

**Explicitly teaching current Year One Reading
Recovery students to paraphrase improves literal
listening comprehension.**

Abstract

Listening comprehension precedes reading and writing comprehension. Comprehension is an active cognitive process which involves the use of strategies, metalanguage, ability to make meaning links to prior knowledge, development of vocabulary meaning networks and use of existing psycholinguistic knowledge as well as a person's attitude and belief in themselves as a learner (self efficacy).

Pre literate developments, word and sentence comprehension processes, verbal short term memory along with expressive and receptive vocabulary affect a child's ability to comprehend and make sense of what they hear.

Research shows that strategic training in the use of comprehension strategies improves overall comprehension. Explicitly teaching children to paraphrase and verbalize the strategy prior to listening to a text improves literal listening comprehension.

The aim of this research was to assist current year one Reading Recovery students to build strong foundations in literal listening comprehension in order to provide a basis for the development of literal (as well as inferential) reading comprehension to scaffold their acceleration in the Reading Recovery series of lessons.

Three year one Reading Recovery students who demonstrated difficulty in oral retell of aural text were chosen to participate in a series of nine teaching sessions where the explicit teaching of the paraphrasing strategy was taught. These students were taught to think about what they had listened to and draw a picture as a prompt to orally paraphrase the text. They were then taught to provide synonyms for a single word – first in isolation and then within the context of a sentence, to paraphrase a sentence and then to paraphrase a short story sentence by sentence using aural text. The students were taught to verbalize the strategy of paraphrasing prior to retelling a sentence or short story in which they used their own words. This aided students to build upon and expand their own vocabulary meaning networks, broaden their existing psycholinguistic knowledge as well as pragmatic use of language, and develop their self efficacy which led to an improvement in overall ability in making meaning at the word, sentence and text levels.

Outcomes showed that students' receptive and expressive language abilities improved through the quality of the responses given in the oral paraphrase of an aural text, the synonyms chosen and the

oral language structures used in the retelling of the sentence or short story heard. This implies that explicit strategic training in paraphrasing can assist in the overall listening literal comprehension of aural text.

Introduction

Broad Topic Targeted

Many children have difficulty comprehending what they listen to. An inability to paraphrase and verbalize their understanding of aural text at the word and sentence level contributes to poor comprehension of written text.

“Paraphrasing a sentence is one aspect of sentence comprehension. It gives students the opportunity to learn and link new concepts, often in unfamiliar relationships and to talk about new ideas. It teaches them ways of talking about the ideas in the topic area and helps them retain the related ideas in short term memory...it helps... to link new ideas with what they know. When students re-tell a sentence ... they link the new concepts with concepts they know.” (Munro, 2002, p7)

As listening comprehension development precedes reading and writing comprehension development, teachers need to be mindful in avoiding the situation where children are able to decode texts proficiently whilst an understanding of what is read is lacking and where meaningful links made to writing are absent. Links between spoken and written text need to be made to ensure that the message is clearly understood.

A child’s comprehension of what is heard and read is limited by the quality of their own oral language (psycholinguistic knowledge), prior experiences and knowledge derived from these experiences (pre-literate experiences) and the attitude and belief they have of themselves as learners (self efficacy). Research supports cognitive strategy training as an effective tool in developing comprehension.

Related Research

Comprehension is a cognitive process which is closely linked to a child's psycholinguistic knowledge. A child's oral language skills in terms of vocabulary, sentence structure and meaning, discourse, listening comprehension, narrative and recounting ability, articulation, use of language to communicate and to learn, as well as perceiving and attending to spoken information affects literacy learning ability (Munro 2005).

Oral language knowledge and knowledge gained through prior experiences support the child in making sense of their world and all the information he/she receives in many and varied forms. A child who is able to attend and "tune into" information they are listening to (receptive language) is then able to interpret and make links to prior knowledge in order to make meaning. A child's competence in listening (comprehension) and speaking (expressive language) occurs through explicit instruction, practice and verbalization of strategies. The child's re-telling and talking about their own personal experiences and of spoken (aural) text leads to an increase in vocabulary networks and choices, text length and complexity that can be understood, development and use of increasingly complex oral language structures and communication in various contexts (expressive language).

Poor comprehenders of text have a poor understanding of the conventions of language use. They need to know these rules of language and how language works to comprehend what others say as well as make themselves understood (Munro 2005).

Westwood (2001) refers to inadequate pre-school language experiences as a cause for deficiencies in vocabulary, language awareness and aural comprehension. Clay (2002) supports this notion in that conditions for learning need to be right for children to become literate where experience counts in cognitive functioning. Clay (2002, p18) goes on to say, "we create many of the necessary links in the brain as we learn to engage in literate activities. If we do not engage in literate activities, we do not create those linked pathways".

Pre-literate experiences where children have listened to stories read or told to them and have had opportunities to retell stories in their own words with or without the support of a book provide a basis for a child's literacy learning (Clay 2002). Opportunities to engage in listening and speaking, whilst participating in story readings, set up expectations that what is written in books will mean something; that is, to make sense (Westwood 2001).

