Explicit teaching of visualization will improve both the comprehension of text and the oral language of grade two students that are experiencing comprehension difficulties.

Abstract

Many students display difficulty in comprehending text even when their accuracy and rate of reading appear satisfactory. Students are able to decode a text but lack the ability to comprehend and recall what they have read. Research has suggested that teaching the R.I.D.E.R. visualization strategy (Clark, Deshler, Schumaker, Alley and Warner1984) improves and enhances students' recall and retelling of events within a text.

The present study aims to test the hypothesis that explicit teaching of visualization will improve both the comprehension of text and the oral language of grade two students that are experiencing comprehension difficulties.

This study involved 8 year 2 students that had displayed reading difficulties (6 of the students had been on the Reading Recovery Program the previous year and the other 2 were on the tentative selection list for the program but did not receive Reading Recovery intervention.)

All 8 students' reading comprehension was assessed (pre and post instruction) through the use of NEALE analysis of reading behaviours, Spontaneous Oral Retell, Record of Oral Language, Visualisation Task, Easy Reading Level Running Record and associated Comprehension questions and their reading attitudes were recorded through the use of a Self-Efficacy Survey.

Four students received explicit instruction in visualization through the use of the R.I.D.E.R. visualization strategy.
Results indicated a significant improvement in comprehension and oral language skills. The strategy provided the students with a means of recalling ideas from the text and comprehending the message of the text. Implications for teaching students with comprehension difficulties are that these students require explicit modeling and teaching of strategies to visualize as they read to enable them to comprehend their reading.

**Introduction**
Comprehension is the core component of meaningful reading. It is how readers make sense of text. Reading is a complicated process and therefore developing comprehension skills can be an arduous task. During the early years of schooling the emphasis can be on letter and word identification and accuracy of reading with less importance being given to comprehension. However (Clay 1998 pg 217) states "If we train the child to read without involving powerful thinking strategies from the beginning, it will be more difficult for some of them to think about content later".

Good readers recognize that reading is more than decoding. They make connections to themselves, to themes and to the world around them. However in the early years of school when students become aware that print on a page can be read they often become focused on reading exactly what is on the page. For many children this becomes their only focus of reading.

To comprehend what they read, the reader must become so involved in the text that they engage in their own inner dialogue to involve emotion about what is being read and use that dialogue to gain greater insight and make connections with the text.

Transferring their inner dialogue to oral language helps the reader to internalize their understandings and therefore strengthen their learning. This internalization assists the learner to transfer their knowledge to new situations and therefore scaffold their
learning. Clay (1998 p.3) states that successful learning happens when a learner is helped to move forward from where they are towards attaining new skills.

Fountas and Pinnell (2001) support the notion that comprehension is a fundamental component of reading. It cannot be considered as a separate entity to the reading process. Munro (2007) developed the Multiple Levels of Text Processing (MYLOP) model that provides an explanation of what readers do when they read and the process they undergo to develop the skills required to become proficient readers. The MYLOP model is made up of four components- Literacy Knowledge, Metacognitive Knowledge, Existing Knowledge and Sensory Input. This model is not sequential. All the components are interdependence. We therefore need to teach comprehension skills at the initial stage of teaching reading skills. The task for educators is to bring comprehension skills in line with reading accuracy skills.

Duke and Pearson (2002, ch.10 pps 205, 206) say that "good" readers are both active and purposeful when reading. "Good" readers are able to integrate their prior knowledge as well as monitor and adjust their understandings as they read. For those readers the processing of a text occurs prior, during and after reading.

It is necessary for educators to teach comprehension skills. There are many possible strategies that may improve comprehension of text in children; forming questions about ideas in text while reading, summarizing and analyzing stories read under guidelines of setting, character, events and conclusion, making mental images about the text and many more. Hibbing and Rankin-Erickson (2003) conducted research into mental imagery. Their findings were that students who were able to visualize were able to develop comprehension skills at a more rapid rate than those who could not make mental images.

The focus of the current research is to assess the level of comprehension in students that are experiencing reading difficulty and then support their learning by assisting
them to create and make mental images (pictures in their mind) through the strategy of visualization. The focus was derived from concern arising from the results of recent testing done within the school and an interest in establishing something to support students that have had intervention through the Reading Recovery program.

