Hypothesis:
The explicit teaching of the paraphrasing strategy to students in Years 3 and 4, with low comprehension skills, will improve comprehension skills and self efficacy.
Abstract

Reading comprehension is a complex process but, fundamentally, it is reliant upon the reader interacting and processing text at a number of levels -sentence, conceptual and topic-to make meaning. Poor comprehenders may well have age appropriate reading accuracy but exhibit low levels of comprehension and self- efficacy. The reader’s ability to make meaning can be influenced by a range of variables however the foci of this study are:

1. The reader’s ability to make meaning at a sentence level. Instructional strategies such as paraphrasing, visualisation, summarizing are being employed by educators to assist students of a range of abilities to improve their comprehension. This study examines the effects of one such instructional strategy, paraphrasing. It explores the effects of the explicit teaching of paraphrasing on text comprehension for Year 3 and 4 students who exhibit age appropriate reading accuracy but demonstrate low levels of comprehension. The findings of this study are that paraphrasing is a successful strategy for improving the reading comprehension of low level achievers in Years 3 and 4.

2. Reading self- efficacy (the reader’s perception of him/herself as a reader). The reader’s self- perception of the value of the task and how confident he/she is that he/she can be successful at reading tasks affects their intrinsic motivation. This study suggests that the learning of an instructional strategy equips the student with a positive action to employ, replacing negative self script and serves as a catalyst to improved self efficacy. It also contends that a reciprocal effect occurs, that positive perceptions or self -efficacy improves reading comprehension.

After administering and comparing a series of comprehension and self perception assessments as baseline data, this study found that a link can be drawn between self efficacy and improvement in comprehension. However, subsequent research using a larger sample may extend the findings of this present study.
Introduction

The act of reading is a very complex process however Leu and Kinzer refer to skilled readers as those readers who are fundamentally good comprehenders. (Leu and Kinzer,1995). Text comprehension is the ability to understand or gather meaning from text. Comprehension is the primary reason for reading and a critical component of all content learning. “My child can read but he does not comprehend what he reads” is far too common a statement heard echoing through schools at parent/teacher interviews. Students of middle primary school age with reading difficulties are often characterised by this comment; they exhibit age appropriate decoding skills but demonstrate low levels of comprehension. While there are many causes of reading difficulties, researchers such as Katims and Harris,(1997); Munro, (2006); Schumaker, Denton & Deshler(1984), have identified that poor comprehenders often fail to employ strategies such as paraphrasing while they read. They further contend that the explicit teaching of such strategies will have a positive impact on a reader’s ability to comprehend.

Other research suggests an interrelationship between the explicit teaching of learning strategies, such as paraphrasing and growth in comprehension, with a readers’ self efficacy. Many readers demonstrating reading difficulties do not believe they can operate as successful readers. The effective use of an instructional strategy can have a reciprocal effect on the growth of self efficacy. As the reader has a successful action to employ, the reader becomes more motivated to learn. This view is supported by previous research as cited by McCrudden, Perkins & Putney(2005) which found self efficacy and interest were promoted by the use of strategy instruction and that positive perceptions could improve reading achievement.

The reading process involves many complex skills which together lead to rich understanding of text. To comprehend the text, the reader needs to use what the reader knows in various ways and to act on the text in particular ways. This complex process can be integrated into a model of reading referred to as the ‘multiple levels of text processing[MLOTP] ( Munro, 2006). Through use of this model, we are able to identify possible causes of a student’s reading difficulties. Students with poor reading comprehension processes are less likely to have a strategy for making meaning as they read. Through applying the MLOTP and the gathering, and rigorous analysis of data, teachers are able to identify causes of comprehension difficulties at a sentence, conceptual or topic level.( Munro, 2006; Dewitz & Dewitz, 2003.) maintain that the application of an explicit learning strategy to match the learner’s needs will enhance the reader’s comprehension. Such instruction works on the premise that the instructional strategy will be developed at an individual’s Zone of Proximal Development. Vygotsky [1978,p86] refers to this zone as “the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance, or in collaboration with capable peers”. Greenspan,( 1997) cited in Fisk & Hurst, 2003, found that children will only be inspired to continue to risk- take, make errors and struggle if they have a reasonable chance of success. Providing scaffolded explicit strategy instruction at an individual’s zone of proximal development, empowers the student to take control and go beyond the level of attainment that the student could otherwise achieve unsupported. Once internalised, the strategy enables the reader to apply the reader’s new learning independently.

The instructional strategy of paraphrasing, that is, to restate a passage in one’s own words while retaining the thought of an author, is a strategy that has had a positive impact on comprehension levels. Though slight changes in variables exist in the method of paraphrasing across studies, components that remain constant include :

1: Reading a piece of text .
2: Asking yourself questions about the main idea and details
3: Putting the main ideas into your own sentence
4. Writing the sentence:
5. Sharing of paraphrased text with peers.
In addition, Munro (2006) has identified that it is essential that students understand the purpose of the paraphrasing strategy in order to take it to a metacognitive level. These steps integrate four modes of language, reading, writing, listening and speaking which have been identified over time as enhancing comprehension. (Vacca & Vacca, 1999, cited in Fisk & Hurst, 2003).