What if these conditions did not exist before the child entered school? Teachers must keep this question in mind in order to cater for all students' needs and facilitate optimal literacy learning.

Children with limited vocabulary, poor understanding of word meanings, difficulty understanding simple spoken text have comprehension difficulties. Munro (2005, p11) supports this in saying, "the networks of meanings that make up people's vocabularies influence how they comprehend and respond to what they hear".

A child's belief in and of themselves as a learner has a great impact on their ability to become literate and how they interpret and come to understand the world around them. Developing a child's ability to understand and interpret what they listen to and the ability to effectively communicate his/her understanding, using links to a variety of vocabulary networks from which to choose, helps them to become strategic. Pressley in Westwood (2001, p11) argues that "strategy training should be an essential part of any balanced approach to literacy teaching". Strategy training can improve comprehension (Magliano, Trabasso and Graesser 1999, as cited in Westwood 2001). Pressley (1999 as cited in Westwood 2001, p10) supports this in saying "that good comprehenders of text are effective users of comprehension strategies when they work with text".

This, therefore, has implications for the teaching of comprehension. The challenge for teachers is to ensure that children internalize, make links to prior knowledge, develop and expand vocabulary networks and extend known oral language structures.

Developing strategic processes in literal comprehension will then support children to identify what is explicitly stated in a text, therefore providing a basis for meaning making. In support, Hellekson and Feitler (1994, p1) cite that this "helps them to become more independent and fluent and increases metacognitive approaches to comprehension".

Paraphrasing aural text is helpful in developing literal listening comprehension and provides children with a scaffold to support them in becoming strategic comprehenders of text. The explicit teaching of the 'why' and 'how' of paraphrasing to students of "another person's ideas will motivate them to use paraphrasing". (Fisk and Hurst, 2003, p2)

It is at this point that teachers also need to be clear on what makes a good paraphrase. Fisk and Hurst (2003) argue that students need to be taught that paraphrasing is not a word by word

translation of the text but a genuine retelling where the students own words and phrasing are used to convey the meaning of the original text and that the voice of the original author is maintained.

As listening comprehension is active in nature, the strategic instruction needs to follow a specific pattern where the student is both supported and scaffolded where needed with a gradual increase in control is given over by the teacher. Berne (2004) notes that the learner needs to take an active role in orienting themselves to the listening task, access their background knowledge, compare their interpretation of the input with the actual input and evaluate and monitor their strategy use.

The paraphrasing strategy using a mnemonic helps students to remember and verbalize what they must do. Schumaker, Denton and Deshler (1984, as cited in Sorrell, 1996, p 10 and 11) have demonstrated the effective use of the paraphrasing strategy – RAP. The mnemonic RAP is used (and has been modified by myself in this research to be used at the sentence level with aural text) to teach students to recall the main idea and specific facts in a text.

In using the mnemonic RAP students learn to –

1. **R**ead a paragraph (or for this research, listen to an aural text).
2. **A**sk yourself, “what are the main ideas and details in this paragraph (sentence)?
3. **P**ut the main idea and details in your own words.

Lee and Von Colln (2003) support this in their study where it was found that the paraphrasing strategy was effective in aiding comprehension. Adding to this, Fisk and Hurst (2003, p10) state that “listening and speaking, or social interaction have also been found to aid comprehension”. This serves to highlight the importance of the active and interactive nature of teaching explicitly for comprehension.

In contrast, Hellekson and Feitler (1994) suggest that groups of students instructed in paraphrasing and self verbalization techniques, while developing in metacognitive learning ability, were best supported through scaffolding and teacher modelling in active listening where students paraphrased statements made by the teacher or other students during instructional discussions. Hellekson and Feitler (1994, p 6) go on to state that students were “taught paraphrasing and clarifying skills to help them internalize effective strategy use and encourage active listening”. In this study, students paraphrased various cognitive routines in order to enhance comprehension and self monitoring abilities. Instructional conversations employed helped children internalize strategies and create

opportunities for cognitive and linguistic development. In developing active listening ability, the student needs to comprehend the content of the conversation or discussion and “restate the significant elements” (Hellekson and Feitler, 1994, p14). This is achieved through the teacher paraphrasing a strategy statement of a child in the instructional group and another child paraphrases the content of the conversation or lesson. This may be useful in re-enforcing strategy training in the paraphrasing of aural text where the group actively listen to each other in order to promote automaticity of strategy selection, use and monitoring for effectiveness in comprehension.

With this in mind, this investigation aims to confirm the plethora of research studied by building upon students’ pre-literate developments and sentence comprehension processes where unpacking sentences of different grammatical forms, knowledge of sentence propositions, the retention of information in the short term memory, ability to retrieve information and link to prior knowledge, and the self verbalization of strategies are developed (along with the ‘why’ and ‘how’). The modification of the mnemonic **RAP** will be used to teach current year one Reading Recovery students the strategy of paraphrasing for literal listening comprehension in aural text as follows;

LAP

1. **L**isten to a sentence or short story.
2. **A**sk yourself what the main ideas and details are.
3. **P**ut the main idea and details into your own words.

