	308283,00	62					

Table 5

ANCOVA Results of Pretest and Posttest Word Recognition Scores

Source of variance	SS	*df*	MS	*F*	*p*	η^2	Difference
Model	379,12	3	126,38	6,40	.00*	.25	
Pretest	114,31	1	114,31	5,79	.01*	.10	
Group	221,69	2	110,85	5,61	.01*	.16	Experimental1(R) > control Experimental2(T) > control
Error	1146,00	58	19,76				
Total	559539,12	62					

affect the second-grade students word recognition scores. According to another paired comparison finding, no statistically significant difference in the pretest and posttest comparison of experimental 1(R) and experimental 2(T) groups in terms of word recognition scores of the groups has been observed. Hence, no positive or negative change occurred in the word recognition scores of experimental 1(R) and experimental 2(T) groups for which IRA practices were performed by the researcher and teacher. Based on this, considering that the plan for the process of practicing IRA applied in both experimental groups is the same, it would be safe to say that the practitioner effect does not make a significant difference in IRA practices.

Table 6 presents the results of ANCOVA analysis conducted to make a group comparison for the pretest and posttest reading prosody scores of the students included in the experimental 1(R), experimental 2(T) and control groups.

As Table 6 shows, based on the prosody pretest scores of experimental and control groups, the difference in corrected posttest mean scores for reading prosody was statistically significant ($F_{(2;58)}$ = 46,49; p = .01; p < .05). The findings of the post hoc test performed to find sources of difference revealed that the statistical difference in favor of the students in experimental groups between the experimental 1(R) and control and experimental 2(T) and control. According to this finding, it can be said that IRA practices positively affect the second-grade students' prosody scores. As a result of another paired comparison, no statistically significant difference in pretest and posttest comparison of experimental 1(R) and experimental 2(T) groups in terms of reading prosody scores of the groups has been observed. In other words, no positive or negative change occurred in the prosody scores of experimental 1(R) and experimental 2(T) groups for which IRA practices were performed by the researcher and teacher. Based on this finding, considering that the plan for the process of practicing IRA applied in both experimental groups is the same, we can state that the practitioner effect does not make a significant difference in IRA practices.

Discussion

The findings obtained from the analyses revealed that the practices based on the IRA strategy increased the reading comprehension levels of the second-grade students. Hazzard (2016) argued that students were involved in the reading process and interacted with their teachers, learned how to use reading comprehension strategies such as summarizing, making connections, clarifying the meaning of the word, directing questions, thinking about answering the questions during IRA lessons, and, therefore, the reading comprehension levels of students improved.

Santoro et al. (2008) highlighted that the IRA practices improved reading comprehension level as students could talk to their teachers about the text and learned how to think to comprehend during those talks, how to identify the sequence of events as they occurred in the text, and new vocabularies in the IRA lessons. Türkben and Temizyürek (2018) claimed that the teacher modeled thinking aloud strategy and taught comprehension skills to students in that way during practicing IRA, and after a while, students would comprehend the text by putting what they learned from their teachers into practice when they encounter with a text, and, therefore, the levels of

Table 6

ANCOVA Results of Pretest and Posttest Reading Prosody Scores

Source of variance	SS	*df*	MS	*F*	*p*	η^2	Difference
Model	416,16	3	138,72	48,86	.00	.72	
Pretest	177,91	1	177,91	62,66	.00	.52	
Group	264,01	2	132,00	46,49	.00*	.62	Experimental1(R) > control Experimental2(T) > control
Error	164,68	58	2,84				
Total	9176,00	62					

student reading comprehension would be increased. Giorgis and Johnson (2003) claimed that teacher was a model for students and taught them how to visualize an event while reading a text and understand the emotions aimed to be given in the story in the IRA lessons, and, thus, students could perform the reading comprehension strategies they learned from their teachers while reading on their own and their levels of reading comprehension improved accordingly.

Alshehri (2014) emphasized that he taught basic strategies for reading comprehension to students during IRA lessons and then, students could comprehend better while reading alone by using those strategies. Delacruz (2009), after examining what the teachers did to increase reading comprehension level in the IRA lessons in her study, determined that during IRA lessons, teachers benefited from reading comprehension strategies such as asking questions, making a prediction, summarizing and taught students how to make connections between the story being read and the other lessons. Mitchell (2015), in the IRA lessons, the lesson plans for which she prepared meticulously, taught students to use reading comprehension strategies by modeling think-aloud and graphic organizers to see what was read more perceptibly. As a result of these studies, an increase was observed in students' reading comprehension scores.