Studies in this field by Deshler & Schumaker (1986) describe this strategy approach as including both cognitive [what goes on in a person’s head] and behavioural [what a person actually does] elements that guide student performance and evaluation of the task. Paraphrasing goes beyond being merely a behavioural strategy but involves cognitive processing and metacognition. Students are called to understand what good comprehenders do, to construct meaning and apply this process. By explicitly teaching students the paraphrasing strategy, we are empowering students to know how to learn, as well as how to gain understanding from a text. Enabling students to take strategic action and control is a cognitive strategy to increase their effectiveness in managing the comprehension process.

Schumaker, Denton & Deshler (1984), in a middle years study, exploring the effects of paraphrasing on high school students with learning disabilities, also found paraphrasing to have a positive effect. Students’ ability to respond to comprehension questions developed from 48% to 84% at post-testing. The study also found the more paraphrasing a student did, the higher was his or her comprehension score. Another study by Katims and Harris (1997) investigating the effectiveness of a paraphrasing strategy on reading comprehension of middle school students in inclusive classrooms, found that paraphrasing not only improved the comprehension results of students with learning disabilities but enhanced the comprehension levels of non LD students.

“The use of the cognitive strategy by the experimental group improved their reading comprehension performance from pre- to the post testing in a very strong [statistically significant] way. Students in the experimental group gained 17%, compared to students in the control group who gained 3.5%.” Katims & Harris [1997].

As cited by Katims and Harris (1997), other studies by Duffy et al., (1987); Haller, Child, & Wallber. (1988); Palinscar & Brown (1995) identified that such cognitive strategies supported and facilitated reading comprehension in both average and low achieving students.

Few early studies explicitly target paraphrasing and self efficacy however links have been drawn between the use of strategy instruction and self efficacy. Self efficacy for reading refers to individuals’ assessments of how well they think they can accomplish a particular reading task and is influenced by how well they have performed on similar tasks, including any accompanying feedback and encouragement received (Wigfield, Guthrie, Tonks & Perencevich, 2004). Students who do not have a learning strategy to assist in the process of comprehending are less likely to employ positive self script and often demonstrate low levels of self efficacy. They believe they are not good readers and this perception is perpetuated when they call upon negative self talk. Conversely, researchers have found that through strategy instruction, which provides an alternative self script and a positive action to employ, self efficacy has improved. Schunk and Rice (2005) found that strategy instruction increased self efficacy for reading comprehension as well as reading achievement. Clark, Deshler, Alley & Warner (1984) and Nelson & Smith (1992) also found that the use of learning strategies helps students maintain interest and concentration during many learning tasks.

The present study was exploratory in nature and sought to address two aspects. First, it examines the effects of the explicit teaching of paraphrasing on text comprehension for students who demonstrated low levels of comprehension prior to instruction. Secondly, it also explores the correlation between the teaching of this reading instructional strategy, comprehension, and the growth of students’ self efficacy. This study hypothesis is that the explicit teaching of the paraphrasing strategy to students in Grades 3 and 4 with low comprehending skills will lead to improved comprehension levels. It further contends that the teaching of an instructional strategy will have a reciprocal effect between improved comprehension levels and increased levels of self efficacy.
**Design**

This study employs an xox design model in which comprehension attainment and growth in self efficacy are measured after the explicit teaching of the instructional learning strategy paraphrasing. We employed a pre- and post- test design for comprehension. Self efficacy utilized a three- phase design, pre- instructional reading self concept profile, ongoing reading concept profile and post instructional profile.

**Participant:**

The participants are Year 3 and 4 students who all attend a school in the western suburbs of Melbourne. The participants are aged between 8 years 3 months and 10 years 3 month. All students at Year 3 and 4 level at the school were tested for comprehension levels using the TORCH tests of Reading Comprehension, 1987. The students selected for this study were those at or below the 25th percentile and who had a history of poor reading comprehension skills. Ongoing teacher monitoring and assessment data coupled with anecdotal records assisted in profiling the student history. The control group and the experimental group were matched for independent variables similar/comparative age, reading comprehension levels and self- efficacy as illustrated by Table 1, Appendix 4. There were three females and four males in each group.

**Materials:**

**Comprehension Measures:**
- Teacher ongoing assessments: Anecdotal records and Daily focus sheets to establish students’ comprehension history.

**Scoring:** One point was awarded for each response where the author’s intended message was retained. Total raw scores are converted to a scaled TORCH score and calibrated against the Australian Reference Group data [Appendix 1.1] to determine each participant’s percentile ranking.

**Strategies for comprehending**
- This assessment required children to reflect on which strategies they were using to help them understand text at a sentence level.

**Scoring:** Points not awarded, strategies articulated were recorded and coded. (Refer to Table 1.)

**Self Efficacy Measures:**
- Appendix 1.2 Self Efficacy Profile Assessments No. 1 Adaptation of Format A Reading Self Perception Test: Ask Kids Inventory For Children, Bornholt,2005.
- Appendix 1.3 Self Efficacy Profile Assessments No.2 & No.3 Adapted from SELF-EFFICACY SCALES James W Chapman & William E Tunmer
- Appendix 1.4. Self Reflection Booklet.

**Scoring:** Assessments 1 and 2 used a five point scale rating per item. Item scores were totalled and converted to a mean score. Assessment 3: 1 point awarded for each item responded to accurately.

