Teaching of paraphrasing will improve student’s comprehension skills

ABSTRACT
Students often experience difficulties in reading. These difficulties have been linked to the inability of those students with reading difficulties to use a variety of comprehension strategies when exposed to an unknown text. Those strategies that are intrinsically used by competent readers need to be explicitly taught in order to increase the ability of low achieving students to access text.

The aim of this particular study was to research the understanding that when students are taught the reading strategy of Paraphrasing they will then in turn increase their over all reading comprehension. Research into this area suggests that students who are taught the process of paraphrasing have an opportunity to practise it and receive corrective feedback have an increased comprehension of unknown text. Researches also concur that students require an opportunity to verbalise their thinking, this is essential as students need the opportunity to articulate their thinking in order to use it effectively. They then need to have an opportunity to reflect their learning through writing in order to embed that learning and subsequently develop the automaticity needed for them to become a proficient reader.

This study compared a control group of students and an experimental group of students. The experimental group of students were taught the process of paraphrasing in an explicit focused small group. The control group were exposed to general classroom programs as part of a whole class. The results indicated that those students who were taught the skill of paraphrasing improved both in paraphrasing and reading comprehension.
INTRODUCTION

Reading is a complex process that has specific skills, strategies and procedures that may be inherently used by competent readers but need to be explicitly taught to those students who find the reading process difficult to grasp and then utilise. In John Munro’s (2004) model of Multiply Levels of Text Processing he identifies five levels that competent readers work within in order to access and comprehend text. He suggests that within those levels there are three areas that need to be identified in order to establish a student’s working knowledge of reading. One stage is the reading strategies that the student uses when comprehending text at a sentence level. Munro (2004) would suggest one such strategy needed in order for students to access text authentically is paraphrasing, which when taught explicitly can enhance a student’s ability to grapple more effectively with both known and unknown text.

It is recognised that the explicit teaching of reading strategies enhances the ability of students to comprehend a variety of texts. Paraphrasing is identified as one strategy that can allow readers of all levels to understand and identify the main concepts of a piece of writing. The inability to paraphrase affects a student’s capacity to articulate a text’s idea. It also hinders their ability to locate evidence that supports those main ideas and the author’s intention. When a reader lacks skills in paraphrasing it affects the students ability to reflect deeply and internalise a text in-depth.

When dealing with the issue of reading difficulties Hurst and Fisk (2003) suggested paraphrasing is an effective reading strategy that helps students to process and comprehend what they are reading. When teaching the skill explicitly teachers enable students to clearly understand what they have read through all means of communication as cited in Hurst and Fisk (2003). They further contended that it is in the use of reading, writing, speaking and listening that students are able to clearly articulate and internalise the authentic message.
of text they read. The social aspect of this method when teaching paraphrasing contributes to it’s effectiveness, in that it allows students an opportunity to read, discuss and internalise the message of what they have read in a meaningful manner. Hurst and Fisk (2003) have also suggested that when dealing with teaching the specific skill of paraphrasing teachers build up a number of comprehension strategies within their students. They enable students to identify the main idea of a text; they give the skills needed to support their understanding of the main idea with contributing details as well as being able to identify the author’s voice. They support the understanding that establishing meaning through the author’s voice is essential when paraphrasing, as it needs to be maintained in order to establish authentic meaning.

Steven and Von Colln (2003) would suggest that paraphrasing has a number of recognisable and tested benefits when used to comprehend text. According to their research it also assists students when studying and in note taking. Paraphrasing enables readers to move away from the word for word translation of both written and oral text that many students are reliant on, assisting them in moving to a more holistic approach to reading and comprehending a text. There is an understanding that when a reader develops the skill of paraphrasing they are able to make a deeper link between their own experiences and therefore have a broader understanding of content and context of what they have read.

Steven and Von Colln also identified paraphrasing as a useful tool for developing explicit reading comprehension strategies. It is a skill that is easily transferable and that according to their research is popular in part due to it being a logical approach used informally by many teachers and it is easily incorporated into classroom instruction (Steven and Von Colln 2003). This understanding acknowledges the fact that teachers, and in more general terms, readers who are competent paraphrase in order to create better understanding of what is being read. The next stage is then to develop the ability of non-competent readers to use this skill consciously as a tool. Steven and Von Colln further state
that this explicit recognition of the strategies readers use enables struggling readers to recall them more readily until they become embedded. This re-education of students with severe learning difficulties in particular, has been identified as a way in which to redress some of the patterns of inaccurate reading behaviours, which readers with reading difficulties face.