While conducting IRA practices, the teacher displays how to connect reading with the things in his/her life and what he/she has learned about the world through other texts he/she has read at the points where he/she stopped reading. The teacher models how to pose a question to the author while reading the text and how to pay attention to important information between the lines while making an inference (Albright & Ariail, 2005). Modeling the eight basic comprehension strategies, the components of the IRA lessons, enables students to make relevant connections with the text and make sense of the text (Lane & Wright, 2007; Scharlach, 2008).

Teachers, who prepare plans for the IRA lessons to ensure that their students understand better based on the book they will read and the things they want to teach, first prepare questions for which preliminary information they will give to their students, how to make possible for their students to make connections and predictions, how to teach summarizing strategies, and how to make their students identify the essential elements of a story such as the main theme, setting, conflict and resolution, central message, protagonist, and other characters in the story. During the lesson, the teacher also encourages students to think through the questions he/she asks while thinking aloud for the answers to these questions. In this way, students learn what they need to pay attention to comprehend while reading a text on their own.

According to Tompkins (2006), comprehension can be taught with clear instructions. Teachers teach students how to activate prior knowledge, identify the objectives, use comprehension strategies, and make inferences. Students put this learning into practice when they read and write. When teachers actively engage their students in the text, students are not only more motivated to read independently but also learn how to learn (Boyd & Devennie, 2009). In the IRA lessons, teachers should explain what the things they want to teach mean and why they are important, and they should model how a text can be understood, while reading aloud and how thinking aloud can be performed (Tompkins, 2006). Competent readers, who are aware of whether they understand what they read, often use comprehension strategies such as reading comprehension, rereading, slow reading, and looking up definitions for words (McTavish, 2008). Students, as active listeners in the IRA lessons, learn comprehension strategies that their teacher is trying to teach by modeling think-aloud and use these strategies while reading on their own in time, to better understand what they read. The findings of the study revealed that the practices based on the IRA strategy increased the reading motivation levels for the second grade students. Spencer (2011) emphasized that the IRA practices improved students' curiosity and interest in reading and, therefore, their reading motivation. Kindle (2009) claimed that the books chosen by teachers for the IRA lessons attracted students' attention and, thus, they were curious about the events narrated in the book and their reading motivation increased. Morgan (2009) emphasized that it is possible to gather students with different cultures at a common point and create shared reading

pleasure thanks to IRA lessons to increase students' reading motivation. The study of Young and Rasinski (2009) revealed that reading aloud lessons increased students' interest in reading and, therefore, their motivation to read. The fact that teachers present the IRA lessons to their students in their classes, regardless of the age of students, allows them to become more interested in reading and participate in the lesson to motivate them to read (Duncan, 2010).

As the attitude toward reading and interest and curiosity in reading directly affect reading motivation, it appears that the reading motivation levels of students who are interested in reading and have a positive attitude toward reading will increase. Arial and Albright (2006) used the IRA strategies in the lessons in which they benefited from informative texts, and consequently determined that students could learn better in that way by feeling more motivated to understand while reading as they learned the reading comprehension strategies during the lessons. Fox (2008) stated that when an adult reads a book aloud to a child, both the adult and child could have a lot of fun and the child would be awaiting the following page curiously. Ivey (2003) found that the student could learn how to understand the text in the IRA lessons exactly, and, therefore, his/her interest in reading might increase.

Braun (2010) expressed that practices based on the IRA strategy increased the reading motivation levels of students. Muller (2005) stated that reading aloud was the most effective way to improve reading motivation. Trelease (2013) claimed that, thanks to the interaction between teacher and student in the IRA lessons, the positive attitude that the teacher displays toward a book would also encourage students to have a positive attitude toward it. Considering this interaction, he also emphasized that students will be more interested in reading if the topics of the books selected appeal to students. Children interested in reading are also motivated to read and spend more time on reading: thus they are more successful at reading (Gambrell, 2011). The main purpose of reading is to understand, and teachers can educate students who are more motivated to read, are enthusiastic about reading and have attained reading competency (Scharlach, 2008). In the IRA lessons, a teacher reads the book and student is in the listener's position; however, this does not necessarily mean he/she is a passive listener. Students interact with both their teachers by answering their questions and friends by sharing their own ideas.