If educators are to teach reading comprehension there needs to be a program for the teaching of essential comprehension strategies to be put into place. A number of researchers have expressed concerns that teachers are excellent at testing comprehension skills yet few are expert at teaching comprehension strategies. Konza (2003) believes that modeling and explicit instructions are important elements when teaching. The use of visualization was incorporated into a strategy known as the R.I.D.E.R strategy (Clark Deshler, Schumaker, Alley and Warner 1984). R.I.D.E.R is an acronym for “Read”, “Imagine”, “Describe”, “Evaluate” and “Read On”. When using this comprehension strategy students use visual imagery when learning new material by converting what is to be learned into meaningful visual, auditory or kinesthetic images of information. Learners make mental images as the text is read, the images transform as the reader continues and then students recall and relate these images through verbalization. This process encourages readers to become active rather than passive learners. The R.I.D.E.R strategy also gives participants the opportunity to develop oral language skills and access their prior knowledge and experiences when discussing the topic before, during and after reading. This verbalizing assists in internalizing their understandings and subsequently applying their learning to new situations. It gives students the ability to become more engaged in their reading and use their imagery to draw conclusions, create interpretations of the text and recall details and elements of the text (Keene & Zimmerman, 1997).
The present study aims to investigate the fact that focused and explicit teaching of visualization strategies enables students to improve both their comprehension of text and their oral language skills.

The independent variable in this research is the ability to visualize with the support and knowledge of the R.I.D.E.R. strategy. The dependent variable is improvement in comprehension and oral language skills.

**Method**

This study employed an OXO approach (Assessment-Teaching-Assessment) in which the visualization strategy of R.I.D.E.R. was taught to improve comprehension and oral language skills. Progress of the development of these skills was monitored following the teaching of the visualization strategy to four year 2 students with comprehension difficulties. All four students read at an age appropriate level for accuracy and decoding but demonstrated a low level of comprehension. The students selected for the intervention were in the lower level of reading ability in their classroom. All students in the study had either had Reading Recovery instruction in the previous year or were on the tentative selection list for Reading Recovery but had not received the intervention. Although these students read at an age appropriate accuracy level while the remainder of the class read at a higher level.

A control group consisting of four students of matched ability was assessed at pre and post testing in order to compare results with the intervention group.

The students were assessed, both pre and post intervention, to determine their capability in comprehension and oral language skills. They were assessed using: PROBE Comprehension, Record of Oral Language, Nearle Analysis, Visualisation Task, Listening and Oral Retell Task and a Self Efficacy Survey. The PROBE Comprehension task was administered to check their reading accuracy on an age appropriate passage of text and
also to assess their comprehension using literal, inferential and evaluative questioning. The Record of Oral Language task gave a measure of accurate listening skills and ability to recall and retell sentences accurately. The Nearle Analysis was used to measure reading accuracy, comprehension and rate. The Visualisation task (Appendix 3 and 4) provided a measurement for literal comprehension using visualization skills. The Listening and Oral Retell task provided an assessment for recall of events and oral language skills and finally the Self Efficacy task measured how the students felt about reading.

Between the pre and post testing the target group participated in ten lessons of 40-45 minutes during which the R.I.D.E.R strategy was explicitly taught. The control group, during this time participated in regular classroom activities. Neither of the groups had been taught the R.I.D.E.R. strategy previously.

All lessons for the target group were carried out during the classroom literacy block; however the group were removed from the classroom for instruction. The students in the group were familiar and comfortable with the administrator and with the procedure of being withdrawn for instruction.

This research took place in a Catholic school in the north-east of Melbourne. The school has an enrolment of approximately 220 children with an average of 26 children per class. The population of the school is predominately Anglo-Saxon of middle class status. There are no families at the school that have a language other than English spoken as a first language.
Participants

The control group consisted of 4 children; 3 girls, 1 boy. The age range of these children was 7 years 3 months to 7 years 11 months. They were from two different classrooms: both grade one/two composites. Three of these students had received Reading Recovery in grade one.