Prediction

Explicitly teaching current year one Reading Recovery students to paraphrase improves literal listening comprehension.

Method

This investigation used an OXO design where gains made in literal listening comprehension of current year one Reading Recovery students with poor comprehension of aural text was monitored. Lesson procedures were based on Munro’s Comprehension Intervention format for Paraphrasing as well as teacher derived lessons.

Students were assessed at pre-test using the following;

1. Record of Oral Language – The Levels Sentences (Clay, Gill, Glynn, McNaughton and Salmon).
2. Neale Analysis of Comprehension (form 1 level 1).
3. Listening Comprehension Test (Munro).

Students were assessed at post-test using the following;

1. Record of Oral Language – Alternative Levelled Sentences (author unknown).
2. Neale Analysis of Comprehension (form 2 level 1).
3. Listening Comprehension Test (Munro).

During instructional sessions, students were taught the strategy of paraphrasing through the development of knowledge, the use of synonyms, the verbalizing of the ‘how’ and ‘why’ of strategy use and active listening.

Explicit instruction was given throughout the intervention where modelling by the teacher, support and scaffolding of the student’s effective use of the strategy was enabled to facilitate development in literal listening comprehension.

Participants

Candidates chosen to participate in the intervention are all current Year One Reading Recovery Students who have demonstrated very limited literal listening comprehension of aural text. These Year One students were withdrawn for group instruction activities in addition to and outside the Reading Recovery series of lessons and daily literacy instruction sessions delivered by their own classroom teachers.

Student One

Student 1 is 6.8 years of age and is the youngest of two children. He lacks confidence in his abilities and experiences difficulties when approaching literacy tasks in the classroom. He is able to decode simple text but has difficulty in re-telling what he reads, often becoming confused with detail. He is inattentive in the classroom and is often disruptive, failing to apply himself effectively to set tasks. His ability to communicate and talk about knowledge gained from prior experiences is good. He is currently reading text at Reading Recovery level 3. His belief in his ability to learn is low and experiences difficulty in remembering instructions beyond one and some two event sentences as well as the recall and correct use of appropriate strategies in order to problem solve in both reading and writing.

Student Two

Student 2 is 6.9 years of age and is the second child of three children. She is very fearful of new situations and believes she cannot 'do' many things. She experiences difficulty attending to and concentrating on tasks in the classroom and lacks the ability to organize herself. Her participation in classroom activities is minimal, preferring not to speak during class discussions, ask or answer questions. Her experiences at kindergarten were not positive where teachers noted a significant lack in resilience, coping mechanisms, organization and basic skills. She has had various assessments completed in language, auditory processing, behavioural optometry and speech; the outcomes of which further therapy was recommended. She is currently reading at Reading Recovery level 4. She has difficulty verbalizing her thoughts in sufficient detail as well as recalling information quickly enough to aid her in re-telling a sentence or short story before forgetting.

Student Three

Student 3 is the youngest of two children where English is not the first language spoken in the home. She is 7 years of age and has currently been referred for Auditory Processing and Behavioural Optometry assessments. Her participation in the classroom is minimal and she rarely completes set tasks. She is reluctant to speak in any situation and is very fearful of 'new' people, routines and occurrences. During her Prep year, she was receiving the services of a counsellor for her lack of resilience and coping mechanisms. Her self efficacy is low and therefore will avoid taking risks in any situation where she fears failure. She is currently reading at Reading Recovery level 3 and has demonstrated difficulty discussing and re-telling the text, often refusing to speak at all.

Materials

Materials used include the following-

- *Record of Oral Language – The Levels Sentences* – to determine students’ ability to verbalize structures in aural text to three event sentences at pre-test.
- *Record of Oral Language – Alternative Levelled Sentences* – to determine students’ ability to verbalize structures in aural text to three event sentences at post-test.
- *Comprehension Test using Neale Analysis of Reading Ability* – (form 1 level 1 – pre-test, form 2 level 1 – post test). Text used aurally to determine students’ literal listening comprehension responses. Raw scores used only at pre and post test.
- *Listening Comprehension Test (Munro)* – text used aurally to determine students’ literal listening comprehension of longer text used both at pre and post test.
- Texts from Reading Recovery resources (PM and Macmillan) – used in teaching sessions to facilitate development of students’ literal listening comprehension of aural text.
- Teaching Paraphrasing Strategy flow chart – John Munro.
- Classroom consumables – sentence strips, flashcards, paper and textas for drawing, chart paper, whiteboard.