In research conducted by Katims and Harris (1997) it is suggested that when improving the reading comprehension of middle school students, paraphrasing is established as demonstrating significant increases in reading comprehension in students with or without learning disabilities. (Katims and Harris 1997) Their study, which was conducted in multileveled, inclusive classrooms concluded that when the steps of paraphrasing are taught all students at all levels improved in the area of reading comprehension. The step that Katims and Harris (1997) include in their teaching of paraphrasing is commonly referred to as the RAP strategy.
The strategy involves

Read the text
Ask yourself questions about the main idea and details
Put the ideas into your own words and try to change as many as you can

While the acronym is used to assist students in that it gives them access to the skill of paraphrasing in a seemingly simplistic manner, teachers need to be aware of the complex nature of the strategy. (Katims and Harris 1997)

The purpose of the present study is to further research the specific understanding that the explicit teaching of paraphrasing will assist students who have reading difficulties to develop their comprehension skills. It is in the teaching of paraphrasing that the study hopes to explore the idea that when a reader is able to articulate the ideas in a text in their own words, orally and in writing, that they will be able to gain greater understanding of what they've read.
METHOD
The model used to research the hypothesis that the teaching of paraphrasing will improve student's comprehension skills was an OXO design. The students were observed though a pre assessment, and then taught a series of lessons focused on paraphrasing and then observed again through the use of post assessments. Two cohorts were observed and one cohort was identified as the experimental group.

The two cohorts consisted of students in grade threes and four. They include a range of boys and girls who were identified as students at risk in reading comprehension. The students who were in the experimental group were given a pre and post assessment as well as being monitored throughout the teaching process. A control group of six students from an alternative grade 3/4 class were also pre and post tested. Both groups were monitored to establish their use of paraphrasing and the impact that developing that skill had on their overall reading comprehension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age in MONTHS</th>
<th>Teaching/Control Group0=control 1=teaching group</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>LBOTE</th>
<th>EMA Yes=E No=NE</th>
<th>Learning Disability Yes=LD No = NLD</th>
<th>Earlier Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1 Gr.3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1 Gr. 3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1 Gr.3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1 Gr.3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1 Gr4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1 Gr 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0 Gr3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0 Gr.3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 9</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0 Gr. 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 10</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0 Gr. 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 11</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0 Gr.4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 12</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0 Gr4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
Table 1 describes the twelve students involved in the study. Students 1 to 6 are the students involved in the experimental group and students 7 to 12 are those involved in the control group.

The participants identified to partake in the experimental group and control groups were chosen using a variety of criteria. Each child had been observed within their classroom environment as working significantly below peers. Their behaviours indicated a general lack of understanding of text, which was demonstrated through an inability to identify the main ideas within text at an age appropriate level, nor could they offer contributing evidence to support that understanding. They also lacked the ability to articulate their thoughts either orally or in written form.

The students in the control group and the experimental groups were given two assessments one prior to the ten lessons taught and one after the teaching. The reading comprehension test was the TORCH reading comprehension test. The students completed *Grasshoppers* in an unspecified time frame. The test was given in its entirety, in its original form. They were also given a paraphrasing assessment as designed by John Munro. They were able to complete the assessments within individual time limits.

The students were gathered together in small groups for the assessment tasks in an area separate to their classes. They were then given copies of the TORCH comprehension test. Each child was given a copy of the assessment blown up to A3 size in order to limit the effect of text being presented in a small font on the outcome. The children then read through the text silently as the teacher read through the text aloud. The students then read the text again independently. The process lasted approximately twenty minutes. Both groups of children were then given an opportunity to ask clarifying questions. Once the discussion was complete the cloze was explained and the children were told they would need to pay careful attention to the text. The children then completed the cloze comprehension task within individual time frames.
On the following day the students were again gathered together in their small group apart from their class. The students were asked to discuss their understanding of paraphrasing and given a brief description of the purpose and process of the strategy. Each child was given a copy of the assessment blown up to A3 size in order to limit the effect of small text on the outcome. The three examples at the beginning of the text were read to the students and the teacher offered examples of paraphrasing. The students had an opportunity to ask clarifying questions and then complete the assessment changing as many words as they could without changing the meaning of the sentence.