**Paraphrasing Measure:**
- Paraphrasing task: Group administration, Munro,2005. Appendix 2.

**Scoring:** Using a two point scale. 1: One word changed 2: Two or more words words changed. Total added.

**Paraphrasing Lesson Plans:**
- Text used for paraphrasing instruction: A Jaguar: A Great Cat.
Procedure:

Pre-Instructional Phase
All students in Year 3 and at the school were administered the TORCH Comprehension Test and the Self Efficacy measures cited above. The data from both assessments were also used to determine the correlation between comprehension levels and levels of self efficacy. The TORCH Test Grasshoppers A1 was administered to each respective grade level group. The task required students to read the given passage silently, graded as suitable using Figure 1, Appendix 1.1; Student ability compared with test difficulty and grade level. After reading, all students were given a retelling of the passage containing gaps. Students were required to complete that passage filling in the gaps using words which complete the cloze and relate to details of the original text. To follow, a paraphrasing task: Group administration, Munro(2006), was administered to both the control group and the experimental group to determine the students’ existing use of the paraphrasing strategy. This task required students to read each sentence, tell themselves what the sentence said and then write another sentence giving the same message. Students were instructed to try to change as many words as they could in the sentence but to make sure it still meant the same thing. Finally, a battery of tests was administered to gauge students’ self efficacy levels in relation to reading. A battery of tests, described in full in Appendix 1, was administered as a pilot test prior to the study had deemed the use of a single test as inconclusive. Students’ responses in the pilot indicated that students recorded what they thought teachers wanted to hear, rather than how students truly felt. Therefore, this study employed a battery of tests to try to minimise this effect.

Instructional Phase
Instructional Learning Strategy Procedure- Paraphrasing
The control group remained in its classroom setting and usual comprehension tasks were employed. Paraphrasing was not amongst the teaching regime however there was a whole school focus on another instructional strategy, visualizing.
The experimental group of eight students was exposed to 10 lessons of 20 minutes, duration. The session structure was consistent with that of Teaching a Paraphrasing Strategy, Munro 2006 [Appendix 3]. Both groups were instructed by qualified primary teachers from within the school.

Lesson structure :
Lesson 1:  The teacher introduced the strategy paraphrasing.
  Explained the strategy : When you paraphrase you read a sentence then say it in your own words.
  Teacher modelled the strategy.
  The teacher read a paragraph to the students.
  Each sentence was then re-read by the teacher and students cued in to apply the strategy.
  The students were instructed to practise this through six tasks.
  After each task, the teacher / peers discuss and provide corrective feedback.
  After each paraphrase, students articulated what they did and why it was useful, reviewing the strategy as a positive action and employing positive self script.
  At the conclusion of each lesson, the students would ‘Review the Action’
  At the end of each session, students completed the self reflection booklet- self concept profile.

Each session followed the same sequence but with the following modifications:
From session 2 on, students were instructed to articulate the strategy at the commencement of each lesson [replacing the teacher’s introduction of the strategy].
Prior to lessons 2 and 3, three sub- lessons were added to support vocabulary. Students read a sentence prepared by the teacher and written on cardboard. Students take turns in physically paraphrasing one word by replacing it with their own word.
Individually, each student reads his/her sentence and reviews the strategy employed.
Lesson 3- 10.A further step was applied to include a written component. Students write a paraphrased sentence in pairs or independently, alternating every second lesson. The strategy was applied to sets of two sentences from lesson 5-10.

Post Instruction Phase:
All pre- assessments were re-administered at the conclusion of the training sessions.
Results
Pre and post intervention scores for comprehension, self efficacy and paraphrasing were calculated for Year 3 and 4 students. The influence of the instructional strategy paraphrasing on comprehension and the correlation between growth in comprehension and self efficacy were examined. Self efficacy was also measured through pre and post testing and at random intervals throughout the intervention phase to determine progressive changes in self efficacy.

Overview data:
Table 1, Appendix 4, illustrates all pre and post data collected for students in both the control and the experimental groups and is referred to throughout this section.

1. Growth in the instructional strategy of paraphrasing:

Graph 1 and Graph 2 illustrate the relative growth in students’ paraphrasing ability for both the experimental and control group.

Graph 1 demonstrates that all students in the experimental group improved their paraphrasing ability from pre to post testing. The mean growth was from 6% at pre testing, to 29% at post-test.

Graph 2 demonstrates that the control group also made gains in paraphrasing however the mean score for the control group was largely influenced by Student 11, whose individual paraphrasing score increased 37%. The mean for the control group at pre-testing was 8% and 20% at post-testing.

Table 1 articulates the instructional strategies independently employed by each student prior to and after the intervention phase. As was predicted, 90% of students in the experimental group, who were explicitly taught paraphrasing, articulated that at post testing they used paraphrasing strategy to help understand a sentence they could decode but did not immediately have meaning for. This result highlights that the experimental group had a strategy to employ at post intervention that they could not readily employ pre-intervention. Two students in the control group also articulated that they used paraphrasing, while 50% employed visualizing and one student guessed.
2. The influence of paraphrasing instruction on comprehension of Year 3 and 4 students.

Table 3: TORCH Percentile ranks and verbal descriptions areas under the normal curve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Percentile Score Pre-test</th>
<th>Verbal description under the bell curve</th>
<th>Percentile Score Post-test</th>
<th>Verbal description under the bell curve. Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Below average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One aspect examined was the extent to which comprehension levels were enhanced through the implementation of paraphrasing. Table 1 and Graph 5 demonstrate that, as a general trend, paraphrasing had a positive effect on comprehension acquisition. After instruction, the percentile mean score for the experimental group had increased from 7.5% [Pre-TORCH Percentile Score] to 48.16% [Post-TORCH Percentile Score] demonstrating a mean increase of over six times the original percentile ranking after 10 sessions. Table 1 and Graph 5 indicate that the control group, which was exposed to a range of strategies which included whole group instruction of visualisation, also made gains in comprehension skills, with an increase in the mean score from 12.3 to 30.8%.

