

HYPOTHESIS

Teaching synonyms develops a strong vocabulary, which supports the understanding of grammatical structure. These elements combined strengthen the oral language abilities of Year 1 children

ABSTRACT

Oral language is the foundation for all learning. I was interested to find out why, despite excellent classroom teaching, a significant number of our Year 1 students were still achieving low Record of Oral Language scores. Analysis of the data gathered on the ROL indicated difficulty with grammatical structures and auditory memory. I suggest that if children have grammatical structures in place they are better able to retain information. Therefore I hypothesise that teaching synonyms and developing a strong vocabulary will result in a greater understanding of grammatical structure. These elements combined will strengthen the oral language abilities of year 1 children.

This research project was based on the OXO model. This involved six Year 1 students. Three were in the test group and three were in the control group. The Test group consisted of two boys and one girl. The Control group consisted of two girls and one boy. There were 10 consecutive intervention sessions. The test administered at both pre and post test was the Renfrew Action Picture Test, 3rd Edition. The test was designed to fulfil the need for a standardised test that would stimulate children to give samples of spoken language that could be evaluated in terms of information given and grammatical structures used.

The findings of the study supported my hypothesis in that all the test children showed improvement in their word information and 2 of the 3 showed improvement in grammatical knowledge. The control group also recorded areas with some improvement and no change in others. I suggest that the implications for teaching are two fold. Firstly, the accurate and regular collection of data about the child's oral language capabilities. And secondly, that children speak and explicitly comprehend oral language as often as possible. I recommend small groupings of 3-4 children provide optimum conditions for oral language strategies.

Areas for further investigation would include applying the same hypothesis to ESL children.

INTRODUCTION

The broad topic / problem.

Oral language has long been considered the skill that underpins all literacy learning. It is a vital tool for thought. Children, as well as adults, almost naturally talk ideas through out loud, repeat thoughts back, argue different points of view, and make sense of new information. Oral language is a vital strategy when learning new information.

Lewis Carroll once said, we generally say what we mean and mean what we say. However, what we say and how we say it is not always clear. For example, children may know to add 'ed' to actions that have occurred in the past, consider 'goed' for 'went, but the English language is more complicated than simply adding 'ed' to convert to the past tense. Word order is important, as meaning is derived from the structure of a sentence. Consider who did what to whom in the following

'The doctor gave the mother her baby.'(The doctor's baby or the mother's baby)

Or the position of one word -

'Not all the girls were given a note.'

'All the girls were not given a note'

Word knowledge and an understanding of the structure of the English language are key components in literacy. Children with poor oral language skills are at a distinct disadvantage if they are not able to support their literacy development, as other students almost naturally seem to do. This is essence the problem I am tackling.

Often children have a framework in place that allows them to make sense of new words and build new meanings. They know to practice a new word, to link it to similar words, try it out and see if it makes sense to them and others around them. The skill of 'making sense' is important as it leads children to attempt to communicate their intended message, and if it doesn't work, they can take actions to try another way. It is similar when children receive information, a Reading Recovery teacher will ask their student, 'Does it make sense? Does it sound right? Does it look right?'

However, it is possible to make some sense of text with some basic understanding of grammatical structure and there is anecdotal evidence that some children can answer basic literal comprehension questions simply by decoding the print. Consider

'The zurg schlushed over the krig'

What did the zurg do? Etc

Meaning in this instance is non-existent.

If this shortcoming is not addressed in a systematic and consistent way, the discrepancies will lead to the child becoming increasingly frustrated and disengaged from not only literacy but also academic success in general.

RELATED RESEARCH

Research has consistently shown that oral language is a key area in literacy development. Children use strategies from learning oral language to help them make sense of environmental print. Paulson et al stated that

“Three major areas found to be critically important in the development of early and emerging literacy skills (Brauger, Lewis, Hagans, 1997; Lonigan et al., 1999; Snow et al., 1998; Whitehurst & Lonigan, 1998) 1) are a strong foundation in oral language skills, 2) an awareness of sound structure of language, and 3) much exposure and experience with print. A strong foundation in oral language skills develops as children gain an understanding of the structures and meaning of language,” pg 170.

