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## Appendix A

**Teacher participants’ professional experience in early childhood classrooms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Years as teacher</th>
<th>ECE training?</th>
<th>Years taught ECE classes (approx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jacqui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15 or more</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>15 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peta</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheryl</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15 or more</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>15 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suze</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>less than 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>more than 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toni</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15 or more</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>less than 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Jacqui, Maree, Penny and Toni are the four teachers whose data features in the structured narrative reporting.
Appendix B

Consent to use child data

FOR PARENTS / GUARDIANS TO SIGN ON BEHALF ON THEIR CHILDREN.

This form certifies that, I,
(Print your name as parent / guardian) _______________________________________________

have been fully informed about this project and I understand the meaning and demands of participation as a ‘focus child’.

I give permission for my child, ______________________________________________ (child’s name) to be a ‘focus child’ in this LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT conducted by Carmel Bochenek from the University of Notre Dame Australia, at __________ Primary School Busselton; for the years 2000-2001.

Upon signing this form, I agree to the use of my child’s research records for professional purposes. I understand that the project may be presented to audiences of teachers and other professionals. Although the project is scheduled for formal completion in 2001/2, the use of research data is not end-dated.

I also understand that ‘focus child’ data may include: (Please tick those you agree to.)

• Case study as a ‘focus’ child. ____

• Oral & written language sampling as needed. ____

• Access to school and specialist records, as needed. ____

• Confidential discussion with other personnel. ____

• Collection of school work samples. ____

• The trial of language support strategies. ____

• The use of audio / videotape of the child within professional presentations. ____

• The use of pre-existing professional records re this child. ____

• The use of the child’s records in professional reports, theses, publications, presentations and clinical work. Records will be coded for anonymity and presented confidentially at all times, without identifying data. ____

WITHDRAWAL OPTION.

I understand that at any time, I may choose to withdraw my consent for further involvement by my child. Use of existing research records for my child will be renegotiated at that time.

DATA ACCESS.

Original research data will remain as the personal and intellectual property of the researcher. Data will be stored with attention to maintaining confidentiality and limiting access to the researcher, supervising University staff and approved audiences (as above). These conditions will be maintained after formal completion of the project.

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION.

Project participants will be kept informed of the progress and outcomes of the LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT in three ways.

i) Via regular written summaries to the school community.

ii) During participant interaction with the researcher.

iii) Via direct contact with the researcher as necessary.

Your signature _____________________________ Date ___________

Researcher’s signature ______________________ Date ___________

With thanks, Carmel Bochenek.
Appendix C

Consent to use adult data

TEACHERS / EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS / PARENTS / GUARDIANS AS PARTICIPANTS.
This form certifies that, I, (Print your name as Teacher / Educational Assistant / Parent / Guardian)
___________________________________________________________________________
agree to be involved in the LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT conducted by Carmel Bochenek from the University of Notre Dame Australia, at _____________ Primary School Busselton, for the years 2000-2001.
Upon signing this form, I agree to the use of my research records for professional purposes.
I understand that the project will be described under various titles, to suit the audience and purpose of presentation. Although the project is scheduled for formal completion in 2001/2, the use of research data is not end-dated.

I understand that my involvement may relate to: (Please tick those you agree to.)

• Case studies of ‘focus’ children. ___

• Oral & written language sampling. ___

• School and specialist records, as needed. ___

• Discussion with other personnel. ___

• School work samples. ___

• The trial of language support strategies. ___

• The use of audio / videotape / photos of me for professional presentations. ___

• The use of specified pre-existing professional records. ___

• The use of research data in professional reports, theses, publications, presentations and clinical work. Records will be coded for anonymity and presented confidentially at all times, without intent to identify individual participants. ___

WITHDRAWAL OPTION.
I understand that at any time, I may choose to withdraw my consent for further involvement. Use of my existing research records will be renegotiated at that time.

DATA ACCESS.
Original research data will remain as the personal and intellectual property of the researcher. Data will be stored with attention to maintaining confidentiality and limiting access to the researcher, supervising University staff and approved audiences (as above). These conditions will be maintained after formal completion of the project.

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION.
Project participants will be kept informed of the progress and outcomes of the LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT in three ways.
iv) Via regular written summaries to the school community.
v) During participant interaction with the researcher.
vi) Via direct contact with the researcher as necessary.

Your signature _____________________________ Date ___________
Researcher’s signature ______________________ Date ___________

With thanks, Carmel Bochenek.
Appendix D

Example of the content and format of the Oral and Written Language Database
Term One - OWLD1

GENERAL INFORMATION.
- The 20 point database will be referred to as the Oral and Written Language Database or OWLD.
- It was compiled for each focus child during Term 1 (2000) of the Language Development Project.
- Please note the combination of classroom based descriptive data and formal assessments used. The Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals Preschool CELF-P (1992) was used to formally assess the oral language levels of each focus child this term.
- The OWLD will be used for programming the Language Development Project (LDP) during Term 2. As further strategies are tried and the database updated, this summary will be amended. Parents and teaching staff will receive another summary next term.
- Comments have been added to this summary to personalise the OWLD for this child.
- Areas for LDP planning are indicated with an *

PLEASE CONTACT ME IF YOU WISH TO DISCUSS THIS SUMMARY.