The target group consisted of 4 children from the same two composite classrooms as the control group. Their age range was 7 years 2 months to 7 years 10 months. Three of these students had also received reading recovery intervention in the previous year.

Student A

Student A is a male aged 7 years 7 months. He received Reading Recovery instruction of 97 lessons. He progressed from entry level 2 to discontinue at level 15. He is usually a focused learner and tries hard to improve.

Student B

Student B is a female aged 7 years 6 months. She received Reading Recovery for 65 lessons. She entered the program on level 4 and discontinued on level 15. She is not a focused learner and seems disinterested in her progress.

Student C

Student C is a female aged 7 years 10 months. She was a second semester intake in Reading Recovery and received 34 lessons of instruction. She progressed from level 14 to level 23 while on the program. She is focused and competitive as a learner.

Student D

Student D is a female aged 7 years 3 months. She has not had any intervention. She is a focused learner.
Student E
Student E is a female aged 7 years 10 months. She was a second semester intake in Reading Recovery and received 44 lessons of instruction. She progressed from level 13 to level 19 while on the program. She is not generally a focused learner.

Student F
Student F is a male aged 7 years 8 months. He has not had any intervention and he is a focused participant in learning.

Student G
Student G is a female aged 7 years 2 months. She received Reading Recovery instruction for 57 lessons and progressed from level 5 to level 15 while on the program. She is not always a focused learner.

Student H
Student H is a female aged 7 years 11 months. She received Reading Recovery instruction for 63 lessons. She entered the program on level 6 and discontinued on level 15. She is a focused learner.

Procedure
All students (both in the intervention and control group) were administered the following tests during the pre-testing.

- PROBE: The Gift (6.6-7.5 years)
- ROL
- Nearle Analysis of Reading Ability
- Visualisation Task A. Developed by researcher (Appendix 3) See note below.
- Listening Comprehension and Oral retell. Developed by researcher (Appendix 2) See note below.
- Self Efficacy Survey. (Appendix 7) See teaching references.
Post testing results were obtained in the week after instruction by re-testing the tests listed above. The text for the visualization task for post testing (Appendix 4) was the only test that was different from the pre-testing.

**Visualisation Tasks (Appendix 3 and 4)**

This task was used to measure listening and recall skills using a visual medium. The short passage was read to the student and they were required to draw as much detail as they could in the box provided, after the reading. They did not see or read the text. The paper was folded so that only the blank boxes were visible to the student. Each passage had a possible score dependent on items mentioned.

**Listening Comprehension and Oral Retell**

The passage was read to the student and their oral retell was recorded immediately after reading. Minimal prompting for information was allowed. Their response was then marked against the analysis grid to obtain a score.

**Self Efficacy Survey (See teaching references)**

The results were given a numerical value for comparison. The number in brackets was assigned to each response. The scores were then totaled and students were given a percentage score.

"I know I can’t". -1

"I think I can’t". -2

"I’m half and half sure". -3

"I think I can". -4

"I know I can". -5
Daily Lessons (See Appendix 1 for detailed lesson plans)
Only the intervention group received the following set of lessons.

Session 1
Teaching Focus: Visualisation.
Teaching Strategy: To make a mental image using a poster as a stimulus.

Session 2
Teaching Focus: Visualisation.
Teaching Strategy: To pictorially record an image using a poster as a stimulus.

Session 3
Teaching Focus: Visualisation
Teaching Strategy: Prediction using a poster as a stimulus.

Session 4
Teaching Focus: Visualisation
Teaching Strategy: Prediction using a poster as a stimulus.

Session 5
Teaching Focus: Visualisation, prediction and comprehension.

Session 6
Teaching Focus: Visualisation, prediction and comprehension.

Session 7
Teaching Focus: Visualisation, prediction and comprehension.

Session 8
Teaching Focus: Visualisation, prediction and comprehension.

Session 9
Teaching Focus: Visualisation, prediction and comprehension. Oral language

Session 10
Teaching Focus: Visualisation, prediction and comprehension. Oral language.
Results
For all results students A-D (inclusive) are the intervention group and students E-H (inclusive) are the control group.