Table 3: TORCH Percentile ranks and verbal descriptions areas under the normal curve.

This table demonstrates that all students in the experimental group moved from low or below average scores to achieving average scores at post testing, with the exception of Student 3. Student 3 made gains in comprehension moving from the low to below average range. 50% of students in the control group moved from low scores to average scores and the other 50% of students remained in the lower end of the bell curve. For Student 9, a negative impact occurred, moving her from the average range to the low range.
Individually, the variance in student comprehension growth is illustrated by Graphs 3 and 4. Graph 3 demonstrates students 4, 5 and 6, who were placed at between the first and third percentile prior to paraphrasing instruction, made the greatest gain at post testing, between 45% and 62%. Graph 4: In comparison, student 7 demonstrated the largest growth while student 9 demonstrated a significant decline in reading comprehension at post testing.

Table 4: Post TORCH Percentile Scores Standard deviations: All students.
**Italics + Bold = Experimental Group.**
Standard Font= Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 8</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 9</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student10</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student11</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student12</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 7</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Individual deviations in TORCH Percentile Growth Scores
**Italics + Bold = Experimental Group.**
Standard Font= Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>TORCH Per Growth: All Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 7</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 11</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 9</td>
<td>-29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows standard deviations from the mean for both the control and experimental groups. The post testing scores demonstrate that most students showed positive impact from pre-testing to post-testing. However, students in the experimental group, with the exception of Student 3, fall to the positive side of a bell curve and 50% of students in the control group fall to the left or negative side of a bell curve. Table 5 demonstrates deviations from the mean percentile growth scores pre and post scores. Students 4 and 5 demonstrated the greatest growth, with a 1.21 and 0.9 deviation respectively. Students 10, 8, 9 and 3 all deviated negatively from the norm.
Table 1: Using Table 1 to compare the post comprehension scores of students who receive Educational Maintenance Allowance, or who have been identified as having Learning Difficulties, the results are positive. The results show that paraphrasing had a positive effect on students who had been identified with Learning Difficulties and/or receiving Educational Maintenance Allowance. Of the students placed in the experimental group, 50% received EMA and 50% had been identified as LD and qualify for support through Catholic Education Office. Comparison results indicate that EMA and/or LD was not a significant sole factor in predetermining the effectiveness of paraphrasing on reading comprehension for the students in the experimental group. Though it should be noted that Student 3, who moved from the 3rd percentile to the 15th percentile, showing the least growth in the experimental group, received EMA and had been identified with LD. This study found that the teaching of paraphrasing enhanced comprehension skills of all students in the experimental group.

3. A second aspect to be examined was the correlation between the gains made in comprehension skills, as a result of paraphrasing, and self efficacy.

Graph 6 indicates that, as a general trend, students in the experimental group demonstrated greater self efficacy post-testing than at pre-testing. The exceptions were student 5, who recorded a decrease in self efficacy, and student 4, who displayed no change.

Graph 7 demonstrates that the self efficacy of students 10 and 12 increased however the remainder of this cohort displayed lower self efficacy at post - testing than at pre-testing.
Graphs 8 and 9 show that, for 75% of students over both cohorts [Experimental and Control] where an increase in comprehension skills occurred, there was also an increase in self efficacy. The two students [Students 4 and 9] who deviated the most from the comprehension mean score showed the least degree of change in self efficacy. It is interesting to note that Student 9, who was the only student to demonstrate, a decrease in comprehension skill at post testing, showed 0.1 increase in self efficacy. Self efficacy scores remained constant for Student 4, who demonstrated the highest level of comprehension growth.
Graph 8 further indicates that all students in the experimental group increased in comprehension skills and most demonstrated a rise in self efficacy although, in one case, the rate of self efficacy remained constant. Both the control group and the experimental group began at the same mean self efficacy score of 7.83. The experimental group's mean self efficacy score increased by 0.783 while the control group’s mean score decreased marginally by 0.033 at post-testing. Self reflection booklets that recorded ongoing data on self efficacy were inconclusive and varied little during the intervention phase. More effective and revealing in determining changes in self efficacy during the intervention were comments articulated by students at random intervals.

Student 1: I can understand every sentence Mrs… puts in front of me. I can read much better now.
Student 4: I think in my head and change the word. Reading is easy!
Student 6: I think in my head and change. This helps me to be a great reader.

The results using the students’ raw data demonstrate that a link can be drawn between the teaching of paraphrasing, enhanced comprehension skills and self efficacy. A students’ self efficacy improved when his or her comprehension improved however the level of self efficacy improvement did not correlate with the level of comprehension attainment. That is, is not true to say, that the higher the level of comprehension attained by a student, would be reflected proportionately to his or her self efficacy score. At pre-testing, there was no significant statistical correlation between levels of comprehension skills and self efficacy for either the control group -.17 or the experimental-.544. At pre-testing all students in Years 3 &4 at the school were administered comprehension & self efficacy assessments providing additional data and similarly, no correlations between the two sets of data was found for this cohort; .046. Post testing revealed similar results. The correlation between Total Self Efficacy Post Scores and TORCH POST was -0.17 for the combined cohorts. -0.35 for the experimental group and -0.40 for the control group. These correlations are not statistically significant.
**Discussion**

The explicit teaching of paraphrasing enhanced the comprehension skills of Years 3 and 4 students. These findings support the use of strategy training, specifically paraphrasing, for the enhancement of comprehension. This study also found that, although not statistically significant, a link can be drawn between an increase in comprehension skills and improvement in self-efficacy.