Even though children come to school with good oral language skills, it is vitally important that they are further extended in this area. Schools must ensure that adequate assessments are made and teaching is directed at point of need. The Record of Oral Language in my opinion serves as a good screening tool to bring to the fore children who may be at risk in this area. In simple terms the test requires the child to repeat verbatim the sentences as dictated by the teacher. No credit is given if the sentence is not repeated accurately. From that point the teacher is able to analyse the errors. For instance, was the difficulty based on auditory memory? In this case the child may leave out chunks at a time. Or, did the child omit a clause because s/he had no understanding of the meaning of the sentence? If a word was substituted, did it make sense? Was correct tense maintained? Was meaning maintained? Once these areas are established, teaching can be directed. I suggest that if children have sound grammatical structures in place, then they are able to make sense of, visualise or understand the sentence they hear. They then are better able to retain, remember if you will the sentence. I propose that a strong vocabulary would enrich their word knowledge, further supporting their oral language.

In the article by Edwards et al the author writes that there is a growing body of research that

“...the claim that children acquire a phonological system based on generalisations over the lexicon predicts that children with larger lexicons should have more robustly generalised phonological systems. Their representations of familiar sub-lexical patterns can be more quickly accessed and more flexibly reapplied to less familiar but analogous patterns. Children with smaller vocabularies, conversely, will know fewer words that exemplify any particular sequence in a variety of larger contexts, as well as fewer words that exemplify the component segments in a variety of more or less similar sequences. Smaller vocabularies thus provide less support for abstracting knowledge about the acoustics and articulation of consonants and vowels away from the specific contexts in which they have been encountered.”

Of their research into children's phonological acquisition, Edwards et al. found that

"Our results support a particular view of the relationship between grammatical knowledge and processing skills in general. Knowledge of more word forms is associated with more robustly generalised knowledge of how to learn to hear and say new word forms. This is consistent with a view of grammar as an emergent property the history of interactions between the language user and the language events in the world. ...The more often a child has heard and said a word, the better the child knows the word. The child can fluently incorporate the word into unfamiliar prosodic structures in productions of novel sentences."

Gabrell in Exploring the Connection between Oral Language and Early Reading found

"The two semantic skills that were important for reading comprehension were oral definitions and word retrieval. The findings of this study are in line with previous research by Snow and her colleagues (Dickson & Snow, 1987; Snow, 1991; Snow, Cancino, Gonzalez, & Shriberg, 1989), indicating that decontextualized language skills, such as the ability to define words, are strongly correlated with children's reading and spelling achievement."

The authors went further to suggest

"While phonological awareness may be a significant factor in early reading development. Roth et al.'s (2002) study provides evidence that others variables, such as vocabulary knowledge and print awareness, are also important predictors of beginning reading for both word-level skills and text comprehension. We should not lose sight of the fact that other aspects of oral language may be equally important. Early literacy instruction should emphasise vocabulary development and print awareness, along with phonemic awareness."

So, if poor phonological knowledge restricts reading accuracy and poor oral language knowledge restricts comprehension, then it would follow that by improving vocabulary and phonological knowledge and understanding of grammatical structures will in turn improve oral language which in turn support other areas of literacy development. Children are better able to recall information if it makes sense to them or understand the vocabulary used. Meaning is maintained and built upon, supporting their efforts in other areas of literacy ie reading and writing. Consider the following: -

"The study permits a number of conclusions to be made concerning oral language ability in children with poor reading comprehension. Arguably, the most obvious index of a child's speech and language status is how fluent and accurate their speech production is. Similarly, the most obvious index of a child's reading ability is how accurate they are at reading words and texts. Children with obvious difficulties in these areas are likely to be known to specialist professionals and consequently, are likely to be referred to research studies investigating SLI or reading disorders. In contrast, children we define as poor

comprehenders have accurate and fluent speech, and moreover they also read accurately and fluently (Nation & Snowling, 1997; Stothard & Hulme, 1992). Their difficulties are seldom recognised in the classroom, and is only when tested that their underlying difficulties with oral language and reading comprehension are revealed.”

From Hidden Language Impairments in Children: Parallels Between Poor Reading Comprehension and Specific Language Impairment.

The implication of this is enormous as it suggests that children with poor oral language have limited understanding of grammatical structures, and are experiencing difficulties making meaning of text and recalling information. This impacts directly on their success in literacy and academic success in general. The investigation I intend to undertake will investigate the explicit teaching of synonyms to enhance vocabulary development. I also expect the intervention will have a direct impact on the understanding of grammatical structures.

METHOD

DESIGN:

The study uses a case study OXO design in which the improvements in oral language will demonstrate improved vocabulary and understanding of grammatical structure, resulting in overall improvements in recalling of information and meaning retained in speech.