Procedure

All students were individually withdrawn from the classroom for the administration of pre and post testing procedures. Following collation and analysis of pre-test data, the students were then withdrawn to work together in a group situation for approximately 30 minutes at a time. The intervention ran for a total of 9 sessions over a three week period, which was in addition to each student’s classroom literacy lessons and individual Reading Recovery series of lessons.

The first session began with a reading of an aural text where students listened to a text contrived by the teacher. The students were asked to draw a picture about the text and instructed to include as much detail as possible in their drawings. The students used these as a prompt to re-tell the text listened to. Student’s responses were recorded under each picture to note the choice of vocabulary any synonym use, the amount of detail remembered, type of sentence structure used as well as the ability to construct a meaningful re-tell of the text heard. Strategy training was then introduced through the verbalization of the paraphrasing strategy as ‘saying what I hear in my own words’,

using student's own pictures of aural text as a prompt and as a means to monitor meaning in oral language transactions for literal listening comprehension.

The second session began with explicit instruction of the 'why' and 'what' of the paraphrasing strategy followed by modelling of the strategy and cueing of student activity. The session continues with a review of the action where the lesson is deconstructed, ending with a time for students to ask questions. The modelling to and cueing of students to practice the strategy, reviewing the action by verbalizing what needs to be done when paraphrasing continues. Students then paraphrase an aural text individually using appropriate synonyms, each time reviewing what was done. Feedback and support was provided by scaffolding and paraphrasing students responses.

The third session required students to consolidate the use of the strategy, reviewing steps involved in paraphrasing and practicing the strategy. Student action was monitored and appropriate feedback was provided. This was done to facilitate the transfer of the strategy to new aural texts. The students verbalized the strategy to be practiced (LAP). Students were given the opportunity to paraphrase other students responses in order to establish their own understanding and use of the strategy.

Students practiced the strategy every session, moving from the word, sentence and finally to the short story level, each time paraphrasing what was heard in their own words. Students began each session by verbalizing the paraphrasing strategy to provide the focus for the lesson. The sessions had an oral language focus where equal opportunity was given to all students to verbalize and practice the strategy, suggest synonyms, paraphrase the text listened to and review the lesson.

The remaining 6 sessions proceeded in the following manner –

- Retelling of text listened to in the previous session.
- Text reading (read to strategy) from previous session.
- Synonyms (using text from previous session).
- Reading Target Words (teacher reads and students match orally). New text – students suggest synonyms.
- Writing Target words (teacher writes) – new text.
- Text reading (read to strategy) – new text.
- Share time – students articulate learnings gained from the session.

Student behaviours and progress were noted during and at the end of each session in order to monitor and evaluate teaching effectiveness and used for subsequent lesson planning.

Results

Analysis of results and collated data has demonstrated an overall improvement for all students in the intervention group. The trend in literal listening comprehension of aural text with paraphrasing training before and after teaching the intervention show that cognitive training using the paraphrasing strategy improves literal listening comprehension, accuracy in recalling detail in re-telling as a measure of comprehension, the ability to use extended structures in oral language and answer literal questions related to aural text in order to demonstrate comprehension.

The Record of Oral Language measures the students' ability to control structures in sentences listened to in terms of one, two or three event sentences, with a maximum score of 42 that can be awarded upon completion of the test. In table 1, whilst all students were able to score a maximum of 14 for level one (one event sentences), moderate improvements were indicated for level two (two event sentences) and more significant increases in control of level three (three event) sentences was noted. Although student 3 demonstrated improvement in her ROL scores, her level of psycholinguistic knowledge and her lack of willingness to contribute consistently in teaching sessions affected her outcomes. Students 1 and 2, however, became increasingly enthusiastic, participative, more strategically skilled and demonstrative, and tended to dominate discussions during sessions, leading to a lively exchange of thoughts and ideas which lead to a noted development in these students' oral language outputs.

Table One

Record of Oral Language (scores out of 14 for each of the levelled sentences)

	Level One	Level Two	Level Three
Pre-test Student 1	14	12	3
Post-test Student 1	14	13	11
Pre-test Student 2	14	13	7
Post-test Student 2	14	14	11
Pre-test Student 3	14	5	0
Post-test Student 3	14	9	5

The Listening Comprehension Test (Munro, 2006) was used to measure each students' immediate re-call of the text listened to, noting the amount of detail recalled, the sequence of events recalled, the types of sentence structures used and the ability to paraphrase the text. This gave a measure of each student's level of literal listening comprehension and the effectiveness of the paraphrasing strategy as a tool. Each student improved in their re-tell ability, with student 1 and 3 demonstrating modest gains and student 2 achieving the greatest gain. The same testing text was administered at both pre and post test and some element of 'test practice' may have affected the outcome of the results achieved at post-test, with the possibility that the meaning of the story may have been remembered.