Tompkins (2006) expressed that motivation has a dimension related to social environment and students want to share their ideas in social circles, i.e., with their group of friends. When teachers provide students and their classmates with the opportunity of reading aloud, they gain self-confidence and get motivated (Hurst et al., 2011). Also, Morgan (2009) stated that teachers can motivate students to read, especially when they read aloud to their students, by reading a book that is pleasant for them. Giorgis and Johnson (2003) underlined that when a book is read aloud to students, teachers and students take pleasure in reading. According to Tompkins (2006), the student-related factors affecting students' engagement in literacy are expectations, collaboration, reading and writing competency, and choices. Students are more interested in reading when they think that they will be successful, cooperate with their classmates, become competent readers and have the opportunity to make choices to improve their reading skills. Thus, IRA, an effective process in which students interact with their teacher and classmates, share their own ideas and pay attention to the ideas of others, motivates the students to share with their teachers and friends to read. When the findings were evaluated, it was concluded that the practices based on the IRA strategy improved the reading fluency levels of the second-grade students. Myers (2015), Muller (2005), Lane and Wright (2007), Hurst et al. (2011), and Spencer (2011) similarly claimed that the practices based on the IRA strategy refer to an interactive process between teacher and students. They also emphasized that the teacher was a model to the students while reading the book aloud by paying attention to reading rate, accentuation, intonation, and accurate pronunciation of the words. In the IRA lessons, teachers read the book to students by pronouncing the words correctly and reading fluently with an appropriate intonation and reading rate. During the readings, teachers model themselves to the students to show how to read fluently so that students can improve their skills of reading fluency by watching and listening the teachers (Hurst et al., 2011).

During the IRA strategy practices, the practitioners tried modeling themselves to the students by reading at the proper rate, pronouncing accurately, and observing intonation and punctuation marks. With appropriate pausing, they let the students repeat the words they had difficulty pronouncing them. During the practices, the reading fluency of the students was aimed to be improved by modeling the teachers. In this respect, Akyol (2012) emphasized that teachers should read aloud to their students by using different text types every day to improve their reading fluency. Reading fluency improves as students listen to teachers' readings repeatedly in the IRA lessons, carried out by the repetitive readings of the same book (Trealese, 2013). The IRA lessons enabled the students to read the same book three times in accordance with the plans prepared for each reading throughout the whole process of practicing appropriately. Thus, all the necessary activities could be practiced in an understandable way and students were allowed to model by performing the same reading more than

one.

Researchers may perform IRA practices at different grade levels. Narrative texts were used in this research. Researchers may use different types of texts in new studies. Practitioners may be taught how they should prepare a plan for IRA lessons and teach the lesson.

References

Adam, I. (2017). *Vygotsky's social constructivists theory of learning.* Unpublished research paper. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/814b/464a27539857222315137a8efa7d405469b6.pdf

Akyol, H. (2011). *Türkçe ilk okuma yazma öğretimi.* Pegem Yayıncılık.

Akyol, H. (2012). *Programa uygun Türkçe öğretim yöntemleri (5th Edition).* Pegem Yayıncılık.

Akyol, H., Yıldırım, K., Ateş, S., Çetinkaya, Ç., & Rasinski, T. (2014). *Okumayı değerlendirme öğretmenler için kolay ve pratik bir yol.* Pegem Akademi.

Albright, L. K., & Ariail, M. (2005). Tapping the potential of teacher read alouds in middle schools. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 48*(7), 582–591.

Allington, R. L. (2006). Fluency: Still waiting after all these years. S. J. Samuels and A. E. Farstrup (Ed.), *What research has to say about fluency instruction* (pp. 94–105). International Reading Association.

Alshehri, M. (2014). *Improving reading comprehension for Saudi students by using the reading aloud strategy.* curriculum and instruction in inclusive education department of curriculum and instruction. [Master's thesis]. State University, New York at Fredonia.

Ariail, M. & Albright, L. (2006). A survey of teachers' read-aloud practices in middle schools. *Reading Research and Instruction, 45*(2), 69–89.

Beck, I. L., & McKeown, M. G. (2001). Text talk: capturing the benefits of read-aloud experiences for young children. *The Reading Teacher, 55*(1), 10–20.

Boyd, M. & Devennie, M. (2009). Student voices and teacher voices: selecting chapter book read-alouds. *Childhood Education, 85*(3), 148–153.

Braun, P. (2010). Taking the time to read-aloud. *Science Scope, 34*(2), 45–49.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2016). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri.* Pegem Akademi.

Delacruz, S. (2009). *Using interactive read-alouds to increase k-2 students reading comprehension.* [Doctoral dissertation]. Walden University, Minnesota.

Duncan, S. (2010). Instilling a lifelong love of reading. Kappa Delta Pi, 46(2), 90–93. Dunston, P. J. & Headley, K. N. (2002). "Think-Aloud". InGuzzetti, Barbara J. (Ed). *Literacy in America: An Encyclopedia of History, Theory, and Practice.* ABC-CLIO, Inc.

Fox, M. (2008). *Reading magic: Why reading aloud to our children will change their lives forever.* Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Gambrell, L. (2011). Ask the expert. *The Reading Teacher, 64*(6), 459.