PARTICIPANTS:

The participants are 6 Year 1 children who have low Record of Oral Language scores. The initial analysis of the errors revealed common problems. Children left out chunks out of the more complex sentences, as well as substituting words that made no sense within the sentences. Anecdotal information from their teachers reveals inconsistent phrasing when the children speak aloud, as well limited subject matter. This has made the children on occasion difficult to understand, and has left the children themselves with little to speak or write about

See Appendix 1 for child data

Children who scored less than 30 on the Record of Oral Language (It is an expectation of CLaSS-Children's Literacy Success Strategy- that Year 1 children score closer to 42), were considered for the case study. These children were not receiving any other intervention (i.e. Reading Recovery). There were no integration or ESL issues.

The Renfrew Action Picture Test, 3rd Edition was administered. The test was designed to fulfil the need for a standardised test that would stimulate children to give samples of spoken language that could be evaluated in terms of information given and grammatical structures used.

The test collected data in the following areas: -

- 1 words used to convey information ie nouns, verbs, prepositions
- 2 present, past and future tenses
- 3 irregular forms of plural and past tenses
- 4 simple and complex sentence structure
- 5 passive voice

The materials used included the ten action pictures, score sheet/book, and the tape recorder. The test was administered one on one, in a quiet location

Three children were selected to be in the test group, and three children were in the control group. The composition of the smaller groups ensured that one child in each group was quite verbose to facilitate discussion.

PROCEDURE:

The intervention I administered consisted of 10 sessions, duration of 20 – 30 minutes.

Each followed a similar format.

The lessons were designed so that they could easily become a teaching lesson in a focus group for the class teacher or are used as a learning centre activity with a classroom helper guiding the discussion/activity.

Materials used are easily accessible in all schools ie stimulus pictures, chalkboards, paper, textas, sentence strips, scissors, paste, whiteboard

Each session occurred during the literacy block at the school, and for the purposes of the research the children were taken out of the room and the session were conducted in a smaller, quieter workroom (this allowed me to accurately record their responses)

Pre testing occurred a week before the sessions began. The 10 sessions occurred over 10 consecutive days. Post test occurred immediately after on the 11th day. The Renfrew test was readministered as a post test.

Each lesson contained a stimulus (pictures, book) to generate vocabulary known and new.

Children were initially shown large, colourful stimulus pictures to generate ideas. These pictures were linked closely with the topic they were covering in class, in this instance, healthy foods. As vocabulary (nouns) was suggested it was written up for all to see. The teacher also suggested words. After the list was complete, the words were grouped according to any phonological features that existed. Other words were then generated through the use of analogy.

The children were then asked to choose one of the words discussed. They were asked to visualise it, and describe either what it was like or what they were doing with it.

Eg pie

“I have an apple pie.” “I am eating a meat pie at the footy”

They were asked to draw what they visualised and attempt to write a sentence about it This was always an oral activity first. The sentences were checked for meaning and alterations made “Does that sound right?” What about this...’

To further enhance the element of vocabulary development and grammatical structure, the sentences were cut up into individual words and synonyms were substituted.

At about the 4th session the stimulus became simpler, consisting more of black and white drawings, smaller more stylised pictures. This required a bit more interpreting on the part of the children and discussion to justify their statements. More vocabularies were generated, using more descriptive language

Each session included a game, which focussed on memory or vocabulary development eg “I went to market and I bought...” or 20 Questions etc

Data was collected at each session. Initially this required the teacher to transcribe as the children were speaking (a tape recorder is very useful at this stage!) but in the latter sessions the data consisted of the sentences the children wrote on strips. To manage the data, different coloured paper was used for each child. This collection is vital as it drives the teaching in subsequent sessions. I was looking for evidence of a growing vocabulary, comment on recognised phonological features, use of analogy, and the development of increasingly more complex sentences.