The finding that Years 3 and 4 students’ comprehension skills are enhanced by teaching paraphrasing further supports the work undertaken by Munro (2004); Katims and Harris (1997) in this field. All students in the experimental cohort made significant gains in comprehension. Paraphrasing requires the reader to break down the text incrementally and retell the text with the reader’s own vocabulary without changing the author’s meaning. To carry out this task, students are required to make links with existing knowledge; the reader is called to ask him/herself how the reader might say what has just been read. The explicit teaching of paraphrasing empowers the reader to take positive action systematically and independently (as the strategy is internalised).

It is interesting to note that, prior to the commencement of this study, the school had implemented the instructional strategy of visualisation as a whole class strategy across all levels. Therefore, all participants had had some exposure to an instructional strategy. The control group continued to be exposed to visualisation among a range of strategies while the experimental group was given explicit instruction in paraphrasing. Comprehension improvements by some members of the control group may also be linked to that general exposure to strategy instruction. However, the effectiveness of one strategy over the other was not the focus of this study and too many variables exist for any real conclusion to be tabled. Subsequent studies may support and extend upon the work of earlier researchers Katims and Harris (1997); Schumaker, Denton and Deshler (1984); Fisk and Hurst (2003) and Munro (2004) who have found a number of instructional strategies to a positive effect on comprehension.

It should be noted that, although it was originally intended that students in the experimental group would gradually apply the paraphrasing strategy from one sentence to a paragraph, this did not occur. It was necessary to deviate from the original lesson plans for two reasons. First, the students found the strategy difficult, initially, in its abstract form. Therefore, we adjusted the strategy to include a further step to make more concrete the cognitive actions required by the strategy. Students physically removed the word/phrase they were changing and replaced it with their own vocabulary. This physical manipulation provided extra sensory information of a visual and bodily kinaesthetic nature. Thus, scaffolding the students’ learning enabled them to take the action to a cognitive level. Secondly, given the timeline, paraphrasing at a sentence level was deemed appropriate in applying Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development. It is envisaged that the students in this study will transfer their learning to a paragraph level and to harder text gradients, as they become more confident in its use.

The results of the experimental group also found that paraphrasing was equally as effective for students in the group who had been identified with learning difficulties as for those students who had not. This finding correlates with other earlier research by Katims and Harris, 1997 who found that this strategy was useful for all students, both LD and non LD.

The second aspect examined by this study was the relationship between comprehension acquisition and self efficacy.

This investigation found that students at the school had been well supported through targeted programs and the general self efficacy of students was high, as reported in a recent [Insight SRC] review survey. The students’ healthy reading self efficacy, regardless of performance, rendered the task of measuring the correlation between comprehension skill acquisition and self efficacy problematic. Therefore, a number of self efficacy measures were trialled and a battery of measures implemented to capture changes as they occurred and during post- testing. Costa 2001, suggests that praise, for praise’s sake, is not as effective as explicit feedback. Provision of explicit feedback by both teacher and peers is a feature of the paraphrasing strategy and goes beyond praise to assist the student to understand the criteria for acceptability of his/her
action or response. Knowing what was acceptable, the student is more likely to repeat the performance.(Costa,2001). The students in the paraphrasing group were also called to articulate their learning constantly throughout the lessons, promoting internalisation of the purpose for, and steps of, the strategy. Our study found that empowering the student to take control of the student’s learning through an instructional strategy [systematic approach] motivates the student and creates a domino effect. Student motivation is heightened as the student is able to replace negative self script with a positive action. This trend is consistent with findings of earlier studies Parker, Hasbrouk and Denton, 2002; Fullerton, 2001.

A combination of student ongoing reflections and post-testing data found that all students in the paraphrasing group demonstrated improved comprehension skills and that self efficacy rose in four of the six students. The findings suggest that there is a link between improvement in comprehension skills and an increase in self efficacy but the two measures are not matched proportionately to each other. It should be noted that, at the pre-test phase and post-test phase, no statistically significant correlation between comprehension attainment levels and self efficacy was apparent. However, changes in students’ self efficacy were witnessed throughout the study and, in 75% of cases, increased comprehension led to improved self efficacy. Furthermore, findings showed that, for four out of six students in the paraphrasing group, an increase in comprehension skills correlated with an improvement in self efficacy. Though there is little research specifically targeting paraphrasing, comprehension and self efficacy, the findings of this study offer support to the earlier investigations of McCrudden, Perkins and Putney(2005) and Schumaker & Deshler(1992). There is a need here for caution in making generalisations, as the small sample of students in this study means that each individual score has a marked impact on the results. Therefore, subsequent research across a larger sample of students may be useful in supporting the findings of this study.

The findings in this study present a range of implications for teaching practice, reading comprehension and the promotion of student self efficacy.