Giorgis, C. & Johnson, N. (2003). Children's books: celebrating literature. *The Reading Teacher, 56*(8), 838–845.

Guthrie, J. T.,Wigfield, A., Barbosa, P., Perencevich, K. C., Taboada, A., Davis, M. H., Scafiddi, N, T. & Tonks, S. (2004). Increasing reading comprehension and engagement through concept-oriented reading instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 96*(3), 403.

Güneş, F. (2009). *Hızlı okuma ve anlamı yapılandırma.* Nobel Yayın Dağıtım

Hasbrouck, J., & Tindal, G. A. (2006). Oral reading fluency norms: a valuable assessment tool for reading teachers. The Reading Teacher, 59(7), 636–644.Hazzard, K. (2016). *The Effects of read alouds on student comprehension.* [Master's Thesis]. St. John Fisher College.

Hurst, B.,Scales, K., Frecks, E. & Lewis, K. (2011). Sign up for reading: students read aloud to the class. *The Reading Teacher, 64*(6), 439–443.

Ivey, G. (2003). The intermediate grades: The teacher makes it more explainable and other reasons to read-aloud in the intermediate grades. *The Reading Teacher, 56*(8), 812–814.

Justice, L. M. & Ezell, H. K. (2004). Print referencing. *Language, Speech, And Hearing Services in Schools, 35,* 185–193.

Kindle, K. (2009). Vocabulary development during read-alouds: primary practices. *The Reading*

Teacher, 63(3), 202–211.

Lane, H. B. & Wright, T. L. (2007). Maximizing the effectiveness of reading aloud. *The Reading Teacher, 60*(7), 668–675.

McTavish, M. (2008). "What were you thinking?": The use of metacognitive strategy during engagement with reading narrative and informational genres. *Canadian Journal of Education, 31*(2), 405.

Meller, W. B., Richardson, D., & Hatch, J. A. (2009). Using read-alouds with critical literacy literature in K–3 classrooms. *Young Children, 64*(6), 76–78.

Mitchell, A. (2015). *Effect of interactive read-alouds on student comprehension.* [Master's thesis]. , University of Wisconsin..

Morgan, H. (2009). Using read-alouds with culturally sensitive children's books: A strategy that can lead to tolerance and improved reading skills. *Reading Improvement, 46*(1), 3–8.

Morrison, V. & Wlodarczyk, L. (2009). Revisiting read aloud: Instructional strategies that encourage students' engagement with texts. *The Reading Teacher, 63*(2), 110–118.

Muller, P. (2005). Teen read week meets read-aloud to a child week in Virginia. *Young Adult Library Services, Fall 2005,* 23–24.

Myers, J. M. (2015). Interactive read-alouds: *A qualitative study of kindergarten students' analytic dialogue.* [Doctoral thesis]. Indiana University.

Routman, R. (1991). *Invitations changing as teachers and learners k-12.* NH: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc.

Santoro, L. E. Chard, D. J. Howard, L. & Baker, S. K. (2008). Making the very most of classroom read alouds to promote comprehension and vocabulary. *The Reading Teacher, 61*(5), 396–408.

Scharlach, T. D. (2008). START comprehending: Students and teachers actively reading text. *The Reading Teacher, 62*(1), 20–31.

Spencer, R. R. (2011). *Reading aloud and student achievement.* [Doctoral thesis]. Lindenwood University.

Tompkins, G.E. (2006). *Literacy for the 21st century: a balanced approach.* Prentice Hall.

Trelease, J. (2013). *The read-aloud handbook.* Penguin.

Türkben, T. & Temizyürek, F. (2018). Etkileşimsel okuma modelini temel alan Türkçe öğretiminin öğrencilerin okuduğunu anlama becerileri üzerine etkisi. *Electronic Turkish Studies, 13*(4), 1237–1268.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind and society.* MA: Harvard University Press.

Whitehurst, G. J., Arnold, D. S., Epstein, J. N., Angell, A. L., Smith, M., & Fischel, J. E. (1994). A picture book reading intervention in daycare and home for children from low-income families. *Developmental Psychology, 30*(5), 679.

Wigfield, A. & Guthrie, J.T. (1997). Relations of children's motivation for reading to the amount and breadth of their reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 89*(3), 420–432.

Yang, L. & Wilson, K. (2006). Second language classroom reading: A social constructivist approach. *The Reading Matrix, 6*(3), 420–432.

Yıldız, M. (2013). Adaptation of the motivation to read profile to Turkish. *International Journal of Academic Research, 5*(4), 196–199.

Young, C., & Rasinski, T. (2009). Implementing readers theatre as an approach to classroom fluency instruction. *The Reading Teacher, 63*(1), 4–13.