DATABASE
1. Child case history, completed by ...
   Significant information includes…
2. Speech sound samples (Phonology)
   Taken from classroom interactions and individual assessment sessions.
   Examples of this child’s speech sound patterns follow….
   These patterns seemed to be consistent / inconsistent / more frequent in sentences than words.
   Formal assessment is / is not recommended for Term 2.
3. Vocabulary (using and understanding words.)
   Noted during spontaneous conversation.
   Formally assessed with the Formulating Labels subtest of the CELF-P.
   Examples of items not named appropriately follow…
4. Comprehension of words, sentences, stories and directions (Semantics.)
   Observed in the classroom.
   Formally assessed with the Linguistic Concepts, Basic Concepts and Sentence Structure subtests of the CELF-P.
   Examples of items that this child misunderstood, follow…
5. Word building, grammatical changes to words in sentences (Morphology.)
   Noted during spontaneous conversation.
   Formally assessed with the Word Structure and Recalling Words in Sentences subtests of the CELF-P.
   Examples of errors made by this child:
6. Grammar & word order for sentences (Syntax.)
   Noted during spontaneous conversation.
   Formally assessed with the Recalling Words in Sentences subtest of the CELF-P.
   Examples of sentences used by this child:
7. Conversational skills eg. staying on topic, turn-taking, (Pragmatics / discourse.)
   Observed.
   Sampled.
8. Oral text retelling (Narrative.)
   Sampled with the Recalling Words in Sentences subtest of the CELF-P.
   Noted during classroom tasks.
   Sampled with oral and written language play.
9. Organizing and processing spoken information. (Auditory processing.)
   Observed during classroom tasks.
   Noted using the CELF Behavioural Observation Checklist.
   This child displayed signs of difficulty…
10. Awareness of sounds, words, sentences and longer text.
   (Phonological & Metalinguistic awareness.)
   Noted during classroom tasks.
   Sampled with oral and written language play.
   This child was noted to…
11. Task awareness / understanding what to do and reflecting on the steps involved.
   (Metacognition )
   Observed during classroom tasks.
   Probed during formal assessments.
12. Familiarity with books, writing conventions (Concepts of print.)
   Observed.
   Sampled.
13. Reading samples.
   Observing errors & strategies used in Years 1-2.
   Observing “role-play’ reading in K-P.
14. Writing samples.
   Discussed with Year 1s & 2s.
   Encouraged in K-P.
15. Spelling samples.
   From Portfolios (Years 1 & 2) and spontaneous samples. (K-2)
16. Use of punctuation and language genre (Print conventions.)
   From Portfolios in Years 1 & 2.
17. Editing of written work.
   Sampled during whole class sessions (Year 2).
   To be sampled further (Years 1 & 2).
18. How does this child use language to learn? (Language for learning.)
   Group observation.
   1-1 sampling.
19. Classroom participation.
   Anecdotal records related to concentration, attention, and participation.
   Observation of the amount of teacher direction required by this child.
20. Teacher / parent / specialist concerns:
   Interview data.
   Anecdotal records.
   Previous school / specialist reports, referral information.
   From Literacy Net class profiling (P-2) or whole class testing (Year 2.).
SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR THIS FOCUS CHILD IN THE LDP. (Condensed)
1. The main areas of concern have been indicated with an * above.
2. Other comments...
3. Dates and times for teacher feedback and planning sessions. C. Bochenek 1/00
Appendix E

Language Development Project. Term 2, 2000
Summary of sessions: Year 1 groups

1. **IN-CLASS SESSIONS. Explicit teaching/learning experiences included:**

1.1. **SOUND-WORD RELATIONS.**
- Clapping syllables to segment words into sound chunks eg. 1 ‘clap’ words eg. horse; 2 or more ‘clap’ words eg. don-key.
- Talking about new vocabulary eg. farm, zoo, pet topics. Identifying ‘tricky’ words, long words, small words inside bigger words eg. key in don-key, words that sound like other words eg. Troll-roll (from The Three Billy goats Gruff.)
- Showing how 1 sound can change word meaning eg. ‘mouse’ v’s ‘mice’.
- Using first sounds or the first syllable in words to remember them eg. ‘har _ _ for har-yes-ter.’
- Noticing and explaining rhyming words whenever possible eg. pig, wig, dig, jig.
- Working in groups to think of rhyming words. Real and nonsense rhyming words were accepted but we talked about whether each word was ‘real’ or not eg. pen, hen jen, ten. We talk about ‘hearing’ the rhyme at the end of the words and that the words may not LOOK the same but they ‘sound the same at the end.’
- Listening to words stretched out to guess the real word eg. G-o-l-d-i-l-o-c-k-s.
- Encouraging the children to stretch words out so that we can hear every sound. Some children can do this with short words but ‘chunk’ sounds together in longer words. Eg. an-i.-m-a-l / a-n-i.-m-a-l.
- I model words stretched into sounds for the children to identify and copy. Parents have been encouraged to do this to help children ‘hear’ the sounds they need to write.
- During writing, I tick each sound that the child has represented with a letter (or letters.) We say the words slowly to hear any extra sounds and add them in.
- We talk about letter choices (as in THRASS) or ‘rules’ if appropriate. The focus is on writing what we can hear and being aware of ‘look and say’ words at this stage.

1.2. **SPEECH SOUNDS.**
- All words are modelled correctly and discussed when speech errors occur. All the children in the group practise sound postures and sound contrasts in words. We talk about the target sound for the word and speech strategies such as slowing down, breaking the word into parts, looking at the letters to remember the speech sound etc.
- Particular speech sounds are rehearsed in words, explained and cued using mouth and hand cues. The most common speech sounds for attention in year one have been:
  - /s/ words: teeth closed like a gate, keep your tongue inside, letters s and z.
  - /r/ words: lips forward and curly for a long /rrr/, letter r (at the beginning of words).
  - /th/: poke your tongue out. Catch it with your teeth, letters ‘th’ together.
  - /f/: show your teeth on your bottom lip and blow softly, letters f, ff or ph.
  - /l/: tongue up for /l/, letter l.
  - /sh/: lips forward onto our finger, like the ‘quiet’ noise, letters ‘sh’ together.
  - /ch/: tongue forward quickly, like /t/ + /sh/. Letters ‘ch’ or ‘tch’.
- /j/: it sounds like /ch/ but feels ‘harder and louder’ in the mouth. Letters ‘j’ or ‘ge’
- Consonant blend words (have 2 or more consonants before the vowel, making them ‘tricky’ to say.) Some children need to say the sounds separately and slowly like, s.q.u.are, p.lease, t.r.actor, c.r.ocodile.
- Visual cues for speech sounds include: eg. pointing to my teeth out for /f/, showing the long sound /s/, moving my finger forward for /th/ between the teeth.
- I have written the sounds we need to change in words for the children to SEE as well as hear the differences. eg. /th/ for /f/ in thirsty.

1.3. LISTENING SKILLS.
- Listening for your name, for your turn.
- Listening with your eyes (looking at the speaker), your ears (noticing my voice), listening with your hands (keeping them still), listening with your mouth (lips closed.)
- Combining strategies to help the children ‘listen’ to clues. Eg. ‘It starts with a /b/, it’s something you can eat, it might feel soft or squishy… It’s /b/ for … banana.’
- The children are to listen to ALL the clues before guessing a word. They try to recall the clues to match their choice.
- Checking that children have understood tasks by asking them to ‘teach’ someone else.
- Modelling group listening skills eg. “Sam is speaking now. Miss ----- is asking us to listen now.” Asking some children to ‘show the others’ how we listen.
- Encouraging children to listen to and monitor each other’s speech eg. ‘Look for someone who is listening well, to have the next turn’ (in small group work.)
- ‘Check that everyone is listening before you start’ in whole class work such as news sharing. Commenting on appropriate listening behaviours.
- Being aware that children’s hearing can fluctuate and that classroom noise, activity levels and visual distractions can influence ‘attention’.
- Being aware that some children need to have instructions simplified, repeated, rephrased or presented slowly… to assist their understanding.
- Encouraging children to repeat information to others to ‘sort it out’ eg. ‘We have to think of what we would like to eat on bread.’
- I plan ‘listening breaks’ after demanding sessions because listening can be very tiring.