Once the students were allocated to each group the experimental group were involved in ten lessons that explicitly focused on paraphrasing. The students were exposed to a process used when paraphrasing and the purpose of paraphrasing as it relates to reading comprehension. Each lesson was conducted in response to the ongoing needs of the students, although each lesson followed the same skeleton process. The first lesson involved gaining an understanding of reading strategies and comprehension. This was a general discussion, which was used as a basis on which to build the students understanding and use of paraphrasing.

The students were presented with and model the strategy of paraphrasing in a variety of contexts using both factual texts and narratives. The purpose of paraphrasing was also presented to the students in each lesson intermittently. Each step involved in the strategy of paraphrasing was stated clearly as was the purpose of each action. The students then practised each step using individual sentences and then paragraphs, in the hope of embedding their understanding, which they then articulated. After each new skill was presented, the children were asked to state their new learning and make a link to existing learning in an oral review and then again in writing through activities designed to establish learning. Each lesson was reviewed through anecdotal notes and the work product of the students in order to identify the ongoing development and needs of the students.
The experimental group’s progress was monitored throughout the ten sessions in two ways. Each student’s written attempts at paraphrasing were collected and assessed to assist the teacher in identifying what areas the students needed development in. The students were asked to indicate their understanding of paraphrasing which was also assessed on a regular basis. The teacher also collated anecdotal records to monitor the impact of the teaching.

At the conclusion of the ten lessons the students were then given the post testing which followed the routine of the pre-assessment except the teacher did not read the text to the students. The decision was made to give identical assessment in the knowledge that no reference had been made to either assessment task since they had been administered in the pre-assessment. This was done in the hope of measuring the improvement in both the students ability to paraphrase and the students overall reading comprehension ability with greater accuracy.

RESULTS

The results of the research indicate support for the hypothesis that students with difficulties in comprehension will develop those skills when taught the specific skill of paraphrasing.
Table 2
The experimental group and the control group who were tested against the TORCH comprehension test standards reflected poor comprehension skills compared to the standard of their peers (Table 2 and Table 3) both within their individual grades and against the benchmarks established for readers of their age.
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Table 3
The control group demonstrated marginally higher scores in their pre-assessment in comparison to those in the experimental group (table 2). The students in the experimental group scored within the lowest 25\textsuperscript{th} percentile demonstrating that they were performing significantly lower prior to the teaching of paraphrasing.

The post assessment scores for both groups (table 2 and table 3) indicate a development in all but one student in the control group who in fact decreased in her comprehension score. The experimental group demonstrated a consistent development taking all but one student beyond the lowest 25\textsuperscript{th} percentile into and beyond the 50\textsuperscript{th} percentile. The control group also demonstrated growth, some of which was significant without exposure to the specific teaching of
paraphrasing, although it appears as a whole cohort that their progress was more erratic than those in the experimental cohort.

Table 4
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Table 5

Each of the groups paraphrasing scores was significantly lower than those of their peers in pre-testing using the paraphrasing assessment (Munro 2007). The control group performed marginally below that of the students in the experimental group (table 4 and table 5). The experimental group generally received scores of less that 10 percent. There was no set scoring system with the paraphrasing test however both groups in both the pre and post testing were assessed consistently against each other. Both the control group and the
experimental group all improved in their paraphrasing abilities over the teaching period. The control group’s results were however significantly lower than those in the experimental group. All students made significant gains supporting their improvement as a cohort in reading comprehension.

During the teaching of the experimental group all students showed dramatic development in the strategies needed to paraphrase and the purpose of paraphrasing when reading. All students moved from little or no knowledge of paraphrasing to being able to articulate at various stages throughout the ten lessons an ability to demonstrate an understanding of text through their paraphrasing. They all demonstrated an increased ability to articulate synonyms for familiar vocabulary and then unfamiliar vocabulary, which was the first challenge for all members of the experimental cohort.
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**Table 6**

Students 7, student 11 and student 12 in table 6 all made significant gains in their scores from pre to post assessment. This compares successfully with the experimental cohort. All of these students also made similar gains to those students in the experimental group in paraphrasing. So while the value added supports general classroom programs developing the students, It also indicates that when they compared to the other three students in the control group who were exposed to the same teaching, the results reflect an inconsistency. Student
9 (table 6) produced the lowest score across the two groups which when compared to the increases of students in the experimental group (table 7) is not substantial but begins to depict a picture of results being lower without small group focussed teaching of a specific reading strategy.