They demonstrate that:

- explicit teaching of instructional strategies, such as paraphrasing, is valuable in enhancing the reader’s ability to comprehend text.
- students are empowered by the provision of strategy instruction to substitute negative self talk with positive self scripts.
- some students need to be taught strategies to help them make meaning.
- self efficacy has an effect on the students’ motivation to learn.
- explicit feedback improves the prospects of students applying their learning.
- teachers need to consider the use of all modes of learning eg. visual, auditory, bodily kinaesthetic.
- focussed explicit teaching must match the learners’ needs and operate in the zone of proximal development.

Areas of subsequent study could consider the long term sustainability of students’ use of paraphrasing to improve comprehension. Self monitoring is a complex metacognitive practice and takes time and practice to develop. A latitudinal study of the long term effects may give further support to the findings of this study.

The comprehension skills of some students showed improvement when the students were exposed to visualisation as a whole class strategy. Further studies to examine the effectiveness of visualisation and paraphrasing may uncover whether one is more useful than the other for comprehension development. Also, further whole class implementation of the paraphrasing strategy against small group teaching of paraphrasing should extend the findings of this study and determine whether the paraphrasing strategy was the sole variable which led to improved comprehension skill.
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Appendix 1.1: TORCH Australian reference Group data.

### Australian reference group data

**Table 11** Grasshoppers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw score</th>
<th>Percentile rank Year 3</th>
<th>Stanine Year 3</th>
<th>Percentile rank Year 4</th>
<th>Stanine Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Student ability compared with text difficulty.
Table 3: TORCH Percentile ranks and verbal descriptions areas under the normal curve was adapted from Figure 6 below.

![Diagram showing standard deviations, cumulative percentage, percentile equivalents, range of percentile ranks, and stanines.](image)

Figure 6 Percentile ranks and stanines compared with standard deviations and areas under the normal curve
Appendix 1.2 - 1.4: Self Efficacy Assessments

A succession of assessment tests of self efficacy in relation to reading, were carried out prior, and at the closing stages of the teaching sessions for both the experimental and the control groups.

Assessment No 1.2

“Let’s Talk about Reading” - adapted from Ask Kids by Dr.L.J. Burnholt.

Administration:

Script

➢ I’d like to ask you about how you are feeling about reading today.
  Let’s start by filling in the front page.
  Let’s write your name, grade and the name of your school
  What date is your birthday? So, how old are you?
  What languages do you speak at home.
  Can you put a circle around the language that you speak
  at home.
  (Assistance may be required with some children)

➢ Remember, I am going to ask you some questions about reading.
  I want to know how you feel in your heart and what you think
  in your head. (Teacher points to heart & head.)
  Just remember there is no right or wrong answer because
  the questions I ask you are only about what you think & feel.

➢ Let’s talk about each face what do you think the first one means. Child/children
  respond.
  Take a number of responses. Repeat this with each face.
  This builds an understanding of the more subtle differences
  between each face.
Now let’s have a practise.
Here are five faces- Which face shows how you feel about your school work?
Colour in one of the faces. Just remember there are no right or wrong answers. It is just what you think and feel.

If this test is being administered to a group or class of children take a range of responses. If it is being administered individually allow the child to respond verbally.

Now show me how good you are at reading activities. Remember there are no right or wrong answers. Be honest. Colour the face that shows how good you are at reading activities.

Tell me, what do you think talented means? Take some responses. Explain that when you are naturally talented that means you can do something more easily than other things you do. What are you naturally talented at?
Take a range of responses. Children will respond with examples like swimming, drawing, basketball or soccer etc.
Now can you tell me, how talented are you at reading activities?

And how much do you try at reading activities?

How hard [difficult] are reading activities for you? Very hard...a bit harder... ok.... easy ...very easy. Circle the face that shows how hard reading activities are for you?

What about next year when you are in Year[ ] at school how good do you think you will be at reading activities?
**Scoring:**
For faces left to right award points as follows:
Face 1 = 1 point
Face 2 = 2 points
Face 3 = 3 points
Face 4 = 4 points
Face 5 = 5 points

To most children, the difficulty of an activity is the inverse of performance and talent. Therefore, scores generally need to be reversed for children's responses about the difficulty of activities.
For questions 3 & 4, scores for effort and/or difficulty are reversed when the gap is 2 or more between effort and talent and/or difficulty and talent. [Reverse scores 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1] and write R for reversed score next to this response.
For each of five items, add up the child's responses and then divide by 5.

Adapted from SELF-EFFICACY SCALES
James W Chapman & William E Tunmer, Massey University, New Zealand

To administer the questionnaire, the student needs to colour the face which best describes
their answer. Introduce the sheet of faces with the practice questions. The faces relate to
the following five responses:
• I know I can’t
• I think I can’t
• I’m half and half sure
• I think I can
• I know I can

Now I have some more questions that ask you how sure you are about different things when
you read.
Write your name on the paper.
Name: ________________________________________________ Date: ______________________

Self-efficacy scales

In a few minutes you are going to do some reading. I’m going to ask you how you feel about
some things you do when you read. It isn’t a test. There are no right and wrong answers. It
is just about you and what you feel. First of all for practice I’m going to ask you how sure
you are about doing some every day things. Each time you can say:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I know I can’t</th>
<th>I think I can’t</th>
<th>I’m half and half sure</th>
<th>I think I can</th>
<th>I know I can</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let’s practise with these things. How sure are you that you can drink a can of Coke? If you
know you can, colour the face on the end point to the face (far right), if you think you can
colour this face, if you are not sure either way colour this face, if you think you can’t colour
this face and if you know you can’t, colour to this face (far left).