See Appendix 2 Teaching Unit for details

RESULTS

STUDENTS	PRE TEST		POST TEST	
	WORD INFO	GRAMMAR	WORD INFO	GRAMMAR
A-TEST	18	11	<i>18.5</i>	<u>12</u>
B-TEST	26	23	<i>28</i>	<u>18</u>
C-TEST	28	20	<i>35.5</i>	<u>22</u>
D-CONTROL	27.5	19	<i>29</i>	19
E-CONTROL	20.5	11	<i>22</i>	12
F-CONTROL	20	9	<i>17.5</i>	14

Italics-increase in results

N-Decrease

Observations of the group

The results of test group and control group were supportive of my hypothesis. Small changes were seen in both groups but the most significant occurred with a child in the test group. This is important as it suggests that good classroom practice is having an effect, but that focussed teaching brings about a marked improvement. It was a concern to see one child in each group achieve lower results than were achieved at pre test. The control child scoring lower in word and the test child in grammatical structure. However in this the groups were similar in that both groups showed some gain with one in each showing a lower score. Overall the improvements were greater in the test group. Further to this I need to make mention of the timing of the research. Even though the sessions were sequential, they did occur in the latter days of Term 1, which was plagued with shorter weeks and Easter holidays. However, both control and test children were exposed to similar conditions so the effect was the same for both. I would like to continue this strategy with other children during a less disjointed time frame (if that exists in schools!).

Observations of the individual students

Test Group

Student A

STUDENTS	PRE TEST		POST TEST	
	WORD INFO	GRAMMAR	WORD INFO	GRAMMAR
A-TEST	18	11	18.5	12
Mean for Age	33	26	33	26
Range for Age	31-36	23-29	31-36	36

This child showed the least amount of progress in the test group. He recorded a 1% improvement for word information and a 4% improvement on grammatical structure. This child still fell way below the mean for his age and is considerably outside the range for his age. His participation in the sessions was minimal and often he repeated information that had been articulated by other students. However, there was an improvement and I believe he would benefit from smaller group activities where he must contribute something. This child requires extensive oral language work to increase his vocabulary and understanding of grammatical structure. During the interventions this student appeared to struggle to articulate his thoughts, speaking mainly in short simple sentences or incomplete phrases. He requires the opportunity to 'think out loud' and be given the time to do so. In the sessions, the teacher is required to scaffold his learning, as he still requires the most support. This is best achieved in small group work

Student B

STUDENTS	PRE TEST		POST TEST	
	WORD INFO	GRAMMAR	WORD INFO	GRAMMAR
B-TEST	26	23	28	18
Mean for Age	34	28	34	28
Range for Age	31-37	25-30	31-37	25-30

This student contributed well at all the intervention sessions. He quickly grasped the intention of the activity, generated good vocabulary, recalled vocabulary and produced well-constructed sentences. However his results at post test were not indicative of his ability. This demonstrates the need to gain information from a variety of sources and I was pleased that I had collected data from each of the teaching sessions. As it is an expectation that conditions are the same for all participants I did not retest Student B.

But, in other circumstances I would have done so, particularly as the classroom teacher informed me on the test day that he was having 'a bad day'. Looking at his results he achieved a 6% increase in his word information, but an 18% drop in his grammatical structure understanding.

Given those results, I cannot rule out the possibility that this child is still having significant difficulty understanding grammatical structure. This child requires further work in orally constructing sentences. He will benefit from hearing his own efforts spoken out loud. He needs to focus on making clear meaning. Activities that require him to retell information would suit this purpose

Student C

STUDENTS	PRE TEST		POST TEST	
	WORD INFO	GRAMMAR	WORD INFO	GRAMMAR
C-TEST	28	20	35.5	22
Mean for Age	34	28	34	28
Range for Age	31-37	25-30	31-37	25-30

This student achieved good results in both areas. She achieved an 18% increase in her word information scores. This improvement placed her at above the Mean for her age.

She also achieved a 5% increase in her Grammar score, but still is 6 points below the mean for her age and 3 points outside the range for her age group. Her teacher has also reported anecdotal evidence to suggest that improvements are appearing in her classroom reading and writing activities. Through the intervention sessions this student displayed an increase in confidence and was able to self correct her efforts orally. This student requires monitoring to ensure that the new strategies she has developed continue to support her oral language development.

CONTROL GROUP

Student D

STUDENTS	PRE TEST		POST TEST	
	WORD INFO	GRAMMAR	WORD INFO	GRAMMAR
D-CONTROL	27.5	19	29	19
Mean for Age	31	24	31	24
Range for Age	29-35	21-27	29-35	21-27

This student recorded a 4% increase in word knowledge. She recorded no change in her grammar score. Results for word information placed just on the lower end of the range for her age group, but grammar fell below the mean and range for age.

Student E

STUDENTS	PRE TEST		POST TEST	
	WORD INFO	GRAMMAR	WORD INFO	GRAMMAR
E-CONTROL	20.5	11	22	12
Mean for Age	34	28	31	24
Range for Age	31-37	25-30	31-37	25-30

This student recorded a 5% increase in word information and 1-percent increase in grammar.