1.4. LANGUAGE PLANNING.
- Modelling and encouraging whole sentence use as appropriate eg. When answering questions… “I think it could be…”
- Using vocabulary choices to predict words in books eg. When talking about the Three Little Pigs… ‘Shall we say call him the Big Bad Wolf or the Wicked Wolf?’
- Comparing our own ideas with story language to make vocabulary and word order choices.
- Recalling whole sentences to notice the word order and pattern used. Eg. ‘The Big Bad Wolf always said: I’ll huff and I’ll puff and I’ll blow your house down.’
- Checking punctuation to decide how to ‘read’ stories together eg. ! tells me to use an excited voice, a “Wow!” voice. (I model alternative ways to say read sentences for the children to choose the ‘best’ one.)
• Eliciting correct grammar eg. Do we say “I buyed it, or I bought it?”
• Having a real purpose for using speech, language and listening to participate in group tasks eg. Let’s choose a different animal to add to the story…we’ve already got a dog, a cat, a pig, a duck …
• Using clues to help others guess who/what we are thinking about eg. I describe one farm animal from three pictured.
• Telling repetitive stories to encourage oral language role-play eg. “I’m going for a walk on the farm. First I’ll walk past the fence, over the bridge, through the gate…”
• We count the words in stories the children create orally, by looking and listening, eg. ‘I would like to have a pet turtle.’ I repeat the sentence, spacing the words for the children to ‘hear’ and putting one finger up for each word.
• Encouraging children to ‘use their words’ to ask for help, explain a problem, solve a problem etc.
• Sharing ideas as a small group before we write individual texts.
• Talking about similarities and differences between shared ideas eg. ‘We’ve all thought of something to ask the zookeeper. Joe’s asking about the pandas and Nicholas is asking about the snakes.’
• Talking about the children as ‘readers’, ‘writers’, ‘poets’ eg. “These year 1 poets are going to share the poems they’ve written.”

1.5. WRITTEN LANGUAGE.
• Guessing words to complete sentences when sharing familiar and unfamiliar books.
• Writing or finding words in books that the children have used in language planning.
• Reading together in small groups… to notice and discuss how others try words.
• Reading individually to rehearse strategies.
• Encouraging draft ‘writing’ as part of oral language games.
• LOOKING at letters, LISTENING to sounds, and clapping words we use.
• Modelling written tasks eg. letters, invitations, poems. Talking about the features of that language form.
• Writing, reading and explaining our ideas to each other. Sharing finished work with an audience.
• Beginning to give ‘audience comments’ to other readers so they know what is good about their work eg. ‘I liked the bit about Zug hugging the slug.’
• Modelling and discussing reading strategies eg. “I looked at the C, listened to the word camp-ing and thought: That sounds O.K. We went camping by the river.”
• Modelling and explaining the concepts of written language eg. sentence, word, letter, sound. Counting each of these features in shared text eg. “How many words are in the title: Fruit Salad?” “How many letters are in the title?” etc
• Using counters to model sounds within words eg. This word, ‘jumped’, has five sounds ie. j-u-m-p-ed. Encouraging the children to move a counter for each sound. They are better at doing this with me at the moment. Most of the children can separate all of the sounds in short words but ‘chunk’ sounds together in longer ones.
• Telling the children the sounds I can hear, that they have written eg. Sindrla. Saying extra sounds slowly and showing them the extra letters needed eg. Sindrela. Telling the children about letters we can’t hear & alternative letters for sounds eg. Cinderella.
Talking about words we ‘Look at and say’ eg. was; & words to sound out eg. w-i-th.
Discussing errors positively eg. Jolly Postman starts with ‘J’ but it does sound like ‘G’ in “Giant”. It’s great that you knew to change G into J.
Praising children who notice patterns in written models eg. ‘ow is like ou.’
Building a positive self-concept for each child as I talk to them eg. “You read… You wrote…You said…You helped me…You told me about…You listened to.”
Reminding children about correct pencil grip, letter formation and writing posture.

2. PARENT SESSIONS. An overview of the LDP was presented to K-2 parents of focus children in week 2 of term.
- A summary of Year 1 strategies was distributed in week 3.
- Year 1 parents of focus children have not had regular meetings during term 2 but have participated in class sessions and discussed teaching and learning strategies then.
- Other K-2 parent groups have met on a regular basis to discuss the LDP strategies, strengths and needs of individual children, and ideas for home follow-up.

3. OUTCOMES.
- The focus children are all participating enthusiastically in regular LDP sessions.
- Other children show interest in the LDP activities and participate as ‘visitors’.
- The children show awareness of LDP strategies, using them during our sessions.
- Parents have reported specific learning as demonstrated by their children eg. “how to make certain sounds, how to clap sounds in words.”
- Parent feedback suggests that it is more useful to participate in the classroom sessions than to just hear or read about the strategies used. Several parents have initiated discussion specific to individual children. This seems to be valuable.
- Parents in other groups seem to value parent-to-parent sharing also.
- I suggest that a Year 1 parent group be tried during term 3, starting on Tuesday 18/7/00 at 2.45pm, in the school Library.

The Year 1 Teachers and Teacher Assistants have supported the LDP throughout the term. They have discussed the activities as necessary and shared their observations about the children.
Room 14 have had small group and whole class sessions. Room 15 have continued with small group sessions.

FOR TERM 3:
- All Year 1 focus children will remain in the LDP for term 3. Additional focus children will join the program in both classes.
- Both Year 1 classes will try one ‘whole class’ session per week and one session of small group work with focus children. This is to enable the classroom teachers, EA’s and myself to work together on LDP strategies, where they apply to all the students. It will also facilitate joint planning, assessment and review as necessary.
• Parent participation in the classrooms is encouraged for term 3. At this stage, LDP times are:

(Timetable added).

• Outcomes and needs will be reviewed for term 4 planning.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION & SUPPORT FOR THE LDP.
I LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING TOGETHER DURING TERMS 3-4.

Please contact me if you wish to discuss the LDP or your child further. Carmel Bochenek (contact details given).
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Individual interview proforma for participant teachers
(initial & final interviews)

TEACHER: CODE:
SCHOOL: CODE:
CLASS YEAR LEVEL: CODE:
INTERVIEWER:
DATE OF INTERVIEW:
TIME BEGAN: TIME COMPLETED:
VENUE:
TAPE REFERENCE:
OTHERS PRESENT:
OTHER FACTORS:

PURPOSE OF INTERVIEW: tick the relevant description/s (re initial or final interview).
To explore the teacher’s understanding of children at ‘educational risk’, specifically:

i) The oral and written language strengths and needs of focus children, prior to the creation of
an OWLD for each child.

ii) The oral and written language strengths and needs of focus children, after sharing the OWLD
for each child with this teacher.