Administrator says:
Remember I want you to be honest. There is no right or wrong only what you really feel in your heart.
How sure are you that you can

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>catch a ball?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>eat a cake?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>spell supercalifragilisticexpialidocious?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ride a horse?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrator gives time for child/children to colour face.
It is useful to revise the choices after every four questions by saying
How sure are you that you can .................

- *I know I can’t*
- *I think I can’t*
- *I’m half and half sure*
- *I think I can*
- *I know I can*

How sure are you that you can

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>work out new words?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>understand each sentence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>correct any mistakes you make?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>put together the ideas in the story?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>say each word?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>remember what happens in the story as you read it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>read smoothly?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>remember words you have read lots of times already?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>make a picture in your mind as you read?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>tell me what the story is about when you have finished it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>answer questions about the story?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>read fast enough to keep the ideas in your mind?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scoring:
For faces left to right award points as follows:
Face 1 = 1 point
Face 2 = 2 points
Face 3 = 3 points
Face 4 = 4 points
Face 5 = 5 points

For each of the 12 items, add up the child’s responses and then divide by 1.

Assessment No 1.3

Adapted from SELF-EFFICACY SCALES
James W Chapman & William E Tunmer, Massey University. New Zealand

Administrator:
Explain to the child/children that they must tick only one box.
Read each item to the individual/group.
Maintain an even tone. Do not emphasize one response over the other.
Child then chooses a response and places a tick in the box they choose.
Please tick only one box.

1. If you come to a word you don’t know when you are reading would you
   try to work out what the word is?   wait for someone to tell you?

2. If you made a mistake in reading would you
   do nothing about it?   try to fix it up?

3. When you find words hard to read do you
   work them out?   give up on them?

4. When you read a sentence that
   go on reading   read it again
doesn't make sense do you
because it doesn't really matter?
to try to understand it better?

5. When you find a story you are reading hard to understand do you
not worry about it because you can't understand every story
try harder to understand it?

6. When you have trouble working out how to say words do you
find a way to get them right?
think you will get them wrong no matter what you do?

7. If you don't know what a word means do you
Read on to see if it helps you to understand?
Replace the word With another word to see if it makes sense?

Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work out</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do nothing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work them out</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Go on reading</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Not worry</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Right</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wait 0
Fix it 1
Give up 0
Read it again 1
Try harder 1
Wrong 0

Scoring
A score of 1 is awarded for each item. The total raw score for this assessment is 6.

Please Note:
Item 7 is not a given point score. The strategy that was used by each child is recorded.
This assessment requires children to reflect on what strategies they are using to help them understand text at a sentence level.

Ask child/children to turn over the page to blank side
Ask child/children not to say out loud what you are writing, but to write down yes or no whether or not they can read the sentence.

Write on the board

I can jump

Can you read this sentence?
If you can read the sentence, draw what it says.

Now write
The markings on the fawns coat looked like dappled sunlight.

Ask child/children not to say out loud what you are writing but to write down yes or no whether or not they can read the sentence.

If you answered yes, draw what it says and write down what helped you to work out what it means.

Now read the sentence to the child/children.
Ask do you understand this sentence, do you understand what this means?
Draw what you think it means.
Write down what you did in your head to try to work out what the sentence means?

If individually administered it is advisable to scribe for each child. In group situations the administrator should only record for children unable to scribe accurately for themselves.
Assessment No 1.5

Children in the experimental group completed one page of the booklet after each paraphrasing lesson. Students in the control also completed a page in their reading journal after the literacy session. The scoring for the assessments used a five point scale rating per item. Each item scores were totalled and then converted to a mean score. With the assessment 5, 1 point was awarded for each item that the student responded to accurately.
My Reading Journal

Name: ________________________

Year Level: ____________________

Date: _________________________

What did you do that helped you to understand the story today?
How good were you at reading today?

How hard was the reading activity today?

Which face shows how you feel about reading today?
Appendix 2:

Paraphrasing task: Group administration

John Munro

In this task we are going to be reading and writing sentences. This is not a spelling test. If you are not sure of how to spell a word, just write down how you think it is spelt. In this task it doesn’t matter if you write words incorrectly.

Look at the first sentence. I will read it and I want you to read it to yourself with me. Then I will try saying it another way. After that I will ask you to try.

Read the sentence. Then say I will try saying it another way. I will change as many words as I can but still say the same thing. This person who makes toys moved to a new town. Now you have a go at saying the sentence another way. Change as many words as you can. When you have thought of another way of saying it, write down your sentence in the space. Remember you don’t need to spell all the words correctly.

Now you have a go at the second sentence. Read it to yourself. Now have a go at saying it another way. Change as many words as you could. Write down your sentence. Remember you don’t have to spell all the words correctly. Ask some students to share their responses with the class and provide useful corrective feedback. Now listen to how I say it. It says “He wanted to find a place to live.” I could say “He needed to get a house to stay.” Write down what I have said in the space.

Now you have a go at the third sentence. Read it to yourself. Now have a go at saying it another way. Change as many words as you could. Write down your sentence. Remember you don’t have to spell all the words correctly. Ask some students to share their responses with the class and provide useful corrective feedback. Now listen to how I say it. It says “He needs to get to know the city.” I could say “He wants to find out where things are in the big town.” Write down what I have said in the space.