Both results fell below the mean and range for age.

Student F

STUDENTS	PRE TEST		POST TEST	
	WORD INFO	GRAMMAR	WORD INFO	GRAMMAR
F-CONTROL	20	9	<u>17.5</u>	14
Mean for Age*	31	24	33	26
Range for Age*	29-35	21-27	31-36	23-29

*Please note the child had a birthday and thus the mean and range for her age were adjusted

This student recorded an 11% drop in word info but a 16% increase in grammar. Both results fell well below the mean for her age and range for her age. For this student, more investigating is necessary. One explanation I can offer is that the child felt more at ease with me and with the test, and thus contributed more. However with the data I have I cannot rule out other influences. I am concerned with the significant drop in word information. Again, I suspect that she was familiar with the test and proceeded efficiently rather than with detail. This child was a candidate for repeating Prep last year, but was advanced to Year One with the cooperation of her previous Prep teacher taking her on in a Prep/1 combination. Security seems to play a big part in this child's success. From the data, I conclude that confidence is building and good classroom practice is having an effect

DISCUSSION

Overall, the results were better for the test group with twice as many children demonstrating improvements in both vocabulary and grammar information, compared with children in the control group. In percentage terms the gains were higher in the test group. My hypothesis that the development of a strong vocabulary leads to a better understanding of grammatical structures sits well here. One child recording a significant drop in an area requires further investigating before conclusions can be drawn about his results. It is possible that this child despite having made excellent contributions to the sessions still did not make significant connections with his learning experiences and understanding. Here is a child that, if you like, appears to have it all in place, and unless careful data collection is undertaken his true level of achievement would not be known.

Therefore, the notion of data driven teaching which is practiced in other areas of literacy needs to be more evident in the area of oral language.

As improvements were recorded in both, I will acknowledge the good classroom practice that occurs everyday. Since 2000 and the implementation of the CLaSS program, the teachers have had a consistent and uniform approach in collecting data in oral language with the Record of Oral Language. This has provided a starting point for teaching and a reference point to gauge improvements in a systematic way. For most children, the good classroom teaching that was delivered seemed sufficient however post test results showed that a significant number were not making headway. My data suggests that this intervention coupled with good classroom teaching, would maximise the development of oral language, which we accept underpins all literacy development

A key element of the intervention sessions was the opportunity for the children to articulate their thoughts and get immediate feedback from a member of the group who could provide support, clarification, correction, extension and affirmation. The implication is that explicit teaching must occur in oral language sessions for this to be achieved. The children were cued in to think about ways to help themselves control language better. Feedback was also a key strategy in the intervention. The children were told that they were learning new vocabulary and that they can talk better about their ideas. It is essential that who ever is in this role must provide an excellent model of oral language. The sessions themselves ran for about 30 minutes with writing accounting for 5 minutes at most, and a further 5 minutes was allowed for children to re-read, revise and share what they wrote. For the rest of the session the focus was on speaking and listening.

My findings therefore sit well with those of Paulson et al, who wrote

“Three major areas found to be critically important in the development of early and emerging literacy skills (Brauger, Lewis, Hagans, 1997; Lonigan et al., 1999; Snow et al., 1998; Whitehurst & Lonigan, 1998) 1) are a strong foundation in oral language skills, 2)

an awareness of sound structure of language, and 3) much exposure and experience with print. A strong foundation in oral language skills develops as children gain an understanding of the structures and meaning of language”

And Edwards et al

“Knowledge of more word forms is associated with more robustly generalised knowledge of how to learn to hear and say new word forms. This is consistent with a view of grammar as an emergent property the history of interactions between the language user and the language events in the world. ...The more often a child has heard and said a word, the better the child knows the word. The child can fluently incorporate the word into unfamiliar prosodic structures in productions of novel sentences.”

I would like to make comment on the size and composition of the groups. The groups were relatively small, 3 children in each, however I believe that this was an important part of the success of the strategy. One child in the test group took considerably longer to formulate ideas and express them. By having only a small number, time pressure was removed for the teacher ‘to get to everyone’ and there was no soft option for the child not to engage. Each group also contained a range of abilities in that there was a mixture of animated contributors as well as more reticent children. This allowed for more dynamic sessions, with someone always ready to make suggestions and to keep the discussion rolling along, as well as providing another model of oral language, peer support if you like.