Table Two

Listening Comprehension (comparison between pre and post test scores using the same test form. Scores out of 20 for immediate recall only)

Student	Pre-test	Post-test
1	9	14
2	6	15
3	2	8

The Neale Analysis was used as a tool to measure literal listening comprehension through the answering of questions as set out in the testing proforma. Students listened to the text read out loud and answered questions immediately after as a measure of comprehension, with a maximum score of 4 that can be awarded at the completion of the test. The types of sentence structures used, detail and accuracy of events/information recalled were noted in students answers at both pre and post test. All students demonstrated improvement in their ability to answer comprehension questions related directly to the text, with student 2 resulting in the highest gains and student 3 showing the least.

Table Three

Neale Analysis (comparison between pre and post test scores using text for listening comprehension only. Raw scores tabled only.)

Listening Comprehension Raw Scores for questions correctly answered at pre and post test.		
Student	Pre-test Form 1 Level 1	Post-test Form 2 Level 1
1	2	4
2	1	4
3	1	2

Discussion

The focus of this intervention was to explicitly teach current Year One Reading Recovery students to paraphrase an aural text to improve literal listening comprehension. Analysis of results at the conclusion of this series of lessons validate and support this initial hypothesis.

As the intervention progressed, students' ability to verbalize the strategy improved, along with a noted increase in the quality of each student's expressive language. This indicates an improvement in receptive language and aural comprehension. Students' ability to suggest appropriate synonyms in order to aid in the paraphrasing of text listened to also increased. Analysis of testing results indicate that students' overall ability to literally comprehend aural text significantly improved along with the ability to spontaneously paraphrase a text choosing and using appropriate synonyms. Students' ability to include detail and events in the re-tell improved demonstrating higher levels of comprehension and an improved ability to store and retrieve information from the short term auditory memory. Student 1 and 2 demonstrated the greatest improvement, whilst student 3 performed at a lesser rate.

Each student's self efficacy also improved as the intervention progressed with each child articulating that they found it easier to understand what they were listening to. This behaviour was also noted during Reading Recovery sessions where students demonstrated an increased interest in and ability to retell texts used in these sessions. This had a 'flow on' effect in each child's rate of acceleration in Reading Recovery and their ability to access more complex structures in texts in both the reading and writing components of the lessons. The improvement in each child's ability to discuss the text read and compose written text was enhanced by their improved ability to comprehend, provide synonyms in their paraphrase/re-tell and their control over the sentence structures they used in their oral language transactions.

Verbalization of the paraphrasing strategy at the commencement of each teaching session for literal listening comprehension became increasingly automatic as sessions progressed. This aided in reinforcing the procedure and provided an explicit focus for each lesson. This allowed students to 'cue in' to the purpose of the session and overall participation, interest and enthusiasm of each student progressively improved, albeit, to varying degrees for each student.

In conclusion, an overall positive impact on all students' self efficacy, the quality of their responses and participation in subsequent Reading Recovery series of lessons, where the rate of acceleration demonstrated marked improvement was noted.

Implications for teaching

Teachers need to be mindful that teaching for comprehension in listening, speaking, reading and writing forms the basis for literacy development in children. Literal listening comprehension provides the basis for reading and writing comprehension and the springboard for the development of inferential comprehension. The implication for the classroom teacher is that explicit learning in literacy, including that of all levels of comprehension, occurs through explicit teaching. Strategic cognitive training is a useful tool in teaching a wide range of strategies in order to assist student learning outcomes and their self efficacy.

The gains illustrated in student outcomes at the end of this research are testimony to the success of strategic training in the use of the paraphrasing strategy in improving literal listening comprehension and this may assist similar students, if not most students in the classroom. Gaining meaning from both aural and written text is paramount and needs to be given higher priority in the planning of literacy lessons in the classroom. When meaning is firmly established and students' psycholinguistic abilities in both receptive and expressive language are being developed through meaningful and purposeful activities, then this will have a 'flow on' effect on a child's ability to access text of increasing complexity – that is, to listen, speak, read and write for meaning.

Possible directions for future research

- Determine levels of literal listening comprehension for Discontinued Reading Recovery students at the end of their series of lessons.
- Investigate effect of cognitive strategic training in paraphrasing for literal listening comprehension and its effects in literal reading comprehension.
- Investigate 'flow on' effect of paraphrasing in relation to the development of inferential comprehension.
- Use paraphrasing strategy in mainstream classroom practice to develop literal listening comprehension of aural text to measure improvements in reading accuracy and comprehension.
- Include measures for determining levels of comprehension in current pre and post testing regimes for all students.