Table 7
The students in the experimental group made gains in the pre and post Torch score. Student 1 displayed more developed comprehension skills throughout the teaching when they had an opportunity to hear the text as read by another. They made significant gains during the lessons in both vocabulary development as well as being able to articulate sentences in their own words. This is obvious when reflecting on the gains student 1 made in the paraphrasing assessment (table 8) over time. The significance of the change in student’s 1’s Torch score when placed in context of them being required to read the text and understand it is significant. Student 3 performed poorly in ongoing assessment throughout the first three to four lessons. Student 3 showed no signs of being able to articulate the process of paraphrasing or being able to paraphrase a sentence. Student 3 continued to add information as a way to change the sentence. However after the fifth lesson they showed obvious growth in paraphrasing sentences, through the ability to change one or two words while maintaining the meaning of the sentence. This was then reflected in table 4 where student 3’s percentage
increased by 29 percent. It was also reflected, although not as dramatically, in student 3’s over all comprehension score.

The most significant gain in reading comprehension was made by student 6 from the experimental group. The student was the oldest of all students and displayed a great deal of negativity about his learning throughout the initial teaching sessions. He was reluctant to contribute, often lacking an understanding of vocabulary. The last lessons saw him progress dramatically, articulating both the procedure used in paraphrasing and the ability to paraphrase up to two sentences at a time. Student 6 post scores in paraphrasing (table 4) were significant, but the need for the further development in language and a way in which to process more than two sentences at a time may have impacted on his Torch score (table 2) His development was also indicated by the speed in which he compared the post tests and readiness to complete the post assessment tasks without teacher input.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>TO raw PRE</th>
<th>TO raw POST</th>
<th>TO to PRE</th>
<th>TO to POST</th>
<th>TO pc PRE</th>
<th>TO pc POST</th>
<th>Para PRE</th>
<th>Para POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Averages</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.83333</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.3333</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.1667</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.1667</strong></td>
<td><strong>6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>29%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>TO PRE</th>
<th>TO POST</th>
<th>TO PRE</th>
<th>TO POST</th>
<th>TO PRE</th>
<th>TO POST</th>
<th>Para PRE</th>
<th>Para POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Averages</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.66667</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.6667</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.8333</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.3333</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.3333</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.8333</strong></td>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

The averages in Table 8 indicate that in each of the assessments the experimental group performed at the lower standard than the similar cohort in the control group. The averages also indicate that once both groups had completed the post assessments on average the experimental group had
surpassed the average of the control group in all assessments. This would indicate that given the same amount of teaching time in respective classrooms, the students in the experimental group on average performed better with specific teaching in paraphrasing in both the skill of paraphrasing and overall reading comprehension.

**DISCUSSION**

The findings of the research support the idea that when children are taught the skill of paraphrasing their overall reading comprehension will improve. Each of the students in the teaching group made gains from their pre-testing to post assessment data in both the skill of paraphrasing and in overall reading comprehension. The students are all able to articulate the process of paraphrasing and demonstrate it both orally and in writing as suggested in Candice and Fisk (2003). They indicated this throughout the ten lessons in varying degrees. When the children were first exposed to paraphrasing they restated the sentences almost verbatim or added information changing their meaning, by the time the children had been exposed to four or five lessons they were able to change a limited amount of words and maintain meaning. By the end of the ten lessons some students were able to articulate sentences in their own words, still maintaining meaning and then accurately transferring that understanding into writing which supports Candice and Fisk’s idea that students will embed their knowledge and this will be reflected in a variety of ways.

The children in both the teaching group and the control groups were exposed to the explicit teaching of the strategy of Visualisation within their classroom program. This was a strategy that they also articulated an understanding of in discussions about comprehension in lessons, supporting at least in part Katims and Harris’ idea that the teaching of explicit strategies to students is an effective form of intervention although the gains were noticeably different from those students who received instruction in visualisation and those who received instruction in both visualisation and paraphrasing. General classroom practice has an impact on students learning, however the study would suggest that clear
explicit teaching from the student’s point of need using a well defined strategy such as paraphrasing has greater impact. While the fact that the control group were exposed to a teaching strategy other than paraphrasing may have had some impact on the results, the consistent gains of all students in the experimental group gives a clear picture of the success of teaching students paraphrasing as a strategy from their individual point of need.

Katims and Harris understanding of the process of paraphrasing through the use of acronyms and repetition was reflected in the results of the experimental group. The students were able, after practise to articulate the process and conceptualise it. The students were then able to identify when students were able to paraphrase a sentence and evaluate its success. Some were then able to articulate what changes needed to be made in order to effectively paraphrase one or two sentences.