To explore the teacher’s language support programming after sharing the OWLD for each focus child.
Specifically:

iii) The SELECTION of oral and written language support strategies for focus children.

iv) The IMPLEMENTATION of oral and written language support strategies for focus children.

Other:

NUMBER OF FOCUS CHILDREN: CODE/S:
(See attached class list for information specific to individual children.)

EDUCATIONAL RISK

1. Thank-you for completing the details of focus children in your class.
   It’s important that I understand your view of ‘educational risk’. How do you explain ‘educational risk’?

2. Do you think this notion of ‘educational risk’ applies to each of the focus children? Why/why not?

3. What do you notice about each of the focus children in your classroom?

4. Tell me about anything that you’ve noticed each focus child do easily / well?

5. Tell me about current class activities that you believe focus children would have
difficulty completing?

6. Tell me about the educational outcomes you predict for each focus child for this year?

7. Tell me about factors that you think might hinder each focus child’s educational
progress this year?

8. How would you discuss each child’s current ‘progress’ with his/her parents?
9. Do you use specific strategies to strengthen each focus child’s oral or written language? Could you give details or examples?

10. Tell me about strategies you use with any focus child, that you believe are particularly effective in strengthening oral and written language?

11. Are there things that would help you to meet each focus child’s oral and / or written language needs?

12. Do you think any other people could support your language program for the focus child? WHO and HOW?

13. What would help the parents of each focus child to address that child’s oral and / or written language needs?

14. In what ways might Educational Assistants (EA) help to meet the oral and written language needs of focus children? Do you have any examples?

15. What information or assistance would your EA need to help her/him to meet the language needs of focus children?

16. What is your opinion of language support programs for children at ‘educational risk’? What is / isn’t useful?

END OF INITIAL INTERVIEW

THE ORAL AND WRITTEN LANGUAGE DATABASE (OWLD)
(End of Term One or early Term 2 discussion.)

17. We have discussed the assessment data that I have used to create the OWLD for the focus children. Do the ‘profiles’ of the children seem accurate to you?

18. How does each profile match your perception of that focus child?

19. Is there anything here that doesn’t match your perceptions of the focus children?

20. In what ways could this information help teachers / educational assistants / parents?

21. What ideas do you have for presenting this information to other teachers?

22. In what ways could this information enhance understanding of children’s language strengths and needs?

23. In what ways could this information assist the SELECTION of language support strategies for focus children?
24. In what ways could this information assist the IMPLEMENTATION of language support strategies for focus children?

25. To what extent could this information help teachers manage whole classes?

THE OWLD AND LANGUAGE SUPPORT PROGRAMMING
(These issues were discussed at various review & planning times during the year.)

26. I have used the OWLD to select / plan / suggest / implement language support strategies for focus children. Do you think such a database is NECESSARY as a basis for language support planning? Why or why not?

27. What do you think are the pros and cons of using a database such as the OWLD for language support programming?

28. Can you suggest alternative ways to program for children at ‘educational risk’?

29. In your experience, do you think ECE classroom teachers do program for each child’s language strengths and needs? Why or why not?

30. From your experience, how could other teachers be encouraged & supported to plan for each child’s language strengths and needs?

31. If teachers were to include personalised language goals in whole class programs, what would assist them to do so?

32. Having had the opportunity to use this OWLD, which features of it (if any) do you think could help teachers to plan outcomes focused language support programs?

33. Do you have any other comments about ways to improve language support programs for children at ‘educational risk’ in ECE?

34. Do you have any other general comments about the Language Development Program, so far?

Thank you for your time and interest. Your comments will be coded and written up anonymously.
Carmel Bochenek. 15/2/2000.
Appendix G

Example of OWLD1 completed for focus child CPOR

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT.  SCHOOL NAME
DATA GROUP: 1

CONFIDENTIAL

CHILD’S NAME: deleted    LDP CODE: CPOR
YEAR LEVEL:  P/P    TEACHER/S: TPS
Educational Assistant: EA
PARENT/S: Name of Mother & Father deleted

GENERAL INFORMATION.
▪ The 20 point Database will be referred to as the Oral and Written Language Database or OWLD.
▪ It was compiled for each focus child during term 1 (2000) of the Language Development Project
▪ Please note the combination of classroom based descriptive data and formal assessments used.
  The Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals Preschool-CELF-P (1992) was used to
  formally assess the oral language levels of each focus child this term.
▪ The OWLD will be used for programming the Language Development Project (LDP) during term
  2. As further strategies are tried and the database updated, this summary will be amended. Parents
  and teaching staff will receive another summary next term.
▪ Comments have been added to this summary to personalise the OWLD for this child.
▪ Areas for LDP planning are indicated with an *

PLEASE CONTACT ME IF YOU WISH TO DISCUSS THIS SUMMARY.

DATABASE

1. Child case history, completed by Father and Mother. *
  ▪ CPOR is in his second year of Pre-primary. He has a late birthday (7/12/94) and
    his 1999 teacher suggested that he was ‘struggling’ with his Pre-primary
    placement. Mother expressed some concerns about CPOR’s ability to hear and
    listen. She also noted his confusion about how to say some words.
  ▪ CPOR was assessed by an Occupational Therapist in Dec. ’99 and reported to
    have a mild delay with visual motor integration.

2. Speech sound samples (Phonology)
  ▪ Taken from classroom interactions and individual assessment sessions.
  ▪ Examples of this child’s speech sound patterns follow. Some n/m, d or f/th,
    d/t confusion; plano/piano, ‘a glow ball’ for ‘a globe’, ‘He’s coving
    (covering) a present’.
  ▪ These patterns suggest some difficulty with auditory / speech processing.

3. Vocabulary (using and understanding words.)
  ▪ During formal assessment (with the Formulating Labels subtest of the CELF-P)
    CPOR had some difficulty labeling pictures eg. He said jetty/bridge, knitting
    /sewing, party/parade.
  ▪ Later he asked “What does large mean?” and confused top/bottom. Mother has
    noted CPOR’s confusion with concept words such as “front” (door) at home.

4. Comprehension of words, sentences, stories and directions (Semantics.) *
  ▪ The Linguistic Concepts, Basic Concepts and Sentence Structure subtests of the
    CELF-P showed that CPOR misunderstood some standard instructions. He
requested clarification of test items on several occasions eg. ‘What did you say again?’