The results indicate that the explicit teaching of the R.I.D.E.R visualization strategy increases student’s comprehension and oral language skills. Students A, B, C and D (intervention group) showed significant improvement in their test results from pre to post testing after intervention instruction using the R.I.D.E.R strategy. Students E, F, G and H (control group) also showed improvement in their results however the improvements were not as significant as those of the intervention group.

The pre testing was undertaken in the week prior to the ten teaching sessions. These teaching sessions were delivered daily over a ten day period. The post testing was done in the week after the intervention.

Figure 1

NEARLE ANALYSIS Pre and Post Intervention

![NEARLE ANALYSIS Pre and Post Intervention](image_url)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

The NEARLE analysis test was administered to gain a standardized score for accuracy, comprehension and rate. Although accuracy and rate were not part of the field being measured to test the hypothesis of this research the results were noted due to their probable effect on comprehension. All students in this research are students at risk in literacy and their scores reflect this. Pre intervention accuracy scores range from 40th - 70th percentile with most results being around the 50th percentile. This low accuracy rate would necessarily influence their comprehension level. The accuracy level of all students (except Student G) improved in the post testing results. This could be due to the fact that the texts were unseen in the pre testing and seen in the post testing. Comprehension levels improved for all students (except Student G) from the pre to post testing however the level of improvement was greater for the students involved in the intervention sessions.

Overall student reading rate is low which would also impact on their comprehension. It is interesting to note that the reading rate did not change much from pre to post testing while the comprehension gain in the students introduced to the R.I.D.E.R strategy was significant.
A PROBE reading test was administered so that comprehension could be measured on an age appropriate passage of text. Accuracy was not measured and when reading became disconnected due to inaccurate reading students were assisted in order to test comprehension not influenced by poor accuracy. While all students improved in their comprehension scores, students A-D (intervention group) showed greater improvement than students E-H (control group).
The Self-Efficacy Survey was administered both pre and post intervention to gain a measure of how these students see themselves as learners. Students with a high self-efficacy level are generally more confident and their oral language skills are more developed. Students who feel good about their learning are generally more focused and enthusiastic about their learning.

Pre-intervention the self-efficacy percentage scores ranged between 13 and 52. As all these students struggle with literacy this was not a surprise. Student B had a particularly low pre-intervention score of 13. She is easily distracted and loses focus often. Her post-intervention score of 85 reflected her improved focus as well as her
improved opinion of herself as a learner. All students involved in the teaching sessions showed greater levels of improvement (average percentage score of 83) than the students from the control group (average percentage score 58). The improvement shown in the control group could reflect the fact that this survey was administered twice within 3 weeks and all students may have changed their responses as the survey was known in the post testing. This would also have influenced the responses of the intervention group.

During the intervention sessions all students had many opportunities to express themselves and reflect on their learning. This not only improved their oral language but obviously, as seen in their post testing self-efficacy results, greatly improved their opinion of themselves as learners.
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**Figure 4**

**VISUALISATION TASKS: PRE AND POST INTERVENTION.**
(Percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TASK A</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TASK B</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4*
The visualization tasks (Appendix 3 and 4) were designed to gain a measure of the students' ability to visualize. The short passage was read to them and they were required to illustrate as many items from the passage as they could. The number of items in each passage became progressively greater. The student was then given a percentage score for their results. Task A and Task B were different texts but had the same graduating scale of difficulty.

All students (except student F) improved in their results from the pre testing to the post testing. This type of activity could have been new to the students in the pre testing and their improved results, in the post testing, could reflect the fact that they were more familiar with the activity.