The initial lessons (Munro 2007) were modified in order to meets the needs of the students in early lessons. The students in the experimental group were able to articulate the purpose of the strategy as cited in Steven and Colln (2003) as well as being able to generally articulate the reasoning behind the process and its benefits as also stated in Steven and Colln (2003). They did however find it difficult to paraphrase one sentence with all students either adding to the sentence or altering the meaning of the text. This lead to the need to teach students specifically about synonyms (appendix. Lesson 1b and 1c). After this explicit teaching the students were more in control of their ability to complete the paraphrasing tasks. This would suggest that vocabulary development is essential and must be ongoing if the student’s comprehension is to improve. Even if they are able to articulate the process and a paraphrase one or two sentences the challenge would remain in more difficult text if their vocabulary remained limited.

The lessons while obvious effective were given a limited time frame and in an intensive manner. The timing of such lessons would be difficult to maintain in a
regular classroom environment, which may create a void in students learning if they had not received regular instruction in the specific strategy. The lesson and texts were also modified which is an area that when implementing the strategy to whole classes may create issues with meeting students at particular needs. The ¾ in the experimental group found it challenging to use the text first presented and lessons needed to be modified suggesting that it would present challenges to educators if they were not able to take small focussed groups in order to teach the strategy of paraphrasing. This understanding is also supported in part in the results of the control group who demonstrated an increase in their comprehension which could be contributed to the whole class instruction in a particular strategy but the on average those involved in small group instruction in the comprehension strategy of paraphrasing achieved the most effective results.

The results show a definite improvement in the reading comprehension levels of the students who have been taught the strategy of paraphrasing specifically in focussed small groups with the explicit comprehension strategy. Further research in this area could centre on the investigation into the effect of the strategy of Visualisation opposed to Paraphrasing for students within the lowest 25 percentile in the hope of establishing if there is a more effective strategy for students with severe learning difficulties to embed for the greatest improvement in their learning. Research could also be extended through a comparison study of the long-term effect on comprehension when students are exposed to explicit teaching in either small focused groups or whole group instruction using the same strategy.
Appendix 1

Teaching Unit Paraphrasing

Grade Level: Grade three and four students

Lesson 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome: The students will identify the steps taken when paraphrasing at a sentence level. Allowing them to develop comprehension skills that will develop their understanding of a variety of text.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MLOTP: Students will be working at the sentence level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format: Teaching group: Focus teaching of skills to teaching group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Text:

Teaching group: A jaguar a great cat

Each student in teaching group will be provided with a copy of the text.

Description:

Teaching group focus:

Introduction to strategy of paraphrasing
1 Read a sentence
2 Change as many words as you can while keeping the meaning the same
3 Say the sentence again in your own words

(Teacher) We are going to develop a skill that will help you to remember what you read. The skill is called paraphrasing. Has anyone heard the word paraphrasing? When you paraphrase you read a sentence and say it in your own words.

Explicit outcome: This should be recorded on a chart

1 Read a sentence
2 Change as many words as you can while keeping the meaning the same
3 Say the sentence again in your own words

We are going to develop the skill of paraphrasing when we read sentences and then use it when we read paragraphs.

It may be necessary to discuss the structure of a sentence and paragraph.

This is a text about …..

Let’s read the first paragraph aloud. I will read it first and then I’ll ask some of you to take turns to read parts of it.

When the paragraph has been read twice, each sentence will be re-read by the teacher.

The teacher will then paraphrase each sentence changing as many words as you can without changing the meaning.

Ask students to paraphrase sentences by changing one word in each sentence. Record the changes on the white board.

(Teacher) I will read the sentence and I want you to read it to yourselves with me. Then I will try saying it another way. Then I want some of you to have a go. I will write down what you say.
Review the Action:
*Let's look at what we have done here. We read each sentence and then said it in other ways. See how it helped you to understand what the text said.*

Once the group have paraphrased orally the students can have a go at writing their own paraphrase of each sentence.

At the conclusion of lesson Review the Action:
*Now let's discuss what you did when you paraphrased.*

Tell me what you know about paraphrasing and what steps you should follow to paraphrase a text.
1. Read a sentence
2. Change as many words as you can while keeping the meaning the same
3. Say the sentence again in your own words

Students write the procedure in reading journals.

*The students were asked to complete a reflective journal on their reading ability that would monitor their development in how they see themselves as readers and what the skill of paraphrasing may assist them in achieving. This will be done intermittently throughout the lessons.*

The following lessons were added to the original lesson plan as a result of students needs. They were conducted as separate lessons in-order to support the student's individual needs.