The implications for teaching are clear. Oral language is no longer the Cinderella of literacy teaching. Long recognised as doing the hard work, oral language is getting the prominence it deserves. Teachers need to assess and plan for their oral language sessions as thoroughly as they would plan for a guided reading session. Clear foci need to be articulated and data collected for further analysis. The explicit teaching of synonyms to further develop a wide vocabulary is a valid strategy, as demonstrated by my data. During a structured oral language activity, a teacher or carefully chosen parent helper must support the children.

I believe an area that could be further investigated is how ESL learners acquire understanding of grammatical structure. ESL children may have excellent word banks and good grammatical understandings in their mother tongue. The issues that confront them are different from children for whom English is their first language. I believe that my hypothesis would apply to ESL children, ie-strong oral language emphasis, however the intervention would require modification. Another area that my results suggest would require further investigation is to examine why children do not retain information some of the ‘learning’ gained during the intervention sessions. Why is it that some children contribute well, provide well constructed, informative, creative sentences, but under test conditions or times when they are expected to work independently, they fail to retain the new knowledge. Is it that they are too reliant on the adult support? Is it that not enough of the teaching/intervention session was dedicated to reinforcing and converting this new knowledge to understandings?

REFERENCES/BIBLIOGRAPHY

Clay, M.M., Gill, M., Glynn, T., McNaughton, Salmon, K. (1983) *Record of Oral Language and Biks and Gutches*. Auckland, New Zealand: Heinemann Education

Edwards, J., Beckman, M.E., Munson, B.,(2004). The Interaction Between Vocabulary size and Phonotactic Probability Effects on Children's Production Accuracy and Fluency in Nonword Repetition. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*. Rockville: Apr 2004. Vol. 47, Iss 2 pg 421

Gambrell, L., (2004). Exploring the Connection Between Oral Language and Early Reading. *The Reading Teacher* Newark: Feb 2004. Vol 57, Iss. 5

Love,E., Reilly,S., (1997). *Time for Talking* Melbourne, Australia: Pearson Education

Nation, K., Clarke, P., Marshall, C., Durand, M., (2004). Hidden Language Impairments in Children: Parallels Between Poor Reading Comprehension and Specific Language Impairment? . *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*. Rockville: Feb 2004. Vol. 47, Iss 1 pg 199

Paulson, L., Kelly, K., Jepson. S., Van den Pol.R., Ashmore.R., Farrier. M., Guilfoyle.S., (2004) The Effects of an Early Reading Curriculum on Language and Literacy Development of Head Start Children. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*; Spring 2004; 18, 3; Academic Research Library pg 169

Language Disorder Program Teaching and Learning for Children with A Language Disorder Retrieved March 2005
<http://www.sofweb.vic.edu.au/wellbeing/pdf/LanguageDisorderProgram.pdf>

APPENDIX 1

STUDENT DATA

Student A

Year 1 male student aged 6yrs 4months at pre test. He has an older female sibling at the same school. Has been identified as at risk and will most likely be on the Reading Recovery program in the second half of the year. In grade prep he had a teacher aide work with him on a Cued Articulation Program and made limited progress. His pre test results for ClaSS indicate his is still experiencing difficulty with Letter Identification. He recorded a Record of Oral Language score of 14 (out of a possible score of 42)

Student B

Year 1 male student aged 6 years 8 months at pre test. Has a younger male sibling at Kindergarten. His teacher has provided anecdotal evidence that this child participates in class activities yet can be easily distracted and lose the focus of the activity. He recorded a Record of Oral Language score of 19 (out of a possible score of 42)

Student C

Year 1 female student aged 6 years 8 months at pre test. Has an older female sibling at the same school. Her teacher stated that she works well and gives the impression of a confident worker, yet work produced is not up to standard. She recorded a Record of Oral Language score of 22 (out of a possible score of 42)

Student D

Year 1 female student aged 5 years 10 months at pre test, is one of 5 children. She has an older teenage sister and is the oldest of 4 younger children. She recorded a Record of Oral Language score of 29 (out of a possible score of 42)

Student E

Year 1 male student aged 6 years 10 months at pre test. He is an only child and paternal grandmother has custody even though both parents are alive. This is the second school he has attended.