All students in the intervention group showed greater improvement, from their pre testing to their post testing, than the students from the control group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LISTENING COMPREHENSION</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Intervention</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Intervention</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Figure 5
The Listening Comprehension Task (Appendix 2) was adapted from the John Munro model. It was administered to gain a percentage score of the students' ability to not only recall the events of a short passage of text but to express their recount orally. All students' results showed an improvement from pre to post testing results. This was expected as the text was known to them in the post testing and unknown in the pre testing. As seen in Fig 5 the results of the intervention group are significantly greater than those of the control group. All students in the intervention group not only recalled more information from the text but expressed themselves more clearly and confidently. Their retell was recorded on both occasions (pre and post testing) and played back to them after testing. All students from the intervention group commented positively on their improvement.
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**Figure 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Intervention</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Intervention</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6**
Figure 6 shows all students improving in their record of oral language. Administering this test twice over such a short period could have resulted in this improvement. This test was also administered at the beginning of the year (only 7 weeks earlier).
Discussion
The aim of this study was to discover whether explicitly teaching visualization using the R.I.D.E.R. strategy to year two students who are considered students at risk due to poor literacy skills would improve both comprehension and oral language skills. The overall trend of the results showed that all students that received explicit instruction in visualization improved in their post testing comprehension results.
The results support the findings of research on visual imagery training carried out by other researchers. (Clark, Deshler, Schumaker, Alley and Warner 1984). Neilson Hibbing and Rankin-Erickson (2003) stated in their research that children that can create their own images as they read have greater potential for understanding the text being read. This present research supports their findings.
The students’ ability to recall and retell events in greater detail also improved their oral language skills. Their self-efficacy improved and they approached reading with enhanced enthusiasm. The small teaching group assisted their focus and provided greater opportunity for individual input and monitoring.
While all students in the study showed trends of improvement the results of the students that were part of the intervention group were significantly greater.
The average percentile increase for comprehension (NEARLE Analysis test-Figure 1, Table 1) for the intervention group was 16. While the control group students also improved in their comprehension percentile level the average level of improvement was only 3 percentile scores. (Table 1)
The PROBE reading test results (comprehension only) also saw the intervention group having a higher average percentage score increase. (Table 2). The self-efficacy post test results (Figure 3, Table 3) are particularly interesting for students B and D. Student B showed a 72%
positive improvement in her responses to the survey while Student D showed a 50% increase in positive responses. Both these students scored very low (13% and 30%) in their pre test survey but mentioned during the instruction lessons that making pictures in their minds helped them to understand their reading. The positive affirmation and constant positive feedback that is able to be exchanged when a small group is taken on such a regular basis has to be given some credit for their change in attitude towards their reading. This change may only apply while they are being given this intensive instruction. The results of the control group also show an improvement in self-efficacy (average of 14.75%). All students involved in this research were pre tested after only 5 weeks of working in their present grade. The improvement shown by the control group could reflect their settling into a new class with a new teacher. Classroom establishment takes time for all students to feel confident in their new surroundings.

All students, except student F show an improvement in their ability to draw/record their visualisation and recall facts/items. The intervention group average score increased by 11.25% with Student D improving by 13% and Student B improving by 12%. (Students B and D also show the greatest improvement in their self-efficacy scores).

The improved results from the control group (Table 4) could reflect the fact that even though the tasks used different text (Appendix 3 and 4) the format was familiar as it had been undertaken two weeks earlier.

While all students show improvement in their post testing Listening Comprehension scores (Figure 5 Table 5), the intervention group show an average improvement of 28%. This was a known text in the post testing which could have accounted for some of this improvement.

Record of oral language scores also show improvement for all students, however once again those students that were involved in the intervention sessions show greatest improvement. (Table 6, Figure 6)
During the early lessons when large posters were used to assist visualization, the students developed and expressed a confidence in their ability to succeed. They were not required to read and were able to focus on visual images alone. Their oral language and recall of detail greatly improved after each session. Student B stated that she loved coming to the sessions because the work was easy as you didn’t have to read. When text was introduced the focus remained solely on visualization. The text level was always at easy accuracy level and if a student struggled with accuracy they were assisted. After the first lesson involving text, the cue cards (Appendix 6) were introduced and discussed. These became a focus reminder for the students and they stated in their oral review of the sessions that they helped keep them on track.

While the study proved to be positive there were some confounding variables that could have had an impact on the study. The group was small (4 children) and instruction was intense (10 lessons over 2 weeks). The students involved in the intervention instruction had teacher directed and monitored instruction for 30-40 minutes per day for 2 weeks and they were withdrawn from the classroom and possible distraction. The group being small meant that they had plenty of opportunity to express themselves and little opportunity to lose focus. The post testing was undertaken immediately after the instruction sessions. The strategy teaching would still be fresh in their minds. The researcher was not the classroom teacher and they may have associated sessions with the researcher as a cue to use the strategies introduced. The students experienced success in the sessions as accuracy of reading was not being measured. Self esteem was high during the instruction time.