Tell the children that you may not be able to change every word in a sentence. Sometimes you will have to say some of the words that are in the starting sentence.

Now you have a go at the fourth sentence. Read it to yourself. Now have a go at saying it another way. Change as many words as you could. Write down your sentence. Remember you don’t have to spell all the words correctly. Ask some students to share their responses with the class and provide useful corrective feedback. Now listen to how I say it. It says “After he bought a map he looked for a bus.” I could say, “First he got himself a map. Then he searched for a bus stop.” Write down what I have said in the space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence read</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Your try</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A toy maker went to live in another city</td>
<td>This person who makes toys moved to a new town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He wanted to find a place to live.</td>
<td>He needed to get a house to stay.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He needs to get to know the city.</td>
<td>He wants to find out where things are in the town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After he bought a map he looked for a bus.</td>
<td>First he got himself a map. Then he searched for a bus stop.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduce the set of target sentences. Give the students the following instructions: Read each sentence to yourself. Tell yourself what it says. Then write another sentence in the space that says the same message.
Try to change as many words as you can in the sentence you read, but make sure it still says the same thing. Remember I am keen to know about the sentences you make. You will probably say different things from each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Sentence</th>
<th>Modified Sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The young man and his friend rode on the bike.</td>
<td>They rode together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They were enjoying themselves.</td>
<td>They were content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The birds were singing in the trees.</td>
<td>The sparrows chanted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The two friends chatted. They were not paying attention to anything.</td>
<td>They discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They were supposed to watch where they were going.</td>
<td>They kept watch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The track became narrow and twisted.</td>
<td>The path narrowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suddenly it began to slope down and the bike sped up.</td>
<td>The bike gained speed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in the park watched and gasped as it went faster and faster.</td>
<td>The crowd exclaimed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The two riders weren’t smiling and chatting any longer.</td>
<td>They focused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now they were gripping the bike as tightly as they could, showing fear on their faces.</td>
<td>They clutched tightly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in the park had stopped what they were doing and started to yell, “Stop” or “Be careful”.</td>
<td>The crowd urged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of a sudden the path goes around a sharp curve.</td>
<td>The path veers sharply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahead they see in the middle of the path, a huge stone.</td>
<td>Ahead they spot a giant stone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The closer they get to it, the more enormous it becomes.</td>
<td>As they approach, it becomes imposing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As they fly towards it, their hearts are beating louder and louder and they try to take avoidance action.</td>
<td>Their hearts race.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is loud thud, the front wheel crumples and the young couple is airborne, flying over the obstacle to the grass on the side of the path.</td>
<td>The collision is heard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Paraphrasing task: Group administration

#### Student work sheet

**Student name:** _____________________________  **Grade:** ____________  **Date:** __________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Your try</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A toy maker went to live in another city</td>
<td>This person who makes toys moved to a new town.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He wanted to find a place to live.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He needs to get to know the city.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After he bought a map he looked for a bus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentences</th>
<th>Your sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The young man and his friend rode on the bike.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. They were enjoying themselves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The birds were singing in the trees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The two friends chatted. They were not paying attention to anything.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. They were supposed to watch where they were going.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The track became narrow and twisted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Suddenly it began to slope down and the bike sped up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
People in the park watched and gasped as it went faster and faster.

The two riders weren’t smiling and chatting any longer.

Now they were gripping the bike as tightly as they could, showing fear on their faces.

People in the park had stopped what they were doing and started to yell “Stop” or “Be careful”.

All of a sudden the path goes around a sharp curve.

Ahead they see in the middle of the path, a huge stone.

The closer they get to it, the more enormous it becomes.

As they fly towards it, their hearts are beating louder and louder and they try to take avoidance action.

There is loud thud, the front wheel crumples and the young couple is airborne, flying over the obstacle to the grass on the side of the path.
Appendix 3

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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLOTP: Students will be working at the sentence level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format: Teaching group: Focus teaching of skills to teaching group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</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:
*Lets 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.

*Adapted from  John Munro Teaching a paraphrasing strategy  2006*
At the conclusion of lesson Review the Action:
Now lets 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.

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>

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 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>

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 student’s 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 Student Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</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 student's 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 student's 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>
</table>
| 5      | Text: Teaching Group: A Jaguar: A great Cat  
Read aloud each paragraph  
Paraphrase two sentences  
In pairs write a paraphrase of each sentence |
| 6      | Text: Teaching Group: A Jaguar: A great Cat  
Read aloud each paragraph  
Paraphrase two sentences  
Individual students write a paraphrase of each sentence |
| 7      | Text: Teaching Group: A Jaguar: A great Cat  
Read silently each paragraph  
Paraphrase two sentences  
In pairs students write a paraphrase of each sentence |

When paraphrasing sentences, students need to be reminded that it is not a summary. Students should paraphrase the sequence of events.

*Adapted from* John Munro *Teaching a paraphrasing strategy* 2006
## Appendix 4

### Table 1 Part A: All Student Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>Age in MONTHS</th>
<th>Teaching/Control Group</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>EMA</th>
<th>Learning Disability</th>
<th>Earlier Intervention</th>
<th>TO Raw PRE</th>
<th>TO Raw POS</th>
<th>TO POS T</th>
<th>TO PRE</th>
<th>TO pc POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>4D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 9</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 10</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 11</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 12</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1 Part B: All Student Data**