Student F

Year 1 female student aged 5 years 11 months at pre test. She is the youngest of 4 children and two of the older siblings are teenagers. The mother does not support the notion of home reading. She recorded a Record of Oral Language score of 27(out of a possible score of 42)

APPENDIX 2

TEACHING UNITS

SESSION 1

ACTIVITY/ TIME	DESCRIPTION	DATA COLLECTED
5 minutes STIMULUS	PICTURE CHAT Large colourful pictures/photographs of different foods Eg apple, doughnut, lollypop, pizza Vocabulary generated from picture written on white board	
10 minutes Synonyms	Synonyms generated from the vocabulary given Words grouped to any phonological features identified	
5-10 minutes Sentence Work	Children chose a word from the list. Visualise the word. Described in a sentence the picture they had in their mind. Ask “does that make sense?” “How else could we say that?” Draw the picture and attempted to write the sentence	<u>Student A</u> I like pizza I like lollypops. I am sitting in the BBQ area. <u>Student B</u> I like apples because the are nice and sweet. <u>Student C</u> I am eating a apple I am holding my apple.
5 minutes Memory Game	I went to Market and I bought...	<u>Student A</u> recalled 6 objects <u>Student B</u> recalled 16 <u>Student C</u> recalled 8

SESSION 2

ACTIVITY/ TIME	DESCRIPTION	DATA COLLECTED
5min STIMULUS SENTENCE WORK	Retell sentences from previous day	<u>Student A</u> I'm eating a orange and a apple <u>Student B</u> I'm eating a box of chocolates <u>Student C</u> My apple is standing in my hand. Say it so it makes sense I'm holding my apple.
5-10 min SYNONYMS	Introduce new picture Apple pie Words to describe Delicious	Other words like delicious Yummy, nice, good, beautiful
5-10 min SENTENCE WORK	Visualise the apple pie Describe it in a sentence the picture they had in their mind. Ask "does that make sense?" "How else could we say that?" Draw the picture and attempted to write the sentence	<u>Student A</u> I am holding a pie <u>Student B</u> I am eating my giant pie <u>Student C</u> I am eating my delicious pie
Memory Game	I went to market...	<u>Student A</u> struggled all through the game today. <u>Students B and C</u> Each remembered 16 items

SESSION 3

ACTIVITY/TIME	DESCRIPTION	DATA COLLECTED
5-10 min STIMULUS	FLASHCARDS Simple line drawings of fruit and vegetables Name them as quickly as possible	<u>Student A</u> did not name pumpkin, meat, strawberries <u>Student B</u> did not name peas and potato <u>Student C</u> did not name peas, potato and pear.
5 min SYNONYMS/Vocabulary	Look at the flashcards again, consider the different words we had for the same object	
5- 10 minutes SENTENCE WORK	Visualise the fruit or vegetable Describe it in a sentence the picture they had in their mind. Ask “does that make sense?” “How else could we say that?” Draw the picture and attempted to write the sentence	<u>Student A</u> I’m eating bread <u>Student B</u> I drink milk <u>Student C</u> I am eating fish
5-10 min	Put like pictures together	

SESSION 4

ACTIVITY/TIME	DESCRIPTION	DATA COLLECTED
<p>10-15min</p> <p>Different categories</p>	<p>Practice in word exploration and retrieval</p> <p>Categories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *toppings for a pizza *fruits *vegetables *milk products *party foods *breakfast foods *sweets *picnic foods *take away foods <p>Choose category. Roll dice. Have to think of that many words for the category chosen</p>	<p>All students contributed effectively in this activity</p> <p>Student A 1 cake 4 sandwich, weetbix, toast, juice</p> <p>Student B 3 McDonalds, KFC, Pizza 2 ham cheese</p> <p>Student C 5 potato, carrots, peas, beans, broccoli 6 apples, grapes, oranges, pineapple, kiwi, bananas</p>
<p>5-10 min</p> <p>Synonyms Sentence building</p>	<p>Breakfast Food</p> <p>Put one of the words in sentence. Substitute one of the words with a synonym. Ask “does that make sense?” “How else could we say that</p>	<p>Student A I eat my sandwich. Synonym I eat my roll</p> <p>Student B I ate this giant bit of toast. Synonym I ate this big bit of toast.</p> <p>Student C This is a spiky pancake. This is a spiky breakfast.</p>