The findings therefore support the prediction that teaching students to make images in their minds (using the R.I.D.E.R. strategy) as they read will improve their ability to comprehend what they read and will also improve
their oral language skill of retelling. It confirms that students with learning difficulties can be taught a strategy to enhance their performance. Whilst this is not the only strategy that these students require to assist them in becoming proficient in comprehension it has developed their ability to learn a thought process. The results show improved scores and anecdotal notes and self-efficacy results show improved attitude.

Implications from this study for further teaching would be to administer the explicit instruction of the strategy of visualization using the R.I.D.E.R. strategy to small groups within the classroom setting. Visualisation should not be the only strategy for intervention. Multiple strategies should be taught such as paraphrasing and questioning. However all strategies to improve reading comprehension have to be explicitly taught.

**Going Further**

The research project was limited to a sample size of four students and ten intervention sessions. It is not evident that this strategy is embedded and automatic for the students that undertook the intervention even though their results were positive. If the period of intervention was extended and multiple strategies were introduced the development of long term improved comprehension may result. The same level of intervention should be delivered to the control group to map whether the level of success seen in the study is an accurate assumption that all student would benefit from this type of intervention. The instruction should then be administered in teacher focus groups within the classroom to measure whether withdrawal has an influence on the results.
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Appendices
Appendix 1

Lesson 1
(30-40 minutes)
Materials required:
Large poster of carnival. The poster I used had eight large pictures of people enjoying rides at a carnival or fun park.

Teaching Focus: Visualisation.
Teaching Strategy: To make a mental image using a poster as a stimulus.

Step 1: Display the poster and ask the students to have a good look at it and describe what they see.

Step 2: Ask the students to close their eyes and try to see the pictures from the poster in their minds.

Step 3: Ask the students to look again at the poster and try to see something else.

Step 4: Ask the students to close their eyes again and try to see the extra things that they saw in the poster in their minds.

Step 5: Remove the poster and as a group, list the things that they saw. (Key words only)

Step 6: Return the poster and add anything that had not been included in the list.
Remove the poster.

Step 7: Use this list of key words for students to take turns in verbalizing what they saw.
“Put yourself in the picture. Tell a story about what you are doing. Have the rest of the group identify which character in the poster that you are.”
Lesson 2
(30-40 minutes)

Materials required:
Large poster of Wizardry images, (The poster I used had a detailed view of the inside of a castle) paper and coloured pencils

Teaching Focus: Visualisation.
Teaching Strategy: To pictorially record an image using a poster as a stimulus.

Step 1: Display the poster and ask the students to have a good look at it and describe what they see.

Step 2: Ask the students to close their eyes and try to see the pictures from the poster in their minds.

Step 3: Ask the students to look again at the poster and try to see something else.

Step 4: Ask the students to close their eyes again and try to see the extra things that they saw in the poster in their minds.

Step 5: Remove the poster and then ask the students to draw the poster in as much detail as they remember. Remind the students to draw as many items as they can recall as well as the detail of these items. E.g. the young wizard standing in the water had a pointed hat.

Step 6: Return the poster for a short while. Ask the students to have another look at it and find other features to draw.

Step 7: Remove the poster and have students add to their drawings.

Step 8: Using their drawings have students take turns to verbalise what they drew.
Lesson 3  
(30-40 minutes)  
Materials required:  
Poster sized photo of popcorn popping in pot, chart with 3 spaces (photo of poster in centre with a blank box on either side. Appendix 5), coloured pencils and lead pencil.  

Teaching Focus: Visualisation  
Teaching Strategy: Prediction using a poster as a stimulus.  

Step 1: Examine the poster of the popping corn. Discuss-What is happening, who has done it, how does it work, what does it taste like etc  

Step 2: Ask the students to describe a scene that could have happened before this picture. E.g. buying the popcorn, at the shops, tipping the corn in the pot etc  

Step 3: Ask the students to describe a scene that could have happened after this picture. E.g. sprinkling the popcorn with sugar, eating the popcorn, washing the pot. Try to get a variety of possible predictions.  