**Lesson 1 Part b**
**Focus:** Development of Vocabulary

Teacher I would like you to think about the word *munched*. I would like you tell me what *munched* looks like. What are some other words that you can think of that mean the same thing as *munched*?

Students make a list of words and the teacher records the list.

The students are then given a sentence written on cards that are cut up. The word *munched* is replaced with other words with the same meaning.

The students are asked to orally present their word replace.

**Lesson 1 Part c**
**Focus:** Paraphrasing: retelling a story in your own words.

Text: The following sentences
- A giant tiger ran quickly through the burning bush.
- Five friends ate an enormous ice-cream on their way to the movies.

Review the steps of paraphrasing and it's purpose.
*Teacher I would like you to read these sentences and tell me what happened in your own words. Each child should offer a response and discuss whether or not they have paraphrased.*

Adapted from John Munro *Teaching a paraphrasing strategy* 2006
Lesson 2

In each of the sessions students apply the strategy of paraphrasing. The students review the steps involved, having extra practice in single sentences. Teachers actively monitor progress and offer corrective feedback. Students transfer the strategy to new texts.

Each of the three lessons will follow prescribed format in lesson 1. Introduce each new text: discussing the topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Teaching Group Student Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teaching Group: A Jaguar: A great Cat</td>
<td>Write a paraphrased sentence in partner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following need to be stressed in each lesson:

What do you do when you paraphrase a sentence? How does paraphrasing help you?

Teachers remind students of the nature of the task and have them review the action.

Lesson 2 part b.
Focus: Paraphrasing sentences.
Teacher: What is paraphrasing? Why do we paraphrase when we read? What do we do when we paraphrase? I would like you to paraphrase the sentences.

Text:
The children chewed their delicious lollies.
The frightened animals watched the giant spider.
The enormous elephants bolted.
The tiny man ran quickly.
The scared dog chewed a bone.
The girls screamed.

The students will share their paraphrase of one sentence. We will then discuss their responses and identify the skill of paraphrasing. The students will then record their paraphrase in their journal.

Lesson 3

In each of the sessions students apply the strategy of paraphrasing. The students review the steps involved, having extra practice in single sentences. Teachers actively monitor progress and offer corrective feedback. Students transfer the strategy to new texts.

Each of the three lessons will follow prescribed format in lesson 1. Introduce each new paragraph: discussing the topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Teaching Group Student Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teaching Group: A Jaguar: A great Cat</td>
<td>Students write their paraphrased sentence independently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from John Munro Teaching a paraphrasing strategy 2006
The following need to be stressed in each lesson:
What do you do when you paraphrase a sentence?
How does paraphrasing help you?

Teachers remind students of the nature of the task and have them review the action.

Lesson 4
In each of the sessions students apply the strategy of paraphrasing. The students review the steps involved, having extra practice in single sentences. Teachers actively monitor progress and offer corrective feedback. Students transfer the strategy to new texts.

Each of the three lessons will follow prescribed format in lesson 1.
Introduce each new paragraph: discussing the topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Teaching Group</th>
<th>Student Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teaching Group: A Jaguar: A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students write their paraphrased sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>great Cat</td>
<td></td>
<td>independently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following need to be stressed in each lesson:
What do you do when you paraphrase a sentence?
How does paraphrasing help you?

Teachers remind students of the nature of the task and have them review the action.

Lessons 5 to 7
In each of the sessions students apply the strategy of paraphrasing. The students review the steps involved, having extra practice in single sentences. Teachers actively monitor progress and offer corrective feedback. Students transfer the strategy to new texts.

Each of the three lessons will follow prescribed format in lesson 1.
Introduce each new text: discussing the topic

The following need to be stressed in each lesson:
What do you do when you paraphrase a sentence?
How does paraphrasing help you?

Teachers remind students of the nature of the task and have them review the action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Variations in lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Text: Teaching Group: A Jaguar: A great Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read aloud each paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paraphrase two sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In pairs write a paraphrase of each sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Text: Teaching Group: A Jaguar: A great Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read aloud each paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paraphrase two sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual students write a paraphrase of each sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Text: Teaching Group: A Jaguar: A great Cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read silently each paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paraphrase two sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In pairs students write a paraphrase of each sentence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from John Munro Teaching a paraphrasing strategy 2006
When paraphrasing sentences students need to be reminded that it is not a summary. Students should paraphrase the sequence of events.
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