- Sometimes CPOR seemed unsure whether I had spoken or not. He watched me carefully during the assessments and needed prompts to help him focus on the language tasks.

5. Word building, grammatical changes to words in sentences (Morphology.) *

- Spontaneous conversation & formal assessment (with the Word Structure and Recalling Words in Sentences subtests of the CELF-P) provided examples of CPOR’s errors. Eg. “She’s bike…. Girl/girl’s.

6. Grammar & word order for sentences (Syntax.) *

- Spontaneous conversation & formal assessment provided examples of CPOR’s difficulty with sentence planning. eg. “Mum will said, the moving. If you have a big sleep the moving van will come. Her can move too. That she said, I just look like Mum with this”

7. Conversational skills eg. staying on topic, turn-taking, (Pragmatics / discourse.)

- CPOR was keen to introduce his topics but needed some prompts to stay “on topic” appropriately.

8. Oral text retelling (Narrative.)

- Sampled with the Recalling Words in Sentences subtest of the CELF-P. CPOR enjoyed the story-sharing task.
- He was keen to participate in story tasks. He told one about himself falling out of a window.

9. Organizing and processing spoken information. (Auditory processing.) *

- Observed during classroom tasks & using the CELF-P Behavioural Observation Checklist.
- CPOR displayed significant difficulty processing spoken language, especially in noise.
- Formal assessment of CPOR’s auditory processing is recommended.

10. Awareness of sounds, words, sentences and longer text. (Phonological & Metalinguistic awareness.) *

- Formal assessment of CPOR’s speech sound (phonological) processing is recommended.
- He did not demonstrate awareness of his speech/language errors today eg. Kim/ him.

11. Task awareness / understanding what to do and reflecting on the steps involved. (Metacognition )

- CPOR used facial expressions and questions to effectively clarify task expectations.

12. Familiarity with books, writing conventions (Concepts of print.)

- CPOR is reported to be more interested in books and writing activities this year.

DATABASE ITEMS 13-17 ARE NOT APPROPRIATE IN TERM 1.

13. Reading samples.
14. Writing samples.
15. Spelling samples.
16. Use of punctuation and language genre (Print conventions.)
17. Editing of written work.
18. How does this child use language to learn? (Language for learning.)

- CPOR is aware of his confusion with some language tasks and seeks help. He benefits from adult support to complete some class activities.
19. Classroom participation.
   • CPOR’s teacher noted his reduced participation in class discussion and that he needs some help to maintain concentration during mat sessions.

20. Teacher / parent / specialist concerns:
   • Interview data: Parents and teachers are aware of CPOR’s difficulties in Pre-primary during 1999.
   • CPOR has not had previous Speech – Language – Hearing assessments.
   • Literacy Net class profiling (P-2) prompted CPOR’s LDP inclusion.
   • CPOR’s parents and teachers support his inclusion in the LDP.

SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR THIS FOCUS CHILD IN THE LDP.
1. The main areas of concern have been indicated with an * above.
2. CPOR presented as a child who mouth breathes and may have fluctuating hearing levels. He seemed to concentrate more easily in a quiet v’s noisy classroom. An audiological assessment is recommended.
3. Although CPOR’s speech is usually clear enough to be understood, he shows signs of difficulty with auditory / speech processing. His sentence forms and grammatical patterns are “below the expected range for age”.
4. Despite seeming to enjoy the data collection sessions, CPOR had difficulty with some standard instructions and needed additional support. His language scores for comprehension & production tasks were “below the expected range for age.”
5. Further auditory/ speech processing assessment is planned during the LDP.
6. CPOR’s total language score was “below the average range for his age”. His significantly low score for ‘word structure’ also suggests he is “at risk for language-learning difficulties”.
7. My recommendation is that CPOR’s specific language needs are identified and supported through the LDP during 2000.
8. His LDP project time will focus on specific oral and written language strategies in the areas shown *.

Language strengths
• CPOR’s language strengths are:
  - His enjoyment of 1-1 language interaction eg. the story-sharing task.
  - His recent interest in books and writing activities.
  - His ability to talk about his own experiences. Eg. His story about falling out of a window.
  - His use of language to clarify meaning eg. “What did you say again?”

PLEASE NOTE:

This data is specific to CPOR.
He has been placed in language data group 1 for LDP planning purposes.
The next LDP parent meeting will be on Thurs afternoon 4/5/00.
Time and venue will be advised in the school newsletter.

Carmel Bochenek 4/00
AN OVERVIEW OF DATA COLLECTED FOR LDP FOCUS CHILDREN
(As attached to OWLD1 for all teachers and parents.)

Three data groups were identified according to children’s oral and written language characteristics and possible “educational risk”. All of the LDP focus children are considered to have some form of “specific speech-language impairment”.

GROUP 1. CHILDREN WITH GENERAL LANGUAGE WEAKNESS

Difficulty with language comprehension AND speech / language production. These children are “at educational risk” because language is the main tool of teaching and learning. If the learning tools aren’t ‘working well’ it’s difficult to progress with the job!

GROUP 2. CHILDREN WITH A SKEWED LANGUAGE PROFILE

These children have developed adequate language comprehension levels but have significant difficulties with speech/language production. Difficulty with language planning &/or phonological processing can impact on literacy outcomes. Therefore these children present with some “educational risk”.

GROUP 3. CHILDREN WITH LANGUAGE TEST SCORES “WITHIN THE RANGE FOR AGE”

These children demonstrated very specific features of oral or written language impairment. For example, data for one child showed early middle-ear problems, compromised listening development, significantly reduced speech clarity (probably due to phonological processing difficulty) and difficulty with early drawing / written language tasks. Although “bright”, this child has particular difficulty learning language.

Such children are “at educational risk” because their strengths and needs take sometime and expertise to identify. In Kindy and Pre-primary such children may be viewed as “developmentally immature” rather than “at educational risk of language-learning difficulty”. As they progress to years 1&2, such children are noticed as “strugglers” or those “failing to meet literacy benchmarks”. They can be easily “missed” because their strengths may disguise their needs. For example, they may exhibit specific difficulties with spelling rather than reading, and may not contribute confidently in whole group oral language tasks. These children often “pass” standardized language tests but their teachers express concerns about their classroom performance.

These children may have “learnt to talk” but may not use “talk to learn”. They may need additional explicit teaching in some, but not all speech / language areas and may need to be made aware of specific strategies for oral and written language tasks.

NOTE: Children in all data groups showed VERY SPECIFIC STRENGTHS / NEEDS in some of the 20 language areas sampled. Individual profiles will be considered when planning language outcomes. Teacher feedback and planning sessions will be scheduled as necessary.  