Step 4: Complete A4 worksheet of pre and post pictures and include written summary.  

Step 5: Share results/work with group.  
As the students are sharing their results have remainder of the group close their eyes and visualize the sequence of events that are being described.
Lesson 4
(30-40 minutes)

Materials required:
Poster sized photo of aeroplane taking off,(Appendix 5, lesson 4) chart with 3 spaces (photo of poster in centre with a blank box on either side), coloured pencils and lead pencil.

Teaching Focus: Visualisation

Teaching Strategy: Prediction using a poster as a stimulus.

Step 1: Examine the poster of the aeroplane taking off.

Step 2: Ask the students to describe a scene that could have happened before this picture. E.g. packing to go away, getting to the airport etc

Step 3: Ask the students to describe a scene that could have happened after this picture. E.g. arriving at your destination, unpacking, being met by people at the airport etc. Try to get a variety of possible predictions.

Step 4: Complete A4 worksheet of pre and post pictures and include written summary.

Step 5: Share results/work with group. Have remainder of group visualize as students share.
Lesson 5
(30-40 minutes)

Materials required:
Big book with short amount of text as caption on each page (I used The Sunflower Tree-Launch Pad Readers-Level 12). Paper to cover pictures before reading.
Teaching Focus: Visualisation, prediction and comprehension.

Step 1: Review activities from previous lessons. Have students verbalise what we have been doing. (Using pictures to place and retain visual images in our minds and using these images to predict pre and post events. Using images to orally provide possible sequence of events. Investigate, discuss and evaluate pictures)

Step 2: Tell the students that we are now going to evaluate and discuss text in much the same way we did with the pictures. Discuss cover and title. Make predictions about possible words and events that we may find in this story. (Cover pictures before students take turns to read the following pages.)

Step 3: Read page 2. Ask students to make a mental image of the picture under the paper. Share their ideas. Prompt for detail. Uncover the picture and compare their images to the picture provided. How are they the same/different?

Step 4: Continue in the same manner for pages 3-7.

Step 5: Make predictions about the remainder of the story. Share ideas.

Step 6: Read pages 8-17. Investigate and discuss pictures as you uncover them. Evaluate their mental images with pictures provided. Check and evaluate predictions.

Step 7: Make further predictions based on increased knowledge. Read remainder of book. Evaluate your predictions.

Step 8: Students take turns to retell the story in sequence.

Step 9: Ask students literal, inferential and evaluative questions to be answered orally.

Review as a group what we did during this session: Read, investigated, described and evaluated a story.
Lesson 6
(30-40 minutes)

Materials required:
Big book with short amount of text as caption on each page (I used: My Mum and Dad Make Me Laugh-Walker Books)

Teaching Focus: Visualisation, prediction and comprehension.


Step 1: Review activities from previous lessons. Have students verbalise what we have been doing. Read, investigate, discuss and evaluate text)
Explain to students that this is a way to understand what we read. Introduce the R.I.D.E.R. strategy and explain that it is exactly what we have been doing. Discuss acronym. Ask students to think of these terms as a prompt as we read the next book.

Continue following the steps (2-9) from lesson 5. Ask students to name the prompt from the R.I.D.E.R. strategy as they use them.

Lesson 7
(30-40 minutes)

Teaching Focus: Visualisation, prediction and comprehension.


Materials required:
5 blank cards for each student or R.I.D.E.R. cue cards (appendix 6)
Short text from ERIK Kit-Session 18 (The House on the Hill) Copy the text so that each student has their own copy.

Step 1: Review the R.I.D.E.R. strategy. Give each student 5 blank cards. Ask them to write the R.I.D.E.R acronym on the cards (1 letter per card) and to draw an appropriate prompt for each letter.

Step 2: Students are to place the cards in front of them and move the appropriate card forward as they use a particular component of the strategy.

Step 3: Introduce short story-Title only. Discuss.

Step 4: Using the R.I.D.E.R. strategy what would we do now? Move the appropriate card forward-READ.