References / Bibliography

- Beckman, Pat. (2002) *ED474302 2002-12-00 S Strategy Instruction. Eric Digest*, Arlington VA; p1-7.
- Berne, J. (2004) *Listening Comprehension Strategies: A review of the Literature*, Foreign Language Annals. Alexandria, Vol 37 Iss.4; p1-13.
- Clay, M. (2002) *An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement*, Second Edition, New Zealand, Heinemann.
- Clay, M. (2005) *Literacy Lessons Designed For Individuals-Part Two Teaching Procedures*, New Zealand, Heinemann.
- Clay, M., Gill, M., Glynn, T., McNaughton., Salmon., K. (1983) *Record of Oral Language and Biks and Gutches*, New Zealand, Heinemann.
- Fisk, C. and Hurst, B. (2003) *Paraphrasing for Comprehension – The Reading Teacher*, Vol 57, Iss 2., Newark, p1-4.
- Hellekson, L.E. and Feitler, F.C. (1994) *Positive Effects Os Teaching Emergent Readers To Verbalize Effective Reading Strategies*, Paper- American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, p3-19.
- Lee, S. and VonColln., (2003) *The Effect of Instruction in the Paraphrasing Strategy on Reading Fluency and Comprehension*, Research Paper, University of Kansas, p1-18.
- Munro, J. (2006) *Literacy Comprehension Test*, 4766969 Integrative Study Website, Melbourne University.
- Munro, J. (2006) *Literacy Intervention Strategies – Subject Notes*.
- Munro, J. (2005) *Language Disorder Program – Draft*, ED Assist.
- Munro, J. (2002) *High Reliability Literacy Teaching Procedures : A means of fostering literacy learning across the curriculum*, Victoria, p23-31.
- Neale, M.D. (2001) *Neale Analysis of Reading Ability: 3rd Edition*, Melbourne, ACER Press.
- Sorrell, AL. (1996) *Triadic Approach to Reading Comprehension Strategy Instruction*, Conference Paper, p2-13.
- Westwood, P. (2003) *Reading and Learning Difficulties, Approaches to Teaching and Assessment*, Camberwell, Victoria : ACER Press.

References / Bibliography of texts used in order of teaching procedures in lessons 4,5,6,7,8,9 in Appendix 4.

- Giles, Jenny. (2000) *The Toytown Helicopter*, Australia: Nelson.
- Randell, Beverly. (2000) *Mother's Day*, Australia: Nelson.
- Smith, Ben. (2004) *Carla Crocodile goes shoe shopping*, Australia: Macmillan Education.
- Ashley, Michelle. (2004) *Lunch in the park*, Australia: Macmillan Education.
- Giles, Jenny. (2001) *Billy at school*, Australia: Nelson.
- Randell, Beverly. (2001) *Baby Bear's hiding place*, Australia: Nelson.

Appendices

- *Appendix 1* – Record of Oral Language – Alternative Levelled Sentences.
- *Appendix 2* – Listening Comprehension Test (Munro)
- *Appendix 3* – Comprehension – Paraphrasing Teaching Sequence (based on Munro’s teaching sequence for paraphrasing – appendices in notes, 2006)
- *Appendix 4* – Teaching sequence.

The aim of this intervention series of lessons is to improve literal listening comprehension in aural text using the paraphrasing strategy. References to Munro’s model of teaching comprehension through paraphrasing was used to develop cognitive strategic training in assisting student’s ability to literally comprehend aural text.

Appendix 1

NAME: _____	GRADE: _____	RECORDER: _____
DATE: _____	STUDENT’S AGE: _____ years _____ months	

RECORD OF ORAL LANGUAGE ALTERNATIVE LEVELLED SENTENCES

LEVEL 1 – PART 1	LEVEL 1 – PART 2
A. <i>My mother’s arms are cuddly.</i> []	A. <i>My brother’s television is noisy.</i> []
A. <i>Kitty is eating some food.</i> []	B. <i>Mummy is pushing her pram.</i> []
B. <i>Jessie is playing at school.</i> []	C. <i>David is going to soccer.</i> []
C. <i>Dad is giving me a book.</i> []	D. <i>Sally is making me a cake.</i> []
D. <i>I bet she’s in there.</i> []	E. <i>I know she’s here.</i> []
F. <i>There’s another chapter book.</i> []	F. <i>There are some other toys.</i> []
E. <i>He’s eating his lunch slowly.</i> []	G. <i>She’s riding her skateboard very fast.</i> []

Total for Level 1

**RECORD OF ORAL LANGUAGE
ALTERNATIVE LEVELLED SENTENCES**

LEVEL 2 – PART 1	LEVEL 2 – PART 2
A. <i>That small car over there is going to be my mother's.</i> []	A. <i>The old bike in here used to be my sister's.</i> []
B. <i>The girl near the park was walking her dog.</i> []	B. <i>The boy from over there was calling a dog.</i> []
C. <i>The car drove to the edge of the road.</i> []	C. <i>The cat went under the chair in the house.</i> []
D. <i>For the holidays Kerry got her a kite.</i> []	D. <i>For the wedding Aunty gave us a vase.</i> []
E. <i>Will you buy what is sitting on the shelf?</i> []	E. <i>The lady heard what the man was saying to the boy.</i> []
F. <i>There goes a small animal with feathers sticking out its tail.</i> []	F. <i>Here is my sister driving in her motorcar.</i> []
G. <i>My sister cooked the eggs up very slowly.</i> []	G. <i>The boy hit the ball far across the field.</i> []