Carmel Bochenek 4/00
Appendix H

Example of OWLD2 completed for focus child CPOR

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT. SCHOOL NAME
ORAL LANGUAGE DATA GROUP: 1
AUDIOMETRIC DATA GROUP: 2.

CONFIDENTIAL

CHILD’S NAME: deleted LDP CODE: CPOR
YEAR LEVEL: P/P TEACHER/S: TPS
Educational Assistant: EA
PARENT/S: Name of Mother & Father deleted

GENERAL INFORMATION
This is a summary of the Oral and Written Language Database (OWLD2) collected during term 2. Additional data is based on: Classroom observation & interaction.
- Work samples and Portfolios (if applicable).
- Speech & language sampling.
- Parent, Teacher and Educational Assistant feedback.
- Parent meeting issues / phone contact.
- LDP sessions.
- Audiometric assessment.

It is the basis for Language Development Project (LDP) planning during term 3.

PLEASE CONTACT ME IF YOU WISH TO DISCUSS THIS SUMMARY.

DATABASE (LDP Information relates to 20 oral & written language areas.)
Samples have been updated for all children throughout the term.

*1. Early development /Child case history. Plus an Audiometric profile this term.
2. Speech sound samples (Phonology.)
*3. Vocabulary sample (use and understanding of words as labels.)
*4. Comprehension of words, sentences, stories and directions (Semantics.)
*5. Word building, grammatical changes in sentences (Morphology.) eg. fell not failed.
*6. Grammar & word order in sentences (Syntax.)
7. Conversational skills eg. staying on topic, turn-taking, (Pragmatics / discourse.)
8. Oral text creation and retelling (Narrative.)
*9. Organizing and processing spoken information. (Auditory processing.)
*10. Awareness of sounds, words, sentences and longer text.
   (Phonological & Metalinguistic awareness.)
*11. Task awareness, understanding / reflecting on the steps involved.
   (Metacognition.)
12. Familiarity with books, writing conventions (Concepts of print.)
13. Reading samples.
14. Writing samples.
15. Spelling samples.
16. Use of punctuation and language genre (Print conventions.)
17. Editing of written work.
18. The child’s use of language to learn (Asking questions, clarifying, looking &
listening for clues etc.)
19. Classroom participation. (Group and individual tasks.)
*20. Teacher / parent / specialist concerns.
Priority areas for LDP planning for this child, during term 2, are marked *.

TERM 2 UPDATE (OWLD2)

AUDIOMETRIC ASSESSMENT of CPOR between 1-6/6/00 involved three
procedures.
- OTOSCOPY – a visual examination of the ear and ear drum.
- TYMPANOMETRY – an objective measure of middle-ear function. The
tympanometer puts air against the eardrum to measure ear drum movement and
middle ear status.
- AUDIOMETRY – samples the child’s hearing in each ear, across a range of
sound frequencies required for speech. The aim is to record the softest sound that
the child can hear, at various frequencies, in each ear.

These results were combined to suggest the following:
i) CPOR’s hearing levels were within the normal range on 2/6/00 with one low
frequency result at the ‘borderline/normal level’ in the right ear.
ii) CPOR’s tympanometry results showed normal middle ear function in the right ear
and suggest ‘eustachian tube dysfunction’ (as occurs with colds and allergies) in the
left ear.
iii) CPOR usually attends well in the small group. He is aware of our listen
behaviours. He has difficulty “listening” during whole sessions.

SUMMARY COMMENTS FOR CPOR IN THE LDP

1. During term 2, CPOR’s LDP sessions have been integrated with the whole class
program. His parents have attended regular parent meetings.
Details of the Term 2 program content and outcomes were given 27/6/00.
Individually, CPOR has shown significant improvement in his:
- Use of some segmentation strategies eg. clapping syllables, identifying first
sounds.
- Identification of letters & sounds using alphabet picture cards eg. letter s, /s/ -sun.
- Awareness of speech sound positions eg. /th/ tongue out, d/t confusion has
reduced.
- Accurate word prediction, and rhyme awareness, during book sharing.
- Accurate reading of names and simple repetitive phrases eg. “CPOR likes…”
- Spontaneous role-play of reading & enjoyment of books.
- Confidence with written language tasks eg. writing his name, his picture
dictionary.

2. During Term 3, CPOR’s LDP sessions will include:
- Continued attention to syllables, rhyme and letter-sound identification,
- the use of letter forms as part of language games,
- self-monitoring of sentence comprehension & grammar in stories, questions etc.
- regular use of books and reading/writing ‘role play’.
The LDP program will be planned as an adjunct to the whole class program.

3. Additional recommendations include:
   - Continued parent contact. CPOR has responded very positively to home activities!
   - Making CPOR aware of his language strengths.

4. Further assessments recommended during the LDP are:
   - Phonological (speech sound) profiling (Vardi, 1991).
   - Phonological Abilities Test (Muter, Hulme & Snowling, 1997).
   - Test for Auditory Processing Disorders in Children-revised (SCAN.C) (Keith, 2000).
   - Others, as needed.

AN OVERVIEW OF AUDIOMETRIC DATA COLLECTED FOR LDP FOCUS CHILDREN

GROUP 1: Those with audiometric profiles of concern eg. hearing levels outside the expected range when sampled.

GROUP 2: Those with audiometric profiles that suggest hearing levels may fluctuate for this child.

GROUP 3: Those with audiometric profiles “within normal limits” when sampled.

PLEASE NOTE:
CPOR remains in oral language data group 1. He is in audiometric data group 2 for LDP planning purposes.

Please note that children with ‘normal hearing’ can be poor listeners and exhibit concentration and attention difficulties. Children with compromised hearing may have developed adequate listening and concentration strategies.

Audiometric assessment this term provided objective data related to each child’s level of ‘educational risk’ for classroom learning. The SCAN.C test (Term 3) determines how well children can ‘process’ or ‘use’ what they hear. All children are likely to display variation in their listening skills, attention and concentration; related to the conditions in which they are listening AND personal factors such as fatigue, interest and learning style. It is this combination of objective ‘hearing’ assessment and apparent ‘listening’ effectiveness that I am interested in for the LDP.