SESSION 5

ACTIVITY / TIME	DESCRIPTION	DATA COLLECTED
<p>10 –15 min WORD CIRCLE Selecting words which are connected through meaning to a previous word Explain the association between words Understand the association made by others</p>	<p>Words on flashcards. Say the word, give an associated word</p>	<p><u>Student A</u> Soft/nice Ice cream /I love it Chips/ McDonalds Sandwich/ Dinner/eating <u>Student B</u> Cheese/biscuits Breakfast/toast Apple/fruit Tasty/nice Chocolate/cake <u>Student C</u> Knife/cut Lunch/toasted sandwich Pie/hot Smooth/milkshake Pizza/chicken</p>
<p>5- 10 minutes SENTENCE WORK</p>	<p>Visualise one of the words Describe it in a sentence the picture they had in their mind. Ask “does that make sense?” “How else could we say that?” Draw the picture and attempted to write the sentence</p>	<p><u>Student A</u> I like ice cream I love ice cream <u>Student B</u> I like apples. I love apples. My favourite fruit is apples. <u>Student C</u> I like pizza. Pizza is my favourite thing.</p>

SESSION 6

ACTIVITY /TIME	DESCRIPTION	DATA COLLECTED
<p>10 –15 min 20 questions Ask questions to successfully narrow semantic clue. See importance of using specific vocabulary. Apply knowledge gained to exclude or include a particular choice Teacher explicitly model how to ask questions which differentiate between pictures</p>	<p>Child selects picture from pile Model question. Is it a picture of fruit? Is it crunchy fruit? Does it grow on trees? Do you peel it before you eat it? Is it an apple? Continue until a negative response is given</p>	<p>Varied</p>
<p>5- 10 minutes SENTENCE WORK</p>	<p>Visualise one of the words Describe it in a sentence the picture they had in their mind. Ask “does that make sense?” “How else could we say that?” Draw the picture and attempted to write the sentence</p>	<p><u>Student A</u> I can peel a banana. <u>Student B</u> Kiwis are squishy <u>Student C</u> Apples grow on trees</p>

SESSION 7

ACTIVITY/TIME	DESCRIPTION	DATA
<p>10-15 min Different Categories Children respond in a complete sentence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Things which are pointy • Things which are curly • Things which are soft • Things which are shiny 	<p><u>Student A</u> Category- Things that have a switch Lights have switches. Kettles have switches <u>Student B</u> Things with handles Listed fire truck, kettle, door <u>Student C</u> Things with buttons Phrases- jumpers got buttons, toys got buttons</p>
<p>5- 10 minutes SENTENCE WORK</p>	<p>Visualise one of the words Describe it in a sentence the picture they had in their mind. Ask “does that make sense?” “How else could we say that?” Draw the picture and attempted to write the sentence</p>	<p><u>Student A</u> This light has a switch <u>Student B</u> A fire truck has handles. <u>Student C</u> My jumper has buttons</p>

SESSION 8

ACTIVITY/TIME	DESCRIPTION	DATA COLLECTED
<p>10-15 min SORT ME OUT</p>	<p>Word Link Using cards with pictures of everyday objects, the children need so sort according to criteria Eg Legs, no legs Inside /outside Children describe orally what they are doing and what attributes they know</p>	<p><u>Student A</u> This flower and this tree grow in the ground. <u>Student B</u> This glass and this bottle both hold water. <u>Student C</u> This doll and this ball are toys.</p>
<p>10 –15 min Synonyms/ Sentence</p>	<p>Using the sentences they have made, substitute with synonyms. Do they still make sense? What changes need to be made?</p>	<p><u>Student A</u> This plant grows in the ground. <u>Student B</u> This glass and this bottle both hold coke. <u>Student C</u> This bike and this bat are both toys.</p>

SESSION 9

ACTIVITY/TIME	DESCRIPTION	DATA COLLECTED
10-15 min Concept Match	Each child gets 6 cards Each child needs to discard one at a time if they can find a link with the previously discarded card. Eg That girl is playing tennis. You play tennis outside. You can play ball outside too.	Varied
10 –15 min Synonyms/ Sentence	Choose a picture. Write a sentence. Cut it up. Re-order the sentence. Substitute a synonym. Does it make sense? Say it aloud. What changes need to be made?	Varied

SESSION 10

ACTIVITY/TIME	DESCRIPTION	DATA COLLECTED
10 min Concept Match	As for Session 9	Varied
10 min Synonym /sentences Cloze activity	Choose a picture. Write a sentence. Cut it up. Re-order the sentence. Substitute a synonym. Does it make sense? Say it aloud. What changes need to be made? Using the sentences made, complete with suitable words.	Varied Student A required assistance. Students B and C manipulated the individual words to complete this activity, re-reading their efforts to ensure meaning was maintained

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.