Total for Level 2

**RECORD OF ORAL LANGUAGE
ALTERNATIVE LEVELLED SENTENCES**

LEVEL 3 – PART 1	LEVEL 3 – PART 2
A. <i>Be as alert as you can when your mother's alone.</i>	A. <i>Be very careful diving where there's a deep pool.</i>
B. <i>My nanna and pa want to start going to the shops.</i>	B. <i>That man and the one over there like to read the paper.</i>
C. <i>The three boys ran across the park in a fast time.</i>	C. <i>Some of the people spoke quickly to each other at the football.</i>
B. <i>The greengrocer gave my daddy some big plums.</i>	D. <i>The old teacher told his class a funny story.</i>
C. <i>The girl heard who her brother was taking the toys to.</i>	E. <i>The mother knows how much milk we will need for the cake.</i>
D. <i>Here are the games that you were playing in my class.</i>	E. <i>There goes the policeman who caught out the thief at the bakery.</i>
E. <i>My father often puts the bike behind the shed at night.</i>	G. <i>My sister usually puts some meat outside for the dog.</i>

Total for Level 3

Level 1

Level 2

Grand Total

Appendix 2

Task: Listening Comprehension

Instruction to student: *I am going to read you a story. Listen carefully. When I have finished I am going to ask you to tell the story back to me. Read the first story below aloud to the student. Read it as a story. When you have finished, ask the student to tell you what happened. Say *Now tell me the story. Say all you can about it. You can say it in your own way.* After 5 minutes ask the child to retell again. Use the chart to note changes in the students recall. If required, use a prompt: *Can you tell me any more? What happened next?**

**Jane was at school and went out to sit on the seats and eat her lunch.
As she opened her lunch box, it fell over and her lunch went on the ground
Jane wondered what she was going to do. Her sandwiches now had dirt all over them. She told her friend, Susan.
Susan took one of the sandwiches from her lunch-box and shared it with Jane.
After lunch, Jane and Susan went into the playground and had a good time playing chasey.**

Teacher record sheet The student needs to retell events in sequence to score points.

Write down the student's immediate story retelling as accurately as possible

	✓ or X	after 5 mins ✓ or X		✓ or X	after 5 mins ✓ or X		✓ or X	after 5 mins ✓ or X
Jane			at school			went out		
sit			on seats			lunch		
opened lunch-box			fell over			lunch on ground		
sandwiches			dirt			told friend		
Susan			Susan took sandwich from her lunch-box			shared it with Jane		
after lunch			Jane and Susan			went into playground		
had a good time			playing chasey					

Scores: Immediate Recall: / 20

COMPREHENSION – PARAPHRASING

Based on Munro’s Comprehension – Paraphrasing Teaching Strategy – Appendix 3b –Notes 2006

Activity	Task Description	Time
Text Retelling (Passage from previous session)	Students re-tell passage from the previous session. They say what they remember about the text.	3 – 5 mins
Text Reading (Read To Strategy) (Passage from previous session)	Teacher re-reads passage from previous session. Teacher cues use of paraphrasing during the reading. “How would you say it another way?” The student re-tells what is heard using own words – changing as many words as possible, while retaining the meaning.	5 - 8 mins
Synonyms (Passage from previous session)	Students are cued to re-tell in their own words sentences read to them from the text they heard in the previous session.	5 mins
Reading Target Words (New Passage)	Student match key content words from the text to be read with synonyms. They can do this by listening to and sorting words and saying what matches within the text.	3 – 6 mins
Saying Target Words (New Passage)	Students say key content words from the new text heard – teacher scribes on cards.	3 – 6 mins
Text Reading (Read To Strategy) (New Passage)	Students say the paraphrasing strategy before they begin to listen: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “After I have heard each sentence I will try to say it my way.” • “I will change as many words as I can.” Students listen to passage. Teacher cues the student to paraphrase aloud after each sentence heard in the text. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Say it in your own words and what is another way of saying it?” • “What does it mean?” • “Say it to someone else in another way.” • <i>LAP – Listen Ask Paraphrase (mnemonic)</i> 	8 – 12 min
Reflective	Student comments on what has been learnt in the session. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “How does this help us to understand what we listen to better?” 	3 mins
		30 – 45 mins

Appendix 4

Teaching Sequence - Overview

- Sequence of lessons designed for small group instruction for students currently receiving Reading Recovery Intervention (3 students)
- 9 sequential lessons following pre-test. Post-test administered at end of teaching sequence.
- Teaching activities in addition to Reading Recovery lessons and regular classroom literacy lessons.
- Children withdrawn to work in small group situation.

Lesson 1 – Procedure

1. Explicitly introduce purpose of session – *‘today we are going to draw pictures to help us to understand better what we hear’*.
2. Teacher reads aloud contrived text (from sentence strip).