CONCLUSION:
Regardless of the data group (or level of ‘educational risk’) for each child, LDP data suggest that all of the focus children may require specific teaching strategies to match their individual learning strengths and needs. As well as supporting oral and written language development, the LDP aims to identify, rehearse, recommend and support strategies that encourage hearing and listening for learning. LDP data provide a rationale for language development programming. Data are used to match the strengths and needs of individual children to teaching strategies and planned learning outcomes. The LDP also aims to support teachers, EAs and parents involved. It is likely that ‘whole school’ outcomes will be identified during the project year.
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Appendix I

Example of OWLD3 completed for focus child CPOR

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT. SCHOOL NAME
CHILD DATA SUMMARY:OWLD3 TERM 3, 2000 25/9/00

CONFIDENTIAL

CHILD’S NAME: deleted  LDP CODE: CPOR
YEAR LEVEL:  P/P  TEACHER/S: TPS
Educational Assistant: EA
PARENT/S: Name of Mother & Father deleted

CHILD DATA SUMMARY. (PROJECT USE ONLY.)
ORAL LANGUAGE DATA GROUP:
AUDIOMETRIC DATA GROUP:
PHONOLOGICAL PROFILE GROUP:
PHONOLOGICAL ABILITIES DATA GROUP:
AUDITORY PROCESSING DATA GROUP:
WRITTEN LANGUAGE DATA GROUP:
CLASSROOM SAMPLES DATA GROUP:

GENERAL INFORMATION. (PARENTS AND TEACHERS.)

1. What this report tells you.
1.1. The term 3 teaching points from your child’s language development program.
1.2. The discussion points shared by parent groups relevant to your child’s year level.
1.3. Any recommendations / changes negotiated with your child’s teacher/s this term.

2. How to use this report.
2.1. Refer to the SUMMARY COMMENTS section to read about your child:
   ▪ improvements this term,
   ▪ recommendations for further language support (if required).
2.2. Keep this report as a summary of your child’s language status in 2000. It may be useful as a basis for discussion about your child with future teachers or specialist service providers.
2.3. Add your own notes about your child as you notice improvements /new concerns.

3. What to do if you need to discuss this report further.
Please contact Carmel Bochenek on (contact details given.)

PLEASE REFER TO THE ATTACHED DOCUMENTATION.
SUMMARY COMMENTS ABOUT CPOR

1. IMPROVEMENTS THIS TERM
CPOR has shown:
- Improved attention & concentration during small group tasks.
- Increased use of oral language to clarify tasks or discuss small group activities.
- Enjoyment of book based activities such as story prediction.
- Enthusiasm for word-sound activities eg. guessing pictures / words from clues.
- A keen interest in letters and sounds.
- Improved letter formation eg. letter ‘e’.
- Enjoyment / accuracy with rhyme, first sound and nonsense word activities.
- Accurate selection of the correct grammatical form if he is given a choice after making a mistake eg. “I goed to Perth”… (You goed, or you went, to Perth?)
- Awareness of meaning errors during group discussions and spontaneous correction of his peers.
- Eagerness to discuss details of discussions he may not be sure about. I encourage all of the children to use their oral language to learn in this way.
- Enjoyment of all small group language tasks.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER LANGUAGE SUPPORT.
CPOR may benefit from support to:
- Further encourage role-play reading and writing.
- Begin to associate letter forms with mouth postures and speech sounds eg. /th/.
- Continue to copy speech sounds (f/th) & grammatical forms modelled to him.
- Monitor his own listening / concentration / attention behaviours.
- Begin to monitor his own speech / language errors and attempt to correct these.
- Become aware of his speech and language strengths.

3. ASSESSMENTS completed during Term 3, 2000 included:
Phonological Profile (Vardi, 1991),
Literacy Net, Semester 1, Pre-primary (Education Department of Western Australia, 1999). The Literacy Plan developed as a result will be forwarded soon.
Regular speech-language sampling,
Written language sampling, and
The Phonological Abilities Test (Muter et a., 1997).

4. YOUR ADDITIONAL COMMENTS about CPOR are noted for discussion at your next parent interview.
Please contact me before then if necessary.
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Example of OWLD4 completed for focus child CPOR

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT. SCHOOL NAME
CHILD DATA SUMMARY:OWLD4 TERM 4, 2000 11/00

CONFIDENTIAL

CHILD’S NAME: deleted LDP CODE: CPOR
YEAR LEVEL: P/P TEACHER/S: TPS
Educational Assistant: EA
PARENT/S: Name of Mother & Father deleted

INITIAL DATA.
The following table simplifies the initial data gathered from formal assessment or sampling, for CYOR. For each main area of assessment the child’s level of educational risk is suggested. Please use this summary cautiously & discuss it with me or the classroom teacher as necessary.

DATA KEY:
1= high educational risk / overall weakness/ need for development in this area.
2= some educational risk / specific areas of need but specific strengths also.
3= low educational risk / “within the expected range for age”. Although very specific difficulties may have been identified, the overall result has not been significantly lowered.
4= no comment. (In some cases insufficient data were available to comment.)

NOTE: “1” suggests a higher priority for oral &/or written language management than “4”. A rating of 4 does not suggest a need for specific management in this area.

Table OWLD4.
SUMMARY OF EDUCATIONAL RISK / STRENGTHS & NEEDS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Risk</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory Process’g.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Aware.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit.Net Sem.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit.Net Sem.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In.class Sem.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In.class Sem.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Relatns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self concept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSIONS at mid-term4, 2000

1. CPOR has participated enthusiastically in the LDP, supported by his parents. They remain concerned about his need for language support services for classroom learning.

2. CPOR has shown significant improvement in his awareness of listening behaviours, his confident ‘play’ with words, letters and sounds, and his “role-play” reading and writing.

3. CPOR seems to benefit from small group work to frequently rehearse tasks, to receive confirmation that he is “right” and to address his confusions with word and sentence meanings, as they arise.

RECOMMENDATIONS for 2001

1. School based oral / written language support.
2. Close monitoring of classroom progress.
3. Specialist management of oral / written language development (at classroom teacher’s and parents’ discretion).
4. Language ‘focus’ child for 2001, especially re the monitoring of “meaning” from words, sentences, texts.
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Appendix K

The changing focus of action research cycles during the Language Development Project 2000

Ten teachers and the researcher

Teacher focus:
- Getting to know new students,
- Requesting diagnostic information,
- Planning practical support for students at risk,
- Shaping practical support for students at risk,
- Considering teacher change,
- Reflecting on co-construction,
- Research outcomes.

Action research cycle one
School Term 1
Oral & Written Language Data - OWLD

Action research cycle two
School Term 2
Planning & implementing changes to classroom practices

Action research cycle three
School Term 3
Further planning, action, observation & reflection

Action research cycle four
School Term 4
Participants' reflections & interpretations. Triangulation.

Researcher focus:
- Participant observation,
- Understanding teachers' personal constructs,
- Developing the OWLD1,
- Facilitating co-construction,
- Collating additional student data,
- Eliciting the teachers' voice,
- Identifying influential factors & processes in co-construction.