Step 5: Read the first paragraph of the text. Using the R.I.D.E.R. strategy, ask what would we do now? Move the appropriate cards forward-INVESTIGATE and DESCRIBE.
Continue reading the text in short passages, making predictions, checking predictions, investigating sentences and describing context. Have the students move their prompt cards as they use this part of the strategy.

**Step 6:** Evaluate predictions and discuss changes due to increased knowledge of topic.

**Step 7:** Ask students literal, inferential and evaluative questions to be answered orally.

**Step 8:** Students take turns to retell the story in sequence.

**Step 9:** Review the strategies that we used during this lesson. Discuss their benefits.

**Lesson 8**
Complete steps 1-9 from lesson 7 using text- A Day at the Beach (ERIK kit session 19).

**Lesson 9**
Complete steps 1-9 from lesson 7 using text- On the Lake (ERIK kit, session 36)

**Lesson 10**
(30-40 minutes)

**Materials required:**
Short stories- Katie’s Caterpillar (PM+ Level 8), The Broken Flower Pot (PM+ Level 11), Mother Tiger and Her Cubs (PM+ Level 11), Down by the Sea (PM+ Level 11).

**Step 1:** Revise RIDER strategy- Remind chn. to use these strategies while listening to the following short stories.

**Step 2:** Read one of the short stories to the group.

**Step 3:** Ask one of the students to retell this story in sequence. As the story is being retold the remainder of the group listens and checks that all details are included in sequential order.

**Step 4:** Repeat steps 2 and 3 until all chn. have had an opportunity to retell a short story.

**Step 5:** Revise learning in this session. Ask, “What helped you to remember the stories read?”
Appendix 2

**Listening Comprehension.**  
Read the following passage to the student.

**The School Fair.**

Yesterday, Dot went to the school fair. She went with her dad and her mum. It was a hot day so she wore her big hat. There were lots of rides at the fair. Dot liked the tug boat the best. They all got an ice-cream to eat. They sat on their rug in the hot sun. Dot's ice-cream melted and made a mess on the rug. Later, Dot and her dad went to see the animals. There were pigs and cows and some sheep. Dot saw a big bug on one of the cows. Her dad took the bug off the cow's back. Dot had a great time at the fair. Before going home she had a hot dog for tea.

Write the student's retell........

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic of Retelling</th>
<th>No. of points.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Characters.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dot, dad, mum</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Dot, dad and mum did at the fair?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Events</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Yesterday Dot went to the school fair</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• She went with mum and dad</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It was hot</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• She wore a big hat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There were lots of rides</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• She liked the tug boat best</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• They had an ice-cream</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• They sat in the hot sun</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The ice-cream melted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dot and dad went to see the animals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There were pigs, cows and sheep</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There was a bug on the cow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dad took it off</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• They had a great time</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Before they went home, Dot had an ice-cream</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

Read and Draw

Task A
(Fold this page in half so that students do not see text. They are to draw from visualization.)

Sam has a big piece of paper

2 items

On the table there is a card. I have an envelope in my right hand.

3 items

Jenny holds a can and a spoon. She scrapes something from the can into a plastic bowl and places it on the floor in front of the cat.

5 items

It is raining. Greg is wearing his shorts and a red and black striped jumper with number 10 on its back. He ties the laces on his boots.

6 items
Appendix 3A

Name……………………………… Date……………………

Read and Draw
Task B
(Fold this page in half so that students do not see text. They are to draw from visualization.)

I am sitting on a seat.

2 items

A girl in a wheelchair is sitting at her computer. A book is open on the desk.

3 items

Sam holds the hose as he waters the tomatoes. He is wearing a brown jacket and has a hat on his head.

5 items

Kay has put out three cups and has put a tea bag in each one. She is filling the cups from the kettle. The milk and sugar are on the table.

6 items
Appendix 5

Name ___________________________ Date____________________

Lesson 3:

Draw a picture in the boxes on either side of this picture to show what happened before the picture and after the picture

Write a story to go with these 3 pictures.
Lesson 4
Name ........................................ Date.........................

Draw a picture in the boxes on either side of this picture to show what happened before the picture and after the picture

Write a story to go with these 3 pictures.