‘The boy went to the shop to buy an ice cream’.
3. Students draw a picture about aural text, including as much detail as possible.
4. Introduce strategy training – *saying what I hear in my own words*. **LAP**
5. Teacher re-reads text. Students re-tell text using pictures as a prompt. Teacher scribes student responses on sentence strips.
6. Compare group responses recorded on sentence strips with original sentence heard – note similarities and check for accuracy in original meaning.
7. Note and list synonym use for words – *went* → *walked, ran* .
get → *buy*
8. Re-read original sentence.
Highlight key words. Students suggest appropriate synonyms.
Verbalize paraphrasing strategy, first by teacher, then by each student.
Verbalize paraphrased sentence with as many synonyms substituted. Teacher scribes on sentence strip.
Compare original and paraphrased texts – check that original meaning has been maintained.
9. Note student responses – *How does saying in our own words help us to understand better what We listen to?*
10. Share Time – students articulate learnings.

Lesson 2 – Procedure (using Munro’s lesson procedures for introducing paraphrasing – Appendix 3b – lecture notes 2006)

1. Introduce the ‘why’ of paraphrasing – *We are learning things you can do to help you understand better what you listen to.*
2. *One thing you can do is make a picture in your mind and to draw it. Today we are going to learn another thing you can do.*
3. *What you do is tell yourself what you have heard. After you have heard a sentence, you say it to yourself, in your own way. You try to change as many words as you can*
4. *. Let’s practice it.*

Teacher models paraphrasing and cues student activity ;

- Listen to the first sentence.
- I will read it and I want you to listen carefully to what I say.
- Then I will try saying it another way.
- Then I will ask you to try.

Read some sentences that have accompanying pictures with the child. After each sentence, you model paraphrasing it and then have the student practise it. You may need to begin with changing individual words in sentences first (that is, the students suggest synonyms).

For example

Sentence Read	Teacher	Students Paraphrase
A monster came to live in a city. He wanted to find a place to live.	Read sentence twice Model paraphrasing: <i>This monster moved to a new town. He needed to get a new house for him to stay in.</i> Now you try saying it in your own words.	
He needs to get to know the city. After he bought a map he looked for a bus.	Read sentence twice. Model paraphrasing : <i>He wants to find what is in the town. First he got a map. Then he searched around for a bus stop.</i>	

Teacher Reviews the action:

- Let us look at what we did here.
- We heard each sentence and then said it in other ways.
- See how it helped you to understand what the text said.
- Do you have any questions?

Teacher models and students practise:

- Let's do this together with another sentence. Listen to this sentence.

Teacher reviews the action:

- What did you tell yourself to do when you paraphrase?

Student transfers the action to other texts.**Students paraphrase texts individually:**

- Now you are going to practice doing this all by yourself.
- Try to think of a different way of saying each sentence.
- Listen to each sentence.
- Say it to yourself in another way and tell someone what you thought of.
- Try not to use all the words you hear in each sentence.

Students review what they did:

- *Teacher says: At the end of our first session can you tell me what you know about paraphrasing and what you need to do to paraphrase what you hear.*

For example - **L**isten to a sentence.

Ask yourself what it means – questions about the main idea and details.

Paraphrase what you hear by putting the main ideas and details into your own words using sentences.

Lesson 3 - Procedure (using Munro's lesson procedures for introducing paraphrasing – Appendix 3b – lecture notes 2006)

During this session, the students consolidate the use of the strategy. The students review the steps involved in paraphrasing and the teacher gives additional practice in paraphrasing single sentences contrived by the teacher. Monitor the students' work and progress and give appropriate feedback in order to scaffold and support development of cognitive training and metalanguage through strategic conversation. Students transfer the strategy to new aural texts by listening to a text and saying what they will do.

- **L**isten to a sentence.
- **A**sk myself what it means – questions about the main idea and details.
- **P**araphrase what I hear by putting the main ideas and details into my own words using sentences.

Students listen to each other's paraphrase of aural text and provide feedback.

Students share learnings gained and articulate the 'how' and 'why' of the use of paraphrasing in helping us to understand better what we listen to. (Refer to Lesson 2 for procedure). Teacher notes down student responses.

Lessons 4,5,6,7,8,9 – Procedure

Lessons followed format as outlined in appendix 3 –

COMPREHENSION – PARAPHRASING

Based on Munro’s Comprehension – Paraphrasing Teaching Strategy – Appendix 3b –Notes 2006

Texts used for this intervention are as follows:

Lesson 4 – “The Toytown Helicopter”. (PM+ RR level 5) Pages 4,5 and 14.

Lesson 5 - “Mother’s Day”. (PM+ RR level 7) Pages 12 and 14.

Lesson 6 - “Carla Crocodile goes shopping”. (Macmillan RR level 3) Whole text used.

Lesson 7 - “Lunch in the park”. (Macmillan RR level 6) Whole text used.

Lesson 8 - “Billy at school”. (PM+ RR level 9) Whole text used.

Lesson 9 – “Baby Bear’s hiding place”. (PM+ RR level 10) Whole text used.

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.daneprairie.com>.
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.