Research outcomes.
Appendix L

Presentations of this work in progress


Example of LDP planning: Year 1 listening tasks

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
YEAR 1 LISTENING PROGRAM OVERVIEW
TERM 3, 2000, as at 24/7/00.
CLASS: Room 14
TEACHER: T1P
TIMETABLE: Thursdays 8.50-9.30am.

LISTENING TASKS: WHOLE CLASS & SMALL GROUPS
1. GOALS
   - To build children’s awareness of the difference between hearing and listening.
   - To develop children’s awareness of the signs of ‘good listening’.
   - To encourage children to monitor their listening behaviour and improve it as necessary.
   - To direct children towards various types of listening behaviour. For example,
     General listening – choosing to focus on the speaker’s voice.
     Listening in noise – choosing to ignore background noise.
     Listening for a purpose – to find out the speaker’s intent.
     Listening for practice – to ‘get better’ at listening.
     Listening as part of group activities – to participate as expected.
   - To reinforce explicit listening behaviours.
   - To review listening achievements.
   - To reflect on WHAT, WHY, WHEN, WHERE & WHO we listen to.

2. OVERVIEW
   WEEK 2. WHAT IS LISTENING?
   Focus to the first 3 goals.
   Talking about ears (briefly).
   Looking for listeners… eyes, ears, hands, feet, tools, award points.
   Listening times & listening breaks.
   Good listeners in the whole group.
   Good listeners in small groups.

   WEEK 3. LISTENING PRACTICE.
   Various types of listening.
   Choosing to focus on the speaker… shared story telling.
   Listening in noise… ignoring distractions.
   Listening practice… clapping key words, listen and remember, listen and copy, listen and trick.
   Group listening teams… games for points and rewards.

   WEEK 4. REINFORCING & REVIEWING LISTENING BEHAVIOURS
   Class listening models, listening scouts, listening recorders, listening helpers.
   Self-evaluation… for portfolios. (Rubrics)
   Listening posters.
WEEK 5. EVALUATION
Who needs what next?
Self-evaluation.
Role-plays.
Classroom: ‘good listening signs’.

3. STUDENT OUTCOME STATEMENTS
Proposed outcomes: from SPEAKING & LISTENING SL1-SL4 pg 8-9 English SOS. Specifically: Listening level 1. Pg 11, English SOS.
- In the classroom, chn ‘respond to simple questions, instructions, stories & statements.’
- ‘…use strategies to improve communication… their body language demonstrates active listening.’
- ‘They listen to speakers and contribute comments or questions.’
Listening level 2. Pg 12, English SOS.
- ‘consider ways in which speaking and listening change according to the demands of the situation.’
- ‘…take into account the purposes for speaking and listening … observe conventions of taking turns, asking questions & showing respect…’
Listening level 3. Pg 13, English SOS.
- ‘… follow information presented in group discussions… or, with help, from an audio or video text on a familiar topic.’
Listening level 4. Pg. 14, English SOS.
- ‘…in small group discussion they listen and respond constructively’
- ‘…they monitor and respond to strategies used by speakers to influence audiences’ (Volume, stress, rate of speech, special effects etc.)

Carmel Bochenek and T1P, 7/00

EXAMPLE OF DETAILED PLANNING

WEEK 2. WHAT IS LISTENING?

1. Talk briefly about ears, hearing and listening.
   - Text: Clare Has an Ear Infection. (Optional).

2. Looking for listeners.
   - Highlight good listeners with highlight stickers, positive comments.
   - Describe why they are good listeners: eyes, ears, hands, feet, tools.
   - Decide on point system for the morning… reward for class or individuals?

3. Listening times and listening breaks.
   - Listening time: Pet Whispers (variation on Chinese Whispers). Try a sample of 6 good listeners using a short sentence about a pet. The class observe. Those who listen correctly earn points.
   - Try the whole class or small groups with 1 adult / group.
   - At the end of the game it’s talking time until the ‘LISTEN’ cue eg. a special word, sound, action or routine. What will we agree on today? eg. A pet name, noise or mime.
- Listening time again: a longer message or more children in the group.
- Those who speak have to sit out… like musical chairs.
- Listening grand final…. Who can get the message right every time? Points & highlight stickers.

4. **GOOD listeners in the whole group / small groups.**
   - Games to try…
     - Recognition of environmental sounds… All listen, teacher describes, chn guess.
     - Guess the sound…. 2-3 chn turn away, others make a sound, the chd who identifies the sound makes the next sound.
     - Guess the person… 1 child turns away… teacher points to children 1 at a time to say a simple phrase eg. ‘I have a pet turtle’. If the first child identifies the speaker, they swap roles.
     - Copy the rhythm… teacher models, children copy. Those making errors or noise are ‘out’… keep playing to find a listening champion.
     - Add to the list (a variation on Grandmother went to market). Each child says, “I have a pet ____”, the next child repeats that message, using the first child’s name and pet and then adds his/her own pet. The idea is to keep the list going until children forget what they heard. Keep playing to find a new listening champion.
     - Listen for a key word form a shared book eg. “Bertie” in the “Bertie the Bat story”. Every time that word is said, the children have to clap, put their hand up, flap their bat wings etc.

**CONVERSATIONS WITH MY PET. Transition to writing.**
- Writing idea… talk about listening to our pets talk.
- What would they say? What would we say?
- Work in groups to TAKE-TURNS to tell our stories briefly. Those ready to write begin, those needing ideas LISTEN to peer and adult models.
- Recall models, listen to the number of words, model the written text, focus group writing of a conversation with a pet.
- TIME to listen to each other’s work. Recall good listening.
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Appendix N

A visual representation of theory and context for this research,
Chapter 1

Teachers' beliefs about language development practices in early childhood classrooms:
Stimuli for research questions

---

Early childhood classrooms are complex research contexts:
- Developmentally appropriate curriculum,
- Integrated curriculum,
- Individual learning styles,
- Students' strengths & needs,
- Language-based educational risk,
- Assessment, teaching & learning,
- Teachers' strengths and needs.

Frameworks for teacher decision-making: theory & practice
- Personal construct theory,
- Social judgement theory,
- Naturalistic generalization,
- Teacher judgements,
- Specialist input,
- School-based change processes (CBTD, peer coaching etc.),
- Collaborative decision-making processes,
- Other.

---

Individual teachers...
theories, beliefs, experiences & practices?

Research Questions:

1. To what extent do teachers' personal constructs of language-based educational risk determine their pedagogy for students at risk?
2. Which influential factors shape early childhood teachers' thoughts and pedagogy for students at educational risk?
3. What are the implications of the co-construction of classroom language development plans for effecting transitions in teacher thought and pedagogy?
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